

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SALVADORAN REFUGEES

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, because of the violence in El Salvador, thousands of Salvadorans are seeking refuge in the United States. The following article outlines the fate of many of these refugees in their attempts to lead a more secure and safe life in the United States. The article is from the March 2, 1981, New York Times.

The article follows:

U.S. RETURNS ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS WHO ARE FLEEING SALVADOR WAR

(By John M. Crewdson)

LOS ANGELES, March 1.—Refugees from the fighting in El Salvador are streaming into the United States in ever greater numbers, in many cases having sold all they own to finance the difficult, expensive and illegal journey from their Central American homeland. But they are being sent home again nearly as fast as they are captured, to what many of them fear may be mistreatment or death.

Lawyers working in behalf of the Salvadorans say that, in an effort to keep them from clogging the overloaded immigration system, the Immigration and Naturalization Service sometimes does not tell the refugees that they have the right to have a deportation hearing or to seek political asylum, or it intimidates them into foregoing these procedures.

One Mexican immigration official in Tijuana said last month that some of the Salvadorans apprehended in this country had simply been sent back across the border by American officers.

A spokesman for the United States immigration service, Verne Jervis, said that this practice would be illegal but denied that it was going on. Mr. Jervis said that while there "might be some violations" by local offices of the service, he was unaware of widespread trampling on the Salvadorans' rights.

In the fiscal year that ended in September, 11,792 Salvadorans were apprehended by the immigration service, up from 7,890 four years before. Border Patrol Agents estimate that for every illegal alien they catch, from two to five others manage to evade detection, which would place the number of new arrivals at 25,000 to 60,000 a year.

The Salvadorans are only one small group among the uncounted people entering the United States illegally south of the border. But they are the only ones for whom church groups and others are seeking a temporary haven in this country. Unlike the hundreds of thousands of Mexicans who commute here each year to work, the Salvadorans are driven not by poverty but by war, and for them the prospect of returning home holds far more anguish.

In January, alarmed by an unconfirmed report that some refugees sent home in De-

ember had been murdered by right-wing "death squads" shortly after they arrived in San Salvador on Christmas morning, 42 Salvadorans at the immigration service's detention facility in El Centro, Calif., 150 miles southeast of here, released a statement saying they had begun a hunger strike to underline their appeal for asylum from "the political situation which presently exists" in El Salvador.

The report of the Christmas murders, which has gained currency among Salvadoran exiles in this country, remains unconfirmed. But many of those knowledgeable about conditions in El Salvador say there is little doubt that some number of those sent home by the immigration service have been killed, as victims of random violence if not as specific targets of the left or right.

"It just stands to reason," said Millard Arnold, who was deputy assistant Secretary of state for human rights in the Carter Administration. "The odds are some of them are going to be killed."

Prof. Blase Bonpane, a sociologist and Latin American expert at California State University here, went further. "There is no doubt in my mind that somewhere between 5 and 10 percent of those who are returned are executed, because the Government had something on them, a member of a union or something," he said.

Some of the refugees, among them teachers and trade unionists, say their names have appeared on what purport to be "death lists" circulated by various right-wing "terror squads." But United States immigration officials say most of those they apprehend seem to be associated with no political faction. "They've seen the fighting," said one, "but they're generally uninvolved in it. They're just frightened."

Whatever their reasons for leaving, the identities of those who are caught once they arrive here are made known to the Salvadoran Government. Before they can be "repatriated," at a cost to the Federal Government of about \$300 apiece, officials of the immigration service said, the refugees are interviewed by the Salvadoran Consul General in Los Angeles to confirm their nationality. When they arrive home, according to Professor Bonpane, they are interviewed again and asked "to give some kind of explanation" for having left the country. He said he had seen films of such interviews, adding that "the level of abuse is frightening."

A spokesman for the United States Embassy in San Salvador said that he had heard many reports of mistreatment or killing of Salvadorans returned from the United States, but that he had no evidence that any of the reports were true. But Mr. Arnold said the State Department had repeatedly asked the embassy whether it could confirm or disprove the reports and was told, "No one really knows, the situation is so chaotic."

REPORTS OF PEOPLE MISSING OR DEAD

Among the Salvadorans in this country, it seems, almost everyone knows, or has heard of, someone who has been sent back and is now missing or dead. Mario Vasquez, a Los Angeles lawyer representing a 27-year-old Salvadoran mechanic who has been awaiting deportation at El Centro for 13 months,

said his client had received a letter from his mother reporting that two friends sent back to El Salvador a few weeks earlier had been killed.

Such reports are spread mainly through the mail and by word of mouth, but there are also occasional telephone calls from home. It was such a call to a refugee at El Centro, from someone who had been detained there whom he knew only as "Carlos," that provided the Salvadorans with their first account of the rumored Christmas massacre.

The rumor swept through the camp and was passed on to a reporter for El Diario, the Spanish-language newspaper in New York City, which published a brief account Jan. 4. It was later picked up by other Spanish-language newspapers, but none of the published reports contained any confirmation.

Documents of the Immigration and Naturalization Service made available to The New York Times showed that a group of 25 Salvadorans left here Dec. 24 aboard Western Airlines Flight 746, spent the night at the Mexico City airport and arrived in San Salvador on Christmas morning aboard a Costa Rican airliner. Twelve of the Salvadorans were returning under orders of deportation and the rest as "voluntary returnees."

BODIES ALONG THE ROAD

"Carlos," the man who telephoned El Centro with news of the incident, was said to have been among those aboard the plane who somehow escaped death, and the list of passengers includes three persons with that first name. The man reportedly said he had returned to the airport the morning after his arrival and had recognized the bodies of some of his fellow passengers lying along the road.

The immigration service rejected a request by The New York Times, made under the Freedom of Information Act, for the home addresses of those who returned on Christmas Day, saying it was concerned that any inquiries in El Salvador about their well-being might jeopardize their lives.

As is true of all illegal aliens, no one knows how many Salvadorans are living in the United States. Community services officials here estimate that there are 100,000 to 300,000 in the Los Angeles area alone, and there are also sizable Salvadoran communities in San Francisco and the District of Columbia.

The flow of refugees abated somewhat last summer, after the deaths from dehydration of 13 Salvadorans who had crossed the border into Arizona without sufficient water, a case that was widely reported in El Salvador. But immigration officials say the refugees are once again arriving at a rapid pace.

The route they follow leads through Guatemala and Mexico, which as a result are now confronted with illegal immigration problems of their own, and the journey is an expensive one. Rings that specialize in smuggling Salvadorans charge from \$1,000 to \$1,700 for passage to Los Angeles and \$500 more for a trip to the East Coast. Because they come with the intention of remaining here until the Salvadoran conflict

is resolved, many of the refugees sell their houses and personal possessions to pay their way. If they are captured and returned home, there is often nowhere for them to go.

Not many of the refugees appear to be applying for political asylum, which requires a showing that the applicant has a specific reason to fear that he will be harmed upon returning home, for example because of membership in a particular political group. The immigration service has no reliable figures, but some estimates place the total number of applicants as low as 400.

Even though there may be more who could meet the criteria for asylum, the great majority of the refugees are probably not qualified under a strict interpretation of the rules requiring a threat of political persecution. "They say they left because they don't want to take sides," said John Weis, an El Centro lawyer who has many refugees among his clients. "But they're caught in the middle, and they feel that they're in real danger."

STATUS OF TEMPORARY REFUGEE

United States law also provides, however, for giving temporary refuge to aliens unable to return home because of "civil war or catastrophic circumstances." Such status has been conferred at different times on citizens of Vietnam, Laos, Uganda and, most recently, on Nicaraguans after the fall of the Government of President Anastasio Somoza Debayle. Last fall, President Carter ordered the admission of more than 150,000 Cubans and Haitians who had landed in Florida in boats.

A coalition of Congressmen, religious organizations and other groups, among them the National Council of Churches, the United States Catholic Conference and the American Civil Liberties Union, has been urging the State Department to follow the same policy in admitting the Salvadoran refugees. In a letter to Secretary of State Edmund S. Muskie in January, the coalition quoted Phillip Sargisson, the Central American representative of the United Nations High Commission on Refugees, as having declared that "anyone who comes out of El Salvador today deserves refugee status."

When the Carter Administration left office, according to Millard Arnold, the former State Department official, it was "very, very close to working out a compromise" that would have allowed the Salvadorans to remain here temporarily, not through any official action but simply by not sending them home.

The plan was endorsed, he said, by the department's human rights bureau, after reports that more than 10,000 people of El Salvador's 4.5 million people had been killed there last year, a figure Mr. Arnold termed "an enormous number of deaths in a country that size." But he said that it was rejected by other State Department officials concerned that it might suggest that the United States, which had been pushing for a political settlement of the Salvadoran conflict, "did not have faith in the ability of the Salvadorans to resolve their own problems."

There were also concerns, he said, that such a policy might lead to a still greater influx of refugees, and that the arrangement would be "difficult to police" since it might be impossible to distinguish Salvadoran citizens from other Central and South Americans.

Of the nearly 12,000 Salvadorans arrested last year, only 2,378 were formally deported,

suggesting that a large number were returned through what the immigration service calls "voluntary departure," an agreement by an illegal alien to return home without demanding the deportation hearing, with its expensive and time-consuming appeals process, to which he is entitled. Without a large number of voluntary returns, immigration experts agree, the overloaded adjudication system would quickly collapse.

The immigration service is required to provide all those it arrests with a written notice of rights, including the right to free legal counsel. But lawyers working with the Salvadorans say they are convinced that the options are not being fully explained by immigration officials.

REASONS FOR RETURNING QUESTIONED

"I.N.S. would like people to return voluntarily without going through the system," said Mr. Weis, the El Centro lawyer. Another lawyer, William H. Steiner of Los Angeles, questioned why so many Salvadorans were agreeing to return home voluntarily "When they've risked their lives and spent their life savings to go 2,500 miles to get here."

"It's a safe assumption," he said, "that they were forced back."

Mr. Steiner said he had seen some voluntary departure agreements signed with an "X" by Salvadorans who could neither write nor read what they were signing. In "practically every case," Mr. Weis said, his clients withdrew their agreements to return home after being told of the available alternatives.

There are also accounts of instances in which the advice of rights has been followed by what Mr. Steiner termed "mental coercion." "They're told if they want a hearing or asylum they'll have to stay in jail, or that their relatives will be arrested," he said.

"You'll get an overzealous border guard who says, 'You either go back or we'll lock you away for the rest of your life,'" Mr. Arnold said. "So the poor fellow elects to go back."●

WELCOMES UMC YOUNG REPUBLICANS

HON. WENDELL BAILEY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. BAILEY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure to meet on March 24 with 18 young college Republicans from the University of Missouri at Columbia. These YR's were in Washington to attend the 1981 Young Republican Leadership Conference sponsored by the Young Republican National Federation and to participate directly in seminars and discussions ranging from practical politics to polling to foreign and economic policy.

I found these young men and women inordinately well informed, concerned, and involved citizens. Meetings such as I had with these college students confirm my optimism for the future of our Nation and highlight the quality of leadership which will guide our democracy into the 21st century.

As I am sure we will be hearing a lot more in the years to come from these student leaders, I am pleased to share their names with my colleagues:

Susan L. Hutchison, Terry L. Inman, Robert E. Riesmeyer, Jeanne L. Early, Sue L. Goller, Patricia M. Becker, Lisa K. Dale, Ken Long, Janet S. Placek, Jane M. Gilbert, Jeffrey D. Byrne, Bruce Singer, Penelope Nixon, David Barklage, Bryan L. Forbis, Josh Zahn, Gretchen Collins, and Doug Butler.●

FIRST CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL PHYSICIANS FOR THE PREVENTION OF NUCLEAR WAR

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the social, economic, and psychological consequences of a nuclear war as viewed by the First Congress of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. This is the last proceeding of the first congress which I will place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I believe that the physicians have been very perceptive in their conclusions regarding the psychological impact on individuals who live in the threatening context of a possible nuclear war. The desensitization and disbelief which individuals adapt in order to cope with the possibility of a nuclear war help explain why there is not greater fear of such an occurrence. I am hopeful that the efforts of the international physicians will bring greater awareness to the public of the awful consequences of a nuclear war.

The concluding remarks of the first congress remind us that a nuclear war is not inevitable and that rational men can find other means to settle differences. As the physicians note, war is a product of the mind which can be created and prevented by a selective use of the human functions of thought and action.

The material follows:

THE SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND PSYCHOLOGICAL COSTS OF THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE AS RELATED TO HEALTH NEEDS

PREFACE

The health of mankind is inseparably connected with social, economic, and psychological strengths. The greatest risk of the arms race to health is that it increases the likelihood of nuclear war. Even without such a war, precious human, social, medical, and economic resources are presently diverted unproductively to the nuclear arms race, and this diversion adversely affects health.

SOCIAL COSTS

Any social undertaking of the magnitude of the arms buildup is bound to affect social structure and social values, regardless of the bases on which that society is built. In par-

ticular, activities develop which generate further pressure for more arms and thus establish a dangerous cycle. Moreover, as the scale of effort increases relative to the size of the social institutions and strength of values around it, these become subverted and re-oriented to reflect the same unproductive and impoverishing priorities and values inherent in the building of arms.

ECONOMIC COSTS

Consideration of economic issues ranges beyond the special expertise of physicians. However, we believe that they cannot be completely ignored. The diversion of a major portion of the world's economic resources for armaments increases the likelihood of nuclear war that would result in death and disability for much of the world's population. This is the ultimate health cost of the arms race, and would devastate economic and social organization. The arms build-up weakens the application of existing knowledge, technology, and resources to the prevention and treatment of health problems that currently affect large numbers of the world's population. The arms race increasingly burdens much of the world's population who live in less developed countries. These countries can least afford to use their scarce resources for arms and will suffer grave health and social consequences in doing so. Of greatest importance is that use of economic resources for armaments diminishes development of knowledge, technology, and manpower that could address global ecological and overpopulation problems. The strains these problems place on the world's limited resources will result, if not resolved, in dire health consequences, and in themselves increase the likelihood of a nuclear war.

PSYCHOLOGICAL COSTS AND EFFECTS

As physicians we can speak about human psychological responses with confidence based on our professional knowledge and experience. Nuclear arms have created a new reality for humanity with profound and widespread psychological effects. The consequences of the use of nuclear weapons defy human comprehension because of the enormity of their destructiveness. This danger grows steadily more acute as nuclear weapons production continues. Studies indicate among other effects, that living in this threatening context is undermining confidence in the possibility of a meaningful personal future. Further studies are needed of the psychological impact of the nuclear arms race upon various groups both in societies which possess nuclear weapons as well as in those that do not.

Living with the possibility of imminent annihilation in a massive nuclear exchange creates an unprecedented threat to individual human beings. Not only does one have to deal with the possibility of one's own agony or sudden death, but one must also confront the potential destruction of all that one loves—humanity itself—forever.

We have identified several psychological mechanisms which can have short term adaptive value for the individual in protecting himself from such disturbing emotions as terror and guilt. At the same time these defense mechanisms increase the likelihood that nuclear war will actually occur by impairing realistic perspectives of those who possess nuclear arms. This prevents the development and use of measures that could take control of the arms race.

(1) Avoidance. The problem is regarded as too big to handle, too overwhelming, too technical. We leave it to others, to the lead-

ers and the experts, to solve. We become numbed and turn away.

(2) Drawing upon old ways of thinking. In the face of the terror evoked by an adversary we seek security as humanity has traditionally done through developing ever more dangerous weapons in increasing numbers, and from spurious notions of strength dominated by false concepts of winning and losing. Such thought patterns have become outmoded by the realities of nuclear weapons.

(3) Fear and impulsivity. The climate of terror created by the super power confrontation engenders a vicious cycle of fear and mistrust. Fear destroys the capacity for rational thinking and adaptive discrimination and promotes panic-driven, impulsive actions. Such actions provoke fear and similar panic responses in adversaries that further escalate the danger of conflict.

(4) Perceptual distortion. As a response to threat, regression to archaic thinking patterns occurs that divides the world into concepts of total goodness and total evil. An adversary comes to be perceived as an enemy that is completely evil, a process which impedes the discovery of areas of common purpose, and reduces the ability to deal realistically with actual threat or danger from this or other sources.

(5) Dehumanization. In order further to justify our hostility toward the adversary we deny to its leaders and people any human value or worthy motives. The distorted perception of human beings as inanimate objects tends to remove inhibitions against destroying them. The impersonality of graphs and pins on targets, or charts of megatonnage and throw weights (in fact the whole obscene jargon of the nuclear weapons race), destroys not only the appreciation of the humanity of an adversary, but one's own humanity as well.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

War is not an inevitable consequence of human nature. War is a result of interacting social, economic and political factors; it has been a social institution widely used over time to manage conflicts.

To argue that wars have always existed and that this social phenomenon cannot be eliminated ignores history, which has demonstrated a human capacity to change institutions and practices which are no longer useful or are socially destructive. Slavery, cannibalism, dueling, and human sacrifice are among the practices which the human race has recognized to be improper and has abandoned.

The genocidal nature of nuclear weapons has rendered nuclear war obsolete as a viable means for resolving conflict. Because inter-group tensions and conflicts are innate and thus inevitable, effective means for conducting and resolving conflict are indispensable. Human beings have developed and widely used such methods as avoidance/withdrawal, assertive non-violent behavior, unilateral initiative inviting reciprocity, competitive coexistence, negotiation, arbitration, and cooperation.

Rationality and foresight are unique human characteristics which have enabled individuals and groups to override primitive responses, to anticipate future consequences of behavior and, to choose courses of action which offer maximal ultimate benefit.

Wars begin in the mind, but the mind is also capable of preventing war. ●

RADIO FREE EUROPE'S POLISH LANGUAGE SERVICE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, I was privileged to hear the testimony of Mr. Zygmunt Michalowsky, Director of the Polish Service of Radio Free Europe, before the Subcommittee on International Operations. Mr. Michalowsky's words were eloquent and moving; he described the development of the present political events in Poland and the role of RFE in reporting the news of these events to the people of Poland.

Two-thirds or more of the adult population of Poland—approximately 16 million people—listen more or less regularly to Radio Free Europe and the rest know of the broadcasts by word of mouth, Mr. Michalowsky said. It is not always understood that RFE and Radio Liberty, its sister radio which broadcasts to the U.S.S.R., are actually surrogate radio stations of the countries they cover. They provide internal news to the populations of the Eastern Communist countries denied to them by their governments. News from and about Poland, as Mr. Michalowsky pointed out, comprises 65 percent of the content of the Polish Service of RFE.

To illustrate the effect of RFE's broadcasts to Poland, Mr. Michalowsky brought with him from Munich an issue of an unofficial publication, widely distributed in factories in southern Poland, entitled "The Bulletin of Lower Silesia." This publication was dated July 1980, when the strikes began to spread in Poland, and gave the daily schedule of RFE broadcasts. It contained the following introduction:

RFE is the only radio station carrying full information service concerning our country. Irrespective of whether we agree with RFE commentaries or not, the radio station is often the only source of information about all that is really going on here.

RFE reports local news, Mr. Michalowsky pointed out, fills in omissions in the official media and describes foreign reactions to Polish events. It has emphasized from the outset that negotiation rather than force is the way to solve labor and social conflicts and that "one must govern with the people and not against them." RFE also repeats innumerable "samisdat" publications which have made their way out of Poland.

Mr. Charles Ablard, Acting Chairman of the Board for International Broadcasting, which oversees RFE and RL, also testified on March 18. He paid homage to the Polish Service of RFE by quoting two Polish Commu-

nist Party officials. A spokesman for the central committee, according to Mr. Ablard, explained last December official efforts to relax domestic censorship, by saying:

We want the people of Poland to know not only from Radio Free Europe what is going on.

More recently, according to Mr. Ablard, a former member of the Polish Communist Party Politburo, Mr. Grudzien, former party chief of Katowice Province in southern Poland, disclosed publicly that he had first learned last summer of the outbreak of strikes elsewhere in Poland from RFE broadcasts.

Mr. Michalowsky and Mr. Ablard's examples of testimonials on the efficacy of Radio Free Europe were most instructive. Their testimony reinforced my belief that these radios—RFE and RL—are extremely powerful forces in the radio war which we are waging with the Soviet Union and its Communist allies. I think if you could have heard the testimony, you would have agreed. ●

THE UNITED STATES AND THE LAW OF THE SEA

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, we learned that the administration called for a full policy review of the U.S. position in the Conference on the Law of the Sea and that the administration abruptly dismissed several experts from the U.S. delegation's leadership. These two events occurred on the eve of the opening of the 10th session of the Conference that opened in New York at U.N. headquarters on March 10. Many of us had looked forward to this session of the Conference to resolve the few remaining issues in the text of the draft convention. That text consists of more than 300 articles and reflects substantial consensus among the 150 participating states.

Therefore, the effects of these abrupt changes in the U.S. Government's position in regard to the Conference have been of great concern to me and have had a severe impact upon the morale of the Conference.

Mr. Alan James, a retired U.S. Foreign Service officer and consultant to the Department on the Law of the Sea Conference has provided an excellent and thoughtful discussion of the impact of the changes in U.S. posture on the Conference in his March 25 article in *Newsday*, "Let's Get Up Steam for the Law of the Sea." I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and request that the full text of the article be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

LET'S GET UP STEAM FOR THE LAW OF THE SEA

(By Alan G. James)

When the 10th session of the 3rd United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea opened in New York March 9, delegates from more than 150 participating countries were jittery and despondent.

Last summer in Geneva the conferees—with the United States concurring—had agreed that the 10th session should see the conclusion of negotiations and the adoption of a convention on all the uses of ocean space. But delegates were stunned to learn from the press, on the eve of the session, that the United States would not agree to the adoption of a convention at the New York meeting, and that Ambassador George H. Aldrich, acting head of the U.S. delegation, and other professionals on the delegation had been dismissed by the Reagan administration.

Reactions of delegates ranged from concern that the United States intended to scuttle the longest, largest, most complex and possibly most important diplomatic negotiations in postwar history, to uncertainty about how far the Reagan administration would go in repudiating the bipartisan policies of four previous presidents who had committed the United States to achieving a widely acceptable comprehensive treaty on the Law of the Sea.

The abrupt and unexpected change in leadership of the U.S. delegation disturbed delegates deeply, because personal relationships are, arguably, more important at this conference than at other international negotiations. One factor that has facilitated progress has been the mutual trust and respect that the really influential delegates have developed for each other over many years.

During 3½ years as chief negotiator on seabed mining issues and as deputy to Ambassador Elliot Richardson, Aldrich earned the respect and admiration of the conference for being a tough, fair, and resourceful negotiator. Supporters and antagonists of U.S. positions alike were, therefore, chagrined to learn that he had been discharged, particularly at this late stage.

No one contests the prerogative of the new U.S. administration to review the bidding or to put a new man in charge of the delegation. But virtually all delegates—friends of the United States, and those who have been our toughest opponents—were appalled by the clumsiness and poor timing of the decisions.

Actually, the incoming administration had been put on notice last November that the 10th session would begin on March 9. Yet it allowed three months to pass before addressing either the substance of the negotiations or the major associated personnel question of who would succeed Richardson. A little more concern for coherent diplomatic procedure would have ensured that at least the most pressing decisions concerning our participation in these important international negotiations were taken deliberately and in good time.

There is no doubt that the administration sacked these officials despite their effectiveness because it felt they were closely identified with an international list (albeit hard-headed) approach to the law of the sea. It is also evident that the administration deemed them unable or undisciplined to execute its policies. All Americans should be disturbed by the assumption that a career public servant is incapable of executing the policies of the government because he worked closely with the outgoing administration, especially

in such a bipartisan matter as the Law of the Sea.

This assumption strikes at the heart of the concept of an apolitical professional service—a concept fundamental to good government. To react to pressure from special interests like the seabed mining lobby by firing officials whom it does not consider sufficiently responsive to its own interests sets an even more dangerous precedent.

At United Nations headquarters in New York, negotiations and meetings are taking place, but at dead slow speed. Delegates are waiting to learn what the United States is prepared to talk about. There seems to be a disposition on the part of the developing countries of the Group of 77 and other delegations to make the best use of the session under the circumstances. But the U.S. delegation is in a state of confusion and without clear guidance.

The text that delegates had hoped to put in final form in New York this spring is a long, complex document of more than 300 articles and eight annexes. Being a delicate balance of interlocking compromises that attempts to reconcile the divergent interests of coastal states, maritime states (those with substantial merchant and naval fleets) and landlocked states, the text is not, of course, a perfect document. But it goes a long way toward protecting vital U.S. interests.

It ensures right of unimpeded passage for U.S. warships and aircraft through straits (such as Gibraltar, Hormuz and Molucca), archipelagos and the 200-mile exclusive economic zones of coastal states. Our exclusive right to oil, natural gas and fish within 200 miles of our coasts is fully safeguarded. The agreed definition of the continental shelf ensures that we will have sovereignty over all mineral resources as far out as our continental shelf extends—which could be up to 500 miles.

Other provisions for protecting the marine environment (for example, our coastal waters), for the conduct of marine scientific research and for peaceful settlement of disputes arising out of the convention are, by any objective standard, to our net national advantage. The provisions of the draft convention offer a better prospect for a rule of law on the seas than has been known for centuries.

The most controversial part of the draft convention concerns the proposed regime of mining the deep seabed. There, at depths of 18,000 feet or more, lie nodules—potato-sized objects rich in the ores of nickel, cobalt, and manganese—in quantities sufficient for possibly centuries of consumption by U.S. industry.

The seabed mining system is a carefully crafted compromise between the two original extreme positions. The market-economy industrial countries, which would put up all the money for the mining, preferred maximum freedom from international control. The poorer Group of 77 wanted all mining to be conducted by an international body. The compromise is known as the "parallel system." Under it, private companies and an "enterprise," the operating arm of the proposed International Seabed Authority, would each be empowered to conduct mining in separate sites under the general regulation of the authority.

The original U.S. strategy had been to complete satisfactorily the negotiations on a number of key issues, agree to the adoption of a convention, then sign it and encourage others to do so, withholding ratification until a Preparatory Commission had fin-

ished its work on the rules, regulations and procedures of the International Seabed Authority and the United States could make a final judgment on the workability of the system. Meanwhile, it was hoped, the other provisions of the convention—navigation, resource exploitation rights, pollution prevention measures and the like—would ripen into customary international law, thus building precedents that would protect U.S. interests in the oceans, even if a treaty never came into force.

This sensible plan has been put in limbo by the U.S. decision to delay the negotiations. If this postponement is intended to permit a serious examination of the negotiations, however tardy, well and good. The conference can be put in motion again.

But there is an understandable fear at the conference and among U.S. law-of-the-sea experts that the review is simply a pretext of ultra-nationalists to scuttle the treaty. The Reagan Administration has promised that the review will be carried out in good faith and without preconceptions. We hope that it will also be expeditious. Let us also hope that those conducting it will take a broad approach, weighing the totality of U.S. interests in the oceans, unswayed by the pleadings of any special-interest groups.

Let us hope, too, that they will decide that the negotiations are worth pursuing and that a good-faith effort should be made to improve the seabed mining provisions while holding firm on the many other provisions that are so clearly in our interests. If further negotiations should prove that we cannot achieve a seabed mining regime that protects our economic interests and encourages investment, that is one thing. But the effort should be made. Going it alone is a prescription for trouble. For underdeveloped nations, which believe that the mineral resources of the deep seabed belong to all, might be angered by unilateral exploitation of them. In retaliation, they might take over U.S. assets.

The United States originally advocated a conference on the law of the sea to protect our vital national interests now and for a long time to come—not for idealistic notions about world government, but for calculated reasons of state. The political, economic and technological developments in the 1960s that led us to try to find ways to stop pollution and overfishing and remove threats to the freedom of movement of our military forces are as relevant today as then.

If realism and objectivity guide those conducting the U.S. policy review, the worst fears of delegates to the Law of the Sea Conference will have been proved groundless. Since U.S. national interests must always transcend lesser considerations, those of us who have been associated with the long effort to produce a charter for the seas, as well as those still so engaged, must do whatever we can to ensure a result that truly promotes U.S. national objectives on the oceans of the world.●

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND MORTGAGES

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I have filed three bills intended to put and keep homeownership within the reach of more families.

The first of the bills will make more money available for home mortgages. It will allow banks and thrift institutions to establish a new category of savings account. Money placed in these accounts may be invested solely in mortgages on owner-occupied houses. To attract savings, the interest on these accounts will be tax free.

The second bill will permit savings and loan associations to offer "reverse annuity mortgages." This is specifically intended to assist retired and widowed homeowners who now must sell their homes or obtain a conventional mortgage if they hope to gain access to the equity in their property. With a reverse annuity mortgage, the lending institution uses the value of the loan to obtain an annuity for the homeowner. The annuity will return a steady income, either for a fixed number of years or for life. The reverse mortgage would be paid off when the house is sold, either by the homeowner or by his estate.

The third bill provides a refundable tax credit to tenants for the portion of their rent that is paid in local property tax. This is an issue of basic fairness. Renters have been excluded from the property tax credit only because their tax is paid indirectly. Besides correcting a serious inequity in our tax laws, passage of this bill should assist renters in saving for the down payment on a house if they decide to buy. It will also diminish the tax incentives for condominium conversions which are driving so many tenants out of their present homes.

Owning a home was until recently a standard part of the American dream. Economic conditions have turned that dream into a nightmare for young and old alike. The program I have introduced today will help restore that dream without creating new expensive programs or bureaucracies.●

CONGRESSWOMEN'S CAUCUS LOOKS AT THE BUDGET CUTS

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, a number of individuals and organizations have requested information from the Congresswomen's Caucus on the impact of President Reagan's budget cuts on women.

The Women's Research and Education Institute (WREI) of the Congresswomen's Caucus has done such an analysis. I thought my colleagues would be interested in seeing how the budget cuts in AFDC, medicaid, food stamps, child nutrition, and fuel assistance will affect women.

PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT ON WOMEN OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSED BUDGET

INTRODUCTION

This paper provides highlights of an evaluation of the impact on women of the fiscal year 1982 budget revisions, most of which involve a reduction in budget outlays. (A more complete report will follow.) These revisions are designed to slow inflation, stimulate the economy, and promote private saving and investment. Strengthening national defense is another primary goal. Whether the objectives of the budget revisions will be realized is beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, it focuses on cuts in program areas that disproportionately affect women, especially older women.

Millions of women will be seriously affected by proposed cuts in the broad areas of (1) education, training, employment and social services; (2) health; (3) income security; and (4) the administration of justice. Poor, near-poor, and minority women and their children will be hardest hit. In fact, a disproportionate share of the budget reductions are directed at programs in which women have a heavy investment. Fully one-third of the \$44 billion reduction in budget outlays come from just two program areas—health and income security—that are largely designed to meet the needs of poor people. Women predominate among the poor; for every 100 men with incomes below the poverty level, there are 140 women. At the upper ages, the differences are more extreme: for every 100 poor older men (65 plus) there are 232 women.

Although some programs, largely defense, are targeted for increased expenditure, women will not experience any appreciable gains from those programs. Jobs may be created by increased outlays for defense; however, they are not likely to be jobs for which a significant number of women—particularly poor women—are now qualified.

Following is a program-by-program review of reductions that will disproportionately affect women.

It should be stressed that, in many cases, information on the impact of these cuts is seriously deficient. Neither the Administration, the Congressional Budget Office, appropriate government agencies nor groups affected by these cuts have been able to assess adequately the nature or the magnitude of the potential impact of some cuts. This weakness is especially apparent with respect to the minimum Social Security benefit. There are no available data on the characteristics of a large percentage of minimum beneficiaries, the income distribution of minimum beneficiaries, the contribution that the minimum benefit makes to financial well-being, or the number of persons who would be forced into poverty by its elimination.

Informed judgment about the appropriateness of other proposed cuts is impossible because of the lack of adequate information.

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC) (IN FUNCTION 600)

AFDC is a state-administered welfare program that provides cash benefits to needy families with dependent children. The maximum is determined by states, under federal guidelines. The Federal Government provides matching funds for benefits and administration.

Among the Administration proposals are the following:

Count the income of all household members in determining benefits;

Require states to establish "workfare" programs under which beneficiaries must work in return for AFDC payments;

Limit child-care expense deductions; standardize work-related expenses; reform earned income disregards;

Require states to determine AFDC benefits based on previous actual income.

Impact on women

Reductions in AFDC outlays will most definitely affect women. Over ninety percent (93%) of the AFDC recipients are women and their children. Over 80 percent of all single parent households are headed by women; one third of these households are in poverty. According to Administration estimates, 400,000 families would lose all AFDC benefits; 258,000 families would have their benefits reduced. (These families account for one-sixth of all AFDC families.) Not only will these families lose all, or part of their AFDC families, but many of them will lose Medicaid benefits, as well, because they live in states where eligibility for Medicaid is predicated on eligibility for cash assistance.

Comment: The vast majority of AFDC recipients have incomes lower than the current poverty level. Reducing AFDC benefits, as proposed, would reduce program expenditures; however, some savings would be offset by increase in the cost of other programs, namely food stamps and subsidized housing.

Through these changes, the Administration aims to determine welfare needs more accurately, reduce fraud and abuse, eliminate payments to higher income families, and improve incentives to work. The proposed reductions, however, will not necessarily accomplish these objectives without drastically affecting the well-being of many women and children.

Presumably, the persons forced off the AFDC rolls are to enter the workforce. It is worth noting that almost 40 percent of all poverty-level female headed families with no husbands present had some work experience in 1979. The large majority of these women (69%) were service workers, including private household workers, or clerical and sales workers.

The money that these women earned was obviously inadequate to support them and their families, or they would not be poor. It is unrealistic to expect that many women will be able to offset a loss of AFDC benefits by additional earnings. Some may be able to increase the number of hours worked, but the low-paying occupations in which most of them work offer little opportunity for economic advancement. Moreover, employment opportunities for non-working poverty-level female householders are typically slim. These women tend to have few job-related skills; should they be able to find employment, it will be largely in unskilled and low-paying occupations.

The "workfare" requirement will do little, if anything, to promote the private-sector employability of those AFDC recipients who lack education and skills. There is no evidence that work relief programs have facilitated a significant transfer to paid employment. Rather, this requirement is regarded by many as a punishment for receiving AFDC benefits.

MEDICAID (IN FUNCTION 550)

Medicaid, a joint federal and state program, is designed to provide medical assistance to low-income persons who cannot afford medical care. States must extend eli-

gibility to recipients of cash benefits from AFDC and SSI. In addition, they may provide Medicaid assistance to other groups. Eligibility criteria and services are state-determined; hence, there is wide variability among states in Medicaid programs.

The Administration proposes to place a cap on future increases in federal Medicaid outlays. Federal expenditures for 1981 would fall \$100 million below the current estimate for 1981. Expenditures would be increased by five percent in 1982 and thereafter adjusted according to cost-of-living increases. States would be permitted to change reimbursement levels and modify criteria for eligibility and the range of services.

Impact on women

The cap on federal Medicaid expenditures will shift much of the burden for medical care to states and localities. About half of the states now face deficits in Medicaid programs. Thus, there seems to be little doubt that states and cities will be forced to tighten eligibility requirements and cut back on services.

Women and their children will be hard hit by cuts in Medicaid. Older women may suffer greatly. In 1979—

61 percent of all Medicaid recipients—11 million people—were women;

34 percent of all Medicaid recipients were under age 15;

36 percent of all households covered by Medicaid were headed by a female with no spouse present. Another 19 percent were nonfamily households headed by a woman;

Females 65 and older comprise 6 percent of the total population, but 12 percent of the Medicaid population. About 2.1 million Medicaid recipients were older females;

Nursing home care is the largest single health liability for older persons (AARP/NRTA). If long-term care costs are cut, the impact on older women, who comprise the large majority of the nursing home population, may be especially severe. Medicaid covers about 60 percent of the daily expenditures for nursing home care. (About 40 percent of all Medicaid expenditures go for nursing home care.)

Comment: Low-income persons will still require medical care, even with a cut-back in services. Currently, the medical needs of the indigent are not being met, and the inadequacy of care will be greater if states are unable to compensate for reduced federal expenditures. Medicaid presently serves just 39 percent of the population living below the poverty level. Only 34 percent of all older females living in poverty are covered by Medicaid.

If states introduce more restrictive eligibility criteria, the working poor may be most affected. At the present time, only 21 percent of the population with incomes between 100 and 125 percent of the poverty level are covered by Medicaid. Many of these are the working poor. Should states decide to provide Medicaid services only to recipients of public assistance, persons in this income range could lose their Medicaid benefits. It is unlikely that they would be able to afford adequate medical care on their own.

The impact of the proposed Medicaid cuts should also be considered in the context of proposed cuts in AFDC, which are discussed elsewhere in this paper. It is women who will be most drastically affected by the double whammy of losing AFDC benefits and, as a result, also losing Medicaid benefits.

The long-term costs of Medicaid cuts do not appear to have been considered by the Administration. Future demands on medical services can be expected if indigent people do not receive prompt and preventive medical attention. Such costs may more than offset the Medicaid savings.

FOOD STAMPS (IN FUNCTION 600)

Food Stamps subsidize the food purchases of households that have a net income below the poverty level and assets of less than \$1500. The Administration proposes, among other changes, to lower the gross income eligibility to 130 percent of the poverty level, reduce food stamp allotments for those families whose children get free school lunches, and use monthly and retrospective accounting. Some 2 to 3 million people (400,000 to 600,000 families by CBO estimates) may be dropped from the food stamp rolls if these proposals are enacted.

Impact on women

Six out of 10 food stamp households are headed by women, many of whom are elderly. Women would thus be clearly affected by food stamp reductions. For example, households with school-aged children, 5 to 18—which would lose more in benefits than most other groups—account for over half of all recipient households, according to the latest census figures. These households are generally headed by females with no husband present.

CHILD NUTRITION (IN FUNCTION 600)

Child nutrition programs include the national school lunch programs, the breakfast program, the special milk program, child care and summer feeding programs, and special nutrition programs. The Administration proposes eliminating or substantially cutting most federal child nutrition programs.

Impact on women

As many as 700,000 women may be eliminated from Women, Infant and Child (WIC) programs that provide food packages to pregnant low-income women, infants and children. (100,000 women are currently on the waiting list for WIC programs.)

About 1.6 million children may be affected by the reductions in the national school lunch programs. (Another 360,000 would be affected by cuts in the breakfast program.) This cut may also have a disproportionately heavy impact on women. Households with a female head and no husband present comprise 26 percent of all households but 48 percent of all households with a free or reduced price school lunch. Reducing subsidies for school lunches will force an increase in school lunch prices. According to the National Urban Coalition, the working poor who qualify for reduced price lunches would have to pay 60 cents per lunch instead of 20 cents. Many households, especially those with several children, may not be able to afford this increase.

Comment: Reducing outlays for meal programs has short- and long-term consequences. In the short-run, there may be hungry and undernourished children. The consequences may be especially evident in the long run, when the costs of providing medical care to the inadequately nourished, particularly those dropped from WIC programs, become evident.

FUEL ASSISTANCE (IN FUNCTION 600)

The Administration proposes consolidating funding for energy assistance into a block grant and cutting the budget by 25 percent. This cut would reduce average fuel assistance benefits at a time when energy

costs are soaring. The full impact of these revisions depends largely on how states respond and may, therefore, vary significantly among the states.

The National Urban Coalition warns of an increase in the number of households with utility bills greater than their monthly income during heating months. The consequences of this development could be disastrous, especially among the elderly who risk hypothermia from the cold.

Impact on women

The Fuel Assistance Program was designed to help the poor meet their heating needs; because 58 percent of all households below the poverty level are headed by females with no spouse present, any reduction in fuel assistance could be expected to affect women disproportionately. How many fuel assistance recipients are women, however, is not known.●

TRIBUTE TO VERY REV. INNOCENT LOTOCKY

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the Very Reverend Innocent Lotocky, OSBM, whom Pope John Paul II has named bishop of the Ukrainian Rite Catholic Diocese of Chicago. Bishop Lotocky was consecrated on March 1, 1981, in Rome, Italy.

Bishop Lotocky was pastor of Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Mary Parish in Hamtramck, Mich., and local superior of the order of St. Basil the Great, OSBM, since 1962. He now serves from the diocese seat in Chicago; the Diocese of Chicago includes the State of Michigan and extends westward to the coast.

Bishop Lotocky was born November 3, 1915, in Ukraine. He studied for the priesthood at the Basilian Monastery in Krechov, Ukraine; at Krystynopol, Ukraine; and in Czechoslovakia, where he was ordained in 1940. He completed his doctoral dissertation in Vienna in 1945.

Since his arrival in the United States in 1946, Bishop Lotocky has served as: Master of novices, provincial superior of the American province, and as a parish pastor in New York and Chicago.

I know the American people, including the nearly 1 million Ukrainian Rite Catholics in the United States and the approximately 15,000 in the Detroit area, will join me in extending sincere congratulations and warmest wishes for well-being.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ECONOMICS WITHOUT HUMANITY EQUALS RETRENCHMENT

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I think I speak for a majority of Democrats when I say we are willing to accept the magnitude of the cuts recommended by President Reagan. The outstanding difficulty we have with his program, however, is that some of the cuts are immensely difficult to justify on the basis of cost effectiveness or basic social justice. We believe it is possible and appropriate to shape a budget which satisfies the test of cost-benefit analysis and which is consistent with the dictum of St. Matthew:

That you have done unto the least of these, my brother, you have done unto me.

The Reagan budget removes some of the inequitable subsidies from the Federal budget—attacking farm price supports, advocating highway, airport, and barge way user fees, and the like. We will all benefit from this shift in philosophy. Other cuts do not stand up well to even the most casual examinations. One example:

President Reagan seeks to cut the women, infants, and children's program which provides a pregnant, needy woman with \$395 per year of nutritional supplements. The alternative, of course, is spending \$500 per day for hospital monitoring of low birth weight babies, whose conditions are caused by mothers whose diets are inadequate.

Regrettably, the Reagan budget has singled out the poor and the most vulnerable in a variety of areas—low-income energy assistance, health care for the poor, the nutrition programs—where Government service represents both compassion by the Nation and a wise social investment in the future. These programs often represent the difference between an individual living on the margin, and his complete disappearance as a contributor to society.

The Reagan budget, once you get past the philosophical overlay, is a retrenchment on our commitment to those people. It is economics without humanity, cuts which will haunt us in the months and years to come.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most eloquent analyses of the Reagan budget appeared last Sunday in the New York Times. I urge the Members from both parties to read these thoughtful comments. We can find true fat in the budget without the massive retreat called for by the Reagan/Stockman doctrine. I hope we have the heart and decency to rearrange the priorities contained therein:

April 2, 1981

[From the New York Times, Mar. 29, 1981]

CHARITY

What has Ronald Reagan declared war on? If, as first appeared, the enemy is America's economic straits, then many of us, suspending neutrality or partisanship, are willing to enlist. But increasingly we're dogged by the suspicion that he also has another enemy in mind: the philosophy of social justice this country has evolved over the last 50 years.

"I don't think people are entitled to any services," says Budget Director Stockman. Martin Anderson, the President's chief domestic adviser, says, "People are quite benevolent. That's good. But it's quite a different thing for people to demand that they have a right to a certain amount of income or services." And elsewhere the Administration says that services chopped out of the Federal budget can be supplied by the states, or business or volunteers.

In other words, there is no such thing as social obligation. There is only charity—someone else's charity. If that is the Administration's philosophy, it deserves to be denounced.

First, some semantic business. Standing alone, the budgeteers' word "entitlements" certainly does sound arrogant. The poor are not constitutionally entitled to any services they deem necessary. But there are some things people should not have to beg for.

Food, for instance, or safe housing, or a lawyer when there's trouble. Would Mr. Stockman or Mr. Anderson deny a sick person access to a hospital emergency room? Surely not. Is that an entitlement to medical services? Call it what you will.

Americans are a generous people, exceedingly generous. Carl Bakal has written that our collective private philanthropy comes to about \$180 a day for each man, woman and child in the nation. In Canada, it's \$35. There is a vast role for private philanthropy; there may even be a case for enlarging it. Maybe, when Federal job programs are chopped back, industry could help pick up the slack. Maybe, when funding for legal services is eviscerated, private law firms could step in. Maybe. But two problems get in the way.

If this idea of charity, of supplanting Federal social justice with private voluntary action, is sincere, then why does the Administration not pursue it?

The genial host, corporate persuader and Great Communicator in the White House needs no lessons in stimulating the private sector. Has he invited the heads of the 100 biggest companies to the White House to encourage them to create a private job program large enough to offset his budget cuts? Has he assembled partners from large law firms and urged them to provide surrogate legal services?

No. Which raises the suspicion that his Administration is much less interested in proving theories than in abandoning social welfare altogether.

Even if the Administration now injected action into this theory of voluntarism, it would not suffice.

Deep down, society knows that. Consider jobs. Franklin Roosevelt wrote to a friend in 1934 that "I cannot say so out loud yet, but I hope to be able to substitute work for relief." In 1965, Lyndon Johnson and Henry Ford II launched their then-celebrated, soon-forgotten JOBS program. Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter all had similar ideas. One after another, under

the pressure of this merger or that retrenchment, they disappeared.

But assume that a voluntary jobs program could work. How much more can voluntarism do, generally? Federal spending constitutes three-fourths of the total spent for social welfare. Even if Mr. Reagan could mobilize every one of the 800,000-odd charitable institutions, he could not begin to replace Government's role in providing services that help people ranging from alcoholics to lactating mothers.

The Federal Government has undertaken so many services because society has learned that the states alone cannot combat hunger, that volunteers alone cannot provide minimal medical care. Society has turned to the Federal Government because it is the logical place to address such needs, through the organization of voluntary programs like VISTA, or the Foster Grandparent program that Mrs. Reagan has taken to heart.

That Washington is the logical place doesn't mean it is necessarily efficient, or effective, or even humane. But to say "no entitlements," or "let the states do it," or "let the private sector do it" is a barely varnished way of saying "Don't do it." And that is not a war against inflation. It is a war against the poor. ●

STEELHEAD TROUT PROTECTION ACT

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation designed to protect steelhead trout, one of the great game fish in the United States. Several States have traditionally recognized the tremendous game fish characteristics and recreational value of steelhead. These States currently ban the commercial harvest of steelhead trout and require that such fish be taken only with sport fishing equipment. Such a prohibition formerly was in effect in the Pacific Northwest. In 1974, *United States v. Washington*, the so-called Boldt decision, changed that. This decision made it possible for Indians to net between 45,000 to 55,000 steelhead commercially—thus denying sportsmen the right to sport fish for this exciting game fish.

I believe the Federal Government has an obligation to address this situation. Congress, in enacting the Black Bass Act, intended to assist the States in the enforcement of States statutes which prohibit the commercial taking of any species of game fish.

These Federal court decisions, allowing the commercial netting of steelhead trout by the tribes have had detrimental effects on sport fishing, on the economy of the affected States, and on the ability of those States to manage the species effectively and uniformly.

That is why I today am introducing the Steelhead Trout Protection Act.

This legislation allows a State to prohibit the commercial taking of steelhead both on and off Indian reservations, so that all fishermen are treated in a like manner. It also allows a State to enter into a written agreement with an Indian tribe to establish different regulations as to the taking of steelhead by tribal members on reservation land, thus giving the States the flexibility to allow Indian fishing for ceremonial and subsistence purposes.

The Indian tribes are given the authority to license sport fishermen who wish to fish for steelhead on the tribes' Indian trust land or in waters within the exterior boundary of the tribes' reservation. They also are given authority to enforce regulations on tribal lands. The tribes, however, would not be allowed to regulate the taking of steelhead in a manner inconsistent with State law.

This legislation is not intended to work a hardship on tribal fishermen. The rights of tribes to license and manage fees to sports fishermen on Indian lands may well be more valuable to the tribes than the current commercial fishery for steelhead.

The U.S. Court of Claims has been given exclusive jurisdiction to hear any cases based on any alleged taking of Indian treaty rights. Any such claim resulting from this legislation may be filed by an affected Indian treaty tribe. In considering the value of such a claim for compensation, the Court of Claims shall reduce the value of any commercial fishery by the new right to license sports fishermen.

I believe the tradeoff for tribes will adequately compensate them. This legislation is fair, and is designed to protect one of our great natural fish resources.

I hope my colleagues will join me in this effort. ●

THE SUFFERING REFUGEES

HON. MIKE LOWRY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I joined a number of my colleagues in addressing the problem of violence in El Salvador. Today, I would like to say a few words about some of the victims of the violence. Much has been said about the more than 10,000 deaths in El Salvador in 1980. That figure is, indeed, shocking and tragic. It is shocking and tragic that every day more people are killed—that the war has not stopped even if we do not read about it as often as we used to.

Regrettably, there are thousands more victims of the violence in El Salvador. These men, women, and chil-

dren—young and old—live with the memories of their lost family members and of their former ways of life. Reports of 80,000 to 110,000 within El Salvador are heard. In addition, some 300,000 Salvadorans have fled to Honduras in the past 2 years. These people tell of villages being burned, people being tortured, homes destroyed, family members being hunted. The number of people involved and the conditions upon which they are forced to exist wrenches the hearts of all of us.

Assessing guilt is not my aim here. Often drawing attention to a problem in a graphic way can serve as a catalyst for change. Surely, our sending military arms and advisers is not improving the plight of these people—nor is it drawing them any closer to a resumption of their former lives.

This tragic situation is addressed in the following article from the April 1981, *World Press Review* which I would like to add to my comments.

THE SUFFERING REFUGEES—A WAR'S FORGOTTEN VICTIMS

(By Luiz Fernando Emediato)

Dulce Nombre de Maria may never forget the scene of her father's death: his chest torn open, the blood flowing, and her mother screaming. Dulce Nombre de Maria (Sweet Name of Mary) is barely five years old, but she might as well have lived a century in hell. At a wretched refugee center in San Salvador operated by the Roman Catholic Church, she doesn't react when one of the 500 other children calls her over to play. Dulce's mother, in the strong voice of a woman hardened by suffering, recalls how her husband was tortured for hours before he died.

These are innocent victims of war—wives, young children, and aged parents of guerrillas. Some of them are peasants chased off their lands. After roaming the countryside, fleeing war and death, they have found the weak protection of the Church. Because El Salvador is not officially at war these destitute people are not eligible for aid from international institutions such as the United Nations.

Diplomats estimate that there are 100,000 to 110,000 war refugees in El Salvador. The Government puts the number at 80,000, about half of whom are being helped by the Red Cross. The rest are either under the protection of the Church or still wandering. In the past two years 300,000 Salvadorans have fled to Honduras. But the most persecuted group—some 4,000 who are linked, related, or sympathetic to the guerrillas—are still in San Salvador, under protection of the Ecumenical Salvadoran Association for Humanitarian Service and Aid, a Church agency.

Theirs is the country's major refugee center, located in the San José de la Montana seminary, until recently the seat of the Archdiocese of San Salvador. Now the Apostolic Administrator, Don Arturo Rivera y Damas, has moved elsewhere, causing fear among the refugees because the bishop's presence had assured them a degree of protection. Every morning and afternoon Government agents or right-wing commandos appear at the gates to see if they recognize any of the new arrivals.

The first group of refugees came to the seminary in March 1980. They were welcomed by Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero, who was assassinated seventeen days later. He is venerated as a saint, and his tomb in the cathedral is covered with notes thanking him for miraculous cures and divine favors. The number of refugees at the seminary began to grow after Msgr. Romero's death and has continued to swell in direct proportion to repression by the Armed Forces and the paramilitary groups, principally in rural areas.

Some twenty babies have been born in the seminary—without medical assistance because doctors who used to care for the refugees ended their service after right-wing vigilantes killed one of them and threatened the others. There is no medicine, and children suffer from diarrhea, worms, measles, chickenpox, colds, and mycosis. There is rarely any milk; only beans. There is no running water, and there are no beds.

A member of the Church's refugee agency reports, "So far only three countries have sent help—England, Holland, and Germany. Some private institutions, such as Caritas and the World Council of Churches, have also helped. But we need more aid, especially food and medicine." There is little hope for relief unless a state of civil war is declared.

A Church volunteer reports that the refugee centers have been raided. She recalls that the President of the military-civilian junta, in a radio speech, called the centers "sanctuaries for subversives." Then, she says, "they came and dragged away a refugee—just a boy—and beat the priest who tried to protect him. The boy was found dead later."

The guerrillas' offensive, which began in January, split the Salvadoran Church in two. The most prudent Church officials pulled back, while the boldest formed the Msgr. Romero People's Church Coordinating Committee (CONIP), which the junta subsequently accused of being in league with leftist guerrillas. Only after considerable prodding does Don Rivera y Damas talk about the split. "If we remain divided," he says, "we end up helping those who seek a disunited Church."

He will not venture a guess concerning the outcome of the bloody conflict between the Left, the Right, and the Government. But he is sure of one thing: Although the guerrilla offensive was ineffective, it wasn't defeated. "The violence will continue with widespread sacrifice and suffering. As long as there is injustice there cannot be peace." ●

ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT AND TARGETED TAX CUTS

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, a great debate is taking place today across our Nation about the efficacy of targeted tax cuts designed to aid the development of small- and medium-sized firms in distressed areas. I recently reintroduced a refined version of my bill, H.R. 390—the Job Expansion and Urban Development Act of 1981, which is one of the targeted approaches being discussed.

Underlying the targeting strategy is the belief that while broad-based, across-the-board tax incentives are needed to speed investment and increase productivity in our business community as a whole, at the same time we must provide special, supplemental incentives to meet the special needs of our older central cities.

However, of the various bills introduced to achieve this targeting effect all mainly address the need for tax code changes. It is becoming increasingly apparent, as this debate unfolds, that this approach is too narrow and ignores the dynamics of enterprise development.

Deregulation and tax reduction alone cannot spur enterprise development in distressed areas. Deregulation and tax reduction alone cannot and should not entirely replace urban economic development programs designed to provide funds for infrastructure and up-front capital for the purchase of plant and equipment and for working capital.

Targeted tax incentives should be a supplement to our economic development diet, not the whole meal.

The Enterprise Development Act of 1981 (H.R. 2965)—the successor to my H.R. 390—which I have introduced this week seeks to provide a more balanced approach to our urban economic revitalization efforts.

Title I of this act would insure the continuity of the Economic Development Administration's (EDA) role in urban revitalization by consolidating the EDA authorities under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. This consolidation would enable EDA to continue its broad range of economic development activities, patterned after the current title IX programs targeted to areas suffering from long-term economic deterioration.

Under title IX, eligible areas devise a local economic development strategy, subject to EDA approval. EDA then commits itself, in effect, to single or multiyear block grant funding to the local agency for implementing the plan. Title IX works well, as a device for targeting limited Federal aid to areas of need while giving localities control over their destinies.

The title IX strategy is consistent with President Reagan's belief in both the block grant approach and the need for returning more responsibility to localities.

From my own experience with a title IX effort in Buffalo and western New York, I know that this can work. The operative agency, the Erie County Industrial Development Agency, with EDA assistance, has created a Regional Development Corp. to conduct a revolving loan program.

This is geared toward providing financial assistance to growth-oriented industrial and high technology firms

to help them supplement funding from the private marketplace.

In the Buffalo area, the RDC leveraged \$4 million in EDA money, for instance, to generate \$17.2 million in private financing to 22 locally controlled small manufacturers. This resulted in the retention or creation of 1,038 jobs.

I believe EDA—particularly in its title IX efforts—has proven itself to be too valuable an economic development tool to totally eliminate, as the administration has suggested. However, title I of my bill (H.R. 2965) would provide a compromise alternative by retaining the best EDA tools while scaling down its annual budget by more than 50 percent.

The funding provided by title I of my bill, when coupled with the targeted tax incentives in title II, represent a coherent, streamlined approach to urban economic revitalization.

For example, H.R. 2965 also amends the Small Business Investment Act of 1980 to encourage small business investment companies (SBIC's) to invest in small firms located in targeted job expansion zones. SBIC's can now borrow money from the Small Business Administration at a ratio of 3 to 1 or 4 to 1 public to private dollars. My bill would enable them to invest on a 4 to 1 or 5 to 1 basis, with the SBA coordinating and monitoring lending to smaller firms located within the zones.

The targeting criteria for establishing the zones in H.R. 2965 are similar to the criteria in H.R. 390, but more restrictive. The criteria include levels of poverty, unemployment, lag in per capita income and job lag.

The tax portion of H.R. 2965 is identical to H.R. 390, except the refined version provides an incentive to firms which establish employee stock ownership plans (ESOP's). Due to various tax provisions, ESOP's help firms raise capital and allow employees to get a piece of the action. The net result can lead to higher productivity and investment. H.R. 2965 allows firms to deduct an amount equal to 50 percent of the total compensation paid all its employees, if such amount is used to purchase securities to be held by the ESOP trust.

The other tax incentives included in H.R. 2965 would:

First, stimulate new investment by providing increased depreciation allowances.

Second, provide a 5-percent investment tax credit on new structures placed in service by a qualified business in a targeted zone. This will encourage new construction and business and development.

Third, increase the amount of used property eligible for the investment tax credit from \$100,000 to \$400,000.

Fourth, provide for a 25-percent investment tax credit on the rehabilitation of commercial buildings.

Fifth, help startup companies through a refundable investment tax credit of up to \$100,000.

Sixth, expand the present targeted jobs tax credit to stimulate training and employment of the long-term, hard-core unemployed residents of economically deteriorated cities.

Mr. Speaker, I believe H.R. 2965 is a sound, integrated approach to enterprise development in distressed areas.

The combination of EDA title IX seed moneys and the tax incentives will go a long way toward providing small- and medium-sized firms with capital needed for growth and also stimulate construction and building rehabilitation in our older communities.

The scenario would result in a not-so-vicious circle: Smaller firms and startup firms—which generate the most new jobs in our economy—will be encouraged as funds are made available for infrastructure improvements and access to low cost capital loans is assured.

The refundable investment tax will immediately improve internal cash flow generation.

As the firms begin to prosper and make profits, the other tax incentives will encourage investment in new/used equipment, new/rehabilitated buildings. Firms will receive a job tax credit for hiring additional employees and these employees may benefit from stock ownership if the firms utilize an ESOP to purchase machinery or buildings.

This package of investment tools in H.R. 2965 recognizes the facts of life about the birth and maturation of business enterprises in distressed areas. I believe it offers an important, unique and somewhat revolutionary approach to one of the most intractable problems confronting our Nation—revitalizing chronically distressed urban areas. ●

POOR TREATMENT OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES WILL HURT REAGAN'S POLICIES

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, in last Sunday's Washington Post Haynes Johnson wrote an exceptionally fine column about the misguided Government policies which constantly harass top-flight Federal personnel and encourage them to abandon public service. In the President's efforts to combat waste, he gives short shrift to the talent that exists already within Government—talent which is crucial if he hopes to implement his policies.

I include the Haynes Johnson column in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues. It gives us some-

thing to think about as we deal with issues affecting Federal employees in this Congress, and cuts through the simplistic rhetoric that we hear so often.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 29, 1981]

EMPLOYEE FRUSTRATION DRAINING BEST BRAINS OUT OF GOVERNMENT

(By Haynes Johnson)

We've been through waste and fraud week, another president's attempt to capitalize on the public's fed-up feeling about government. And, yes, to do something about it.

Ronald Reagan's team says its campaign against waste and fraud will be led by a new group, "The President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency." Despite that stern Prussian-like title, the effort is worthy and the internal governmental problem real enough. But this highly publicized Reagan campaign, no less than others ordered by his presidential predecessors, masks a greater form of governmental waste.

What's happening inside the government today presents a problem worse than waste and more serious than fraud. The evidence points to a tragic breakdown of the government service itself. If the voices this reporter has been hearing recently are correct, the nation faces a governmental crisis all the more dramatic and damaging because it seems so little understood or discussed. Even though it has been building for years, you don't hear presidents warning about this crisis. They are, you see, part of the problem.

The waste I'm talking about involves the loss of many of the government's best people; the crisis comes from the deterioration of morale and rising frustration at all levels of the U.S. workforce.

Last week the president of the largest union representing federal employees talked openly about a confrontational mood among his membership that could lead to wildcat strikes and slowdowns throughout the government. Even top management officials are discussing the possibility of forming executive unions. A sense of anger and anxiety comes through conversations with government employees of both high and low rank. And the flow of talent out of the government continues.

Stop any top U.S. official on the streets of Washington these days, one of them says, and ask when that person will complete the 25 years of service making him eligible for early retirement. "He'll immediately tell you, not down to the year or the month—but to the exact day," this official remarks. "I think the government is heading down the road to a disaster. Within five years the group of supergrade people that are now between the ages of 50 and 60 will all be gone. The best of them are gone already. . . . The next president of the United States will turn to his top government people and say, 'Do this,' and he'll find no one able to get it done."

That respected official, who entered government service under Eisenhower, found himself rather startled at the apocalyptic tone of his remarks, "but I just can't find any cause to feel other than deeply dismayed today." In that, he seems sadly typical of many others.

From New Year's Day through the first week in March, the federal Office of Personnel Management received 38,000 retirement papers from federal employees—twice the

average monthly rate of retirements, according to the Bureau of National Affairs.

A government study completed before the new year provides disturbing evidence of the rapid departure rate in the government's key managerial echelon—officials who oversee two million civilian employees, a budget of more than \$600 billion, and whose decisions have a profound effect on all American citizens.

"The retirement rate for career employees at the Executive Level V pay ceiling," the study says, "has increased from 17.6 percent of those eligible to retire during the 12 months ending in March 1978 to an astonishing 57.1 percent during the 12 months ending in March 1980."

Not even the dullest set of statistics about federal retirements can cloak an ominous trend—unless, that is, you are among those who believe all U.S. bureaucrats are as bad as recent presidential candidates have depicted them and think the answer to the woes of government is to dismantle it all.

The problem inside the government extends into every area of the workforce. "The bottom line is morale is very low and frustration is very high," says Kenneth Blaylock, national president of the American Federation of Government Employees, the largest federal workers' union. "Government employees—and that includes managers—feel they've been kicked and kicked and kicked."

. . . Now they're forced to pay the price again with a 4.8 percent pay raise in a time of 12 percent inflation and cuts in retirement benefits."

His point about pay and benefits touches a sore nerve among all federal employees. A special commission that recently completed a study of executive government salaries found a direct link between low pay and increasing difficulties of attracting and retaining outstanding people for top U.S. positions.

The commission also found that salaries of key U.S. officials in the three branches of government have fallen dramatically behind the corresponding managerial groups in private business. In addition, in most cases Congress has not allowed annual increases called for in a salary-cost-of-living act for top officials, placing those people significantly behind what they had promised legally. "The resulting compression of salaries," the commission adds, "has created the anomalous situation in which up to seven tiers of management are now being paid identical salaries."

The complaints about pay and benefits are real enough, but the grievances within the government are more serious than economic issues—and they go beyond the present emotional state of fears, rumors and resentments spurred by the Reagan administration's blueprint for federal hiring freezes, pay caps, reductions in force and slashing or junking of government programs and agencies. Another top U.S. official, whose work has drawn praise from a number of presidents, both Democrat and Republican, and who is now highly placed within the White House operation, says we are approaching the end of "a decade of dependency for bureaucrats." He fears the period ahead could worsen.

Ronald Reagan was not the first candidate to run against the bureaucracy and then have to lead it as president. Richard Nixon and Jimmy Carter sounded similar themes, and encountered similar problems in power. Reagan's presidential task is even more delicate, for it is his fate to preside

over the government at a time when respect for public officials has declined even further and the concept of public service continues to generate greater expressions of public cynicism.

Reagan's gifts for conciliation and leadership will be put to a critical test in his handling of the federal workforce. He can attempt to inspire it and begin rebuilding a national sense of public service or he can witness a further disintegration in an already dispirited federal establishment. Before Reagan took office, a veteran bureaucrat, Bertrand M. Harding, who headed the National Civil Service League, said he hoped the new president and his people would put aside all their campaign rhetoric about "faceless bureaucrats." As he said, "for better or worse, these 'faceless' persons belong to the president and for the moment are all the glue he has to keep the government together."

The danger is the glue is coming unstuck.●

LANTOS LAUDS CARPENTER'S BRAVERY

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, America is shocked and saddened by the senseless violence which continues in our political process. As an American by choice, I recognize the need for accessible leadership. But, this type of violence undermines the very pillars which support our democratic form of government. I join with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in a call to eliminate this cancer on the American soul.

There is an actor in this tragedy who played a heroic role in subduing the would-be assassin. He is a man who deserves our thoughts and prayers as he remains hospitalized in Georgetown University Hospital. I am speaking of Mr. Alfred Antonucci, a citizen who demonstrated tremendous courage in the confusion of Monday's events. Mr. Antonucci is a decent American who has worked in the labor movement since the thirties. He is a man committed to his country and to his union. As the business agent and president of Carpenters Local 1750, of Cleveland, Ohio, he knows the realities of life as a hard working citizen. On Monday he demonstrated the most noble aspects of the American character.

I would urge all of my colleagues to join with me in applauding the courage of this fine citizen. For those of us who may not be aware of the actions of Mr. Antonucci, I enclose the following article from the Wednesday morning edition of the New York Times:

MAN WHO TACKLED SUSPECT IS ILL

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Alfred Antonucci, an Ohio labor official who was apparently among the first people to tackle John W. Hinckley Jr., the man charged with the

attack on President Reagan, was hospitalized with severe chest pains two hours after the incident.

Mr. Antonucci, who was in fair condition today at Georgetown University Hospital, is a 68-year-old carpenter from the Garfield Heights section of Cleveland and a member of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Eileen Antonucci, his daughter-in-law, said in a telephone interview from Aurora, Ohio, that Mr. Antonucci had said that he was roughed up in the melee that followed the assassination attempt. She said that Secret Service agents and local police officials later questioned her father-in-law for about an hour and a half.

President Reagan was leaving the Washington Hilton Hotel, where he had spoken to the labor union group when he was wounded. Mr. Antonucci and a friend had arrived at the hotel too late to hear the President and were standing outside as Mr. Reagan left.

"He said the guy was standing right in front of him with his hands in his pocket," the daughter-in-law said. She said that she and her husband, Dominic, first learned that Mr. Antonucci had tried to subdue Mr. Hinckley from friends who had recognized him from television film of the assassination attempt.

"My husband went down to Washington this morning," she said. "I talked to him at 11 A.M. while he was at the hospital and he said that his father is still very emotional every time he starts to talk about it."

Christina Puc, a spokesman for the hospital, said Mr. Antonucci was admitted there at 5:23 P.M. yesterday after he complained of chest pains.

"He was apparently suffering from cardiac arrhythmia," she said, referring to an irregularity in the rhythm of the heartbeat. "He is in fair condition. Only his immediate family is permitted to see him."

Mr. Antonucci's wife, Joan, who was with him at the labor union gathering, visited her husband in the hospital.●

NATURE OF EL SALVADOR GUERRILLAS

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1981, the Washington Star printed an article about a small group of political prisoners in El Salvador. It is poignant in its description of the manner in which these people became involved in the leftist activity which is destroying their country, their homes, and their families.

Because I believe it may help put in perspective the composition of the people against whom the U.S.-aided government in El Salvador is warring, I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues and hereby submit it for consideration today. The underlining for emphasis is my own.

FOR SALVADORAN PEASANTS, WAR IS MATTER OF SURVIVAL

(By Bernard Diederich)

They stood on the stage of the auditorium of the 4th Brigade, a green-painted camp surrounded by new high barbed-wire fence and concrete watch-towers in a little barren valley misnamed el paraiso, paradise.

And for these emaciated, barefoot peasants, many of them suffering from sores and illnesses, the camp of the Salvadoran military in the Northern Department of Chalatenango bordering with Honduras was paradise after what they had been through.

The government said they had been part of the leftist movement trying to overthrow the government. An officer pointing to the dejected looking collection of this country's peasantry, 52 men and women and 30 children, said, "They are guerrillas."

The government calls them arrepentidos, repenters, and a local newspaper said they had surrendered at La Reina, a small town in the hills a dozen miles away, because they were "tired of fleeing in the mountains after their leaders had abandoned them."

The peasants on the stage tell a story of this guerrilla war. Their concern was sheer survival, they insist. Unfortunately for many, the way in which they choose to survive often is translated into a political affiliation without any idea of its ideological content. They are pressured by right and left. Some, like the people on the stage, become tired of fleeing and give up.

Peasants on both political sides move from village to village seeking shelter and food until there is no longer any place to go. None of these people on the stage appeared to be politicized. Each said in a quiet voice, "We just want peace and work."

Victor America, 34, looked 50. "I had hardly any land. I just grew a little corn." His wife with vacant eyes nursed their seventh child and said in a hardly audible voice, "The subversives, they took the last of our corn. We have nothing." One of her daughters had open sores on her head.

Arturo Mendez Vasquez was silenced by his handsome white-haired wife, the mother of 10 children, who said, "We just want peace, nothing more, just peace." An officer, not unfriendly, even sympathetic, asked a young man, a son of Mendez, "You were a militiaman, right?" Like most of these peasants he was quick to please and nodded his head. His mother said quietly, "No he wasn't."

One old man with calloused hands who didn't even know his age said, "We are tired of fleeing through the hills and starving. The subversives made us cut wood and fetch water, and the woman had to make tortillas."

A young man said none of them bore arms in the hills. "They promised us arms, but they didn't give us any." Added another youth, "Maybe they didn't trust us."

There was no way of knowing whether they were telling the truth. The peasants have learned that survival can mean saying the right thing at the right time.

Their admitting to be members of the BPR told more about their situation. The BPR, Revolutionary Popular Bloc, was founded in 1975 as a mass organization and grew rapidly among trade unions and peasants. The BPR enjoyed its greatest strength in the impoverished countryside, but when this non-guerrilla organization, which was aided by the Jesuit priests, linked up in the late 1970s with the guerrillas to the FPL—Popular Liberation Forces—the poor peas-

ant members automatically became members of that leftist force.●

AMENDING THE FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

HON. ADAM BENJAMIN, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to amend section 16 of the Federal Airport Act of November 25, 1947.

The Federal Airport Act of 1947 deeded land to the city of Gary, Ind., to be used for airport purposes. The Gary airport now proposes to convey a portion of its land to the Indiana Toll Road Commission for construction of the Cline Avenue South Interchange which fulfills responsibilities invoked by Public Law 95-599 and Public Law 96-106.

Section 16 of the 1947 Federal Airport Act provides that the land could only be used for airport purposes or it would automatically revert to Federal ownership.

This bill releases the city of Gary from that condition and authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to approve conveyance of the land to the Indiana Toll Road Commission.●

U.S. DEPORTATION OF EL SALVADORANS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, despite the efforts of many of us here in Congress, this administration continues to send military aid to the junta of El Salvador. Thus, we are, in effect, aiding the continuation of the violence there.

Many El Salvadorans have been fleeing that violence torn country, crossing the borders into neighboring Honduras, and also coming north to the United States. Instead of empathizing with their plight, the United States has seen fit to deport them, without due process, back to the very circumstances they fled.

I urge my colleagues to review the following article and to consider their actions should they be confronted with a similar situation:

[From the Newsletter of the Religious Task Force on El Salvador, January-February 1981]

SALVADORANS IN DANGER OF DEPORTATION

Human rights activists share increasing concern over the plight of illegal Salvadoran refugees who have fled political repression. At least 500,000 undocumented Salvadoran aliens are now living in the United States with new arrivals daily. Most

of these refugees are landless peasants who have exchanged "plows for mops and trays" as they perform service jobs in areas around Washington, DC, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. The Immigration and Naturalization Service is engaged in a concerted effort to deport these people back to their violence-torn country.

As evidence of internal political repression mounts, pressure has been exerted upon the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the State Department to grant these refugees "extended voluntary departure" status. On April 24, members of Congress wrote acting Secretary of State Warren Christopher that he "advise the Attorney General and the Commission of Immigration to halt the deportation of Salvadoran nationals until stability returns to that suffering country."

The State Department's response was to praise the moderate, reformist military dominated junta and to state that "special treatment can not be justified at this time" for Salvadorans.

According to the Immigration and Naturalization Service Operating Instructions, guidelines exist to authorize the extension of departure time for aliens when compelling humanitarian factors would make deportation unconscionable. Consequently, persons who receive extended voluntary departure are entitled to receive work authorization and certain government benefits. The use of this permission, however, has reflected how U.S. policy would prefer to view the internal strife in other countries, rather than a realistic view. For example, Cubans who fled to the U.S. in hopes of a better life were considered political refugees, while Haitians, subject to torture and well-documented repression in their country, have been treated as refugees and deported. Nicaraguans who supported former President Somoza received extended time in the U.S. while those who fled Somoza's regime were allowed less than a month of asylum here.

Many of the Salvadorans presently in the United States have fled from their country to escape possible death for demanding social changes—redistribution of the wealth, higher wages, and basic human rights. The U.S. government continues to deport them despite protests of human rights organizations and immigration law offices which testify that deportees are often taken into custody upon their return for questioning and face possible arrest or worse by the government.

It seems clear that U.S. immigration policy is being interpreted with geo-political, rather than Humanitarian considerations, especially since 10,000 Salvadorans have been assassinated in the past year.●

VOLUNTEER SPIRIT CHARACTERIZES SIERRA MADRE IN LIBRARY EXPANSION

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, we all express our appreciation to those who get funding without the Government's help.

As a matter of fact I say "fantastic." When the citizens of Sierra Madre, a city in my district, found their library to be lacking in size and serving capac-

ity, expansion seemed to be the answer. But there also seemed to be no money to do that.

When seeking funds for this expansion they found that, with the passage of proposition 13, the amount of money available to the library from the city was significantly reduced. The limited funds that the city does have are already allocated to several major maintenance projects related to the library's roof and heating/air-conditioning system.

It became obvious, then, that any funds for an expansion program have to come from the community itself. This was an appropriate approach in keeping with the volunteer spirit that characterizes Sierra Madre. In fact, Sierra Madre's very first library was built in 1887 with \$3,000 raised entirely by voluntary contributions from 40 families.

This early library continued to be operated by a citizen's association until 1910 when it was turned over to the city. The Sierra Madre Room Group was organized in 1980 to develop plans for raising funds to expand the library.

Even with declining budgets, the community's use of the library continues to expand. In the past 25 years the number of volumes has gone from 18,000 to 47,000 and periodicals subscribed to have escalated from 79 to 180. This current fund drive will make it possible to meet present and future needs with increased efficiency.

I am sure that my colleagues will join me in applauding the citizens of Sierra Madre for their community serving efforts. In this time of national economic strife with the need of restraint in the growth of tax spending, Sierra Madre is a shining example of American determination and certainly warrants recognition.●

IN SUPPORT OF DR. ERNEST W. LEFEVER

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, confirmation of Dr. Ernest W. Lefever's nomination as Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs will be considered shortly by the Senate. Support for his candidacy is growing. I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an endorsement of Dr. Lefever from the Committee for a Balanced Human Rights Policy, Box 432, Rockville, Md. 20850, as part of the committee's statement of purpose.

The committee's statement reads as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Committee for a Balanced Human Rights Policy was established to promote a balanced, constructive and responsible human rights policy consistent with the interests of the United States and the Free World.

One of the promises made by President Reagan in the course of his campaign was that the direction of U.S. foreign policy in the area of human rights would be changed. Polls had indicated widespread concern by the American people that human rights considerations had been allowed to influence and even determine policy toward Third World and allied countries—often in a manner inconsistent with U.S. and Free World security interests. Questions were raised by a substantial segment of the American electorate concerning an apparent "double standard" in the application of human rights policy. While numerous voices were raised—both inside and outside the government—in protest of violations in certain pro-Western Latin American, African and Asian countries, little public outcry was heard concerning such outrages as were occurring in Cambodia, Ethiopia, Cuba, Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union and other countries subject to Marxist rule.

Responding to these concerns, and in fulfillment of the popular mandate he received on November 4, 1980, President Reagan has designated Dr. Ernest W. Lefever as Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs. Dr. Lefever, we believe, is fully qualified to restore balance in the nation's human rights policy, and will implement policies and programs designed to strengthen human rights around the world consistent with the freedom and independence of the United States and its allies.

DR. LEFEVER: A LIFETIME DEVOTED TO HUMAN RIGHTS

Dr. Lefever is founder and president of the Ethics and Public Policy Center of Washington, D.C., an independent research organization.

He received a B.D. and Ph.D. in Christian ethics from Yale University, spent six summers as a volunteer in work camps serving the needs of slum children in Philadelphia, unemployed persons in Kansas and migratory laborers on the West Coast—long before such social and civil rights work became fashionable.

In 1942, he helped relocate the first Japanese-Americans from a California internment center. For three years after World War II, he was a field director for the World's YMCA, helping resettle prisoners of war.

In 1948, 1949 and 1966, he visited Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the Soviet Union, Poland and East Germany. Reflecting on his visits to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, Dr. Lefever has noted "a deplorable tendency in America to forget, overlook, or downplay the Eastern European victims of Communist oppression. For this reason, I favor a balanced human rights policy which addresses itself in the first instance to the most grievous and brutal assaults on human dignity and freedom."

An ordained minister for 40 years, Dr. Lefever has visited over 85 countries, has written or edited 14 books on morality, ethics and foreign policy, and has lectured widely at home and abroad.

DR. LEFEVER'S STATEMENT ON HUMAN RIGHTS, MARCH 6, 1981

I am committed to pursue a vigorous and humane foreign policy. Human rights are an

inescapable concern in all our foreign policy deliberations. Human freedom and dignity are most seriously violated by direct and indirect aggression, the imposition of foreign control on other people, external subversion, genocide and terror. Totalitarian Communist states are the greatest violators of the full range of human rights. Soviet-bloc regimes not only brutalize their own people, but some of them are exporting their repressive system by subversion and terrorism.

The U.S. Government should use all appropriate means needed to defend and extend freedom, including private persuasion, public condemnation and withholding of trade, which may be necessary and consistent with our security and that of our allies.

We Americans may not always agree on methods, but we are united in our commitment to enlarging the frontiers of freedom and respect for human rights around the world.

ANALYSIS OF DR. LEFEVER'S HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY

Dr. Lefever is clearly committed to deepening and broadening the concept of human rights around the world—both among friends and adversaries. As the Washington Star has accurately pointed out, "Dr. Lefever considers human rights the heart of American foreign policy."

However, Dr. Lefever recognizes that their are gradations of repressiveness among countries, just as there are gradations of good and evil. His belief, in accordance with that of an overwhelming majority of Americans, is that the implementation of a human rights policy should, first and foremost, be consistent with the freedom and independence of the U.S. and its Free World allies.

Consistent with this belief, he has written in "Policy Review" that "the greatest threat to human rights comes from messianic totalitarian regimes whose brutal grip brooks no opposition." He has written critically of the manner in which "human rights activists" have tended "to underestimate the totalitarian threat to the West * * * . In their preoccupation with the minor abridgement of certain rights in authoritarian states, they often overlook the massive threat to the liberty of millions * * * . It would be a great irony if Washington in the name of human rights were to adopt a policy that would deliver 35 million largely free South Koreans into virtual slavery."

It is interesting to note that Dr. Lefever's adversaries, in their recent statement of opposition to his confirmation, have found this balanced and realistic "worldview" a primary point of concern and disagreement with Dr. Lefever. To wit:

"Ernest Lefever's opposition to 'the human rights standard' rests on his conviction that the greatest threat to peace and freedom in the world today comes from Soviet-backed totalitarianism."

One can only conclude that those adversaries believe that Chile, El Salvador and the Republic of the Philippines are the "greatest threat to peace and freedom in the world today."

But Dr. Lefever's concern about human rights extends to countries other than those of the Marxist bloc. He concurs fully with Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick that in relations with friendly, although authoritarian regimes struggling against subversion by totalitarian forces, "U.S. policy could effectively encourage this process of liberalization and democratization * * * aimed at

producing gradual change * * * ." Such a policy, according to Dr. Lefever, should first and foremost "advance human rights by strengthening our resolve and our resources to defend our allies who are threatened by totalitarian aggression and subversion;" secondly, should make use of "quiet diplomatic channels at appropriate times and places;" and, thirdly, through the maintenance of "a regional stability conducive to responsible political development and mutually beneficial economic intercourse * * * broaden the range of cultural and political choice."

In conclusion, it is clear from Dr. Lefever's written and spoken statements that he is deeply committed to "enlarging the frontiers of freedom and respect for human rights around the world." That, in doing so, he will recognize Soviet-backed totalitarianism as the most dangerous threat to human rights, and that he will seek to liberalize and reform regimes allied to us through diplomatic suasion and joint political and economic intercourse and development. This policy, we believe, is one that is balanced, consistent with U.S. and Free World interests and in accordance with President Reagan's commitments and position on human rights.

WE ENDORSE

The individuals and organizations listed below are representative of over 20 million Americans concerned with the nation's human rights policy. Many of them trace their ancestry to countries presently under Marxist totalitarian control, or subject to subversion by Soviet-backed forces. Consequently, they have had a consistent and continuous record of interest and advocacy of human rights for all peoples suffering under repressive regimes.

It is our belief that Dr. Ernest W. Lefever has dedicated his life towards those self-same principles of freedom, democracy and independence on which this country is based. Dr. Lefever, in our opinion, is eminently qualified to assume the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs.

We extend our endorsement to Dr. Lefever and urge the Members of the Senate to unanimously confirm Dr. Lefever's appointment.

Dr. Edward Yambrusic—President, National Confederation of American Ethnic Groups (17 national groups; 33 National and State organizations).

Dr. Mikulas Ferjencik—President, Czechoslovak National Council of America.

John Hebling—German American National Congress.

Istvan Gereben—Executive Secretary, Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations in North America (representing 15 national organizations).

Dr. Igor Glagolev—Director, Association for Cooperation of Democratic Countries.

Dr. Yuri Olkhovskiy—Congress of Russian Americans, Inc.

John J. Kossiak—President, Byelorussian Congress Committee of America.

Dr. John B. Genys—Lithuanian American Council, Inc.

Dimiter Baharoff—President, Bulgarian National Front in the U.S.

Dr. Valentina Kalynyk—President, Americans to Free Captive Nations.

Gunars Meierovics—American Latvian Association in the U.S.A., Inc.

Cecilia Bros—President, American Ethnic League.

Laszlo Pastor—Chairman, Executive Committee, American Hungarian Federation.

Dr. Julian Hutnyk—President, Carpathian Alliance.

Maido Kari—Estonian American National Council.

Rev. Baan Vitez—President, World Federation of Hungarian Freedom Fighters.

Dr. Mychajlo Kushnir—Organization for Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine.

Dr. Alexander Ronnet—President, Romanian American National Congress.

Albert Karali—President, Coalition for a Free Russia.

M. Karkaj—President, Ukrainian Committee of America.

Dr. George Radojevich—President, Serbian American Committee.

Dr. Le Phuoc Sang—President, American Coalition of Asian Pacific Organizations.

Dr. Laszlo Varga—President, Federation of Free Hungarian Jurists.

Prof. Andrew Ehrenkreutz—President, North American Studies Center for Polish Affairs.

W. Rostrigin—President, Cossack American Nationalists in the U.S.

Dr. Konstanty Hanff—President, "Wolna Polska".

Quac Vien Bieu—President, Chinese American Committee for Social Justice.

Dr. A. Bonifacie—President, Croatian National Association.

Dr. Doan Le Phoung Hoang—Secretary General, Indochinese American Coalition for Human Rights.

Ulana Mazurkevich—President, Human Rights for Ukraine Committee.

Dr. Jan Morelewski—Chairman, East European Studies Center.

Dr. E. Paprikoff—President, Bulgarian Liberation Front.

Tibor Helcz—President, Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners.

Horst Ulich—President, East German Association of the U.S.

Joseph Bosilvich—Chairman, Croatian Human Rights Committee.

Prof. Brutus Coste—President, Truth About Romania Committee.

Dr. Buong Phuc Hung—President, Vietnamese National Front for Restoration of Vietnam.

Dr. Nguyah Huynh—President, Vietnamese American Coalition for Democratic Values.

Laszlo Sirchich—Chairman, National Committee of Hungarians from Czechoslovakia.

Eugene Gyimesy Kasas—President, World Federation of Hungarian Artists.

Baohong Minh—United Community of Boat People.

Ha Cong Minh—Hao Buddhist Community for National Restoration of Vietnam.

Dr. Istvan Eszterhas—Chairman, Committee of Hungarian Liberation.

Paul Fenchak—President, Ukrainian Education Association, Inc.

Prof. Anthony Bouscaren—Chairman, Syracuse Captive Nations Committee.

Frank Simko—President, Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation, New York Chapter.

John Basarab—Director, Ukrainian National Information Service.

Prof. Askold Skalsky—Editor, "News from Ukraine".

Dr. Walter Dushnyck—Editor, "The Ukrainian Quarterly".

Alexandra Schwed—Ukrainian Anti-Defamation League of Philadelphia.

Many of the organizations listed above include nationwide chapters and affiliates too numerous to list—totalling over 1000 organizations. Organizations are listed for identification purposes.●

SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT REAGAN'S BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are truly interested in righting the economic ills of our Nation by restoring sound fiscal policies, are concerned by the number of voices we hear crying out about the number of needy Americans who they say will be left out in the cold if the President's program for consolidating categorical social welfare grants into block grants is approved. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The fact is that although the President's budget sharply slows the rate of growth of social welfare programs, the actual spending levels recommended for fiscal years 1981 and 1982 Health and Human Services' budgets exceed those of previous years. Funds will be consolidated and delivered for apportionment by the States according to their specific priorities. How anyone can call this sensible move toward direct Government insensitive is incomprehensible. It seems more accurate that those who are loudly protesting that people will suffer from this move, are really bent on unraveling the administration's package solution to soaring social welfare spending.

A chart of the growth in Federal spending for social programs shows a dramatic incline during the last decade. Between 1970 and 1980, outlays went from approximately \$90 billion to more than \$300 billion for welfare programs. No one believes that this increase is due to corresponding growth in the number of people requiring assistance. This huge debt has been the result of shortsighted liberal spending policies which have fostered an amalgamation of federally administered programs which seek to blanket the Nation's social concerns at an outrageous cost to the taxpayers. With the last election, the taxpayers have signaled that their limit of tolerance has been exceeded.

Meeting critical social needs while cutting administrative costs is the goal, and consolidation of 40 categorical grants into 4 block grants addressing basic objectives will save more than \$1 billion in administrative funds. I wholeheartedly support the President's budget proposals, specifically the block grant programs, as consistent with his promise to protect essential social programs while carrying out the mandate of the people to limit the influence of the Federal Government and reduce the growth of Government spending.●

SALVADORANS TELL OF FEAR

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, as the violence and instability in El Salvador continues, the real victims in that country's battle become more apparent: its people. The campesinos, the shopkeepers, the laborers, and the teachers are caught in a power struggle over which they have no control. They are the byproducts of a faltering society. Many Salvadorans have, therefore, been forced to leave their country for political reasons. I do not believe that it is fair to turn back these refugees because they do not have proper documentation, at least not until they have pleaded their cases before the U.S. Government. They must be given due process. For the benefit of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a copy of an article from the Los Angeles Times regarding this issue.

SALVADORANS TELL OF FEAR

(By Laurie Becklund and Paul Nussbaum)

More than a dozen Salvadorans who have applied for political asylum in the United States have been staging an intermittent hunger strike since Jan. 1 at a U.S. Border Patrol detention camp in El Centro "to dramatize our plight," a member of the group said Wednesday.

Members of the group said in telephone interviews that they have refused many of their meals to demonstrate their fear of being returned to violence-wracked El Salvador, and to demand reduced bonds and speedier hearings.

Harry Malone, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service official in charge of detention and deportation at the camp, said he had received a statement from the group demanding that their asylum hearings be speeded up but he denied that any detainee had consistently refused to eat. "Everybody's at lunch right now," he said.

The Salvadorans described the hunger strike as "intermittent," saying that everyone was eating or abstaining from meals as he chose.

The protest was set off by a telephone conversation one of the Salvadorans in El Centro had with a friend who had been flown back to El Salvador at Christmas on a routine deportation flight.

"He said he saw bodies alongside the highway to the airport in San Salvador the next morning and that he recognized some of them from the flight," said Ricardo Hernandez, 20.

Hernandez said he left El Salvador in December after he was fired from his factory job during a strike and threatened by a factory manager when he sought severance pay. "He told me he was the brother-in-law of a junta member and he had the power to have people killed," Hernandez said.

About 9,500 persons have died in El Salvador during the past year because of political violence.

Lawyers representing the men held press conferences in San Diego and Los Angeles to demand that "the men be treated as

human beings and not as criminals." They said the men's bonds, set at \$2,000 to \$4,000, should be lowered to allow their release.

Because formal deportation hearings, particularly political asylum cases, can take months or years, the attorneys said, their clients want to work to support their families in El Salvador while their cases are being processed.

"We are not criminals," said Mauricio Castellanos, 30. "I am a professional man and was about to receive my license to practice law. But there are others here who were in the National Guard, or teacher's unions, or farmers. We're all afraid to go back—that much we have in common.

"And we all feel like dogs in a cage. We can't work. We can't go back. We can't do anything."

Because of increasing violence in El Salvador, church and lawyers groups have pressed the Carter Administration to grant what is termed "extended voluntary departures" to all Salvadorans in the United States. That status, which was granted to Iranians after the overthrow of the Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi and to Nicaraguans before the fall of dictator Anastasio Somoza, would allow them to stay here until the danger in El Salvador diminishes.

When a delegation of U.S. Roman Catholic bishops met with President Carter Dec. 22, the delegation reported that Carter had promised to consider the matter. However, a few hundred Salvadorans a week continue to be returned to El Salvador from Los Angeles alone, an immigration official said.●

U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PLO

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a serious breach of commitment by the Reagan administration in formulating its foreign policy. If this is really an administration committed to stamping out global terrorism, then why does the administration's State Department authorization bill allow U.S. payments to the United Nations to be funneled to the Palestinian Liberation Organization?

From the beginning of this administration we have been told that the fight against international terrorism would be a top priority. The previous administration's excessive concern for human rights had contributed to the erosion of America's power in the world. The new emphasis on stamping out international terrorism was hailed as the key to reversing this decline. No terrorist act would go unnoticed, and none would be ignored.

Given this well-publicized position, it is hard to understand why the administration's bill omits a provision added by the Congress to the last State Department authorization bill, which prohibited any distribution of U.S. funds to U.N. organizations that are merely fronts for PLO activities—namely, the Committee on the Exer-

cise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, and the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights.

Although the administration's bill has been introduced in the Senate, the House Foreign Affairs Committee is drawing up its own bill. I have already introduced a separate bill which will make permanent the prohibition on distribution of U.S. funds to the PLO. I strongly urge the Foreign Affairs Committee to incorporate this prohibition in its bill. Should the committee report a bill that does not contain such a provision, I will offer the prohibition as an amendment at the appropriate time. My colleague from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, will introduce a similar amendment in the Senate next week.

I need not remind the Members of this body of the terrorist practices of the PLO. This is an organization which bombs schoolhouses and gladly takes credit for it. It is an organization which has as its foremost goal the elimination of an entire country and its people. To allow U.S. money contributed to the United Nations—an organization that is supposed to be dedicated to world peace—to be funneled to such a terrorist gang would be unconscionable.

Is this any way to fight international terrorism?●

THE PLIGHT OF SALVADORAN REFUGEES

HON. WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, as the horrible civil strife in El Salvador drags on, many have found it easy to ignore the very human factor in this affair. Every day large numbers of Salvadorans have sought to enter the United States out of fear that they and their families are no longer safe under the repressive Duarte regime.

Rightwing elements in that violence torn nation have undertaken systematic acts of physical abuse and murder against many individuals or organized groups perceived to be a threat to the central government. Death squads regularly roam the cities and the countryside in pursuit of those on their hit list that are to be eliminated or tortured. The story of one such targeted individual is captured in the following statement recently released by the Council on Hemispheric Affairs. This Government, Mr. Speaker, must be prepared to assist the unfortunate victims of this violent conflict forced to flee their homeland.

The story of Tulio Mendoza Figueroa and the many like him is but further evidence of a government unable or unwilling to restrain elements in its

armed forces bent on ruthless violence. As a nation unalterably committed to the protection of human rights, we can no longer condone or foster this unfortunate situation.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following statement of the Council on Hemispheric Affairs into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT OF THE COUNCIL ON HEMISPHERIC AFFAIRS

An estimated 30,000 Salvadorans have fled to the United States since the beginning of 1980. Most of them arrive with little or no money and are forced to enter the country illegally, as it is nearly impossible for them to obtain visas. Having fled the mounting political violence and the threat from rightwing death squads in El Salvador, the U.S. is deporting them at an estimated rate of 400 per month from the Los Angeles area alone.

The case of Tulio Mendoza Figueroa, a school teacher who fled his home on December 26, when he learned his name was on the "hit list" of a local death squad, is typical of many refugees arriving in the U.S. Mendoza was a member of ANDES (Asociacion Nacional de Educadores Salvadoreños), the major teachers' union in El Salvador. The teaching profession, like every other which attempts to organize to protect its rights, has been subjected to brutal repression by the armed forces and by the right wing death squads. Mendoza's only crime was to have been a member of ANDES, which like almost all the other independent unions has joined the opposition umbrella group.

Mendoza and two other teachers learned from a former student, who held his teachers in high esteem, that they were to be killed. The student who warned them was a member of the death squad which was to have carried out the murders. The three hurriedly left the country with Mendoza's family, travelling by bus through Guatemala into Mexico. Unable to find work and running short of money, Mendoza left his family in Guadalajara and pushed north with the other two. The three were arrested by the U.S. Border Patrol while attempting to cross near Tijuana, and were told that unless they signed an agreement to return to El Salvador voluntarily, they would spend a year in jail and "suffer a lot." Having run out of money, and without any knowledge of U.S. law, they signed.

A rumor reached the detention center where they were being held that of the 60 Salvadorans who had been sent back at Christmastime, 42 had been killed by the security forces upon arrival. Terrified, the detainees tried to annul their "voluntary" agreements and contracted lawyers in the community. It was only then that Mendoza learned that, by law, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) must provide all those arrested with written notice of their rights, which include the right to a deportation hearing, the right to seek political asylum, and the right to legal counsel. By signing the "voluntary" agreement, they had forfeited these rights and could be sent back to El Salvador.

This is exactly what happened to Mendoza's two friends. Unable to raise the bond money required for more than one of them, the detainees elected Mendoza to be released so that he could publicize the plight of the refugees. Mendoza was released pending a hearing (he was able to retract the de-

parture agreement) on his request for political asylum. He says his two friends were sent back to San Salvador on February 12. He has not heard from them since.

Mendoza and his compatriots in this country are convinced that if forced to return, they would be killed, or at best forced underground. The official INS procedure for all returnees is to make their identity known to the Salvadoran government, and then to fly them back to San Salvador. In El Salvador, they are subjected to a government interview to determine why they left the country.

One American university professor, who has seen films of these interviews, describes the level of abuse as "frightening," and said that "there is no doubt in my mind that somewhere between 5% and 10% of those who are returned are executed, because the government had something on them, a labor union or something." Millard Arnold, a former State Department official, says, "It just stands to reason. The odds are that some of them are going to be tortured or killed." Despite the mounting evidence of danger, the deportations continue.

U.S. immigration law provides for the safety of foreign nationals endangered by "civil war or catastrophic circumstances" in their home countries. Under this provision, the State Department could issue a blanket exemption from immigration requirements for Salvadoran refugees. Many of these refugees, like Mendoza, have specific reasons (membership in a "hostile" labor union, etc.) to fear political retribution should they return, and would thus be eligible for political asylum. Others who left because they feared the growing violence would affect them could be protected by being granted what the INS terms "extended voluntary departures," which would allow them to remain until the danger at home has lessened. The U.S. seldom before has sent refugees back into a situation of civil war, where they face grave dangers. The treatment of Salvadorans is almost unprecedented, but apparently not without motive.

In the case of El Salvador, political considerations arising from the Reagan administration's near-paranoia about alleged communist influence in Central America have overruled humanitarian concerns, with the result that innocent civilians are being sent back to almost certain persecution, if not to their deaths. Requests for blanket "extended voluntary departures" must originate with the State Department. But State thus far has consistently ignored pleas by a coalition of members of Congress, religious organizations and other civic groups, as well as from its own Human Rights Bureau, to grant the Salvadorans refugee status.

The United States has, of course, been generous in offering asylum to refugees from communist and other "unfriendly" governments (in the past, the "extended departure" provision has been applied to refugees from Vietnam, Laos, Iran and—most recently—Nicaragua), because in doing so it confirmed the evil nature of these nations. But to admit refugees from El Salvador that are equally deserving of asylum would seriously undermine the already controversial position the U.S. has taken in support of the military-civilian junta there. It would be tantamount to conceding what opponents of the U.S. policy have claimed all along—that the ruling junta in fact condones many of the human rights abuses occurring there, and is guilty of persecuting its own citizens.

It appears that the much vaunted Reagan "consistency" in foreign policy has taken

another blow from its own morally inconsistent manner of implementation. By making a distinction between refugees from so-called communist nations and from allies who are nominally anti-communist, the U.S. is blatantly ignoring the humanitarian intent of the Refugee Act of 1980, which states that "... it is the historic policy of the United States to respond to the urgent needs of persons subject to persecution in their homelands."●

TRIBUTE OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, last year more than 2 million Cub Scouts in the United States joined in celebrating the golden anniversary of the Cub Scout program of the Boy Scouts of America.

The Cub Scout program was officially instituted in 1930 in order to provide for younger boys the fun of home centered activities which would involve their families and friends. The objectives of the Boy Scouts of America and cub scouting for boys 8 through 10 are character development, citizenship training, mental and physical fitness, and fun and adventure. During the golden anniversary year, the 30 million Cub Scouts joined the program to participate in the excitement and life-lasting experience of scouting.

The scouting movement has been active in the Washington, D.C. area since scouting, as developed by Lord Baden-Powell in England, arrived in America in 1910. The first scouting constitution and bylaws for the area were adopted in 1911. The local council was incorporated on May 12, 1922, as the District of Columbia Council, subsequently changed to the National Capital Area Council. Since its beginning the council has organized scouting to fully involve parents, leaders and organizations in the District of Columbia and nearby Virginia and Maryland.

Early records of the National Capital Area Council indicate Cub Scout packs were organized beginning in 1930 and the growth of this younger boy program has continued to the present time. At the end of 1980, over 27,000 Cub Scouts were registered in the Washington, D.C., region. They participate in activities in 734 packs located in 17 counties between Fredericksburg, Va., the District of Columbia, and Frederick, Md.

Cub scouting has not severed its ties with the past and has continually evolved to keep up with the ever-changing needs of America's boys and their families. Historical material regarding the early activities of Cub Scouts in the National Capital Area

Council is currently being researched. Some Cub Scout packs are developing a history of their packs which material can be preserved for the future, and many units which have been in operation for decades—some over 40 years—are trying to locate former members. Such research has developed information, such as the Cub Scout pack formed at Fort Myer, Va., in April 1931, which was a mounted unit.

Activities during the golden anniversary to help Cub Scouts celebrate their 50th birthday included hundreds of celebrations on the unit level and program events to help them remember the past, consider the present, and plan for the future.

This same enthusiasm continues in the 51st year of cub scouting. As a former scout, I am proud to endorse and support the scouting program. I invite you to join me in saluting the Cub Scouts of America for their contributions to helping strengthen our communities, and indeed our Nation.●

SPACE, PROGRESS AND DEFENSE

HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, as the United States prepares to launch its first Space Shuttle, it is time, I think, to take stock of our space program and the need to continue it. The cost of the program over the years has been a subject of some criticism, and there are now among us those who consider it a luxury we can ill afford.

But as we continue to consider the part space exploration and utilization should have in our national priorities, I believe we must look beyond those blinding dollar marks in the sky, as it were, and reflect on the advisability, if not the necessity, of maintaining our leadership in this technology.

I was very much interested by two articles which appeared on the same day, March 22, in the Washington Post and the Washington Star. The Post article, by Henry Fairlie, dealt with the Space Shuttle and its relation to the future of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Star commentary, by Lt. Gen. Daniel Graham, U.S. Army, retired, was based on an interview in which the general discussed space-age warfare.

I commend the two articles to my colleagues and insert them in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 22, 1981]

WHERE IS THE SPACE SHUTTLE TAKING US?

(By Henry Fairlie)

There was television, of course, in Europe in the 15th century. Since there was televi-

sion, there was a "Today Show." It advertised itself with the slogan, "We are in the Dark Ages. Now make light of them."

On the morning of Aug. 3, 1492, it carried the usual kind of interviews: "What and what not to tell the priest at confession" and "Why serfs shouldn't jog on empty stomachs." But between them, that morning, was something unusual. "Kit Columbus sails from Palos today," said Joanna Paulina, a nun whom the church had put in charge of the program after the beatification of St. Barbara.

Grouchy merchants all over Europe turned away to gaze at their rancid medieval butter melting into the holes of their fork-split medieval muffins. "Haven't their Most Christian Majesties something better to spend their money on?" they grumbled. "It probably all comes out of the taxes which we now pay to Castile." And their rancorous medieval wives agreed.

It is not different today with the Space Shuttle.

No matter that their children were then playing with models of the Nina, the Pinta and the Santa Maria in their filthy medieval bath water: "Sixty Minutes" the Sunday before had exposed the fact that all three ships were unseaworthy, and it was an article of faith of the church that "Sixty Minutes" was infallible. Had not Danielus Rathersmus, a tense monk, said that Columbus could not reach the Indies?

The first flight of the Space Shuttle, two weeks from now, will be an extraordinary event. Yet where it is not just greeted with a yawn, people seem to be like jackals, hoping that it will nosedive to earth.

One ought not to have to argue, at this late hour, the importance of man's exploration of space. Both its immediate and practical results and its far-reaching if unforeseeable consequences are already and will be dramatic. They have already changed our lives, even just in the technological spinoffs. They will radically alter our concept of ourselves. In the exploration of space, we are driving very deep.

It is put very simply in NASA's own description of its mission, as prescribed by Congress, in its 223-page Program Plan, 1981-1985, which deserves anyone's study. "Space science deals with the most fundamental questions we can ask about ourselves, our origins and our destiny. Who are you? Where did we come from? Where are we going? Are we alone?"

Who does not pause at those questions, and especially at the last? It is not too much to say that, in the exploration of space, science is asking questions about God. I can even forgive George Will his occasional choice of dinner guests because he is one of the few commentators who is intellectually and even spiritually alert to the depth of the concerns to which we are reaching as we journey into space.

Again one can turn to NASA's own description of its mission. It "seeks to understand the origin and evolution of the universe." The questions to which it reaches are "at the core of human concern since the most primitive times." Those questions are exact. "What are the size, scope and structure of the universe? What is our place in it? How did it begin? Is it unchanging or does it evolve; and will it have an end?" One has only to ask: In what other program, prescribed and funded by Congress, are such questions put? Put with the real hope of finding the answers now, outside "the dirty basement windows of the atmosphere?"

But let us stay with the shuttle. It is too easy to think of it only as a toy. After all,

it's a bus. But even simply as a bus, consider where it will take us.

Part of NASA's mission is its life sciences program. This program seeks, among other things, "to ensure the health, safety, well-being and effective performances of humans in space." The furthestest purpose of this program is that it will "ultimately break human dependence on earth's environment." Space will become a habitable place for us.

My own application to be on the first shuttle which will carry reporters into space is treated with a clear if affectionate lack of seriousness. Gentle references to my age, and to the fact that an open-heart patient may not be the best risk up there, leave me with no answer. Yet if I am really to be "at large," what lesser place should be my beat? I should be on that bus.

But if we are to understand what the shuttle means, there are more immediate functions to ponder. Unless David Stockman has his way, 1984 will be an astonishing year.

The exploration of space will by then be beginning to accelerate. One need not mention here every new adventure which will be started. It is enough just to say, for example, that the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh spacelabs will be launched. But among the new initiatives will be the launching of the space telescope.

This will be the first permanent observatory in space. It will be the most powerful telescope ever built. It will be put into orbit, and it will be long-lived. It will be serviced by the shuttle.

If one thinks of the telescopes available to Galileo, it is not less than breathtaking to think of this telescope, 2.4 meters in diameter, traveling around in space, and again outside our dirty basement windows. It could not be put into orbit, and given its long life to do its amazing work, if a shuttle did not service it. And in 1984 also the third shuttle is meant to be available.

But there is, of course, much more than the shuttle will do. The first shuttle this year, if all goes well, will carry a large-format camera up. This camera will "provide stereoscopic, panchromatic imagery, with a resolution of approximately 10 meters." But the essential point is that all of NASA's missions—including the scientific and the technological, including the observation of earth, of our environment and sources of energy—cannot be carried much further without the shuttle.

The shuttle is only one element in the regular space transportation system which is now to be developed. The whole system includes the spacelabs, the shuttle and the "inertial upper stage." This last may simply be inadequately described as a boost to the shuttle when it is already up. It will extend its range. We may think of Columbus as he gazed with his trained seaman's eye at his three vessels, adjusting their sails for their uncharted voyage and wishing for an inertial upper stage atop the rigging.

The extent and complexity of NASA's programs is barely known or understood by most people. Even if one takes only the 13 spacelabs which are supposed to be launched by 1985, each will serve one of the individual programs in NASA's several missions.

From the life sciences mission to the astrophysics mission to the earth observation mission, all affecting our immediate lives as well as man's furthest futures, it is these which the space transportation system will carry out. To imagine continuing the explo-

ration of space with no shuttles is to imagine flying on a commercial airline with no ground crews to service its planes.

If you still are not interested in the largest questions which are being asked in space, then you can at least come down to earth with a sharp bump. Among the many missions which NASA undertakes is the development of the advanced aircraft we will use here: "to improve the usefulness, performance, speed, safety and efficiency of civil and military aircraft vehicles, and to preserve U.S. leadership in aeronautical science and technology." This program will next year begin the development of the technology, for example, needed for fire-resistant material which will reduce the dangers of aircraft crashes.

That would seem to be a program whose impact is immediate enough to us all.

And if the shuttle does indeed nosedive to earth two weeks from now? We ought not to smirk at the disaster. We ought to consider what would be one of its causes. The space program depends on the long-range development of the most sophisticated technology. It has for years now been subject to erratic funding and arbitrary cuts in its budget. If the shuttle crashes, it will be our fault.

Columbus had to go begging round the courts of a still medieval Europe to find the funding for his first journey. When he was at last given it by Isabella and Ferdinand, it cost them the same as one of their court balls. Our vision sometimes seems to be as narrow as 500 years ago.

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 22, 1981]

MOVING INTO SPACE-AGE WARFARE

(By Daniel Graham)

Lt. Gen. Daniel Graham, USA retired, was director of the Defense Intelligence Agency until 1976. He served as a defense adviser to Ronald Reagan during the presidential campaign. He is co-chairman of the Alliance for Peace Through Strength, an adjunct of the American Security Council.

This is excerpted from an interview with journalist Dan Gregory.

Gregory: The plan selected by President Carter for deploying MX missiles has come under attack. Your views?

Graham: The problem is that MX is the grotesque child of bad strategy. It's grotesque to take a missile that's designed for counterforce—that is, to hit certain of the most dangerous Soviet weapons before they can hit you—and then deploy it in a system that is supposed to absorb all the effects of those weapons before you fire. That's a grotesquery, from a military standpoint.

And then to put \$50-60 billion into that grotesquery is absolutely stupid. The MX deployment scheme should be rejected, not because its going to endanger the pronghorn antelope or the desert tortoise, but because it is the final offspring of very bad strategy.

They say we need the MX to protect because the Minuteman has become vulnerable. If I were a Minuteman missile I wouldn't consider the MX to be doing much about my vulnerability. How do you protect the Minuteman from its vulnerability? Well, the best thing to do is to defend. Get some kind of effective defense. How best to do that is the way that puts the most doubt in the Soviet general staff's mind: With a space-born defense.

Look at it this way. What do you do by putting out more things for the Soviets to shoot at? That's what you do with MX. There's one missile and you go to great ex-

pense to move it around to 23 different places that it might fire from. The worst problem you give the Soviets, assuming they can't figure out where the missile is, is that they have to shoot at 22 more things than they would have liked to have to shoot at. How do they solve that problem? They add 44 more warheads to their inventory—because two warheads dedicated to each one of those targets will insure—85, 90 percent insure—that it will be destroyed. So the Soviets have a pure arithmetic problem, the way we've been going about things.

But look what happens if you add an active defense. Now, I'm not talking about a perfect one that says "no missiles hit the ground," but just one that takes out any significant portion, say 10, 20 per cent of the Soviet striking force. Now the Soviets don't know how many of their warheads would get through and, what's worse for them, they don't know which ones would get through. And now you've got a formula that's not straight arithmetic, it's all full of permutations, combinations, and probabilities, which sharply reduces any assurance in the Soviet general staff's mind that they could attack MX or our bombers or our submarines in port with any assurance. And that doubt in the mind of the aggressor is the essence of deterrence, so that's how you repair your deterrent.

Q: Even as it came into being, many people accepted MAD (mutually assured destruction) only as a stop-gap until improved technology would provide something more concrete in the way of strategic protection. Is MAD now obsolete or is it becoming so?

A: There was about a year in the history of man when MAD looked like it might work. And even Khrushchev thought so for awhile. But it only lasted for a year that there was any possibility of MAD working because then technology began to make these weapons usable in a true military fashion rather than in the sort of "I'm going to blow up your city if you blow up my city," context.

Yes, we are at a real watershed in military affairs. If the United States does not change its strategic framework of thinking about these things, and allows the contest to remain in that technical area where the Soviets have learned how to compete very well and, as a matter of fact, beat us in those technologies because their mass more than makes up for what small technical advantages we have, then the Soviets are bound to win it. They're bound to win that contest and their strategic superiority over the United States will grow.

We must recognize the strategic watershed we have reached and put together a new strategic framework that is compatible with both the historical situation and the technical situation we're in today. If we don't do that I'm afraid we're not going to succeed and we're just going to fall further and further behind the Soviets.

If the Reagan administration's budget is simply a matter of incremental add-ons to all the various programs in the Pentagon, many of which—all of them were conceived within the framework of bad strategy (some of them are still good even though conceived within the framework of a bad strategy) but if that's all we do, just add to programs already going instead of making those fundamental changes required, we can wind up after five years or a decade of putting tremendous funds into those programs being worse off than we are today.

Q: You have predicted a major change of emphasis in this country's nuclear strategy within the decade, away from . . .

A: Away from straight destructive nuclear offensive capability to a sophisticated combination of defense and offense. And if done properly it is my contention that it's going to be cheaper than trying to meet the Soviets in the "mass" contest for masses of missiles and masses of airplanes and masses of ships and so forth. We've got to end-run them technologically but that we won't do unless we change the strategic framework in which we think.

I told you that within 10 years we will change. The problem is that if we don't change soon enough within the 10 years we are going to continue to allow the Soviets advantages that are going to be very detrimental to the Western world and the United States.

We can establish a space-borne defense against Soviet nuclear threats quicker, with less money and with more popular support than we can do anything else to change the strategic balance. I see signs all over now that we're likely to go in that direction provided we can overcome a lot of bureaucratic turf-guarding and program managers' biases toward ongoing programs.

Q: You are referring to laser satellites?

A: I am referring to a thorough-going space effort which would involve some small, manned military vehicles in space that are multipurpose, could do a number of things including defending the installations we already have in space, satellites and so forth, inspecting Soviet satellites, destroying Soviet satellites if necessary, and intercepting some portion of a Soviet attack force using high-powered chemical lasers.

In addition, there is the possibility of what really constitutes a high-powered one-shot laser minefield. It's a satellite that you put up in the way of a Soviet attack that would shoot down great numbers of Soviet missiles and warheads if they tried to fire at us, a satellite that you could put up in times of danger.

I would couple the whole thing with the first steps toward acquiring solar energy platforms which would allow us, on an unlimited basis, to acquire power that's not dependent upon the OPEC nations or, as a matter of fact, upon any non-replenishable source of carbon fuels.

All of these things in a package are well within our technical grasp and if we do it we will re-establish strategic superiority over the Soviet Union or anybody else, and, furthermore, help to solve other basic strategic problems in the United States, such as our energy problem.

Q: You're talking about a radical departure. And the Soviets are ahead of us in anti-satellite technology.

A: In the application of space technology to military matters they lead us because they have been doing this and they have an anti-satellite capability. The technology that they're using is relatively primitive, it's no problem in terms of sheer technology. But they're ahead of us in applying the available technology to the problem of attacking objects in space.

We can overcome that very quickly and go well beyond them, and move the contest in a number of ways that even the most dovish American ought to agree with me are good.

One is, you move the contest with the Soviets out of the realm of sheer mass of offensive capability, into the high-technology arena where the United States should be able to and, I am convinced, will be able to stay ahead of the Soviets, and that's in a contest to control cislunar space.

Secondly, you reduce the urge to constantly stockpile more and more offensive

nuclear weapons which, I understand, is a great problem for many.

The third thing is, you move the first and perhaps the only battle in a future central war into outer space where you're not blowing off chunks of the face of the planet.

But from a strictly military point of view, the greatest advantage is that you force the Soviets to compete with the United States in an arena in which they compete badly, and that is in high technology.

Somebody is going to establish a strategic superiority in space. The Soviets know that. They're working on it very hard. And we, with far better tools at hand to establish that dominion, have failed to do so. And we must—because if we don't, they will and from then on, whoever controls that high ground of space is going to have a tremendous edge, no matter what other level of confrontation occurs.●

ALLIES NEED TO INCREASE THEIR DEFENSE EFFORTS

HON. JAMES A. COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, over the past decade, we have watched the Soviet Union, our principal adversary, make immense strides in furthering their global interests at the expense of Western security. The massive Soviet buildup in tanks, aircraft, naval vessels, and strategic weapons, coupled with their outrageous behavior in Afghanistan and use of proxy forces in the Third World, requires a strong and united Western response, especially at a time when Poland is threatened. Unless our country, along with our NATO allies, Japan, and other pro-Western nations, take meaningful actions to bolster their defenses, the Soviets may win, not necessarily through war, but by outright intimidation. The "Finlandization" of Western Europe is surely a top Soviet goal.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has borne the brunt and cost of defending the free world, since the end of World War II. Our Nation, with its Armed Forces and National Treasury, continues to underwrite the West's security. We devoted 5.2 percent of our GNP to the defense of the free world in 1980 and spent nearly 25 percent of our national budget in the areas of defense and international security assistance. Despite pledges from our allies of a 3-percent increase in real terms in their defense budgets, very few came even close to attaining that important goal. This trend cannot continue. Nothing is more dear or costly than defending one's independence and liberty. The primary ingredient is the national will to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD an article that addresses the subject of allied defense expenditures, written by an outstanding defense analyst, Dr. Wayne Schroeder

of the Heritage Foundation. I believe that he makes some cogent points with regard to this issue that we can all learn from.

ALLIES NEED TO INCREASE DEFENSE EFFORTS

Although it appears inadvisable for the Reagan Administration to pressure them at this time, Japan and members of the NATO Alliance must assume greater responsibility for their own defenses, either physically or financially, according to analysts at The Heritage Foundation.

"Certainly, our allies cannot be expected at this time to raise their real growth in defense spending up to an order of magnitude approaching that of either the Soviet Union or their American ally," the defense experts write in the current issue of National Security Record.

"However, the U.S. (should) seek from its allies a consensus as to the seriousness of the Soviet threat, the inadequacy of past plans and programs, and a commitment to increase their defense burden gradually—in spite of economic stringencies, which the U.S. also faces."

Paying for their collective security has been a growing point of contention in recent years between the nations of the West, the Heritage analysts say. "Throughout the past three years, the commitment of NATO's allies to the defense of Western Europe has been gauged in terms of whether or not they were meeting the 1978 pledge to a three percent annual real growth in defense spending. By late 1980, however, it became apparent that due to low economic growth, high inflation, and budgetary constraints, most of our European allies would fail to meet the three percent real growth pledge in 1981."

"Rather than couching the NATO defense spending issue for our European allies primarily in terms of whether they are meeting an arbitrary, fixed percentage increase in defense spending each year, U.S. policy should seek to define exactly what areas in the NATO Long-Term Defense Plan and in European defense programs are in need of increased funding, and adopt an approach which squarely states European defense spending will have to rise far above the three percent real growth level."

While financial problems may plague Western Europe, Japan has no such economic justification for its posture, with its five percent annual inflation rate, a \$14 billion trade surplus, an auto industry that is overwhelming Detroit, and an expanding volume of overseas investment. Because its July 1980 pledge to increase defense spending by 9.7 percent was substantially reduced in December, Japan's new defense budget will barely compensate for inflation, the Heritage analysts say.

The analysts conclude, "It is true that many Western nations are now in a period of great economic difficulty. Unfortunately, there is no assurance that these difficulties will soon pass away—indeed, they may worsen before they get better. The true measure of leadership for the U.S. is to act now—in the midst of a critical economic and budgetary crisis of its own—to increase substantially its defense spending and revise *** security policies. *** Such action will signal to our allies that we are serious about redressing the military imbalance, and that they, too, can join in this task, provided the political will exists to do so."

National Security Record is published monthly by The Heritage Foundation, a Washington-based public policy research institute.

COMPARATIVE DEFENSE SPENDING FOR THE 10 WEALTHIEST WESTERN NATIONS

Nation	As percent of GNP	1980 U.S. dollars (in billions)
United States.....	5.2	142.7
United Kingdom.....	4.9	24.4
France.....	3.9	20.2
Netherlands.....	3.4	5.2
West Germany.....	3.3	25.1
Belgium.....	3.3	3.7
Australia.....	2.8	3.9
Italy.....	2.4	6.6
Canada.....	1.7	4.2
Japan.....	0.9	9.0

IT IS TIME FOR A CONFERENCE OF THE INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACIES

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, over 1 year ago I called for the formation of a conference of the industrial democracies in which questions of mutual interest could be discussed and debated. I based that idea on the fact that although we have such forums as NATO, the United Nations, and regional organizations, there is at present no international group, composed of members sharing basic political and economic values where economic, political, military, social, and philosophical matters can be discussed.

We need such a conference. A recent article in the Wall Street Journal tells why.

At this point I insert in the RECORD, "Discord in the West—Economic Difficulties Beyond Arms Budgets Strain NATO Alliance" from the Wall Street Journal, April 1, 1981:

DISCORD IN WEST—ECONOMIC DIFFERENCES BEYOND ARMS BUDGETS STRAIN NATO ALLIANCE

(By Eric Morgenthaler)

BRUSSELS.—In a sprawl of low buildings on the outskirts of town are the headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It is the administrative center of the Western defense alliance, a sort of transatlantic Pentagon.

These days, however, many of the people inside are sounding more as though they worked in a transatlantic Treasury. They are talking of inflation and unemployment interest rates and oil prices, social security and welfare, trade and aid, and the problems of spurring economic growth.

Their talk is anything but idle. Many analysts in Europe and the U.S. think that such pocketbook issues may well be among the most important—and most divisive—problems facing the NATO alliance over the next decade.

"Economic policy is vital, and it relates directly to our security policy," says a senior economist at NATO. "A successful economic policy may have to be the very basis of a resurgent defense policy."

That possibility matters to the United States as it tries to persuade the NATO allies to increase their defense spending at a time when their sluggish economies are forcing many of them to slash popular social programs. But the problem goes beyond the question of spending, or not spending, on defense: It involves a thicket of economic strains that threaten, many Westerners feel, to weaken and divide the alliance for years to come.

GUNS AND BUTTER

Those strains start with the age-old quandary of guns versus butter, a choice that many European countries, with their expanding economies, haven't really had to confront since the post-World War II period.

The strains extend to such globally sensitive issues as trade with the Soviet bloc (which is more important to Europe than to the U.S.) and reliance on Middle East oil (the Europeans are more dependent on it). There also are a number of intra-alliance issues, ranging from competing interest rates and possibly protectionism to the fact that the unhappy economic climate is pitting ally against ally in a fierce race for shrinking world markets.

"The main point is there is going to be a hell of a lot of hassle on a number of economic issues," says David Watt, director of the London-based Royal Institute of International Affairs.

Mr. Watt believes that because of such problems as the slowdown in Western growth, the continuing fallout from the oil-price jumps since 1973, the weakness of the dollar in recent years and "the rather clumsy handling of all these issues by the Carter administration," Washington faces a much more difficult situation than the last two or three administrations have had.

A COMPLICATING FACTOR

Its task is complicated by Europe's being stronger and more assertive, both economically and politically, than it used to be. "If you compare it with the '50s or '60s, the whole situation has changed," says Helmut Hubel, who is with the German Foreign Policy Research Institute, a think tank in Bonn. "The economic strength of the European states has grown so much."

The world view of many European states also has changed—and moved somewhat away from the American vision of things. "There's a real problem of a divergence of opinion on what are the underlying trends in world affairs—one of which is The Threat," says Gregory Flynn, assistant director of the Paris-based Atlantic Institute for International Affairs.

The threat, of course, is that from the Soviet Union. The Europeans call for continued emphasis on strategic-arms limitation and other elements of detente while Washington seems to be putting detente on the back burner in favor of an arms buildup.

"What America sees frequently as Europeans' being unwilling to carry their share of the defense burden," Mr. Flynn says, is precisely what the Europeans see as their right to have more of a say in alliance policy making.

DIFFICULT TRADEOFF

The argument over sharing the burden is exacerbated by Europe's economic troubles. These days, more money for guns, which is what Washington seems to want from the Europeans, could well mean less money from butter. But for a European politician, whose countrymen have long been accus-

tomed to the butter of benevolent social programs, that trade-off isn't as easily made as it might be for an American.

"I don't think people in Europe would understand having to cut back social-welfare programs in order to make more money available for defense spending," says a defense planner in Bonn. "In Europe, much more than in the U.S., we need a sound, stable social atmosphere to prepare people for defense expenditures."

For decades now, the countries of Europe have built their extensive and popular range of social programs on the assumption of ever-increasing economic growth. Now that growth is trailing off, says one senior American diplomat, those programs have become "an albatross" and "an intense political handicap" for many European leaders. They also are a large problem for those who would raise defense outlays.

"For the past 30 years or so, you were able to combine the other priorities in public expenditure with defense," observes Christoph Bertram, director of the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies. But today, he adds, "the perimeters of economic experience which have governed European society for 30 years are no longer valid"—and that means hard questions over public spending.

"At a time when you are trying to combat recession and fight inflation by reducing public expenditures, you can't keep the defense budget untouched," Mr. Bertram says. Because many Western leaders are trying to do precisely that, he suggests, "defense, by trying to be a sacred cow at a time when everything else is being cut, is risking becoming more and more controversial."

Aside from the basic differences over defense spending, there are other economic friction points that could hamper NATO's ability to act cohesively in a crisis, analysts warn. One that is often mentioned, but whose significance is hotly disputed, is the trade ties between Western Europe and the Soviet bloc.

"It's very difficult, because we have to combine a lot of conflicting objectives," says a foreign-ministry official in Paris. "In West Germany and France, there is a view that through trade, the Eastern-bloc societies are changing. It's a very protracted process, but it may lead to some evolution in those societies." Thus, trade with the Soviet bloc "isn't a purely economic question" for France, he says. "It's more a political one."

But that doesn't reassure the Americans. Most recently, they have voiced considerable concern as negotiations have proceeded over a proposed 3,600-mile pipeline to deliver Soviet natural gas to Western Europe.

A MATTER OF LEVERS

What worries the U.S. is that if the transaction goes through, the Soviets by 1990 could be providing 10% to 12% of the natural-gas needs of the West European nations outside Scandinavia—30% in West Germany's case.

"There's always some suspicion in the U.S. that our trade with the Soviet Union could be a lever for the Soviets against us," says Mr. Hubel of the institute in Bonn. "But we think it's also a lever for us against the Soviets. It's a two-way commitment, a measure for stabilization. The Soviets could sell us gas, but they're highly interested in our technology—they really need it."

Wherever one stands on East-West trade, it's clear why it's an issue that affects NATO. But there are other issues where the link may be less obvious, for they involve

trade or relations between the NATO countries themselves.

Many of those controversies are the stuff of everyday global economic life—disputes over a country's monetary or trade policy, say, or over the subsidizing of troubled industries—and in times of healthy growth, they usually don't cause much of a stir. But during an economic slowdown such as the current one, as countries everywhere scramble globally for business to save jobs at home, such spats can become major political rows.

Thus, officials in several European countries now and complaining loudly about high U.S. interest rates—which, they say, are luring investors' funds away from Europe. "One reason we are so slow in recovering economically is the tremendously high interest rates in the U.S.," says W. F. van Eekelen, under minister of defense in the Netherlands. He adds, however, that "NATO really isn't set up to handle that sort of debate."

CARLUCCI'S SPEECH

Washington seems determined to try to reassert U.S. leadership—in defense, as well as in economic affairs. It made that clear a few weeks ago with a tough call from Frank C. Carlucci, deputy secretary of defense, for the NATO allies to follow the Reagan lead and increase their defense outlays.

"The United States cannot be expected to improve and strengthen U.S. forces in Europe unless other allies increase their own contribution to the combined defense effort," Mr. Carlucci told a defense conference in Munich. "Nor can the United States, unaided, bear the burden of promoting Western interests beyond Europe."

Although there is confusion in Europe over just what Washington wants in the way of spending, it is already apparent that most European nations, faced with their own deep economic worries, aren't in any hurry to meet the administration's call.

"I think Carlucci is misreading Europe if he thinks tough talk is making a great impression," says Klaas de Vries, a socialist member of the Dutch Parliament, a long time defense-spending critic and chairman of the Parliament's defense committee. "It was a very insensitive speech. And it focuses the attention of the Europeans far more on determining what their own priorities are than it induces them to follow the leader."

Which is simply one way of saying that—for political, economic and social reasons—difficult times lie ahead for the NATO alliance. A senior American diplomat has another way of saying it. As the U.S. gears up to sell its allies on greater defense spending, he observes, "one has the net impression that it is going to be the same — old tired, uphill battle."●

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY WILDCATS

HON. JIM JEFFRIES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, many of you may have seen the March 23, 1981, issue of Sports Illustrated which features Rolando Blackman of the Kansas State basketball team on the front cover.

The Kansas State Wildcats have always been noted for their speed and

agility despite the size of the players and have the reputation of a team not to be taken lightly.

The Wildcats have indeed made this year an exciting season for sports fans of my district, and even though the Kansas State Wildcats did not make the final four to qualify for the NCAA title, I would like to extend my congratulations to them for advancing as far as they did and praise them for the valiant try.

Under the direction of Coach Jack Hartman for the past 11 years, the Kansas State Wildcats have certainly proven not only to Kansas but to the Nation that they are contenders and will undoubtedly be back again. Good luck next year, Jack, and congratulations on a fine 1980-81 season.

For the benefit of my colleagues who did not see the Sports Illustrated story, the article follows:

K-State coach Jack Hartman's squad is in his image—quiet, colorless, collected; a friendly hardware dealer camouflaging the mind of a crafty terrorist. Down by 12 points against San Francisco, Hartman had replaced his struggling star, Rolando Blackman, with Brazil's own Eduardo Galvao, who despite being called "Edweirdo" by his teammates, was instrumental in the Wildcats' 64-60 victory. Then, against Oregon State, Hartman went from Edweirdo back to Rolando, who showed his appreciation by sinking the gamer with two seconds left.

Before that happened Kansas State plugged along 10 points in arrears until 6' 7" Center Ed Nealy and his backup, Les Craft, wore down Johnson and forced him into fouls and turnovers so that the 'Cats could proceed on a 16-6 tear and tie the game at 48 with 3:23 to play, precisely the point at which Johnson fouled out for the 51st time in his career. "We were working our butts off," said Craft. Not to mention Johnson's, a feat of some magnitude.

Now it was a chess game between masters. And, as Miller said, "You don't beat a Jack Hartman team making mistakes. They're too smart." Miller elected to slow things down, but the Wildcats fouled Charlie Sitton, who, being a rookie, missed on the one-and-one. Kansas State then held the ball down to 10 seconds when Blackman, the Olympian from Brooklyn, backed Mark Radford to the baseline, where they were joined by Blume. "He made a good strong move and I cut him off," said Radford. "Then he made another strong move."

It was the second one—Blackman spinning in the air from 16 feet, swish—that did it. "I had the good release," Blackman said. "I wasn't even aware that anyone was on me. It was just me and the rim."●

AN ANALYSIS OF THE REAGAN BUDGET—PART I

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, now that the dust is settling on President Reagan's budget proposal and time for analysis of some of the actual figures

has transpired, a picture is developing which does not portend a hopeful future, through we all certainly wish the contrary were true. The distinguished economist, Murray Rothbard, recently published an article entitled "The Reagan Budget Fraud" in the *World Market Perspective*, March 19, 1981, issue. Mr. Rothbard is a key member of the Austrian school of economics. Although he is perhaps subject to criticism for support of what might be termed extreme libertarian views with an antidefense bias; nevertheless, his analysis is one that is excellent in scope and depth. I strongly commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The following is the first part of the article that is to appear in a two-part series:

THE REAGAN BUDGET FRAUD
(By Murray Rothbard)

"Reagan New Deal," and "Reagan Revolution!" proclaim the headlines. As the media prattle on about "massive tax and budget cuts" and an "historic" change in American politics rivalling that of FDR, conservatives are mobilizing for a great confrontation while liberals organize for a last-ditch defense of the millions of poor who are supposed to be thrown out into the street. Both sides can relax, however. For there is no Reagan Revolution. There is no budget cut; there is no tax cut. The whole brouhaha is sound and fury, signifying nothing. Nothing is happening.

THE BUDGET CUT THAT IS NOT

The myth propounded by the Reagan Administration is that he has proposed a "massive" budget cut for fiscal 1982 amounting to a whopping \$41.6 billion. Even at face value, no sensible person could possibly refer to such a piddling 5.6 percent cut (from a total spending of \$736.9 billion) as "massive" or historic. We might be entitled to say, however, that such a cut would be a nice, if hardly earth-shaking "new beginning." But there is no cut. For estimated total federal spending for fiscal 1981 is \$655.2 billion; President Reagan's proposed 1982 budget comes to \$695.3 billion, which, in my old-fashioned arithmetic, amounts to a \$40.1 billion or 6.1 percent increase, not a cut.

When is a cut not a cut? In the old days, before the voodoo semantics of public relations entered the fray, a "budget cut" meant exactly that: a cut in the budget from one year to the next. Thus, President Eisenhower cut his first full year's budget from \$74.3 billion in fiscal 1953 to \$67.8 billion in fiscal 1954—a real, genuine cut of \$6.5 billion or 8.7 percent. That, in old-fashioned parlance, was a budget cut.

The Reagan flim-flam, in contrast, takes not Mr. Carter's last budget, but Carter's projected increase for fiscal 1982, as the point of reference. Carter had projected an increase from his estimated \$657.8 billion in fiscal 1981 to \$729.7 billion in 1982, and the Reagan "cuts" are made out of the proposed increase.¹ In other words, Reagan is in no

¹ Even on its own terms, the Reagan budget only "cut" by \$34.4 billion, not \$41.6; the other \$7.2 billion were simply tacked on arbitrarily by the Reagan people to the Carter proposals to provide for allegedly "adequate defense." So we have a minor fraud within a larger one.

honest sense "cutting the budget"; he is merely increasing the budget at a lower rate than Mr. Carter had proposed. The "budget cut" is a fraud. No one at the time called the first Eisenhower budget a "revolution"; in fact, liberals hailed Eisenhower for preserving the New Deal-Fair Deal and conservatives at the time attacked him bitterly for the same reason. Yet, if Reagan had only cut the budget to the same degree as the self-proclaimed "moderate" Eisenhower, he would have weighed in with a \$600.6 billion budget, not his "historic" \$695.3.

In fact, a better gauge of the sincerity of Mr. Reagan's budget-cutting is to compare his 1982 budget with the last full Carter budget, for fiscal 1980 (Oct. 1, 1979-Sept. 30, 1980). We would then be contrasting the last budget under Carter's complete control with the first one totally under President Reagan. Estimated total spending for fiscal 1980 was \$579.6 billion. This gives us a \$115.7 billion increase over the last two years, or a 10 percent annual budget increase of Reagan over Carter. That's a "cut"?

FORFEITING 1981

Before analyzing the 1982 Reagan budget in more detail, we should not completely skip over the Reagan stepchild, 1981. The new President, after all, has eight months out of fiscal 1981 to cut this year's budget; one would think that was plenty of time. Indeed, before taking office, Reagan promised faithfully to institute his income-tax cut retroactive to January 1, and his young Galahad of a budget-cutter, David Stockman, was talking about a \$14 billion cut in the fiscal 1981 budget. All that is now forgotten: the tax cuts have been put forward to July 1, and the budget cuts proposed for 1981 have been pared to a scarcely discernible \$2.6 billion.²

Indeed, the true role of the Reagan Administration in relation to the free market and conservatism was presaged in early February. Hardly was the new President installed when the Reagan team persuaded most of the conservative Republicans in Congress, many of whom had voted against increases in the public debt limit all their lives, to go along with Reagan's proposed \$50 billion increase in the limit. It was rather pitiful to see hardened anti-debt Congressmen say that since they trusted Mr. Reagan to cut the budget, they would reluctantly vote to give him a chance. In this way, politics triumphs over principle. Is the destiny of the Reagan Era to be the killer of the hard-money dream?

THE \$3-6 BILLION BOO-BOO

In a way, it was merely a funny incident, but it also chillingly revealed the political-bureaucratic mentality at work. Scarcely a week after President Reagan had delivered his February 18 State of the Union message, the Administration discovered that Stockman, their budget wunderkind, had somehow mislaid \$3 to \$6 billion from the Carter 1982 estimates, and that therefore they would have to "cut" that much more from the increase to come in at their target of \$695.5 billion. The humor comes from the embarrassment and the continued insistence of the Reagan aides that, for political reasons, the President could not have admitted any uncertainty in the seeming precision of his budget figures. As his press secretary put it, "If the trumpet sounds an un-

² Once again, the officially estimated cut is padded by Reagan's tacking on an arbitrary \$1.3 billion for "adequate defense" before counting his own cut.

certain note, then who can prepare for battle? Who indeed? But if the trumpet really is uncertain, and it only fakes certainty, what happens when the mistake and the pretense are uncovered? Won't things then be much worse? But of course politicians, in their relentless scramble for advantage in today's news, are ever heedless of tomorrow. We the people have to pick up their pieces.

The chilling aspect is the instant cover up and ruthless buckpassing reminiscent of the Watergate era. When the boo-boo surfaced, everyone in the White House hastened to put the blame on Stockman. "Those are Dave Stockman's numbers." Each aide, plus of course the President, must be protected at all times. And yet, as Harry Truman once said, "The buck stops here"—in the Oval Office. It was Reagan's message, Reagan selected his advisers, and therefore he must shoulder the blame. Or is President Reagan's role in this administration merely to be a "good communicator" to be trotted out to soft-soap the American public?

THE 1982 BUDGET

The first thing to be said about the proposed 1982 budget is that nothing is abolished. Most programs have their rate of increase reduced; a few programs are really cut; and a few more are increased even over the Carter projections. But nothing is really abolished, not even the Council on Wage and Price Stability, a totally ineffective agency which always served as a sinister threat of wage-price controls hanging over the market. Certainly, the wage-price monitoring program has been abolished, but the cut of \$1.5 million and the firing of 135 employees hardly makes a dent in the swollen federal bureaucracy.

Abolition serves a purpose even greater than the massive budget cuts that would follow. For a mere cut, even a large cut, keeps the bureaucracy in place, ready for a later comeback. Parkinson's Law decrees that any bureaucracy tends to grow and grow, unless checked sternly by outside forces—for example, by slashing its budget. But if an agency is abolished, the bureaucracy disappears and will no longer serve as a nucleus for future raids on the taxpayer.

During his campaign, Ronald Reagan promised to abolish two new and calamitous Cabinet departments: the Department of Education and the Department of Energy; all that is conveniently forgotten. The mammoth synfuel boondoggle remains, though some of its functions will be shifted out of the Energy Department.

Let us take just one of the 83 programs where the Reagan Administration has trumpeted its "cuts"—the widely and justly hated food stamp program. Food stamps have been accelerating rapidly and monstrously over the last decade: from \$551 million in fiscal 1970 to \$5.5 billion in fiscal 1978 (a tenfold increase in eight years) to \$8.7 billion two years later. The 1981 food stamp budget is estimated at \$10.95 billion; Reagan's 1982 proposal is \$10.45 billion. This piddling 4.6 percent cut is in sharp contrast to the Administration's phony self-proclaimed 16.2 percent decrease, which again comes from using Carter's projected 1982 figure instead of actual 1981 expenditures. Moreover, if we compare Reagan's 1982 food stamp budget to the last full Carter figures of 1980, we get a 10 percent annual increase in food stamp expenditures from Carter to Reagan.

Not only that: if we take the projected figures for the rest of the Reagan era, we get a food stamp expenditure of \$11.06 billion in

fiscal 1985, a 5.8 percent increase over fiscal 1982. So that instead of food stamps being cut further, we are to eliminate the measly cut over 1981 by the year 1983, and then food stamps will continue growing. This is the Reagan Revolution?

But again: the Reagan Administration's phony figures enable it to claim a healthy 20.3 percent cut in food stamp spending by 1985—because it persists in using as a reference point what Carter's budget would have been. For how many years can we continue to blame Jimmy Carter for current heavy spending? When does President Reagan become accountable?

When tackling food stamps, of course, the Reagan forces would be facing two sets of powerful enemies: the highly paid class of social workers, bureaucrats, and other professional "friends of the poor"; and the untouchable farmers, as well as retail stores, all of whom are heavily subsidized by this ten-plus billion dollar boondoggle.

The press has given some attention to the Sacred Seven, programs where Reagan has not even dared to reduce the Carter increases for 1982. Total annual cost to the taxpayer of the Sacred Seven programs is a colossal \$210 billion. Leading the pack is Social Security, at an annual cost of \$140 billion—an inherently fraudulent program that was sold to the public as old age "insurance." In reality Social Security imposes a regressive double tax on the poor, first to "contribute" to a fund which is quickly dissipated, and then to pay the tax on the ever-greater benefits. The program is widely recognized as bankrupt, yet not a thing is being done to get us out from under it. Moreover, the alleged "savings" of \$1.7 billion from abolishing minimum monthly payments and payments to young adult students, turns out, when we cut through the familiar phony reckoning, to be an actual increase for these programs of \$19.1 billion in 1982. Overall, Social Security payments rose by 14.3 percent last year; the reason is that these benefits are indexed for inflation, courtesy of the taxpayer—a courtesy not extended to other pensioners or wage-earners across the country.

Another "social safety net" untouched by Reagan is the \$45.4 billion Medicare program, which is responsible for much of the enormous increase in medical and hospital costs that plague all of us except the elderly recipients of the program.

Still another Reagan sacred cow is the veterans' benefit program, most of which aids veterans with non-existent disabilities. As recently as 1975, then Congressional aide David Stockman denounced the fact that many Congressmen "openly admit to holding their noses when the annual \$12 billion is appropriated for the Veteran's Administration"; the difference is that the annual sum, by now doubled to \$25 billion, is now sequestered by Stockman as an untouchable program. This despite the fact that the VA runs with notorious inefficiency the largest hospital system in the Western world.

Because of its \$3-6 billion boo-boo, the Reagan Administration is finally biting the bullet and proposing an \$800 million cut in Veterans Administration programs. But should we be grateful for this belated 3 percent cut, when Professor Cotton Lindsay, a leading young economist, has shown that \$8.2 billion—over ten times that amount—could be saved next year on veterans' programs if the benefits were merely limited to those the law had intended to help?

Some sacred cows are apparently so untouchable that they were not even listed as such by government or media. The outrageous tobacco price-support and acreage restriction program remains untouched—apparently in deference to North Carolina's Senator Jesse Helms. The Defense Department budget increases right away by \$5.8 billion, with promises of much more to come. I am not stressing this area since the Reagan campaign had always promised big defense increases. But are we to assume that this huge area, marked throughout by extraordinarily inefficient cost-plus programs, includes no waste whatsoever?

A particularly aggravating, and extremely costly, untouchable program is federal employee pensions. Not only is federal pay high and tenure secure, but civilian government employees may retire after 30 years and immediately start collecting their hefty pensions, regardless of age. Military employees have an even sweeter deal: they can start collecting pensions after only 20 years' service. What is more, while most of us can't have our pensions indexed for inflation, government pensioners have their payments adjusted twice yearly as the cost of living rises. It is true that Reagan's State of the Union Message proposed reducing this inflation adjustment to once yearly, to match the Social Security recipients, but, as one budget-cutting Reagan aide admitted: "We won't really push for the change. Some things are just for show."

The particularly aggravating thing about government pensions is that they thwart the democratic process. One of the best features of democracy is that it allows the public to kick the rascals out—to get politicians and bureaucrats they don't like out of the public trough. But with automatic pensions in place, we no longer have that luxury. We simply can't get rid of any of them.

Another disquieting feature of the budget is a tendency to proclaim "savings" to the taxpayer only by placing higher costs on the public in other ways. Thus, \$100 million is to be "saved" on the Coast Guard by levying compulsory fees on boat owners. A fee is another form of tax. More importantly, Reagan proposes to reduce by \$630 million the subsidy to the U.S. Postal Service. But the allegedly "independent" Postal Service will simply offset this by raising postal rates unconscionably or by eliminating Saturday mail service, which they have been itching to do for a long time. So are we to lose as letter-writers what we save as taxpayers? Yet there is no sign from this Administration of the truly free-market and budget-saving solution: to dismantle the hideously costly and inefficient Postal Service altogether, and to allow private firms to carry the mail—a service that is now unfortunately illegal.

Finally, little is being done by the Reagan budget-cutters about many free-spending federal items that are, conveniently, off-budget, and therefore not subject to Congressional scrutiny. In addition to the \$55 billion deficit announced by Jimmy Carter for 1981, there is a no less than \$47 billion deficit being spent on "off-budget programs" such as the Federal Financing Bank, and on "government-sponsored enterprises" such as numerous mortgage loan programs.

THE TAX CUT THAT ISN'T

Just as the budget cut is a myth, so is the alleged "tax cut." The media have been bal-

lyhooning the tax program as the acid test for "supply-side" economics: taxes of the wealthy have been cut drastically, say the media, and we'll see whether savings, investments and productivity increase dramatically as a result.

The problem with this common judgment is everything: taxes are not being cut, and the wealthy are getting less of a tax break than anyone else. The highly publicized 10 percent across-the-board income tax cut next year, for example, is by no means across-the-board. An individual making \$200,000 a year will receive only a 3.4 percent cut; the \$10,000 person will get a 15.3 percent reduction. A big problem is that the top-bracket tax on dividends and interest was not cut from 70 percent to 50 percent as Reagan had promised.

It is true that Reagan projects a \$45 billion reduction in income taxes in 1982 as a result of the scheduled cuts. However, these reductions will be more than offset by two unpublished but crucial items: the rise in Social Security taxes, and "bracket creep," by which inflation moves us all into higher brackets, there to be socked by a higher tax. Social Security tax and bracket creep will more than offset any cuts, so that tax receipts will rise by \$50 billion in 1982.

The Reagan Administration has failed to deliver on its promise to index our taxes so as to avoid bracket creep. It has also failed to cut at all the disastrous capital gains tax or the corporate income tax. How can savings and investment increase substantially while these crippling taxes are still in place and intact?

True, a more accelerated depreciation will now be permitted, and this is welcome relief. But the benefits will be concentrated on the old highly capitalized industries with long-lived capital; the modern, new and progressive industries which have the greatest potential for growth have already been depreciating at the new maximum rates. They should have been aided by the government, at long last, permitting any rate of depreciation that a firm deems to be appropriate.

Moreover, the President leaves intact one of President Carter's worst innovations: the misnamed "windfall profits tax" on oil, which is really a steeply graduated excise tax on crude oil at the wellhead. How are we supposed to achieve self-sufficiency in crude oil production when this tax will be operating with crippling effect? The Administration answer to this betrayal is: "We need the money." Indeed.

Some tax rates are actually going up. The already ailing airline industry especially will get hit. The federal tax on aviation fuel will be more than doubled to 20 percent, the tax on airline passenger tickets will be nearly doubled to 9 percent, and a new tax of 5 percent will be slapped on air-freight. Every airline passenger and shipper will soon be suffering the effects.

The Reagan program is not a tax cut, and it is not a test of "supply-side" economics. It is a sham. As the President admitted in his State of the Union Message, referring to the much-vaunted three-year, 30 percent income tax cut, "It's only a reduction in the tax increase already built into the system." ●

EL SALVADOR: THE VICTIMS OF
VIOLENCE

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I and many of my colleagues discussed the question of violence in El Salvador. Today, we want to talk about the thousands of victims of that violence.

More than 12,000 people have been killed in El Salvador since the military and the Christian Democratic Party assumed control of the junta in January of last year. Tens of thousands more have been forced to seek shelter in refugee camps located within El Salvador itself, across the northern border in Honduras, or in other parts of Central America. In addition, Salvadorans have come in increasing numbers to the United States in search of temporary safety from the violence and danger at home.

Last January, I traveled to Honduras, along with Representatives ROBERT EDGAR and BARBARA MIKULSKI, to examine first hand the effect which the current situation in El Salvador has had on the Salvadoran people, and on other countries in Central America. The U.N. High Commission on Refugees estimates that more than 20,000 Salvadoran refugees now live in Honduras, surviving on food provided by international relief agencies and on the charity of Honduran peasants who are desperately poor themselves.

Representatives MIKULSKI and EDGAR traveled to the border region, itself, to talk to many of these refugees, and found them living in conditions of terrible malnutrition and poverty. Similar conditions exist in refugee camps within El Salvador.

Last year, the American public was shocked to learn of the discovery of more than a dozen bodies in the Arizona desert; bodies of Salvadorans seeking refuge from the violence of their own country. Today, Salvadorans make up the second largest group of individuals entering the United States illegally. Unlike many others from around the hemisphere, they are motivated not simply by a desire to seek improvement in their own economic status, but instead many are coming because they fear their lives are in danger at home. Many have found their names, or the names of friends, on the lists of people targeted for death. They know, far better than others, that death can come in El Salvador quickly, irrationally, and from almost any source. The fear of many about returning home is genuine, and no one familiar with the violence of El Salvador can suggest there is no basis for such a fear.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

To date, the response of the current administration to the victims of violence in El Salvador has been to urge the European Economic Community to delay sending food to refugees in El Salvador—because some of it might be eaten by guerrillas—and to continue deporting hundreds of Salvadorans monthly to an uncertain fate at home.

I submit that the United States can and should do better. A nation that can afford to send millions of dollars worth of guns to an outlaw military can afford to send large quantities of food and medicine to comfort those fleeing the violence which is, in large measure, perpetrated by that military; and a nation as large and as wealthy as ours can afford at least as well as Costa Rica and Mexico to provide shelter and safety for those who fear they may lose their lives if they return to El Salvador.●

A RATIONAL ALTERNATIVE TO
SYNFUELS

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the words "district heating" or "cogeneration" are new to many Americans. Cogeneration is an alternative to the usual way of generating electricity by producing two products: electricity and higher temperature heat. District heating is a form of cogeneration which refers to a pipeline network which connects residential, commercial, and industrial buildings and utilizes a single thermal energy source to meet three needs: Hot water, space heating, and process steam needs. District heating is used widely in Europe, the Soviet Union, and Japan. It is now used by about a third of the Swedish and Danish populations, serves 70 percent of Soviet urban heat demand, and is supplied in West Germany through 474 central heating networks. There are estimates that district heating, if implemented in the United States now, could save 1 to 2.5 million barrels of oil or natural gas equivalent a day by the year 2000. A number of utilities in the United States are exploring or implementing projects: Northern States Power in two cities in Minnesota; Detroit Edison in Detroit, Mich.; United Illuminating in Bridgeport, Conn.; Pepco in Washington, D.C.; Public Service Electric & Gas in northern New Jersey; Philadelphia Electric Co. in Philadelphia, and many municipal utilities in small communities.

The article I am inserting today from the Baltimore Sun of February 2 will be of interest to everyone who is interested in energy conservation and as the author, Neal Peirce terms dis-

April 2, 1981

trict heating, "A Rational Alternative to Synfuels."

A RATIONAL ALTERNATIVE TO SYNFUELS

WASHINGTON.—Here is a perfect example of how the Reagan administration could curb wasteful, inflationary government spending, assure a more stable U.S. energy future and channel more investment and jobs into hard-pressed urban centers.

First: Follow the counsel of Office of Management and Budget Director David Stockman and "throttle back" on the incredibly expensive synthetic fuels subsidy program. Congress last year authorized synfuels development at an initial \$20 billion, with a suggestion of \$68 billion more later.

Second: The administration could encourage, with minimal federal money, a proven, century-old technology called district heating—a method which could eventually provide low-cost heat and hot water and cooling to the vast majority of America's homes and businesses.

National support for synfuels is thin. Westerners rightly fear coal and oil shale exploitation that would pollute their air, consume scarce water supplies and promote energy boom towns for which they would have to provide most of the expensive new public facilities. Easterners foresee a massive diversion of scarce capital out of their economically pressed region. Environmentalists bemoan a program that would inject cancer-causing chemicals into the atmosphere. Last year Mr. Stockman characterized synfuels as a "multi-billion dollar program (that) would not appreciably ease our energy problems."

District heating, by contrast, had an old-style American entrepreneurial birth 104 years ago when an inventive Lockport, New York, tinkerer named Birdsill Holly decided it would be a smart, economic idea to produce steam that could do double duty—to heat buildings and run the pumps of fire engines. So he built a boiler in his basement, ran steam pipes across his neighbors' lawns to the fire station and down Chestnut Street to nearby homes.

District heating flowered for a few decades in America, to a peak of about 150 systems in 1909. Then it tapered off as oil and gas for individual building heating became cheap and plentiful. Its remnants may be found today on college campuses and military bases and in a handful of aged city steam systems.

But the Europeans, we are now reminded by the Council for International Urban Liaison, took district heating seriously. It now supplies one-third of all space and water heating needs in Scandinavia. The Soviet Union has 67 times our installed district heating capacity. Most modern systems employ hot water, a system now considered more economical, practical and safer than steam.

Today, by various scientific estimates, 50 to 90 percent of U.S. heating and hot water needs, plus considerable air conditioning, could be satisfied by district heating. Immense investments in water pipes would be required to hook up the country's homes and businesses. But the costs would be a fraction of the trillion-dollar-plus capital demands of a full-scale synfuels development.

"If you add up the total amount of waste energy produced by all the electric power plants in the country," says Damascus, Maryland, district heating expert Theodore Taylor, "there's more than enough waste energy to heat the entire United States." The reason: The kinetic energy derived

from an electric turbine represents only 30 percent of the energy potential of a conventional fuel burn. The remaining energy is released as steam or hot water. Yet if recaptured in pipes, in the process called cogeneration, 85 to 90 percent efficiency of the fuel is achieved. And hot water can be economically transported for distances of up to 20 miles.

Cities or suburbs could build their own power plants to burn coal or garbage and transfer the hot water produced by pipelines to their residents. Homes and businesses could use the hot water in lieu of hot water heaters, and also circulate it through radiators for heating, or through radiators with forced air systems for the same effect.

District heating systems could save the equivalent of 55 percent of the country's current oil imports by 2000, supporters say. Unlike synfuels, the technology is of a proven, "off the shelf" variety. And since the systems would require thousands of semi- and low-skill jobs to build, they would create jobs for people where they live—in the cities—instead of creating intense demand for workers and scarce scientists to build questionable synfuel facilities in isolated Appalachian coal or Western oil shale areas. Finally, district heating would make older cities more economical, competitive places to live and do business.●

JEWISH HERITAGE WEEK

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, it was with enthusiasm that I joined my distinguished colleague from New York, Congressman JOSEPH ADDABBO, as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 155, to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating May 3 through May 10, 1981, as Jewish Heritage Week.

House Joint Resolution 155 passed last Thursday, March 26, 1981, and signals this body's commitment to the mutual respect and understanding for all peoples and cultures which is so necessary in making the ideals of America a reality.

The passage of House Joint Resolution 155 had particular meaning for me as I listened to a prayer rendered at a tribute dinner given for me by my constituents this past weekend. In the prayer, Dr. Michael Berenbaum, of the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington, gave thanks to God for the tolerance and pluralism that is and must continue to be our blessing in America.

Mr. Speaker, I now bring this prayer to the attention of my colleagues. It is a prayer symbolic of America and one which embodies the message of Jewish Heritage Week:

PRAYER OF DR. MICHAEL BERENBAUM

It is perhaps only in America that I as a Jew can pray out of the tradition of the rabbis of the people of Israel for a Christian minister who is my representative in Congress, despite the knowledge that we have

and will continue to disagree about how to achieve many of the same goals that we share as precious. Yet we strive together to build a society of justice and integrity, of compassion, and beneficence, one that is sensitive to the needs of the poor, open to the pluralistic traditions, free of racism and bigotry of any kind from which both of our peoples have suffered so brutally in the past and present. On God and God of our ancestors I pray that we join for the sake of your name in kindling light in a world of darkness, hope where there is despair, unity where there is division, compassion where there is self-centeredness, healing where there is sickness. And if we do not succeed in full, grant meaning to our struggle together.

This is a time of peril in our Nation's history, an hour of reassessment, a period of searching and division, yet also one of opportunity and promise. In this moment in history, the responsibility not only of high office, but of real leadership to his people, has fallen upon this Congressman and minister of God.

Grant him the wisdom to realize what is right, the power to achieve that which is good, the humility to know that thou alone art judged, and the sensitivity to bring us all together in the future.

Teach him to seek unity rather than division, to combine the passion born of the knowledge of injustice with the compassion which is kindled by the knowledge of Thee. Guide him to seize the opportunity and to assume the responsibility of healing in an hour of malaise, to give vision in a time of darkness and to retain hope for the poor and underprivileged in a moment of despair.

God, we ask You to guide this Congressman and minister to unite people who have historically known the anguish of suffering who could sing in the fields of slavery by the promise of redemption, who have understood full well the meaning of indignity and injustice by death and destruction, and the hope of the promised land. Let our history of suffering unite us rather than divide us. Let the passion for justice that we share, born in the injustice we experienced in isolation, be a force which brings us together for a common task rather than one that separates us in the pockets of division created by the sensitivities that our histories have developed.

United our voices in condemning violence, terrorism, and hatred, the mindless murder of children whether in Atlanta or Maalot—but let us be certain that the tone of our voices and the content of our words do not encourage more violence and give comfort to those who are its source. As your profit Jeremiah has said:

"Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his richness, but let him that glory in this that he understandeth and knoweth. Me, that I am the Lord that exercises mercy, justice, and righteousness for in these things I delight sayeth the Lord." (IX: 22)

The power has been given; the opportunity is now to offer that which we have in your service in justice, with mercy and in the quest for righteousness. We pray that we will prove equal.●

THE INFANT NUTRITION RESOLUTION

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, today my distinguished colleague from New York, Congressman BENJAMIN GILMAN, and I are introducing a House resolution expressing support for the World Health Organization's (WHO) and UNICEF's International Code of Marketing of Breast Milk Substitutes. The purpose of the WHO-UNICEF code is to contribute to the provision of safe and adequate nutrition for infants, by the protection and support of breast feeding. The code also seeks to insure the proper use of breast milk substitutes when they are necessary or desired.

This code deserves our strong support for one basic reason—it exemplifies the concern of the American people for improving the health and well-being of infants throughout the world. Children raised under conditions of poverty and poor sanitation are, of course, particularly vulnerable to the disease and high rates of malnutrition associated with improper bottle feeding. In the words of James Grant, executive director of UNICEF:

In the crucial first few months of life, breast-feeding is usually the young child's life-line. And the recent drift toward the bottle feeding of babies, a drift for which the industrialized world has provided both the example and the means, has cost tens of thousands of young lives * * *

In part, the campaign for breast feeding must also be a campaign to regulate those who promote and sell commercial infant formula to mothers who do not need it, cannot afford it, and are unable to safely use it.

In addition, the WHO-UNICEF code deserves our support because it offers us the chance to promote self-reliant development in the Third World and enhance U.S. relations with developing countries—who are very deeply committed to enactment of the code—without spending an extra dime of the taxpayers money. Many of our European allies are also quite strongly committed to the code; indeed, at present only the United States seems to be in doubt as to the importance of the code.

Many of my colleagues are undoubtedly aware of the tragic increases in infant malnutrition, disease, and morbidity which are associated with bottle feeding under the unsuitable socioeconomic conditions which are prevalent in the Third World. Nonetheless, let me briefly summarize the situation as it has unfolded in the last few years.

Breast milk has historically been the sole source of nutrition for newborn infants. Even with the addition of

solid weaning foods at an age of approximately 6 months, breast feeding has traditionally been continued as an important supplementary source of nourishment for up to 2 years or more. Modern science has been unable to improve upon or even duplicate the life-giving properties of human milk, and it remains the optimal source of infant nutrition, in all circumstances, for the first 6 months of life. The chemical composition of breast milk contains a host of anti-infective properties, which protect infants against allergies and disease. Breast feeding also provides a unique emotional bond between the baby and the nursing mother, and, according to many health professionals, a relatively effective means of child spacing. In our country, infant formulas have, in general, supplied an adequate, if not completely comparable, substitute for women who choose not to breast feed. The same cannot be said for most areas in the developing world, where unsanitary water supplies, lack of refrigeration and sterilization equipment, illiteracy and extreme poverty make such products unsuitable for safe use.

In recent years, however, health workers, nutritionists, church workers, development specialists, and international health agencies have called attention to the rapidly increasing substitution of artificial formula products for breast milk, in precisely the unfavorable socioeconomic conditions where its use is most hazardous. Numerous studies bear out these observations, as well as the significantly higher rates of malnutrition, disease and death among bottle-fed babies. According to Dr. Halfdan Mahler, Director-General of WHO:

Evidence from the Third World indicates that infants breast fed for less than six months, or not at all, have a mortality five to ten times higher in the second six months of life than those breast fed for six months or more.

Misuse of commercially prepared formulas commonly occurs when contaminated water supplies are mixed with the powdered formula, negating its potential benefits. One study in Chile found that nearly 80 percent of the bottles examined were seriously contaminated. Illiteracy, inadequate knowledge of hygiene, and instructions that are frequently in foreign languages make written instructions on product labels worthless. Purchasing a sufficient quantity of infant formula in areas where poverty is rampant often requires 30 to 70 percent of the family's income. A report from Barbados revealed that 80 percent of bottle feeding mothers were diluting formula to make a 4-day supply stretch anywhere from 5 days to 3 weeks. Dr. Derrick Jelliffe, a prominent pediatrician with years of experience in developing countries and currently a professor at UCLA's School of

Public Health, estimates that the misuse of artificial feeding methods results in approximately 10 million unnecessary cases of malnutrition or death each year.

Why are so many Third World mothers abandoning the costless and nutritionally superior method of breast feeding in exchange for the expensive and dangerous practice of artificial feeding?

Scientists cite several causes, including urbanization, changing social attitudes, and an increased number of women working outside the home. Perhaps the most predominant factor, however—and certainly the most avoidable—is the aggressive and inexcusable mass promotion of formula by the infant formula industry. Posters, product labels, and billboards sell the image of a healthy, well-nourished infant to a population whose desire for a higher standard of living erroneously persuades them to make misguided decision. Free samples distributed indiscriminately in maternity wards and clinics encourage abandonment of the traditional practice of breast feeding. Resuming the lactation process when the supply of free promotional samples expires can be difficult, and often impossible.

Donations from the formula industry of needed equipment and cash for medical institutions,—as well as a variety of personal gifts for doctors, nurses, and administrators—compels a sense of obligation. In an effort to reciprocate, health workers and medical institutions often display and disseminate promotional materials, thereby granting artificial feeding the de facto seal of approval of the highly respected health community. Company employed mothercraft nurses or medical representatives, often clothed in uniforms deceptively similar to that of hospital personnel, make special visits to new mothers, who are often unaware that their primary purpose is to sell their company's product. Otherwise well-intentioned salespeople, motivated at least in part by bonuses and commissions, frequently misjudge the ability of their customers to use infant formula safely.

Despite such excesses in promotion and the subsequently high rate of product misuse, withdrawal of breast milk substitutes from the market is not the answer. A small percentage of women are physically unable to breast feed, and all women deserve the right to choose their preferred means of feeding. But in the interests of infant health, the choice should be an informed one. Informed choice is currently very difficult to achieve because of the success of one-sided promotional campaigns initiated by the infant formula industry.

No one can hold the formula industry responsible for the unfortunate conditions which prevail in developing

countries. But the aggressive, high-powered promotion of a product so predictably damaging when used under poverty conditions is not justifiable. Our economic system is based on the premise of private enterprise supplying the needs of consumers—but not on the creation of such needs through misleading propaganda.

Church, consumer, nutrition, and health organizations have recognized the importance of this issue and brought it to the attention of industry and governments. While such communication has resulted in some modifications of industry practices, self-regulation has proven insufficient to the task of developing appropriate marketing policies. Third World governments, lacking funds and sophisticated regulatory apparatus, often feel somewhat helpless and isolated facing foreign-based multibillion-dollar companies, which appear to have the support of their own governments in Europe, North America, and Japan. To those in search of a workable solution, it became clear that the issue needed to be addressed in the international arena.

In October of 1979, the World Health Organization and UNICEF held a 4-day meeting on infant and young child feeding in Geneva, Switzerland. This landmark meeting brought together experts in nutrition and medicine, and representatives of member governments, international organizations, the infant formula industry, and consumer groups, for the purpose of summarizing existing knowledge about infant feeding and discussing what steps could be taken to decrease malnutrition and infectious diseases. The meeting passed, by consensus, a far-reaching series of recommendations, calling for a halt to most types of infant formula promotion and for the implementation of measures to facilitate the practice of breast feeding and the use of appropriate—low-cost, locally produced—weaning foods. The recommendations have since been endorsed by the executive boards of WHO and UNICEF and by numerous respected domestic health organizations, including the American Medical Association and the Academy of Pediatrics.

While maintaining a public show of cooperation with WHO and UNICEF, the formula industry soon began to voice its opposition to various restrictions implicit in the recommendations of the October meeting. In various statements, including early 1980 testimony before the House Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, industry spokespersons began to distance themselves from the guidelines set forth by WHO and UNICEF. It became clear to concerned health personnel and member governments that the World Health Organization

needed to develop the 1979 recommendations into a formalized code of conduct.

At the May 1980 World Health Assembly, nearly 60 governments spoke strongly in favor of a marketing code. A resolution calling upon the Secretariat of WHO to draft such a document was passed without dissent. Over the next 8 months the staffs of WHO and UNICEF convened numerous consultative sessions with member nations, scientists, industry, and church and consumer groups, refining and redrafting the proposed code in light of the comments of all parties. A final draft version of the code was presented to the January 1981 WHO executive board meeting, where it was passed by unanimous consent. The board's current 30 nation membership includes Great Britain, France, Canada, Norway, New Zealand, and the Netherlands.

The final draft now goes to the World Health Assembly this May for final ratification. It is significant to note that the code lacks any mechanism for enforcement, relying entirely on the moral suasion of recommending to member governments that they enact its provisions into their respective domestic laws or regulatory frameworks—as appropriate in keeping with the "social and legislative framework" of each nation. The board's resolution does make clear, however, that the adoption of an international code represents only a bare minimum step among the range of measures needed to adequately respond to what is acknowledged by virtually everyone—excepting the infant formula industry—to be a major health hazard and a cause for needless suffering by large numbers of infants. James Grant of UNICEF again sums up the need for the WHO-UNICEF code succinctly and convincingly:

If implemented by governments, and observed by the commercial world, [the WHO-UNICEF Code] might mean that infants in many developing countries need not fall victim to the fashion for bottle feeding.

Grant concludes:

If all of us in the international community who are working to promote and protect the practice of breast feeding are successful, we will save one million infant deaths each year in the eighties.

It is with both sadness and some astonishment that I note that the three leading American manufacturers of infant formula do not appear to share the concerns of the international health community. Abbot Laboratories, Bristol-Myers, and American Home Products have recently announced their intention to lobby for U.S. Government opposition to the WHO-UNICEF code. This is quite disturbing to me—both because of my longstanding confidence in the American business community's willingness and ability to act responsibly, and because of the frequently repeated statements by the companies in question

that they would cooperate with and abide by the WHO-UNICEF initiatives.

Because the U.S. infant formula industry has chosen, in my opinion, irresponsibly, to oppose ratification of the WHO-UNICEF code, my colleague Mr. GILMAN and I are introducing this House resolution, expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should support and vote in favor of the code at next month's World Health Assembly. The resolution also calls for U.S. representatives to the WHA to oppose any weakening amendments which might be offered—none are expected—to encourage the American formula companies to abide by the code and to encourage other governments to call on their formula manufacturers to similarly respect the code. Finally, the resolution calls for cooperation with developing countries in their efforts to develop health standards and programs designed to implement the objective of this code.

Passage of this resolution would send a simple but very clear message that Americans remain firmly and fully committed to combatting world hunger, malnutrition, and disease. I urge my colleagues to join with Mr. GILMAN and myself in cosponsoring this resolution and in insuring its early passage. ●

WELCOME TO OUR NEWLY NATURALIZED AMERICANS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere pleasure that I congratulate the 159 Rockland County residents of New York's 26th Congressional District who have recently chosen to become citizens of the United States, with all of the privileges, freedoms, and responsibilities that American citizenship entails.

Our Hudson Valley region in New York State is proud of its newest citizens and I invite my colleagues to join in welcoming the following newly naturalized Americans and extending to them our best wishes for a happy and prosperous life in their new homeland:

Annamma Joy Abraham, Fredy Rafael Abreu, Edward Niiapa Adom, Dora Felicity Adom, Rose Aghshikian, John Alexandra, Maria Perez Alpert, Aracelis Agustina Arias, Subhashini Reddy Bandaru, Ramon Eligio Bare, Elsa Mercedes Baret, Louis Carlos Battiatia, Roberto Arcenas Batuigas, Immacula Belizaire, Gerard Hilarion Bellevue, Harpreet Singh Bhalla, Rafiq Bidewy, Sharon Lee Borgatti, Justine Marie Boursiquot, Samuel Brach.

Marie Gladysse Cajuste, Rosemarie Carfoscia, Mayra Elena Castillo, Amrose Chand, Aurora Chantal, Pei-Chun Chiang, Mary Teresa Fitzgerald Chownes, Jennifer Antoinette Condon, Rose Marie Corriolant, Bir-

gitt Culver, Ann Marie DeLeo, Delias Demande, Ramona Diaz, Wesner Dorvelus, Antonio Ampon Dugaduga, Jean Marc Duroseau, Paul Esperance, Elimelech Fixler, Dvora Rivka Fixler, Sonia Parrenas Floresca, Gloria May Forrest, Winbert Forrest, Rita Fruntino.

Monica Garcia, Edline Marie Garland, John William Garrigan, Marie Marielle Garrigan, Maria Georgescu, Edith Grunhut, Luz Marina Gutierrez, Dieter Hans Hartmann, Barbara Ywk-Kuen Ip, Yury Ismes-tieff, Deenamma Jacob, Sammi Pacco Joseph, Annakutty Kallukulam Josphkunju, Mathai Joy, Moishe Katz, Zaka Ullah Khan, Samuel Kis, Leah Kis, Berta Kolonski, Lydia Kozuhar-Novikov.

Helena Kukla, John Kurian, Catalina Scallona Lagrimas, Yvette Lecorps, Kay Kyung Ui Lee, Kenneth Kiho Lee, Aizik Leibovitch, Pearl Leibovitch, Alla Levit, Vladimir Gregory Levit, Thomas Linares, Quetlie Linse, Juana Maria Liranzo, Jean Uyan-Rong Liu, Lily Liu, Trinidad Salome Lopez, Jayanti Mahapatra, Angelo Maida, Santiago Marquez, Ramon Martelo.

Filomena Martinez, Anna Mathurin, John McGee, Anne Mesida Mesidor, Josephine Antonio Miranda, Reynaldo Vinluan Miravite, Cesar Ismael Munoz, Sarvejit Mohan Narang, Sergei Nemchov, Myong Cha Nivans, Jacques Demos hene Noel, Rivka Ostreicher, Brian Owens, Eduardo Evidente Pavon, Juan Antonio Payan, Jose Odalis Pena, Angela Altagracia Pena, Monette Pierre, Robert Pierre-Antoine.

Vincent Pileggi, Angela Quattrochi, Carol Dawn Reddy, Edgar Edmundo Restrepo, Beresford Alton Robinson, Jeannie Rodriguez, Jose Miguel Rojas, Aron Rubin, Judith Samet, Luis Manuel Santana, Rolando Villaroman Santiago, Carmen Marquez Santiago, Fe Caridad Encarnacion Sarangay, Ignazio Scaglione, Gaby Schettini, Galina Schuetz, Donna Schwartz, Miriam Senderowitz, Aruna Jay Shah, Suhag Shashikant Shah.

Nordchi Schmel David Silber, Frances Soliveres, Rivky Spitzer, Alma Lidora Stewart, Herman Barrington Stewart, Ramy Sultan, Allan I-Luen Sun, Liberacion Alconis Tamondong, Jacob Tapiero, Anita Tapiero, Octavie Tarte, Annamma Thomas, Chu-Yuan Ting, Bella Aquino Tomelden, Serge Valbrun, Jose Manuel Vargas, Marcos Antonio Vargas, Flora Eduvijes Velastegui, Domenico Vicario, Themistocles Christos Vrachnos.

Vasiliki Vrachnos, Esther Wagner, Pinchas Yechezkal Wagner, Elisabeth Walentin, Christel Gertrud Wegner, Haddassa Weis, David Weis, Henney Weis, Eliandra Ester Shand West, Irma Pagayunan Wierer, Lai Mei Au Yeung, Theodoros Ziotis, Triantafyllia Ziotis, Gemil Zulme, Robert Zusman. ●

RESTORING TAXPAYER'S FAITH IN THE AMERICAN SYSTEM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly obvious over the past several years that the American people are tired of financing government overregulation and waste with their tax dollars. Mr. W. David

Stedman, chairman of the board of Stedman Corp. in Asheboro, N.C., is an active and eloquent proponent of tax relief at all government levels. A letter Mr. Stedman recently wrote to the Honorable Dan K. Moore, chairman of the Governor's Blue Ribbon Study Commission on Transportation Needs and Financing in North Carolina, is an excellent illustration of the philosophy that will restore the taxpayer's faith in the American system of government.

DEAR GOVERNOR MOORE: I am sorry that I am unable to be present Wednesday for the report of your Commission of Transportation Needs and Financing. I have, however, read the report carefully. I compliment you and the members of your Commission on all the hard work you have done and on your personal commitment to the welfare of this state. I have no doubt that much work needs to be done on the highway system as your Commission has so ably pointed out.

As important as all this is, I would like to suggest, however, that the real priority issue confronting North Carolinians is not transportation but the level of taxation. The tax burden of North Carolina citizens cannot be isolated to state taxes only. These same people also carry the burden of city, county and federal taxes. This total tax burden now consumes approximately forty-four percent of the average person's income. Just how much are the citizens willing to pay for the cost of government? I shall have to let other citizens speak for themselves, but as for me I am unalterably opposed to any further increase in the tax burden of our citizens. I refer to the percent of our income represented by the total tax burden.

In the medieval days, the feudal lords required that the serfs work forty percent of their time for the state. Obviously, we are already working forty-four percent of our time for government. So great is this problem that I have come to the position that no matter how worthwhile any new program is, if it increases the tax burden as a percentage of income, it must be either denied or other expenses in government must be curtailed to make room for it. In fact, I think it is essential that the tax burden be decreased through the years to come rather than increased further.

Now, accepting as fact that our highways do need the attention which your Commission proposes, the question is, "How do we get it done without further increasing our taxes?" May I suggest two alternatives:

1. Raise taxes on gasoline and perhaps other items as suggested in your report and lower taxes elsewhere by a compensating amount.

2. Continue the gasoline and related taxes as are, combine the highway fund with the general fund, set priorities of expenses as needed and cut the budget elsewhere to accommodate these priorities.

One can take the position that the net result of either of these two alternatives is to shift the burden of the cost of the highway program back to the people through the general fund and thereby ignoring the "user pays" principle, a principle long utilized in connection with the highway fund.

I think, therefore, the time has come when we should re-examine the "user pays" principle. While it is basically a fine concept, I have come to the conclusion that the term is one used mostly for convenience when talking about highway expenditures. Consider the following:

1. The people of North Carolina probably participate more completely in the use of the state highways and roads than any other item of state expense. Even those who don't own cars pay through the fares of public transportation. The "user pays" principle is reasonably approached by the very nature of this situation; i.e., general use by everybody of the state road system.

2. We seem to apply the "user pays" principle when it suits our convenience, as in the highway fund, but don't apply it where it doesn't suit this convenience, as in the higher education fund. Whereas most of our citizens use our highways in one form or another, less than twenty-five percent go to our state universities and colleges. Yet all citizens are taxed for the benefit of the relative few who do go to these state supported institutions. It is also important to note that the cost of this higher education is greater than the highway fund. If the "user pays" principle were used in this very significant budget item of higher education, the university system as we know it would probably be destroyed. We simply could not afford the massive higher education system we now have. How is it we can justify forcing people who never would or can go to college to pay the cost of others who do go? Yet we do it. I believe it is clear that a general tax for everybody to support the highway system, which is used by nearly everyone, is much fairer than a general tax to support our system of higher education which is used by only one fourth of our citizens.

3. The same argument can also be applied to our system of community colleges and technical schools.

4. The same argument, although in a lesser degree, can also be applied to our general education program. There are many people in this state who do not have a high school education, but who are paying taxes to keep up the system for those who do use it. Even here, the "user pays" principle does not work completely either.

To get back to my earlier point, the overriding consideration in the whole picture is the excessive level of tax burden our people now carry. This must be reduced rather than increased. I support good maintenance and proper expansion of our highway system and urge that we put these items into a priority structure with other items of importance and work it all out within our present total tax structure. Otherwise, I cannot in good conscience, accept it, and I don't believe the people of North Carolina will accept it either.

In my opinion, there is a way to do it without increasing our taxes if we only have the will to do it. Surely we shall have to cut back on other things, but if the priorities tell us that this is the thing to do, then so be it.

Thank you again, Governor, for your commitment and hard work in this matter. Please know that I love North Carolina, too, and will do everything in my power to support those programs and causes which I believe are to the ultimate best interest of our citizens.

Sincerely,

W. D. STEDMAN. ●

LEGAL SERVICES: REGULATIONS FOR WHAT?

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in all the discussion about the President's decision to cut funds for Legal Services, there has not been much said about the view of society that those who run this agency bring to their task. Walter Pincus of the Washington Post recently disclosed the fact that Legal Services is proposing regulations that would enforce a perverse philosophy on the taxpayer.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD, "Legal Service Corp. Suits Itself, Waves Red Flag at Reagan" by Walter Pincus, the Washington Post, March 30, 1981.

LEGAL SERVICES CORP. SUITS ITSELF, WAVES RED FLAG AT REAGAN
(By Walter Pincus)

"They have put a gun to their head and pulled the trigger."

That was the way one conservative caller last week described the comprehensive civil rights regulations proposed earlier this month by the Legal Services Corp. and published in the March 23 Federal Register (page 18055).

They include all the rules that drive Reagan conservatives crazy—nondiscrimination against homosexuals, requirements for bilingual employees, affirmative action plans to guarantee employment of women and minorities at levels that reflect "appropriate labor force characteristics," and inclusion of drug addiction and alcoholism as diseases that would qualify someone as being a "handicapped person" and, thus protected from discrimination.

LSC, you must remember, is the nonprofit corporation that supports legal services for the poor by distributing \$300 million in federal grants and contracts to local organizations, which use the money to pay for lawyers and other legal specialists in almost every county across the nation.

President Reagan has long had a distaste for the federally supported legal services program, and his administration, as part of the budget-cutting effort, has marked LSC for elimination next year.

An LSC official conceded that the agency's board was aware that the proposed regulations, developed before the White House termination plan was announced, would be a red flag for the Reaganites. But LSC decided to put the rules out for comment anyway because "this was our position."

The purpose of the proposed rules, according to the notice, "is to prevent discrimination by legal services programs supported in whole or in part by Legal Services Corp. funds in the delivery of services or in employment. . . ."

The proposed rules, which for the most part codify procedures in effect since LSC's establishment in 1974, add a prohibition against discrimination by reason of "sexual orientation." That phrase, an LSC official said, refers to homosexuals.

The agency, she added, decided to prohibit discrimination against homosexuals because similar policies have been adopted by

the District of Columbia and other state and local entities.

The rules, however, also bar recipients of LSC funds from having "any contractual or other relationship" with other agencies or organizations including "labor unions, (or) organizations providing or administering fringe benefits to employees of the recipient . . ." if the agencies discriminate against specified groups, including homosexuals.

That provision, according to my outraged caller, "would eliminate the Catholic Church groups." Not so, according to the LSC official, and if it did, the rule would be altered. "That is why we have put it out for comment."

Another provision that's bound to draw criticism is one that says a recipient of LSC funds cannot "make a preemployment inquiry as to whether an applicant is a handicapped person or as to the nature of or severity of a handicap except where the examination or inquiry is related to an essential job function."

What about drug addiction and alcoholism, which LSC includes as characteristics of a certain kind of "handicapped person"? On first blush, the LSC official said a lawyer certainly could be questioned, but there was doubt about other job applicants.

Fund recipients under the rules would be required to provide bilingual employees, "not limited to clerical positions" in "any area where 5 percent of the eligible population are members of a minority language group." They also must provide informational literature in the appropriate languages and post signs in those languages. The percentage requirement was taken from the federal voting rights law, which requires ballots to be bilingual in areas where 5 percent of the population speaks a language other than English.

Grant recipient that have 50 or more employees must have an affirmative action plan approved by LSC's director of office of equal opportunity. Before producing such a plan, the recipient must, "determine if underutilization on the basis of race, national origin or sex occurs in any job category or unit of its workforce" using a formula supplied by LSC.

Its plan must include "goals and timetables to correct underutilization of women and minorities." In those instances where a recipient is found to have an employe "workforce or segment of the workforce not on parity with the relevant labor market," approval of higher authorities would be needed before any vacancies were filled.

In the Carter years, LSC's rules would have raised a few eyebrows; today they may hasten the lowering of the boom.●

RED SMITH ON HANDGUNS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Red Smith, who is probably the dean of American sportswriters and certainly one of the most highly respected, sees "no valid reason why possession of handguns should not be prohibited by law."

In yesterday's New York Times, Mr. Smith concluded a column on the attempted assassination of President

Reagan with the following pithy paragraphs:

Inevitably the attempted assassination revived talk about strengthening gun-control laws, a campaign that has not had ardent support from the President up to now. Wouldn't this experience alter his views?

Maybe, maybe not. The fact is, there is no valid reason why possession of a handgun should not be prohibited by law, though that would not keep the weapons out of the hands of assassins and other criminals.

Handguns are not sporting goods like rifles and shotguns. They are not used for any normal kind of hunting, not even trap shooting. Target-practice competition could be held with toy guns and rubber-tipped darts. The only practical civilian use for pistols and revolvers is shooting people.

This being the case, the law ought to ban these weapons. Such a law may make it more difficult for a wife, in a moment of pique, to plug her ever-loving helpmeet. It would be observed by the law-abiding and ignored by the lawless. President Reagan, who has waved plenty of six-shooters around playing cowboy in the movies, is perfectly aware of that.

Mr. Smith, the bill that does what you advocate is numbered H.R. 40.●

COGENERATION LEGISLATION

HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. HEFTEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce legislation which I feel will have a significant impact on our Nation's energy conservation effort. The bill, the Cogeneration and Small Power Production Derogation Act of 1981 is intended to streamline those aspects of the 1978 National Energy Act which have constrained the full use of cogeneration by America's industries and utilities.

The United States is faced with an energy problem of unprecedented dimensions. As the present war between Iraq and Iran clearly demonstrates, our Nation is perilously dependent on highly unstable and uncertain foreign supplies of oil. Energy now has a direct and significant impact on our foreign policy and our domestic economy. It is essential then that strategies be devised and implemented to deal with the energy problem in the short term. We feel that a cornerstone of any energy strategy must involve increased conservation. Since America's industries and utilities consume well over half of all energy utilized in the country, we believe that an aggressive energy conservation effort in the industrial and utility sectors is essential to our Nation's energy future.

Cogeneration is perhaps the most important and readily accessible source of industrial conservation in the near term. The highly acclaimed work, "Energy Future," by Harvard Profs. Daniel Yergin and Robert Stoughton, describes cogeneration as "in-

dustry's North Scope." Very simply, cogeneration is the production of two forms of useful energy from one fuel source, leading to a more efficient use of the primary energy. A number of studies estimate that perhaps over 20 percent of total industrial energy presently used in the United States could be saved through cogeneration. Our European allies are already effectively using this conservation technology. For example, cogeneration accounts for approximately 27 percent of all electric power used in West Germany, as compared with less than 5 percent in the United States. Interestingly, the United States once relied on cogeneration for a significant measure of its electricity needs. In 1922, for example, 22 percent of all our electricity came from industrial cogeneration. However, declining electricity prices and inexpensive oil led to a marked decline in the role cogeneration played.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing today is aimed at encouraging utility cogeneration by removing those barriers in the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 which discourage utilities from owning and operating cogeneration plants. By removing these barriers, utilities will have been given a significant incentive to cogenerate, which will in turn maximize the energy efficiency of their power generation. A second major aspect of this legislation is intended to increase the efficiency of oil and gas use by America's industries. By modifying those aspects of the 1978 Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act, which to now have prohibited, the use of oil and gas in industrial cogeneration facilities, I hope to encourage the more efficient use of these precious resources. Eventually, cogeneration using coal, biomass, synthetic fuels, and other energy sources will be used with great efficiency by industry and utilities. For now, oil and gas fired cogeneration will allow us to bridge a major gap in our Nation's conservation effort until such time as these other cogeneration methods are ready and other renewable energy sources are adequately developed.

It is important that we provide regulatory incentives to once again establish cogeneration as a major energy-saving technology. This proposal represents a first step to modifying those regulations which to date have unnecessarily restricted the utilization of cogeneration by industry and by utilities. I look forward to working with you and our colleagues in fashioning a comprehensive energy policy in which cogeneration occupies a major role. Our current energy dilemma requires no less than our full commitment to this challenge.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of our colleagues, I am including a Washington Post editorial on cogeneration

which appeared in the September 8, 1980, edition. The editorial discusses the merits of the technology of cogeneration and the need to proceed expeditiously with regulatory changes to encourage its development. The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 8, 1980]

AN ENERGY SOURCE READY AND WAITING

Like the trolley car and the ceiling fan, a process known as cogeneration is another energy-saving technology that, although once commonplace, disappeared in the march of time, a casualty of "progress." Its enormous potential is finally beginning to be appreciated again. Unfortunately, industries, utilities and state power commissions are simultaneously discovering that a variety of energy regulations unintentionally inhibit its use.

Cogeneration is an alternative to the familiar way of generating electricity by producing electricity together with a large amount of low-temperature "waste heat." Cogeneration produces two products: electricity and useful, higher-temperature heat. That way, much more usable energy is extracted from the same amount of fuel, and energy is conserved.

Since the easiest and cheapest way to use that heat is in an industry that needs a lot of steam, cogeneration facilities are most attractive at industrial sites. Early in this century many American industries produced all the energy they needed by this means. However, as electric utilities grew and the price of electricity fell, most decided to leave the business of making electricity to the utilities.

As the cost of fuel for making electricity has soared in the last few years, cogeneration has slowly begun to be seen as an attractive alternative to conventional electrical plants. One recent study estimated that cogeneration could save the equivalent of almost two million barrels of oil a day, or more than one-quarter of current U.S. electricity consumption.

What is holding back the realization of this enormous savings? The greatest barriers are laws and regulations that discourage utilities from owning and operating cogeneration plants. Because of these, most such facilities are owned by businesses, which are generally reluctant to get involved in the heavily regulated and unfamiliar world of producing energy.

Utilities are far better suited to do the job. They are already in the business of making and selling energy. They are equipped to raise the needed capital. They have the experience to design and build the plants, to operate and maintain them at lowest cost and to obtain the necessary government permits.

Another major hold-up is restrictions that prohibit the use of oil and gas in cogeneration facilities. The most efficient cogeneration technologies today can be run only on oil or gas, though eventually the means will be developed to use coal, biomass and synthetic fuels. In the meantime, the restrictions have the unintended effect of wasting precious fuels.

As in so many other areas of energy policy, government needs to "unwrite" a lot of regulations to start saving more energy. Though utilities have been slow to appreciate its potential, cogeneration is so economically attractive that if they can be set free to get into this business, and encouraged by

a few state utility commissions, the marketplace should do the rest.●

HELP ATLANTA

HON. AUSTIN J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, last week, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 99. This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, acting under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, and other Federal officials should cooperate with State and local officials in their efforts to solve the recent murders of black children in Atlanta, Ga., and to provide for the safety and well-being of the children in Atlanta who are threatened by this crisis. I wish to take this opportunity to briefly explain the thrust of House Concurrent Resolution 99, and solicit your support.

The recent murders of children in Atlanta, Ga., represent one of the most heinous episodes in the history of the United States. Unfortunately, solving these killings will only resolve the superficial criminal element of this crisis. Beneath the surface lie festering psychological scars which will long survive the apprehension of the person or persons responsible for these killings, House Concurrent Resolution 99 seeks to offer assistance to State and local officials as they grapple with these scars.

The National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, established under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1974, has been the focal point of Federal efforts to combat child maltreatment since its inception. It is capable of pulling together the resources necessary to assist the States and local governments as they attempt to treat and provide services to children and families in which the threat of maltreatment exists. The purpose of its activities has been to help States insure that children who have been exposed to the threat of abuse grow to lead normal and productive lives.

Action by the National Center, utilizing its network of resources, could clearly assist the State and local government in providing the services that these children and their families will need in order to cope with the stress under which they have lived for so many months. I do not intend to infer that the families of the slain children have been abusive or neglectful families. Rather, I believe that the stress that these children are experiencing is closely akin to the stress generated by living in an abusive home environment. Each child must constantly ask, "Who can I trust? Who will be next? Will it be me?" It is my belief that the

National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect is in the unique position of being able to provide assistance to the State of Georgia, and the city of Atlanta, as they provide appropriate services to these children and their families. Successful passage of this resolution will mean that the National Center will be able to respond to any request for assistance by Georgia officials.

It is in this spirit that I seek your bipartisan support. Please join me by co-sponsoring this message to the children and families of Atlanta, Ga., that the Members of Congress are concerned and willing to do whatever they can to see them through this period of stress. I need not remind you that the 21st body of a slain black child was discovered yesterday. With each day, the stress grows more severe. If you will join me, please contact my staff of the Subcommittee on Select Education. Your support will be greatly appreciated. Thank you.●

EL SALVADOR POLICY IS WRONG

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely opposed to the present administration policy in El Salvador because I think it is wrong. It is not in the best interests of our Nation. It is not in the best interests of El Salvador—particularly those thousands of Salvadorans who have become refugees as a result of the violence. These refugees have been uprooted from their homes and been subjected to unspeakable horrors—all in the name of stopping communism.

On January 9, 1981, I traveled to Central America as part of a delegation sponsored by the Unitarian-Universalist Service Committee. Congressman GERRY STUDDS and Congressman EDGAR were also part of that delegation. We traveled through Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Honduras. I took every opportunity to speak to people who had been in El Salvador recently; and I also traveled to the Honduran border for extensive meetings with Salvadoran refugees who had fled to that village.

In these meetings, I learned that the uniformed military forces of El Salvador are using American equipment to carry out a deliberate policy of terror against an unarmed civilian population. The soldiers of El Salvador arrive in American helicopters to kill and torture men, women, and children. During my interviews with the refugees, I asked "Who does this?" Always they answered, "It is the military." Again and again I asked, "Does the

Left do this?" "No" they told me—"They do not kill children."

I have said that I believe that our policy in El Salvador is morally wrong. It is morally wrong for this country to lavish arms on a government that cannot or will not stop its own troops from making war against its own people. It is morally wrong to offer U.S. helicopters that will be used to gun down peasants. It is morally wrong to use a small helpless country in our own backyard to send a message of toughness to Moscow.

I would like to insert in the RECORD excerpts of my interviews with the refugees.

A VOICE. The woman previously that we talked to is named Crecensia. We're talking with Maria.

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. She says that she would like to tell us the following, that many of her family were killed, so many that she doesn't even remember all their names now.

She said I'd like to speak first about my brothers and sisters and she just mentioned about five people who had been killed.

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. She said six of her—well, two of her sisters and four of her cousins, all women, were killed and were found naked. One of those women was pregnant.

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. And these women have left children.

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. One woman left two children, the other woman left three children orphans, but they haven't been able to find them all yet, so they haven't accounted for all of them. They do not know where they all are.

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. About nine or seven months ago, they killed one of her family, and the child that was left, one of the children that was left was an infant, and is now in the hospital of a nearby town, and is close to death.

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. The women were bathing in the river when the military found them and they took them into the woods, and then later they were found.

That's all she's going to say right now.

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. She says she personally saw them kill children and rape children from ten years of age and older, and then they would also take their bayonets and make what they call mincemeat out of them.

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. She said with the guns they would shoot at their faces.

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. And disfigure the people.

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. She said even going to the mountainside you weren't safe because they would have these huge machines that would climb up the mountainsides and try and get them, and they would set up their mortars and shoot at the villages.

A VOICE. Did the Left ever do those things?

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. No, they didn't.

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. No, they haven't done those kinds of things.

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. What she was saying is they would cut people's stomachs open and put

salt and coffee inside their stomachs as a mocking.

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. They would open up the people's stomachs, the women's stomachs as if they were iguanas to take the child out as if they took out the eggs of an iguana.

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. And that is what I saw, and that is what I have to say.

The woman that just spoke was named Marcella. She is 45 years old.

[Portions in foreign language.]

He doesn't want to give his name.

A VOICE. This man had a wife and seven children, and one day 15 armed men arrived, some in civilian clothes, and some in army uniforms.

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. The government of Salvador is saying that the United States is helping them, and the man just expressed fear that that aid is going to be used against the people across the border in his country in Salvador, and he is afraid that once they keep on pushing people out they are going to come across the border and use that same armament here in this country.

A VOICE. He is afraid that they are going to take the military aid that the United States Government is giving and use that also to cross the Honduran border in pursuit of the Salvador refugees?

A VOICE. Exactly, yes. That's exactly what he's afraid of.

A VOICE. Is it the helicopters?

[Portions in foreign language.]

A VOICE. He said, yes, we fear the helicopters because they are up in the sky and they shoot at us. ●

WHAT DOES ATLANTA TEACH US?

HON. CHARLES F. DOUGHERTY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 31, 1981

● Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation is in a state of shock and disbelief following yesterday's assassination attempt on the life of our new President. Our hearts cry out for an end to the violence in our streets which threatens the very foundations of America. Our people have shown remarkable resilience throughout the many violent attacks on our national leaders in this century. But today we truly wonder how much more we can take and not lose our national sanity.

On the same tragic day that our President was gunned down in a Washington street, the body of yet another young black child was discovered in Atlanta, making a grim total of 21 children who have been slaughtered in that city by a savage psychopath.

I cannot find the words to describe the sense of sorrow and helplessness I feel for this Nation and I am struggling to find a sense of hope. A renowned news columnist from my city of Philadelphia has described the tragedy in Atlanta far better than I can and he finds hope in the prospect that we will share an "overriding concern

which believes that what hurts one hurts the other." I want to share with my colleagues the words of Chuck Stone in an article he wrote for the February 17, 1981 edition of the Philadelphia Daily News:

WHAT DOES ATLANTA TEACH US?

(By Chuck Stone)

The more gruesome Atlanta's nightmare has become, the wider a national sense of helplessness has spread.

Businesswoman Olivine McCoy probably mirrored a prevailing frustration when she asked in a pain-choked whisper, "What can we do?"

She has shared those mother's anguish. Seven years ago, her youngest son, Tyrone, was killed in a senseless homicide.

"Praying is good and I'm happy people are doing that," she reflected. "But it's not catching the murderers."

Even with those limitations, McCoy still supports prayer vigils and other publicly expressed alliances.

Symbols may not solve a crisis, but they're important. Atlanta mothers need to believe a nation cares for their children. National unity didn't get the hostages released in Iran. But the depths of that love comforted their wounds.

Atlanta's civic heart has been infected with a criminal abscess that will not easily be healed.

The murders of 17 black children in 19 months—almost one per month—in a predominantly black city headed up by a black administration has unleashed a tidal wave of paranoia among black families. Who's out to get them?

When a boiler in a black housing project exploded, few were convinced it was accidental.

Struggling to preserve an inner calm, the city administration reached the outer limits of civic sanity weeks ago.

It has been too reduced to finding bodies instead of catching murderers.

In this kind of vacuum of frustration, the bizarre feeds on the unknowing.

Talk show callers are reliving their dreams in which a particular face or house keeps recurring. Weirdos paint color books of visions.

Psychics have been deputized. Only fortune cookies have not been pressed into service.

Yet, Americans of good will continue to offer hard-nosed strategies. Daily News reporter Kitty Caparella was the first to suggest that a team of trained dogs be used, and they were sent to Atlanta from Philadelphia.

Police Inspector Bernard Small has discussed with Atlanta police a sensible plan to use child-sized featherweight boxers as bait for the killers.

With out-of-state detectives, state investigators and the FBI scouring Atlanta for that one thread that ties the murders together, two one-word questions blanket the city like a circling swarm of vultures.

Who? Why?

The 17 victims are all black. Are their deaths the twisted work of a sick racist or a normal-looking, respectable-acting psychotic?

Some authoritative callers and responsible writers are convinced these kids could not have been murdered so easily if they had not been lured by a guileless-appearing authority figure, somebody they trusted.

What more commanding authority figure than a person in uniform?

White? Some have narrowed it to that one chromatic dimension. That theory suffers from one fault.

Random black-on-black crime has done more to wipe out black kids and desecrate black women today than an army of white racists.

In Philadelphia, some of the most ghastly murders and rapes imaginable in the black community are being committed by black men.

In Atlanta, the possibility of one black psychopathic killer running around loose holds as much water as one city-uniformed white racist stalking those kids.

Again, we are forced to return to the emptiness of our ignorance and the futility of no clues.

If we can hold on to our commonsense long enough before it surrenders to hysteria, we can retain the lessons Atlanta teaches us.

First, organized terror knows no racial boundaries. There is no immunity to depravity whether orchestrated by one fiend or organized by a mob of demented thugs. No defense can be mounted against the planted bomb, the stealth of the rapist or the assassin's plot.

In the Middle East, innocent women and children are systematically murdered. Businessmen are kidnapped in Europe, elderly white women are murdered in Columbus, Ga., black men are assassinated in Buffalo and their hearts ripped out, and the bodies of 33 white boys tortured and murdered in Illinois by John Wayne Gacy Jr. were eventually dug up. At any time anywhere, organized terror can strike any of us.

Secondly, parents have got to be more lovingly protective about their children. In a couple of instances in Atlanta, parents didn't report children missing immediately because it was normal for them not to be at home at a certain time. Parents should know their children's schedule with the same authority as they sign a check.

Thirdly, we ought to be quicker about spotting possible trends.

By the time five kids were missing, Atlanta authorities should have been climbing their municipal walls and offering huge rewards.

Yet there was no great national outcry. The headlines didn't scream. Are five missing kids to be cherished less than 17? Life has been cheapened. We seem to require bigger numbers before we get excited.

To contain the barbarianism within us, we must not rely on occasional prayers or offers of assistance.

The hope of Atlanta, as does the hope of America, lies not in the sponsorship of official prayer breakfasts and longer Sunday morning sermons.

Rather, our peace comes only with the embrace of an overriding concern which believes that what pains one hurts the other. What debauches me eventually destroys you.

That's what makes our humanity indivisible. The cold partitions of color, religion and class ultimately will dissolve in the warmth of our oneness.

If President Reagan can become the forceful exponent of that vision, nothing will come between us and the power of its affection.

Mr. Speaker, surely today we can agree with this outstanding black news columnist that "terror knows no racial boundaries" and that "there is no im-

munity to depravity whether orchestrated by one fiend or organized by a mob of demented thugs". Indeed, in the words of Chuck Stone, "No defense can be mounted against the planted bomb, the stealth of the rapist, or the assassin's plot." He believes with all his heart that when our people "embrace an overriding concern which believes * * * that what debauches me eventually destroys you" then the "cold partitions of color, religion, and class ultimately will dissolve in the warmth of our oneness". Let us pray that it is true. ●

AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES ACT OF 1981

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Agricultural Land Resources Act of 1981, in order to further local and State efforts to address the continuing permanent conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses.

The act builds on the intent of Congress expressed in House Concurrent Resolution 92, which already has 80 cosponsors, and goes further to spell out:

The overall national policy that Federal programs should be administered, except where precluded by law, in a manner that will not cause the unnecessary, irreversible conversion of agricultural land to other nonagricultural uses, and that will not conflict with local or State programs to protect agriculture;

The role that the Secretary of Agriculture should carry out to cooperate with other Federal agencies whose programs may influence the conversion of agricultural land and to report to Congress on how Federal programs could be redesigned to assure the retention of productive agricultural land;

The responsibility of the Secretary to provide technical assistance to any State, locality, or qualifying nonprofit organization which desires to develop farmland retention programs or policies; and

The specific charge to the Secretary to implement educational programs and disseminate educational materials emphasizing the importance of productive agricultural land, and to designate one or more agricultural land information centers.

I was very encouraged by the testimony provided in hearings of the Conservation, Credit, and Rural Development Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, in which several witnesses urged the Congress to seek swift passage of a bill such as I am in-

troducing today. They further recommended that such a bill be made an important part of the 1981 farm bill.

I also was very encouraged by the testimony provided to the full committee earlier this week by Secretary of Agriculture John Block, and the explanatory notes that he provided for the administration's farm bill language. It is very timely to include an agricultural land resources title in the farm bill, and the bill I am introducing today is consistent with the position of the Secretary.

As Secretary Block said at the national agricultural lands study workshop in Chicago in February, the agricultural community has to convince the rest of the Nation of the dangers to farmland of unchecked urban development.

He said:

In the next 20 years we cannot realize a 60- to 85-percent increase in demand for U.S. agricultural products while urbanizing 3 million acres of productive land each year and maintaining current low productivity rates.

At the same time, I know Secretary Block and many of my colleagues understand that decisions about managing and improving the productive capacity of the agricultural land resource belong primarily to citizens and to their local and State governments. Where they request technical assistance or educational materials or background data, the Department of Agriculture should be ready to provide it. Where they call for further information or research, the Department of Agriculture should be ready to seek it. Where they speak up that a Federal program of any kind may be unnecessarily bringing about the irretrievable conversion of agricultural land resources that are important to them, the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Management and Budget should be ready to cooperate with the appropriate agencies in making sure the programs blend with rather than conflicting with the local and State interests or objectives.

The bill I am introducing today calls for no new agency or institution. It calls for no new expenditure of Federal funds. It simply encourages that the Federal Government operate its programs and facilities in a little different way so that this Nation's strategically important ability to produce food and fiber is not unknowingly or unnecessarily compromised. It simply sends a signal to local and State governments that we will begin to help them in their growing efforts to maintain a productive agriculture.

This one bill will not solve the whole problem; I am considering further legislation, along with other Members, that might address such other elements as economic research, tax, and other incentives to farm on good land

and build on other land, and other possible shifts in programs and assistance.

Yet this bill will set the overall stage for a responsive, well coordinated effort to provide the agricultural land resource assistance needed for a permanent agriculture. I am pleased that Secretary Block has agreed to make this kind of title an important segment of the 1981 farm bill. It blends well with initiatives in soil and water conservation, commodity programs, and the like. I encourage all of you to support such a title with the language that I have suggested.●

WOMEN'S RESEARCH AND EDUCATION INSTITUTE

HON. LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Women's Research and Education Institute of the Congresswomen's Caucus, in an effort to determine the impact of the proposed budget revisions on women, has prepared analyses of a number of these cuts. I thought my colleagues would be interested in seeing the reports on student benefits and the proposed tax cut.

GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS (IN FUNCTION 500)

Loans to students and parents from private and state lenders are guaranteed against default by the Guaranteed Student Loan Program. Eligible recipients include any student enrolled at least half-time in a post-secondary education program. Interest charges are paid by the federal government while the students are in school; a 7 to 9 percent interest rate is charged upon leaving. The Administration proposes to:

Take into account other forms of aid, including familial, and limit the loan to the remaining "assessed" need;

Eliminate the in-school interest subsidy;

Eliminate all federal subsidies, except the default guarantee, for parental loans.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the needs requirement would reduce the eligible population by approximately 50 percent. However, there is no guarantee that the number of participants would be reduced, since only about one-third of the eligible population currently borrows.

Impact on Women: It is not clear that cuts in this program would have a direct disproportionate impact on women. One objective of the proposed changes is to ensure that the GSL's go to students who truly need them. Possibly, the children of female-headed households, whose incomes fall well below that of other households, would have a high probability of qualifying for these loans. However, lenders might be more reluctant to provide sufficient capital if loans were made on the basis of need. Thus, these same students might face considerable difficulty in obtaining loans.

Comment: The GSL program must also be considered in relationship to the proposed

elimination of the student Social Security benefit. Cuts in the latter program are discussed elsewhere in this paper; however, we might repeat that a very high percentage of student Social Security beneficiaries are the children of widows. Although no estimates are available, it is likely that students who are—or would have been—eligible for student Social Security benefits will apply instead for a GSL. Cutbacks in the GSL program might make it difficult for some of these students to transfer to GSL, especially if the pool of available loan capital for needy students is reduced.

PELL GRANTS (IN FUNCTION 500)

The Pell Grant (formerly the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant) program provides grants to low-income undergraduate college or post-secondary vocational/technical school students enrolled at least half-time. Grants vary in amount, depending on the family's discretionary income. Among the proposed changes are the following for fiscal year 1981:

Maintaining the maximum grant at \$1,750;

Rescinding an inflation adjustment in the family cost-of-living allowance; and

Requiring students to contribute \$750 to their educational expenses.

These changes would be retained in 1982. In addition, the Administration proposes that the:

Assessment rate on discretionary income be increased; and

State and local tax deductions used in determining family contributions be eliminated.

Impact on Women: Lower-income persons constitute the majority of Pell Grant recipients. The Congressional Budget Office concludes that most of the overall reduction would affect these students. Some 575,000 fewer students would receive grants in fiscal year 1982 than are currently receiving them. In addition, the average benefit would be about \$150 less than it is now.

The impact on women is by no means self-evident. A disproportionately high percentage of low-income families are headed by women. Their children (and children of other low-income families) should receive preferential treatment in the grant award process. Benefit levels to the truly needy, however, will drop. This development, combined with reductions in other forms of student assistance, may have a very negative impact on female-headed households.

Comment: Moderate- and middle-income families would also be affected by these reductions; however, according to the CBO, "even awards for the most truly needy would fall behind previous levels." The demand for other types of assistance will probably increase, although cuts in these programs may make it difficult for many students to obtain adequate financing.

INCOME TAX RATE REDUCTION

With the aim of encouraging savings and investment, and improving the incentive to work, the Administration proposes to cut personal income tax rates by 10 percent a year over the next 3 years.

Impact on Women: Enactment of this proposal would do very little to help the vast majority of those millions of women (some 21 million) who are not part of a married couple. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that only 3.3 percent of the Administration's proposed tax reductions would

benefit taxpayers with incomes below \$10,000, the income category in which 60 percent of all female householders with no spouse present and 70 percent of widows are found. Less than 14 percent of the proposed tax reductions would benefit those with incomes between \$10,000 and \$20,000, the range in which the incomes of 28 percent of female householders and about 20 percent of widows fall. More than four-fifths (84 percent) of the benefits of the proposed tax reductions would go to taxpayers with incomes of more than \$20,000, a group into which only 12 percent of female householders and 10 percent of widows fall.

For women in the nearly 40 percent of all married couples with incomes over \$25,000, the cuts in the tax rates should be helpful, especially in cases where both spouses work. A reduction in the marginal tax rates does lessen the tax impact of a second salary. Nevertheless, the Congressional Budget Office has pointed out that a reduction in tax rates is not as effective in reducing the "tax on marriage" as would be other suggested approaches targeted specifically to the marriage tax.

APPENDIX

POVERTY IS A WOMEN'S ISSUE

1. Three out of every 5 persons with incomes below the poverty level are women. Two out of every 3 older persons living in poverty are women.

2. Female-headed families with no husband present comprise only 15 percent of all families, but 48 percent of all poverty families.

3. Female-headed families with no husband present comprise 11 percent of all households and 27 percent of all poverty households. Another 31 percent of all poverty households are female nonfamily households.

3a. The poverty rate for female-headed families with no husband present is more than triple that of all families. At 64 percent, the poverty rate for households headed by young (aged 15-24) women is seven times the poverty rate for all families.

4. Black female-headed families with no husband present are particularly likely to be poor. Black families headed by young women are especially disadvantaged.

5. The median income of all women aged 14 and older is well below half that of their male counterparts. This income differential widens in the middle years.

6. Older women are concentrated in the lowest income brackets. Seven out of every 10 widows, most of whom are older women, had incomes of less than \$10,000 in 1979.

7. In general, women are much more likely than men to live in central cities. Older women in central cities outnumber men by a wide margin. (Figure 5.) Thus, cuts in aid for apparently gender-neutral city services could disproportionately affect women.

8. Households headed by women are far more likely than other households to be benefiting from federally-assisted programs.

9. Poor women who work are concentrated in the lowest paying kinds of jobs with few opportunities for increasing their income.●

FAMILY ENTERPRISE
PRESERVATION ACT

HON. E. THOMAS COLEMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, Senator NANCY KASSEBAUM introduced S. 574, the Family Enterprise Preservation Act which would ease the burden of taxes on family farm enterprises and other small businesses. It is with great pleasure that Mr. ROBERTS and I offer this bill for the consideration of the House of Representatives.

The family farm has changed greatly during the past decade. Farm values have increased dramatically as inflation has driven up the cost of buying farmland. It is extremely difficult for young people to enter farming on their own.

Mr. Speaker, I have recently heard from young people in my district—who earnestly want to farm—describe the difficulty they expect to face because of the current unfair, confiscatory inheritance taxes.

Land, machinery, and other production costs are quickly becoming insurmountable for the young farmer, especially when coupled with exorbitant interest rates. For these reasons it is absolutely necessary that Congress act to assure that farms can be passed on from one generation to another without losing the greatest asset of the estate, the land.

Under current law the owner of a family enterprise often is forced to sell a portion of the estate to pay taxes. This must be corrected.

This bill would clearly safeguard the family farm enterprise by excluding the first \$750,000 from Federal estate taxes. The bill would allow the \$750,000 exclusion as long as the farm or business accounted for at least half of the estate.

To discourage any kind of windfall to the survivors of an estate, the legislation also provides for a payment of the excluded taxes if the estate is sold within 5 years of the original owner's death. For each year after that, 10 percent of the property's value would be protected from estate taxes.

As the Senator from Kansas noted when S. 574 was introduced, this legislation would be extremely beneficial to farm wives. They are as involved as their husbands in the day-to-day operations of a family farm, but when their husbands die they are often forced to sell the farm in order to pay estate taxes. No consideration is given, under current law, to the fact that these women are fully capable and willing to continue farming on the family estate.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is essential to preserving the family farm in

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

America and I urge my colleagues to give it rapid and favorable consideration.●

PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS
EFFECT ON WOMEN

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, the Women's Research and Education Institute, the research arm of the Congresswomen's Caucus, has prepared analyses of the impact on women of the administration's proposed budget cuts. The areas under consideration include education, selected social security benefits, and health programs. I insert in the RECORD statements by the institute relating to these issues:

PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS EFFECT ON WOMEN
HOUSING ASSISTANCE—FUNCTION 600

The housing programs targeted for reduction subsidize the housing costs of lower-income families in rental units. The Administration proposes to:

Reduce the long-term budget authority for FY81;

Rescind new commitments for FY82 by more than \$9 billion;

Increase over a five-year period the maximum tenant rent payment from 25 to 30 percent of income; and

Reduce funding levels for public housing modernization.

A large proportion of new rental units (perhaps as many as 75 percent in 1979) is subsidized by the federal government. Consequently, the budget decisions may have a substantial impact on the supply of housing in the coming years.

Unsubsidized housing is increasingly out of the reach of low-income persons. A reduction in support, therefore, can be expected to restrict further the housing available to this income group. The National Urban Coalition estimates that 125,000 people faced with displacement or living in unsubsidized housing will be unable to obtain decent, affordable housing.

Impact on Women: Two-thirds of all households in publicly owned or other subsidized housing in 1979 were headed by women. (Some 64 percent of all householders living in subsidized housing were 65 years or older. Sex breakdowns by age are not available; however, the majority are probably women.) Persons currently residing in subsidized housing will not be affected by reductions in capital outlays for such housing, at least while the existing units remain livable.

Estimates of the characteristics of persons who might be inconvenienced or harmed by the proposed reductions in capital outlays for subsidized housing, or by cuts in public housing modernization, are not available. If, however, the population in need of subsidized housing or housing improvement reflects the population currently living in such housing, then the majority of persons would be women.

Again, because the majority of tenants in subsidized housing are female householders, the proposed rent increase would have a disproportionate impact on women. \$5,325 was the median income of female-headed fami-

April 2, 1981

lies, with no husband present, who lived in subsidized housing in 1979. (The median income for nonfamily households headed by women was only \$3,845.) Although the proposed rent increase might seem modest, it could mean economic hardship to those persons who are already straining to make ends meet.

The proposed rental increase should also be viewed within the context of proposed reduction in other programs, namely AFDC. The combined impact of simultaneous cuts in several programs could be devastating for low-income people.

BLOCK GRANTS

The Administration proposes to consolidate 26 health service programs, 13 social service programs, and low-income energy assistance into four block grants to states. The FY82 level of funding would fall some 25 percent below that for FY81. In fact, taking inflation into consideration, the funding reduction would in effect be greater than 25 percent.

A wide range of programs would be affected by consolidation, among which are home health services, primary health care centers and services, mental health, drug abuse and alcoholism services, family planning services, and Title XX social services (which include day care).

Impact on Women: The magnitude of the impact depends largely on how states respond to consolidation. However, a substantial reduction in services can be expected, since there is little evidence that many states would be able to compensate for the cut in federal funding. Moreover, many of these programs were established because states and localities were not meeting certain needs in the first place.

The Majority of the programs proposed for consolidation are targeted toward poor and low-income persons. As noted repeatedly throughout this paper, women predominate among the poor. Thus, they may be disproportionately affected by any cut in services. Some programs, such as day care and employment services, may mean the difference between welfare dependency and self-support, particularly for women. If these services are not available, greater welfare dependency could be the only alternative.

Comment: The long-term consequences of a reduction in some of the proposed block grant services, such as maternal and child health, could be extremely costly (e.g., an increase in untreated health problems, an increase in the already alarmingly high teenage pregnancy rate, etc.). A large portion of the anticipated savings from consolidation might be offset by future expenditures that could have been prevented by timely intervention.

Projected savings in administrative costs might not be as great as estimated, because states and localities would have to develop administrative systems for work that is now done on the federal level. With 40 programs being administered by 50 states, accountability would be extremely difficult.

THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION—FUNCTION
750

The Legal Services Corporation (LSC) was established in 1974 to provide legal assistance to the poor in civil matters. Under present law, LSC is authorized to provide free legal services to persons at or below 125 percent of the poverty guidelines established by the Office of Management and Budget. There are more than 300 local Legal Services programs; the LSC reported

that one million legal services cases were closed in 1979.

The Administration proposes to eliminate funding for the Legal Services Corporation entirely, beginning in FY 1982. (\$321 million was appropriated for LSC in FY 1981.) Under the Administration's proposal the states could fund legal aid for the poor from the proposed consolidated social services block grants if they chose to do so.

Impact on Women: The disproportionate impact on women of eliminating the Legal Services Corporation is clear, since more than two-thirds of Legal Services clients are female. It is likely that at least 15 percent of these women are over 60 years of age—the percentage is probably greater.

Comment: If the Administration's proposals both to eliminate the Legal Services Corporation and to fund major social services programs in block grants at a reduced level of support are adopted, continuing access on the part of the poor to legal assistance in civil matters is likely to depend on the answers to two questions:

1. What budget priority will states assign to legal aid to the poor, given overall reductions in federal funding for a range of social services?

2. Will—as the Administration has suggested—large numbers of private attorneys undertake to help fill the vacuum with "pro bono" legal work for the poor?

If the answers to these questions prove to be "no," there is a third—and fundamental—question:

Can people reasonably be expected to abide by the laws if they themselves are effectively denied legal recourse because they cannot afford the services of lawyers?

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS—BLOCK GRANTS IN FUNCTION 500

The Administration proposes that most federal aid for elementary and secondary education be consolidated into block grants. Among the programs involved are two large categorical grant programs: Title I of the ESEA, which currently funds over \$3 billion in grants for services to disadvantaged students, and approximately \$1 billion in grants for programs for handicapped children. Also included would be a number of other smaller programs, among them the Women's Education Equity Act programs, currently funded at \$10 million, and the Equal Educational Opportunity programs authorized by Title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. 28 percent (\$13 million) of the latter's funds are currently targeted for assistance and training to end sex discrimination in education. (The Administration also proposes to end "impact aid" for school districts having a concentration of federally-assisted low-income housing.)

Under the Administration's plan, these and other programs would be combined into block grants, one to states and one to local education agencies (LEA's). 1981 funding would be cut by 25 percent of current appropriations; in FY82, there would be a small (7 percent) increase over this reduced 1981 level. States and localities would have wide discretion in allocating the block grant funds.

Impact on Women: Since nearly 60 percent of poor families with school-age children are female-headed, a large percentage of the children served by Title I programs are certain to be from female-headed families. The National Urban Coalition estimates that a 25 percent reduction in funding for the kinds of education programs now funded under Title I could mean that as

many as 1.5 million children would be eliminated from such programs.

Eliminating the federal impact aid targeted to school districts with a significant concentration of federally-assisted low-income housing could have a pronounced effect on the schools attended by children of female-headed families, since 58 percent of all families in public or federally-subsidized housing are female-headed. (Two-thirds of all households in such housing are female-headed.)

Women could also be noticeably affected by cuts in education for handicapped children, since mothers are mostly likely to bear the heaviest burden of responsibility for their care. Local school boards faced with allocating a substantially reduced education budget might choose to cut back severely on education and training programs for the handicapped, since "special education" can be more than twice as expensive per child as "regular" education. Moreover, to the extent that education and training equip handicapped children to lead more independent lives in adulthood, failure to provide that education could have serious implications for their mothers in the long run.

Since 71 percent of all elementary and secondary teachers are female, women would be disproportionately affected by reductions in the number of teaching jobs. It has been estimated that 64,460 teacher positions would be eliminated under the Administration's proposed education budget; this translates into 45,000 jobs lost by women teachers.

Women would unquestionably be affected by cuts in programs to end sex discrimination in education. Educational opportunities play an important role in determining the economic status of women in adulthood, and there is still a long way to go before educational inequities based on sex are eliminated. WEAL points out that in 1978 women were only 11 percent of all participants in vocational training programs leading to higher-paying, traditionally male, jobs.

Comments: The Administration proposals will mean a real cut in funds for education programs (The Congressional Budget Office estimates at least 20 percent in 1982, even if the "best case" administrative savings are achieved) unless the states and localities can—and are willing to—make up the difference. Although federal funds have accounted for only about one-tenth of all annual spending on elementary and secondary education, the Administration's proposed reduction in federal support would mean the loss of very large dollar amounts for many states.

The question is whether states and localities, many of which are already having a hard time making ends meet, could—or would—increase taxes to make up for the loss of federal support, and whether they would, in any case, be likely to embrace present federal priorities in targeting funds for the education of disadvantaged and handicapped children. Another question: with a shrunken budget, how much priority would be given to programs to end sex discrimination, especially in light of the fact that the vast majority of high-level school administrators are men?

CETA—FUNCTION 500

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) provides funds to state and local governments for employment and training programs. The Administration proposes eliminating all Public Service Employment (PSE) jobs by the end of 1981. The jobs targeted for elimination include those funded by Title II-D, which ad-

resses structural unemployment, and Title VI, which addresses cyclical unemployment. Some 315,000 PSE slots will be lost. In fact, however, the number of persons may be somewhat higher, since more than one person may fill a PSE slot in a given year. According to the Congressional Budget Office, natural attrition will take care of about half of the jobs; in the other half, workers would be fired, laid off, or perhaps absorbed into other public employment positions.

Impact on Women: Although women will not be disproportionately affected by these PSE cuts, the impact on women should not be minimized. About one-third of the PSE job holders, or some 100,000 persons, are women. Many of these women are structurally unemployed (i.e., unskilled, undereducated, etc.) and have moved from welfare rolls to employment only because of PSE opportunities. It will not be easy for such women—many of them only partially trained—to find employment in the private sector, especially in view of the fact that no proposals to open up private sector jobs for PSE employees have been introduced. Access to other forms of economic assistance, as an alternative to PSE employment, is threatened by other proposed budget cuts. Even though the number of women affected is relatively small, especially when compared to the number affected by cuts in such programs as AFDC, the PSE cuts can be regarded as an erosion of the employment gains that women have managed to make in recent years.

The impact of these cuts may extend to other women, as well. According to Wider Opportunities for Women, about one-fifth of all women's employment programs depend on monies from Titles II-D and VI of CETA. Cuts would limit opportunities for women to increase their employability, thus restricting employment options in the short and long run. In addition, many other programs that benefit women (e.g., displaced homemaker services, women's health clinics, and the like) are staffed by CETA employees. Many of these programs operate from hand to mouth, and whether they could afford to replace a CETA employee is questionable.

Comment: The long-range consequences of these proposed cuts should also be considered. According to preliminary estimates cited by the Congressional Budget Office, CETA participation does increase post-CETA-employment earnings. PSE employees in state and local government jobs have enabled states and localities to stretch limited resources in providing services. Without PSE employees, a cut in some services might ensue. An increase in spending for public assistance and food stamps may also be expected. Unemployment compensation costs will increase, while Social Security and federal tax revenues will decline.

SOCIAL SECURITY MINIMUM BENEFITS—FUNCTION 600

Social Security recipients are currently entitled to a minimum benefit of \$122 a month, regardless of the amount of covered earnings. Although this benefit does not ensure an above-poverty-level income, it does provide a higher income than many sporadic, discontinuous, or low-earning workers would otherwise have received. The Administration proposes to eliminate it.

Impact on Women: Elimination of the minimum Social Security benefit would clearly affect older women. About three-fourths of the beneficiaries—some 2.3 mil-

lion persons, many of them black—are women.

Comment: The proposed cuts are designed to eliminate payments to "double dippers" and persons with substantial income from other sources (e.g., spouse's earnings). The Administration argues that the truly needy would not be adversely affected by this reduction because such individuals would be eligible for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) if they are not already receiving it, or higher benefits if they are.

The recommendation to eliminate the minimum benefit was based on a 1977 General Accounting Office attempt to identify minimum beneficiaries. GAO found that some 15 percent of the beneficiaries were also receiving federal pensions. The average pension was \$900 a month. However, 20 percent of these were receiving federal pensions of \$250-\$499 a month. In some instances, the minimum Social Security benefit might make the difference between a poverty- and above-poverty-level existence.

According to GAO, another 30 percent of the minimum beneficiaries have substantial other income. It is important to note that "substantial" merely means "ineligible for SSI." The benefits of persons with incomes above the SSI maximum (about 75 percent of the federal poverty level for single persons) would be only partially offset by SSI.

Eighteen percent of minimum beneficiaries are receiving SSI. GAO is unable to tell us anything at all about 26 percent of the minimum beneficiaries. GAO believes that a "significant" portion of this 26 percent has substantial other income; however, the validity of this conclusion is very much in question. It was based on a supplemental survey of 89 minimum beneficiaries in Los Angeles, California.

It may be that eliminating this benefit will not cause undue harm to the poor (who will transfer to SSI) or to persons with adequate other sources of income. It is the near poor—many of whom are women—who may experience substantial income reductions if their Social Security minimum benefit is eliminated. Further research on the characteristics and income of minimum beneficiaries is clearly warranted before this benefit reduction is approved.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FOR STUDENTS—
FUNCTION 600

The Administration proposes to phase out Social Security benefits to unmarried, full-time students aged 18 to 21, who are dependents of retired, disabled, or deceased workers. Almost 800,000 students were receiving such benefits in 1979.

Impact on Women: Widows attempting to support and educate their children will be especially affected by this phase-out. Over half of the student beneficiaries are children of deceased male workers. (The remainder are children of retired or disabled male and female workers.)

Comment: According to the Congressional Budget Office, the median income for families with student beneficiaries was only 71 percent of the median income for all families with unmarried full-time college students between the ages of 18 and 21. It is by no means clear that families of student beneficiaries could assume the additional burden of educating these children. A woman receiving a Social Security widow's benefit would truly be between a rock and a hard place if her student child or children no longer received Social Security student benefits. Taking a job, or working longer hours, in order to earn more money for col-

lege bills could cause her widow's benefit to be reduced or eliminated.

The Administration contends that Social Security students benefits duplicate other federally-funded education assistance programs. Some students might benefit from other educational assistance programs. However, the CBO analyses reveal that most low-income student beneficiaries of Pell Grants (formerly Basic Educational Opportunity grants, discussed elsewhere in this paper) are already receiving the maximum allowed under that program. Moreover, estimated additional outlays for Pell Grants for 1982 will offset only about two percent of the Social Security savings.

Low-income students—who come from families that are generally not preferred borrowers—may also have difficulty obtaining Guaranteed Student Loans (GSL's), especially if the GSL loan capital is substantially reduced.●

TO THE AMERICAN LIBERAL
FROM A FORMER VIETNAM
LIBERAL

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is usually away from the Halls of Congress that we find something in our travels worthy of sharing with all our fellow Americans. Such was the case for me, when I recently read the New York Times Magazine of March 29, 1981. The title of the article: "A Lament for Vietnam."

Everybody is familiar with Solzhenitsyn's "The Gulag Archipelago," but as Doan Van Toai, the author of "A Lament for Vietnam," points out, there was such a thing as "The Vietnamese Gulag." He should know. He wrote it.

I earnestly hope that all those who read this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and especially the liberals of the Nation's press who constantly berate those of us who are sincere and dedicated anti-Communists, that they will sharpen their pens, to make the testimony of Doan Van Toai, heard far and wide.

Here is the testimony of one who marched in streets of both Saigon and Berkeley. Here is one who worked in a bank in his land of Vietnam and at the same time, gave secret information to support the Communist Vietcong. Here is one who witnessed the facade of Harrison Salisbury parroting the Communist line for U.S. acceptance by media and the general public.

And then came the rude awakening. Doan Van Toai became the victim of the ideology and the Communist leaders who promoted the massacre of his fellow—peace at any price—liberals. The rude awakening began when his former salary, while working at a bank, was reduced by 90 percent. Then he went to prison. There the list of former ideologues, peace activists, Buddhist peace marchers, and others,

who promoted Communist victory, met their deaths—one by one.

Probably the most devastating item in this New York Times article, is the author quoting Mai Chi Tho, a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam, directing his remarks to a selected group of political prisoners including author Doan Van Toai:

But we won and the Americans were defeated because we convinced the people that Ho Chi Minh is the great man, that Nixon is a murderer and the Americans are the invaders . . . the key factor is how to control people and their opinions. Only Marxism-Leninism can do that. None of you ever see resistance to the Communist regime, so don't think about it. Forget it. Between you—the bright intellectuals—and me, I tell you the truth.

I earnestly hope all will pay heed to the message of this article:

A LAMENT FOR VIETNAM

(By Doan Van Toai)

When the Communists took over North Vietnam in 1954, a million refugees fled to the South. I personally heard stories of their incredible suffering. But, along with other South Vietnamese, I refused to believe them. A generation later, I could not believe Solzhenitsyn's book "The Gulag Archipelago," either. I dismissed it as anti-Communist propaganda. But by 1979, I had published my own book, "The Vietnamese Gulag." Can those who have suffered the horror of Communism ever convince those who have not experienced it?

From 1945, when I was born in the village of Caillon in Vinh Long province, 100 miles south of Saigon, until I left Vietnam in May 1978, I never enjoyed peace. My family's house was burned three times in the war against the French. To escape the fighting, my parents moved from one village to another throughout my youth. Like the majority of Vietnamese patriots, they joined the resistance forces fighting the French. As I grew up, I myself saw how the peasants were oppressed by the local officials of the successive Saigon regimes, how they were victimized by the French bombardments. I learned the history of my country's thousand-year struggle against Chinese occupation and its century-long effort against Western domination. With this background, my compatriots and I grew up with a hatred of foreign intervention.

When the students at Saigon University elected me vice president of the Saigon Student Union in 1969 and 1970, I participated in the different peace efforts, leading student demonstrations against the Thieu regime and against American involvement. I published a magazine called Self-Determination, and traveled in January 1971 to California to give antiwar lectures at Berkeley and Stanford. For my activities, I was arrested and jailed many times by the Thieu Government.

During that period, I believed that I was fulfilling my commitment to peace and the independence of my country. I had faith, too, in the program of the National Liberation Front (N.L.F.), which led the revolutionary resistance in South Vietnam. I hated Saigon's rulers, men like Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu, Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, Gen. Dang Van Quang—former soldiers of the French colonial army. These were the men whom the French had recruited in the

1940's to help destroy the Vietnamese resistance. They had risen over the years to become leaders themselves, but they commanded no respect from the people. Because of their lack of popular support, they were predisposed to rely on foreign forces.

As a student leader, I felt I had to pursue the aspiration of the Vietnamese people for democracy, freedom and peace. Naively, I believed that the Hanoi regime at least had the virtue of being Vietnamese, while the Americans were foreign invaders like the French before them. Like others in the South Vietnamese opposition movements, I believed that our Communist compatriots in the North would be more amenable to compromise and easier to work with than the Americans. Moreover, I was hypnotized by the personal sacrifices and devotion the Communist leaders had demonstrated. Ton Duc Thang, former President of North Vietnam, for example, had been imprisoned for 17 years in a French jail. I was hypnotized also by the political programs advocated by the N.L.F., which included a domestic policy of national reconciliation, without risk of reprisal, and a foreign policy of nonalignment. Finally, I was influenced by progressive movements throughout the world and by the most prestigious intellectuals in the West. My impression was that during the 1960's and early 70's the leaders of the American peace movement shared my convictions.

These convictions endured through the signing of the 1973 Paris peace accords and the subsequent collapse of the South Vietnamese Government two years later. When liberation was imminent, I was the one who told friends and relatives not to flee. "Why do you want to leave?" I asked. "Why are you afraid of the Communists?" I accepted the prospect of enduring hardships to rebuild my country and I decided to stay in Vietnam and continue working as a branch manager at a Saigon bank, where I had been for more than four years, writing secret reports about the economic situation in South Vietnam for the N.L.F. (After leaving the university, I had not been drafted by the South Vietnamese Government because I was the only son in my family. And I had not joined the Vietcong because the N.L.F. felt I could serve a more useful role providing financial reports from the bank.)

Several days after Saigon fell, the Provisional Revolutionary Government, formed by the N.L.F., asked me to join the finance committee, a group of intellectuals whose job it was to advise the Government on matters of economic policy. I complied willingly, taking a pay cut of 90 percent. My first assignment was to help draw up a plan for confiscating all the private property in South Vietnam. Shocked, I proposed that we should expropriate only the property of those who had cooperated with the former regime and those who had used to war to become rich, and that we distribute it in some fashion to the poor and to the victims of the war, Communist and non-Communist alike. My proposals, of course, were rejected. I was naive enough to think that the local cadres were mistaken, that they misunderstood the good intentions of the Communist Party leaders. I had many fights with them, believing as I did Hanoi's previous statement that "the situation in the South is very special and different from that of North Vietnam." A few months before the liberation of Saigon, Le Duan, the First Secretary of the Communist Party, had said, "The South needs its own policy."

In the end, I could not obey the order to help arrange the confiscation of all private property, a plan that was subsequently carried out. Such a scheme had nothing to do with fulfilling the aspirations of the South Vietnamese, and it went against my conscience. I decided to resign. But no one resigns in a Communist regime. The implication of nonconformity is intolerable to Communists. When I submitted my resignation, the chief of the finance committee warned me that my action "would only serve as propaganda to excite the people; here we never do it that way." Several days later, while I was attending a concert at the great National Theater (formerly the National Assembly Hall, which my fellow students and I had occupied so many times under the Thieu regime), I was arrested. No charges were made, no reasons were given.

After the fall of Saigon, many progressive intellectuals and former antiwar-movement leaders believed that the new Vietnamese regime would bring internal democracy and freedom from foreign domination. They believed that the new regime would pursue that best interests of the people, honoring its promise to carry out a policy of national reconciliation without fear of reprisal. Far from adhering to their promises, the Vietnamese rulers have arrested hundreds of thousands of individuals—not only those who had cooperated with the Thieu regime but even those who had not, including religious leaders and former members of the N.L.F.

Vietnam today is a country without any law other than the arbitrary directives of those in power. There is no civil code. Individuals are imprisoned without charges and without trial. Once in jail, prisoners are taught that their behavior, attitude and "good will" are the key factors in determining when they may be released—whatever crimes they may have committed. As a consequence, prisoners often obey the guards blindly, hoping for an early release. In fact, they never know when they may be released—or when their sentences may be extended.

How many political prisoners are there in Vietnam today? And how many of them have died in prisons during the first six years of Communist rule? Nobody can know the exact numbers. The United States Department of State has said there are from 150,000 to 200,000 prisoners; Vietnamese refugees estimate about one million. Hoang Huu Quynh, an intellectual, a graduate of Moscow University, who served as a director of a technical school in Ho Chi Minh City (formerly Saigon), recently defected to France during his Government-sponsored tour of European countries. He told the French press: "There are at least 700,000 prisoners in Vietnam today." Another witness, Nguyen Cong Hoan, a former member of the reunified National Assembly, which was elected in 1976, who escaped by boat in 1978, said that he himself knew "about 300 cases of executions" in his own province of Phu Yen. In 1977, officials in Hanoi insisted that only 50,000 people, who posed the greatest threat to national security, had been arrested. But Prime Minister Pham Van Dong said, in the French magazine *Paris Match*, on Sept. 22, 1978, "In over three years, I released more than one million prisoners from the camps." One wonders how it is possible to release more than a million after having arrested only 50,000.

When I was arrested, I was thrown into a three-foot-by-six-foot cell with my left hand chained to my right foot and my right hand

chained to my left foot. My food was rice mixed with sand. When I complained about the sand, the guards explained that sand is added to the rice to remind prisoners of their crimes. I discovered that pouring water in the rice bowl would make the sand separate from the rice and sink to the bottom. But the water ration was only one liter a day for drinking and bathing, and I had to husband it carefully.

After two months in solitary confinement, I was transferred to a collective cell, a room 15 feet wide and 25 feet long, where at different times anywhere from 40 to 100 prisoners were crushed together. Here we had to take turns lying down to sleep, and most of the younger, stronger prisoners slept sitting up. In the sweltering heat, we also took turns snatching a few breaths of fresh air in front of the narrow opening that was the cell's only window. Every day I watched my friends die at my feet.

In March 1976, when a group of Western reporters visited my prison, the Communist officials moved out all the prisoners and substituted North Vietnamese soldiers. In front of the prisons, one sees no barbed wire, no watchtowers, only a few policemen and a large sign above the entrance that proclaims Ho Chi Minh's best-known slogan: "Nothing Is More Precious Than Liberty and Independence." Only those detained inside and those who guard them know what kind of place is hidden behind that sign. And every prisoner knows that if he is suspected of planning to escape, his fellow inmates and relatives at home will be punished rather than he himself.

We will never know precisely the number of dead prisoners, but we do know about the deaths of many well-known prisoners who, in the past, never cooperated with President Thieu or the Americans: for example, Thich Thien Minh, the strategist of all the Buddhist peace movements in Saigon, an antiwar activist who was sentenced to 10 years in jail by the Thieu regime, then released after an outpouring of protest from Vietnamese and antiwar protesters around the world. Thien Minh died in Ham Tan prison after six months of detention in 1979. Another silent death was that of the lawyer Tran Van Tuyen, a leader of the opposition bloc in the Saigon Assembly under President Thieu. This well-known activist died in Communist hands in 1976, although as late as April 1977, Prime Minister Pham Van Dong was telling French reporters that Tuyen was alive and well in a re-education camp. One of the greatest losses has been that of the famous Vietnamese philosopher Ho Huu Tuong. Tuong, a classmate of Jean-Paul Sartre's in Paris in the 1930's was perhaps the leading intellectual in South Vietnam. He died in Ham Tan prison on June 26, 1980. These men were arrested, along with many others among the most prominent and respected South Vietnamese, in order to pre-empt any possible opposition to the Communists.

Some American supporters of Hanoi have ignored or rationalized these deaths, as they have the countless other tragedies that have befallen Vietnam since 1975. It is more than likely that they will continue to maintain their silence in order to avoid the profound disillusionment that accepting the truth about Vietnam means for them. Yet if liberty and democracy are worth struggling for in the Philippines, in Chile, in South Korea or in South Africa, they are no less worth defending in Communist countries like Vietnam. Everyone remembers the numerous demonstrations protesting United

States involvement in Vietnam and the war crimes of the Thieu regime. But some of those people who were then so passionately committed to democratic principles and human rights have developed a strange indifference now that these same principles are under assault in Communist Vietnam. For example, one antiwar activist, William Kunstler, refused to sign a May 1979 open letter to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in which many former antiwar activists, including Joan Baez, protested Hanoi's violations of human rights. Kunstler said, "I don't believe in criticizing socialist governments publicly, even if there are human-rights violations," and, "The entire Baez campaign may be a C.I.A. plot." This statement reminds me of the argument used by the Thieu regime to suppress opposition: "The peace movements and the opposition activists are all the Communists' lackeys."

There are other illusions about the current regime in Vietnam about which people should be disabused. Many people believed that Ho Chi Minh was primarily a nationalist and that the Vietnamese Communists were and are independent of the Soviet Union. I believed the same before they took over South Vietnam. But portraits of Soviet leaders now adorn public buildings, schools and administrative offices throughout "independent Vietnam." In contrast, one never saw pictures of American leaders even during the so-called puppet regime of President Thieu. The degree of subordination the present Government feels toward its Soviet patron is suggested by a famous poem by the well-known Vietnamese poet To Huu, a member of the Politburo and president of the Communist Party Committee of Culture. Here we have an opportunity to listen to a high ranking Vietnamese weep on the occasion of Stalin's death:

Oh, Stalin! Oh, Stalin!
The love I bear my father, my mother, my wife, myself
It's nothing beside the love I bear you,
Oh, Stalin! Oh, Stalin!
What remains of the earth and of the sky!
Now that you are dead.

It may seem incredible that such a poem could have been written in Vietnam, which is known for the strength of its family traditions and its feeling for filial piety. Yet this poem occupied a prominent place in a major anthology of contemporary Vietnamese poetry recently published in Hanoi.

Moreover, Le Duan, First Secretary of the Communist Party, said in his political report to the reunified National Assembly in 1976: "The Vietnamese revolution is to fulfill the internationalist duty and the international obligation," and to do so, in the words of the 1971 party platform, "under the leadership of the Soviet Union." The glorification of Soviet life is, in fact, a major goal of Communist Vietnam's censorship policy.

Immediately after the fall of Saigon, the Government closed all bookshops and theaters. All books published under the former regimes were confiscated or burned. Cultural literature was not exempt, including translations of Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus and Dale Carnegie. Margaret Mitchell's "Gone With the Wind" was on the list of decadent literature as well. The new regime replaced such books with literature designed to indoctrinate children and adults with the idea that the "Soviet Union is a paradise of the socialist world."

Another argument made at times by Western apologists has to do with freedom of religion in Vietnam. One article in the new

Constitution of Vietnam, adopted this year, declares that "the regime respects the liberty of the believers and also the liberty of the nonbelievers." In regard to this article, Le Duan has repeatedly proclaimed: "Our present regime is a million times more democratic than any other in the world." The reality, though, is suggested by an incident involving the desecration of a Buddhist pagoda, in which a nude woman, on orders from the Government, entered the pagoda during a worship service. When Thich Man Giac, a prominent Buddhist leader, protested, the Government used the opportunity to try to discredit the Buddhists as enemies of democracy—specifically, of the freedom to disbelieve. Thich Man Giac, who had served as liaison between the Buddhists and the Communist Government, escaped Vietnam by boat in 1977 and is now living in Los Angeles.

All of those who supported the N.L.F. in its struggle should be aware of how they were betrayed and deceived. When Harrison Salisbury of The New York Times visited Hanoi in December 1966, the leaders in Hanoi told him: "The direction of the struggle in the South is by the South and not by the North." Pham Van Dong, Prime Minister, said to Salisbury: "No one in the North had this stupid, criminal idea in mind" that the North wanted to annex the South.

Yet in a victory-day celebration speech made on May 19, 1975, Le Duan said, "Our party is the unique and single leader that organized, controlled and governed the entire struggle of the Vietnamese people from the first day of the revolution." In his political report to the reunified National Assembly in Hanoi on June 26, 1976, Le Duan said: "The strategic task of the revolution in our country in the new stage is to achieve the reunification of our homeland and to take the whole country rapidly, vigorously and steadily to socialism, and Communism."

In 1976, the Provisional Revolutionary Government formed by the N.L.F. was abolished, and South and North Vietnam were reunified under Communist rule. Today, among 17 members of the Politburo and 134 members of the Central Committee of the Vietnamese Communist Party, not a single one is from the N.L.F. (there are several members who had been North Vietnam Communist Party representatives with the N.L.F.). Even Nguyen Huu Tho, former chairman of the N.L.F., holds only the post of acting President of State, a ceremonial position that involves greeting visitors and participating in festivals. But his position will be abolished under the new Constitution.

Listen to Truong Nhu Tang, 57 years old, a founder of the N.L.F., former Justice Minister of the Provisional Revolutionary Government, more recently one of the boat people. Tang escaped in November 1979 and is now living in Paris. He told reporters of his experience in a news conference in Paris in June 1980. Twelve years earlier, he said, when he had been jailed by the Thieu regime for his Communist activities, his father came to visit. "Why," he asked Tang, "have you abandoned everything—a good job, a rich family—to join the Communists? Don't you know that the Communists will betray you and persecute you, and when you finally understand, it will be too late to wake up?" Tang, an intellectual, answered his father: "You would do better to keep quiet and accept the sacrifice of one of your sons for democracy and our country's independence. . . ."

After the Tet offensive in 1968, Tang was exchanged for three American colonels who

had been prisoners of war held by the Vietcong; then he vanished into the jungle with the N.L.F. He has visited many Communist and third-world countries on behalf of the N.L.F. during the war. Tang said in his news conference: "I was well aware that the N.L.F. was a Communist-dominated national united front and I was naive enough to believe that Ho Chi Minh and his party would place national interests above ideology and would place the interest of the Vietnamese people above the party's. But the people and I were wrong."

Truong Nhu Tang told of his own knowledge of the way Communist ruling circles operate: "The Communists are expert in the arts of seduction and will go to any length to woo you over to their side, as long as they don't control the Government. But once they are in power they suddenly become harsh, ungrateful, cynical and brutal." Tang summarized current conditions in Vietnam: "The family is divided, society is divided, even the party is divided."

Looking back now on the Vietnam war, I feel nothing but sorrow for my own naiveté in believing that the Communists were revolutionaries worthy of support. In fact, they betrayed the Vietnamese people and deceived progressives throughout the world. The responsibility for the tragedies that have engulfed my compatriots is mine. And now I can only bear witness to this truth so that all former supporters of the Vietcong may share their responsibility with me.

While I was in jail, Mai Chi Tho, a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, addressed a selected group of political prisoners. He told us: "Ho Chi Minh may have been an evil man; Nixon may have been a great man. The Americans may have had the just cause; we may not have had the just cause. But we won and the Americans were defeated because we convinced the people that Ho Chi Minh is the great man, that Nixon is a murderer and the Americans are the invaders." He concluded that "the key factor is how to control people and their opinions. Only Marxism-Leninism can do that. None of you ever see resistance to the Communist regime, so don't think about it. Forget it. Between you—the bright intellectuals—and me, I tell you the truth."

And he did tell us the truth. Since 1978, the Vietnamese-Communists have occupied Laos, invaded Cambodia and attacked Thailand, while the Soviet Union has invaded Afghanistan. In each of these depredations, the Communists have portrayed themselves, incredibly, as liberators, saviors, and bulwarks against foreign aggression. And each time, world opinion has remained relatively quiescent.

But in Vietnam, people often remark: "Don't believe what the Communists say, look instead at what they have done." One South Vietnamese Communist, Nguyen Van Tang, who was detained 15 years by the French, eight years by Diem, six years by Thieu, and who is still in jail today, this time in a Communist prison, told me: "In order to understand the Communists, one must first live under a Communist regime." One rainy evening in Saigon's Le Van Duyet prison, he told me: "My dream now is not to be released; it is not to see my family. My dream is that I could be back in a French prison 30 years ago." This is the one wish of a 60-year-old man who has spent his entire adult life in and out of prison fighting for the freedom and the independence of his country. At this moment, he may already

have died in his cell or have been executed by the new rulers.

The Vietnamese people wish to achieve the real revolution; they do not want Communism. The measure of popular hatred for the Communists is that thousands of Vietnamese have abandoned their historical attachment to the land. Under French colonial domination, throughout the long war years, even during the catastrophic famine of 1945 when two million starved to death, Vietnamese simply did not willingly leave their homeland—the land of their ancestors' graves. The recent outpouring of refugees is a direct result of the terror of the present regime. Listen to another refugee, Nguyen Cong Hoan, former N.L.F. agent and member of the new unified Assembly elected in 1976: "This current regime is the most inhuman and oppressive [Vietnam] has ever known." Hoan escaped by boat in 1977, after abandoning his position in the Communist Assembly. "The Assembly," he declared, "is a puppet, the members know only how to say yes, never how to say no."

Among the boat people who survived, including those who were raped by pirates and those who suffered in the refugee camps, nobody regrets his escape from the present regime. I am confident that the truth about Vietnam will eventually emerge. It is already available to those who wish to know it. As Solzhenitsyn has said, "Truth weighs as heavy as the world." And Vietnam is a lesson in truth. ●

THE PLIGHT OF REFUGEES FROM EL SALVADOR

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, thousands of refugees from the violence in El Salvador could be forced to return to their war-torn homeland unless the United States gives them temporary refuge. The current policy of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service is to force as many as 400 refugees to return to El Salvador each month. Once in El Salvador, some refugees face retribution from their government and all are thrown again into the dangerous situation they sought to escape.

An article which appeared recently in the New York Times provides a thorough explanation of the problems faced by Salvadoran refugees, and of the poor response thus far by U.S. officials. The Secretary of State could initiate a procedure which would grant temporary shelter to these refugees, and a letter urging him to do so was sent 3 weeks ago by myself and 19 of my colleagues. In spite of the urgent importance of offering a temporary haven to Salvadoran refugees, documented in the article which follows, the Secretary of State has failed to take such action.

The issue is of serious concern to us all. I urge my colleagues to carefully consider the information provided by this article.

[From the New York Times]

U.S. IS SENDING HOME SALVADORAN ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS

(By John M. Crewdson)

LOS ANGELES, March 1.—Refugees from the fighting in El Salvador are streaming into the United States in ever-greater numbers, in many cases having sold all they own to finance the difficult, expensive and illegal journey from their Central American homeland. But they are being sent home again nearly as fast as they are captured, to what many of them fear may be mistreatment or death.

Lawyers working in behalf of the Salvadorans say that, in an effort to keep them from clogging the overloaded immigration system, the Immigration and Naturalization Service sometimes does not tell the refugees that they have the right to have a deportation hearing or to seek political asylum, or it intimidates them into forgoing these procedures.

One Mexican immigration official in Tijuana said last month that some of the Salvadorans apprehended in this country had simply been sent back across the border by American officers.

A spokesman for the United States immigration service, Verne Jervis, said that this practice would be illegal but denied that it was going on. Mr. Jervis said that while there "might be some violations" by local offices of the service, he was unaware of widespread trampling on the Salvadorans' rights.

In the fiscal year that ended in September, 11,792 Salvadorans were apprehended by the immigration service, up from 7,890 four years before. Border Patrol Agents estimate that for every illegal alien they catch, from two to five others manage to evade detection, which would place the number of new arrivals at 25,000 to 60,000 a year.

The Salvadorans are only one small group among the uncounted people entering the United States illegally south of the border. But they are the only ones for whom church groups and others are seeking a temporary haven in this country. Unlike the hundreds of thousands of Mexicans who commute here each year to work, the Salvadorans are driven not by poverty but by war, and for them the prospect of returning home holds far more anguish.

In January, alarmed by an unconfirmed report that some refugees sent home in December had been murdered by right-wing "death squads" shortly after they arrived in San Salvador on Christmas morning, 42 Salvadorans at the immigration service's detention facility in El Entro, Calif., 150 miles southeast of here, released a statement saying they had begun a hunger strike to underline their appeal for asylum from "the political situation which presently exists" in El Salvador.

The report of the Christmas murders, which has gained currency among Salvadoran exiles in this country, remains unconfirmed. But many of those knowledgeable about conditions in El Salvador say there is little doubt that some number of those sent home by the immigration service have been killed, as victims of random violence if not as specific targets of the left or right.

"It just stands to reason," said Millard Arnold, who was deputy assistant secretary of State for human rights in the Carter Administration. "The odds are some of them are going to be killed."

Prof. Blase Bonpane, a sociologist and Latin American expert at California State University here, went further. "There is no

doubt in my mind that somewhere between 5 and 10 percent of those who are returned are executed, because the Government had something on them, a member of a union or something," he said.

Some of the refugees, among them teachers and trade unionists, say their names have appeared on what purport to be "death lists" circulated by various right-wing "terror squads." But United States immigration officials say most of those they apprehend seem to be associated with no political faction. "They've seen the fighting," said one, "but they're generally uninvolved in it. They're just frightened."

Whatever their reasons for leaving, the identities of those who are caught once they arrive here are made known to the Salvadoran Government. Before they can be "repatriated," at a cost to the Federal Government of about \$300 apiece, officials of the immigration service said, the refugees are interviewed by the Salvadoran Consul General in Los Angeles to confirm their nationality. When they arrive home, according to Professor Bonpane, they are interviewed again and asked "to give some kind of explanation" for having left the country. He said he had seen films of such interviews, adding that "the level of abuse is frightening."

A spokesman for the United States Embassy in San Salvador said that he had heard many reports of mistreatment or killing of Salvadorans returned from the United States, but that he had no evidence that any of the reports were true. But Mr. Arnold said the State Department had repeatedly asked the embassy whether it could confirm or disprove the reports and was told, "No one really knows, the situation is so chaotic."

REPORTS OF PEOPLE MISSING OR DEAD

Among the Salvadorans in this country, it seems, almost everyone knows, or has heard of, someone who has been sent back and is now missing or dead. Mario Vasquez, a Los Angeles lawyer representing a 27-year-old Salvadoran mechanic who has been awaiting deportation at El Centro for 13 months, said his client had received a letter from his mother reporting that two friends sent back to El Salvador a few weeks earlier had been killed.

Such reports are spread mainly through the mail and by word of mouth, but there are also occasional telephone calls from home. It was such a call to a refugee at El Centro, from someone who had been detained there whom he knew only as "Carlos," that provided the Salvadorans with their first account of the rumored Christmas massacre.

The rumor swept through the camp and was passed on to a reporter for El Diario, the Spanish-language newspaper in New York City, which published a brief account Jan. 4. It was later picked up by other Spanish-language newspapers, but none of the published reports have contained any confirmation.

Documents of the Immigration and Naturalization Service made available to The New York Times showed that a group of 25 Salvadorans left here Dec. 24 aboard Western Airlines Flight 746, spent the night at the Mexico City airport and arrived in San Salvador on Christmas morning aboard a Costa Rican airliner. Twelve of the Salvadorans were returning under orders of deportation and the rest as "voluntary returnees."

BODIES ALONG THE ROAD

"Carlos," the man who telephoned El Centro with news of the incident, was said to have been among those aboard the plane who somehow escaped death, and the list of passengers includes three persons with that first name. The man reportedly said he had returned to the airport the morning after his arrival and had recognized the bodies of some of his fellow passengers lying along the road.

The immigration service rejected a request by The New York Times, made under the Freedom of Information Act, for the home addresses of those who returned on Christmas Day, saying it was concerned that any inquiries in El Salvador about their well-being might jeopardize their lives.

As is true of all illegal aliens, no one knows how many Salvadorans are living in the United States. Community services officials here estimate that there are 100,000 to 300,000 in the Los Angeles area alone, and there are also sizable Salvadoran communities in San Francisco and the District of Columbia.

The flow of refugees abated somewhat last summer after the deaths from dehydration of 13 Salvadorans who had crossed the border into Arizona without sufficient water, a case that was widely reported in El Salvador. But immigration officials say the refugees are once again arriving at a rapid pace.

The route they follow leads through Guatemala and Mexico, which as a result are now confronted with illegal immigration problems of their own, and the journey is an expensive one. Rings that specialize in smuggling Salvadorans charge from \$1,000 to \$1,700 for passage to Los Angeles and \$500 more for a trip to the East Coast. Because they come with the intention of remaining here until the Salvadoran conflict is resolved, many of the refugees sell their houses and personal possessions to pay their way. If they are captured and returned home, there is often nowhere for them to go.

Not many of the refugees appear to be applying for political asylum, which requires a showing that the applicant has a specific reason to fear that he will be harmed upon returning home, for example because of membership in a particular political group. The immigration service has no reliable figures, but some estimates place the total number of applicants as low as 400.

Even though there may be more who could meet the criteria for asylum, the great majority of the refugees are probably not qualified under a strict interpretation of the rules requiring a threat of political persecution. "They say they left because they don't want to take sides," said John Weis, an El Centro lawyer who has many refugees among his clients. "but they're caught in the middle, and they feel that they're in real danger."

STATUS OF TEMPORARY REFUGEE

United States law also provides, however, for giving temporary refuge to aliens unable to return home because of "civil war or catastrophic circumstances." Such status has been conferred at different times on citizens of Vietnam, Laos, Uganda and, most recently, on Nicaraguans after the fall of the Government of President Anastasio Somoza Debayle. Last fall, President Carter ordered the admission of more than 150,000 Cubans and Haitians who had landed in Florida in boats.

A coalition of Congressmen, religious organizations and other groups, among them

the National Council of Churches, the United States Catholic Conference and the American Civil Liberties Union, has been urging the State Department to follow the same policy in admitting the Salvadoran refugees. In a letter to Secretary of State Edmund S. Muskie in January, the coalition quoted Phillip Sargisson, the Central American representative of the United Nations High Commission on Refugees, as having declared that "anyone who comes out of El Salvador today deserves refugee status."

When the Carter Administration left office, according to Millard Arnold, the former State Department official, it was "very, very, close to working out a compromise" that would have allowed the Salvadorans to remain here temporarily, not through any official action but simply by not sending them home.

The plan was endorsed, he said, by the department's human rights bureau, after reports that more than 10,000 people of El Salvador's 4.5 million people had been killed there last year, a figure Mr. Arnold termed "an enormous number of deaths in a country that size." But he said that it was rejected by other State Department officials concerned that it might suggest that the United States, which had been pushing for a political settlement of the Salvadoran conflict, "did not have faith in the ability of the Salvadorans to resolve their own problems."

There were also concerns, he said, that such a policy might lead to a still greater influx of refugees, and that the arrangement would be "difficult to police" since it might be impossible to distinguish Salvadoran citizens from other Central and South Americans.

Of the nearly 12,000 Salvadorans arrested last year, only 2,378 were formally deported, suggesting that a large number were returned through what the immigration service calls "voluntary departure," an agreement by an illegal alien to return home without demanding the deportation hearing, with its expensive and time-consuming appeals process, to which he is entitled. Without a large number of voluntary returns, immigration experts agree, the overloaded adjudication system would quickly collapse.

The immigration service is required to provide all those it arrests with a written notice of rights, including the right to free legal counsel. But lawyers working with the Salvadorans say they are convinced that the options are not being fully explained by immigration officials.

REASONS FOR RETURNING QUESTIONED

"I.N.S. would like people to return voluntarily without going through the system," said Mr. Weis, the El Centro lawyer. Another lawyer, William H. Steiner of Los Angeles, questioned why so many Salvadorans were agreeing to return home voluntarily "when they've risked their lives and spent their life savings to go 2,500 miles to get here."

"It's a safe assumption," he said, "that they were forced back."

Mr. Steiner said he had seen some voluntary departure agreements signed with an "X" by Salvadorans who could neither write nor read what they were signing. In "practically every case," Mr. Weis said, his clients withdrew their agreements to return home after being told of the available alternatives.

There are also accounts of instances in which the advice of rights has been followed

by what Mr. Steiner termed "mental coercion." "They're told if they want a hearing or asylum they'll have to stay in jail, or that their relatives will be arrested," he said.

"You'll get an overzealous border guard who says, 'You either go back or we'll lock you away for the rest of your life,'" Mr. Arnold said. "So the poor fellow elects to go back." ●

A LAMENT FOR VIETNAM

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, those who worked to see to it that the South Vietnamese Government was finally conquered by the tanks of the Communist North Vietnamese Army have much to answer for. Despite overwhelming evidence of the brutality of Communist dictatorship in Vietnam today, those who told us that such a dictatorship was what the Vietnamese people wanted are curiously silent about their terrible error.

I commend to their attention an article appearing in the New York Times Sunday Magazine, entitled "A Lament for Vietnam."

At this time I insert "A Lament for Vietnam" by Doan Van Toai, the Sunday New York Times Magazine, March 31, 1981.

A LAMENT FOR VIETNAM

(By Doan Van Toai)

When the Communists took over North Vietnam in 1954, a million refugees fled to the South. I personally heard stories of their incredible suffering. But, along with other South Vietnamese, I refused to believe them. A generation later, I could not believe Solzhenitsyn's book "The Gulag Archipelago," either. I dismissed it as anti-Communist propaganda. But by 1979, I had published my own book, "The Vietnamese Gulag." Can those who have suffered the horror of Communism ever convince those who have not experienced it?

From 1945, when I was born in the village of Caivon in Vinh Long province, 100 miles south of Saigon, until I left Vietnam in May 1978, I never enjoyed peace. My family's house was burned three times in the war against the French. To escape the fighting, my parents moved from one village to another throughout my youth. Like the majority of Vietnamese patriots, they joined the resistance forces fighting the French. As I grew up, I myself saw how the peasants were oppressed by the local officials of the successive Saigon regimes, how they were victimized by the French bombardments. I learned the history of my country's thousand-year struggle against Chinese occupation and its century-long effort against Western domination. With this background, my compatriots and I grew up with a hatred of foreign intervention.

When the students at Saigon University elected me vice president of the Saigon Student Union in 1969 and 1970, I participated in the different peace efforts, leading student demonstrations against the Thieu regime and against American involvement. I published a magazine called Self-Determina-

tion, and traveled in January 1971 to California to give antiwar lectures at Berkeley and Stanford. For my activities, I was arrested and jailed many times by the Thieu Government.

During that period, I believed that I was fulfilling my commitment to peace and the independence of my country. I had faith, too, in the program of the National Liberation Front (N.L.F.), which led the revolutionary resistance in South Vietnam. I hated Saigon's rulers, men like Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu, Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, Gen. Dang Van Quang—former soldiers of the French colonial army. These were the men whom the French had recruited in the 1940's to help destroy the Vietnamese resistance. They had risen over the years to become leaders themselves, but they commanded no respect from the people. Because of their lack of popular support, they were predisposed to rely on foreign forces.

As a student leader, I felt I had to pursue the aspiration of the Vietnamese people for democracy, freedom and peace. Naively, I believed that the Hanoi regime at least had the virtue of being Vietnamese, while the Americans were foreign invaders like the French before them. Like others in the South Vietnamese opposition movements, I believed that our Communist compatriots in the North would be more amenable to compromise and easier to work with than the Americans. Moreover, I was hypnotized by the personal sacrifices and devotion the Communist leaders had demonstrated. Ton Duc Thang, former President of North Vietnam, for example, had been imprisoned for 17 years in a French jail. I was hypnotized also by the political programs advocated by the N.L.F., which included a domestic policy of national reconciliation, without risk of reprisal, and a foreign policy of nonalignment. Finally, I was influenced by progressive movements throughout the world and by the most prestigious intellectuals in the West. My impression was that during the 1960's and early 70's the leaders of the American peace movement shared my convictions.

These convictions endured through the signing of the 1973 Paris peace accords and the subsequent collapse of the South Vietnamese Government two years later. When liberation was imminent, I was the one who told friends and relatives not to flee. "Why do you want to leave?" I asked. "Why are you afraid of the Communists?" I accepted the prospect of enduring hardships to rebuild my country and I decided to stay in Vietnam and continue working as a branch manager at a Saigon bank, where I had been for more than four years, writing secret reports about the economic situation in South Vietnam for the N.L.F. (After leaving the university, I had not been drafted by the South Vietnamese Government because I was the only son in my family. And I had not joined the Vietcong because the N.L.F. felt I could serve a more useful role providing financial reports from the bank.)

Several days after Saigon fell, the Provisional Revolutionary Government, formed by the N.L.F., asked me to join the finance committee, a group of intellectuals whose job it was to advise the Government on matters of economic policy. I complied willingly, taking a pay cut of 90 percent. My first assignment was to help draw up a plan for confiscating all the private property in South Vietnam. Shocked, I proposed that we should expropriate only the property of those who had cooperated with the former regime and those who had used the war to

become rich, and that we distribute it in some fashion to the poor and to the victims of the war, Communist and non-Communist alike. My proposals, of course, were rejected. I was naive enough to think that the local cadres were mistaken, that they misunderstood the good intentions of the Communist Party leaders. I had many fights with them, believing as I did Hanoi's previous statement that "the situation in the South is very special and different from that of North Vietnam." A few months before the liberation of Saigon, Le Duan, the First Secretary of the Communist Party, had said, "The South needs its own policy."

In the end, I could not obey the order to help arrange the confiscation of all private property, a plan that was subsequently carried out. Such a scheme had nothing to do with fulfilling the aspirations of the South Vietnamese, and it went against my conscience. I decided to resign. But no one resigns in a Communist regime. The implication of nonconformity is intolerable to Communists. When I submitted my resignation, the chief of the finance committee warned me that my action "would only serve as propaganda to excite the people; here we never do it that way." Several days later, while I was attending a concert at the great National Theater (formerly the National Assembly Hall, which my fellow students and I had occupied so many times under the Thieu regime), I was arrested. No charges were made, no reasons were given.

After the fall of Saigon, many progressive intellectuals and former antiwar-movement leaders believed that the new Vietnamese regime would bring internal democracy and freedom from foreign domination. They believed that the new regime would pursue the best interests of the people, honoring its promise to carry out a policy of national reconciliation without fear of reprisal. Far from adhering to their promises, the Vietnamese rulers have arrested hundreds of thousands of individuals—not only those who had cooperated with the Thieu regime but even those who had not, including religious leaders and former members of the N.L.F.

Vietnam today is a country without any law other than the arbitrary directives of those in power. There is no civil code. Individuals are imprisoned without charges and without trial. Once in jail, prisoners are taught that their behavior, attitude and "good will" are the key factors in determining when they may be released—whatever crimes they may have committed. As a consequence, prisoners often obey the guards blindly, hoping for an early release. In fact, they never know when they may be released—or when their sentences may be extended.

How many political prisoners are there in Vietnam today? And how many of them have died in prisons during the first six years of Communist rule? Nobody can know the exact numbers. The United States Department of State has said there are from 150,000 to 200,000 prisoners; Vietnamese refugees estimate about one million. Hoang Huu Quynh, an intellectual, a graduate of Moscow University, who served as a director of a technical school in Ho Chi Minh City (formerly Saigon), recently defected to France during his Government-sponsored tour of European countries. He told the French press: "There are at least 700,000 prisoners in Vietnam today." Another witness, Nguyen Cong Hoan, a former member of the reunified National Assembly, which

was elected in 1976, who escaped by boat in 1978, said that he himself knew "about 300 cases of executions" in his own province of Phu Yen. In 1977, officials in Hanoi insisted that only 50,000 people, who posed the greatest threat to national security, had been arrested. But Prime Minister Pham Van Dong said, in the French magazine *Paris Match*, on Sept. 22, 1978, "In over three years, I released more than one million prisoners from the camps." One wonders how it is possible to release more than a million after having arrested only 50,000.

When I was arrested, I was thrown into a three-foot-by-six-foot cell with my left hand chained to my right foot and my right hand chained to my left foot. My food was rice mixed with sand. When I complained about the sand, the guards explained that sand is added to the rice to remind prisoners of their crimes. I discovered that pouring water in the rice bowl would make the sand separate from the rice and sink to the bottom. But the water ration was only one liter a day for drinking and bathing, and I had to husband it carefully.

After two months in solitary confinement, I was transferred to a collective cell, a room 15 feet wide and 25 feet long, where at different times anywhere from 40 to 100 prisoners were crushed together. Here we had to take turns lying down to sleep, and most of the younger, stronger prisoners slept sitting up. In the sweltering heat, we also took turns snatching a few breaths of fresh air in front of the narrow opening that was the cell's only window. Every day I watched my friends die at my feet.

In March 1976, when a group of Western reporters visited my prison, the Communist officials moved out all the prisoners and substituted North Vietnamese soldiers. In front of the prisons, one sees no barbed wire, no watchtowers, only a few policemen and a large sign above the entrance that proclaims Ho Chi Minh's best-known slogan: "Nothing Is More Precious Than Liberty and Independence." Only those detained inside and those who guard them know what kind of place is hidden behind that sign. And every prisoner knows that if he is suspected of planning to escape, his fellow inmates and relatives at home will be punished rather than he himself.

We will never know precisely the number of dead prisoners, but we do know about the deaths of many well-known prisoners who, in the past, never cooperated with President Thieu or the Americans: for example, Thich Thien Minh, the strategist of all the Buddhist peace movements in Saigon, an antiwar activist who was sentenced to 10 years in jail by the Thieu regime, then released after an outpouring of protest from Vietnamese and antiwar protesters around the world. Thien Minh died in Ham Tan prison after six months of detention in 1979. Another silent death was that of the lawyer Tran Van Tuyen, a leader of the opposition bloc in the Saigon Assembly under President Thieu. This well-known activist died in Communist hands in 1976, although as late as April 1977, Prime Minister Pham Van Dong was telling French reporters that Tuyen was alive and well in a re-education camp. One of the greatest losses has been that of the famous Vietnamese philosopher Ho Huu Tuong, Tuong, a classmate of Jean-Paul Sartre's in Paris in the 1930's was perhaps the leading intellectual in South Vietnam. He died in Ham Tan prison on June 26, 1980. These men were arrested, along with many others among the most prominent and respected South Vietnamese, in

order to pre-empt any possible opposition to the Communists.

Some American supporters of Hanoi have ignored or rationalized these deaths, as they have the countless other tragedies that have befallen Vietnam since 1975. It is more than likely that they will continue to maintain their silence in order to avoid the profound disillusionment that accepting the truth about Vietnam means for them. Yet if liberty and democracy are worth struggling for in the Philippines, in Chile, in South Korea or in South Africa, they are no less worth defending in Communist countries like Vietnam. Everyone remembers the numerous demonstrations protesting United States involvement in Vietnam and the war crimes of the Thieu regime. But some of those people who were then so passionately committed to democratic principles and human rights have developed a strange indifference now that these same principles are under assault in Communist Vietnam. For example, one antiwar activist, William Kunstler, refused to sign a May 1979 open letter to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in which many former antiwar activists, including Joan Baez, protested Hanoi's violations of human rights. Kunstler said, "I don't believe in criticizing socialist governments publicly, even if there are human-rights violations," and, "The entire Baez campaign may be a C.I.A. plot." This statement reminds me of the argument used by the Thieu regime to suppress opposition: "The peace movements and the opposition activists are all the Communists' lackeys."

There are other illusions about the current regime in Vietnam about which people should be disabused. Many people believed that Ho Chi Minh was primarily a nationalist and that the Vietnamese Communists were and are independent of the Soviet Union. I believed the same before they took over South Vietnam. But portraits of Soviet leaders now adorn public buildings, schools and administrative offices throughout "independent Vietnam." In contrast, one never saw pictures of American leaders even during the so-called puppet regime of President Thieu. The degree of subordination the present Government feels toward its Soviet patron is suggested by a famous poem by the well-known Vietnamese poet To Huu, a member of the Politburo and president of the Communist Party Committee of Culture. Here we have an opportunity to listen to a high ranking Vietnamese weep on the occasion of Stalin's death:

Oh, Stalin! Oh, Stalin!
The love I bear my father, my mother, my wife, myself
It's nothing beside the love I bear you,
Oh, Stalin! Oh, Stalin!
What remains of the earth and of the sky!
Now that you are dead.

It may seem incredible that such a poem could have been written in Vietnam, which is known for the strength of its family traditions and its feeling for filial piety. Yet this poem occupied a prominent place in a major anthology of contemporary Vietnamese poetry recently published in Hanoi.

Moreover, Le Duan, First Secretary of the Communist Party, said in his political report to the reunified National Assembly in 1976: "The Vietnamese revolution is to fulfill the internationalist duty and the international obligation," and to do so, in the words of the 1971 party platform, "under the leadership of the Soviet Union." The glorification of Soviet life is, in fact, a major goal of Communist Vietnam's censorship policy.

Immediately after the fall of Saigon, the Government closed all bookshops and theaters. All books published under the former regimes were confiscated or burned. Cultural literature was not exempt, including translations of Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus and Dale Carnegie. Margaret Mitchell's "Gone With the Wind" was on the list of decadent literature as well. The new regime replaced such books with literature designed to indoctrinate children and adults with the idea that the "Soviet Union is a paradise of the socialist world."

Another argument made at times by Western apologists has to do with freedom of religion in Vietnam. One article in the new Constitution of Vietnam, adopted this year, declares that "the regime respects the liberty of the believers and also the liberty of the nonbelievers." In regard to this article, Le Duan has repeatedly proclaimed: "Our present regime is a million times more democratic than any other in the world." The reality, though, is suggested by an incident involving the desecration of a Buddhist pagoda, in which a nude woman, on orders from the Government, entered the pagoda during a worship service. When Thich Man Giac, a prominent Buddhist leader, protested, the Government used the opportunity to try to discredit the Buddhists as enemies of democracy—specifically, of the freedom to disbelieve. Thich Man Giac, who had served as liaison between the Buddhists and the Communist Government, escaped Vietnam by boat in 1977 and is now living in Los Angeles.

All of those who supported the N.L.F. in its struggle should be aware of how they were betrayed and deceived. When Harrison Salisbury of The New York Times visited Hanoi in December 1966, the leaders in Hanoi told him: "The direction of the struggle in the South is by the South and not by the North." Pham Van Dong, Prime Minister, said to Salisbury: "No one in the North had this stupid, criminal idea in mind" that the North wanted to annex the South.

Yet in a victory-day celebration speech made on May 19, 1975, Le Duan said, "Our party is the unique and single leader that organized, controlled and governed the entire struggle of the Vietnamese people from the first day of the revolution." In his political report to the reunified National Assembly in Hanoi in June 26, 1976, Le Duan said: "The strategic task of the revolution in our country in the new stage is to achieve the reunification of our homeland and to take the whole country rapidly, vigorously and steadily to socialism, and Communism."

In 1976, the Provisional Revolutionary Government formed by the N.L.F. was abolished, and South and North Vietnam were reunified under Communist rule. Today, among 17 members of the Politburo and 134 members of the Central Committee of the Vietnamese Communist Party, not a single one is from the N.L.F. (there are several members who had been North Vietnam Communist Party representatives with the N.L.F.). Even Nguyen Huu Tho, former chairman of the N.L.F., holds only the post of acting President of State, a ceremonial position that involves greeting visitors and participating in festivals. But his position will be abolished under the new Constitution.

Listen to Truong Nhu Tang, 57 years old, a founder of the N.L.F., former Justice Minister of the Provisional Revolutionary Government, more recently one of the boat people. Tang escaped in November 1979 and is now living in Paris. He told reporters of

his experience in a news conference in Paris in June 1980. Twelve years earlier, he said, when he had been jailed by the Thieu regime for his Communist activities, his father came to visit. "Why," he asked Tang, "have you abandoned everything—a good job, a rich family—to join the Communists? Don't you know that the Communists will betray you and persecute you, and when you finally understand, it will be too late to wake up?" Tang, an intellectual, answered his father: "You would do better to keep quiet and accept the sacrifice of one of your sons for democracy and our country's independence. . . ."

After the Tet offensive in 1968, Tang was exchanged for three American colonels who had been prisoners of war held by the Vietcong; then he vanished into the jungle with the N.L.F. He has visited many Communist and third-world countries on behalf of the N.L.F. during the war. Tang said in his news conference: "I was well aware that the N.L.F. was a Communist-dominated national united front and I was naive enough to believe that Ho Chi Minh and his party would place national interests above ideology and would place the interest of the Vietnamese people above the party's. But the people and I were wrong."

Truong Nhu Tang told of his own knowledge of the way Communist ruling circles operate: "The Communists are expert in the arts of seduction and will go to any length to woo you over to their side, as long as they don't control the Government. But once they are in power they suddenly become harsh, ungrateful, cynical and brutal." Tang summarized current conditions in Vietnam: "The family is divided, society is divided, even the party is divided."

Looking back now on the Vietnam war, I feel nothing but sorrow for my own naiveté in believing that the Communists were revolutionaries worthy of support. In fact, they betrayed the Vietnamese people and deceived progressives throughout the world. The responsibility for the tragedies that have engulfed my compatriots is mine. And now I can only bear witness to this truth so that all former supporters of the Vietcong may share their responsibility with me.

While I was in jail, Mai Chi Tho, a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, addressed a selected group of political prisoners. He told us: "Ho Chi Minh may have been an evil man; Nixon may have been a great man. The Americans may have had the just cause; we may not have had the just cause. But we won and the Americans were defeated because we convinced the people that Ho Chi Minh is the great man, that Nixon is a murderer and the Americans are the invaders." He concluded that "the key factor is how to control people and their opinions. Only Marxism-Leninism can do that. None of you ever see resistance to the Communist regime, so don't think about it. Forget it. Between you—the bright intellectuals—and me, I tell you the truth."

And he did tell us the truth. Since 1978, the Vietnamese Communists have occupied Laos, invaded Cambodia and attacked Thailand, while the Soviet Union has invaded Afghanistan. In each of these deprecations, the Communists have portrayed themselves, incredibly, as liberators, saviors and bulwarks against foreign aggression. And each time, world opinion has remained relatively quiescent.

But in Vietnam, people often remark: "Don't believe what the Communists say, look instead at what they have done." One

South Vietnamese Communist, Nguyen Van Tang, who was detained 15 years by the French, eight years by Diem, six years by Thieu, and who is still in jail today, this time in a Communist prison, told me: "In order to understand the Communists, one must first live under a Communists regime." One rainy evening in Saigon's Le Van Duyet prison, he told me: "My dream now is not to be released; it is not to see my family. My dream is that I could be back in a French prison 30 years ago." This is the one wish of a 60-year-old man who has spent his entire adult life in and out of prison fighting for the freedom and the independence of his country. At this moment, he may already have died in his cell or have been executed by the new rulers.

The Vietnamese people wish to achieve the real revolution; they do not want Communism. The measure of popular hatred for the Communists is that thousands of Vietnamese have abandoned their historical attachment to the land. Under French colonial domination, throughout the long war years, even during the catastrophic famine of 1945 when two million starved to death, Vietnamese simply did not willingly leave their homeland—the land of their ancestors' graves. The recent outpouring of refugees is a direct result of the terror of the present regime. Listen to another refugee, Nguyen Cong Hoan, former N.L.F. agent and member of the new unified Assembly elected in 1976: "This current regime is the most inhuman and oppressive [Vietnam] has ever known." Hoan escaped by boat in 1977, after abandoning his position in the Communist Assembly. "The Assembly," he declared, "is a puppet, the members know only how to say yes, never how to say no."

Among the boat people who survived, including those who were raped by pirates and those who suffered in the refugee camps, nobody regrets his escape from the present regime. I am confident that the truth about Vietnam will eventually emerge. It is already available to those who wish to know it. As Solzhenitsyn has said, "Truth weighs as heavy as the world." And Vietnam is a lesson in truth. ●

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID
TRANSIT DISTRICT HONORS
JACK GREASBY WITH RETIRE-
MENT DINNER**

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 2, 1981

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, 1981, at the Chalon Mart Restaurant in Los Angeles, the Southern California Rapid Transit District will be honoring the retirement of one of its most distinguished employees, Jack Greasby.

Jack was born on January 9, 1922, in Mangum, Okla. After his 1940 graduation from Mangum High School, he entered the National Guard and was mobilized into service for World War II. He was assigned to the 179th Infantry of the 45th Division, U.S. Army. While in the service, he married the former Frances Fuqua. He rose to the rank of sergeant, and while operating

an Army motor pool developed the expertise that would lead to a career in public transportation.

Jack and his wife moved to California in 1947, where his first job was as a trolley driver with Los Angeles Transit Lines, the company that was later to become the Southern California Rapid Transit District. He was promoted to clerk, then cashier, and then assistant manager. He next assumed the responsibilities of the El Monte Division manager, and in 1978 became transportation superintendent in downtown Los Angeles.

Upon retirement from the Southern California Rapid Transit District, Jack and his wife will be moving to Houston, Tex., where he will be lending his expertise to the Houston Metropolitan Transit Authority as assistant director of transportation. Before that assignment starts, however, Jack and Frances will leave on May 10 for a vacation that will celebrate their 40th wedding anniversary. They will also celebrate their first honeymoon, which was delayed by military, family rearing, and employment obligations. They are indeed a fortunate pair to be on a honeymoon after 40 years of marriage.

My wife, Lee, joins me in wishing the best of success in the years ahead to Jack, Frances, and their children John, Jr., Charles, and their youngest son Glenn, whom I am privileged to have as my namesake. ●