EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEW PRESIDENT OF MOUNT SINAI MEDICAL CENTER SPEAKS ON HEALTH MANPOWER

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on December 8, 1983, Dr. James F. Glenn was inaugurated as the fourth president of the Mount Sinai Medical Center, which is in my congressional district.

He served most recently as dean of the medical school at Emory University in Atlanta. Prior to his deanship, Mr. Glenn was chief of the division of urologic surgery at Duke University Medical Center, one of the largest and most prestigious urological residency programs in the country. His book, "Urologic Surgery," is considered the standard reference text in the field, and he is the author of more than 200 scientific papers.

Dr. Glenn spoke considerably, in his speech, about the problems facing us with regard to medical manpower. He included his concerns about Federal policy in this area.

As you know, health manpower legislation comes up for reauthorization in 1984. I am sure Dr. Glenn's remarks will be very useful to the members and staff of those committees dealing with the matter. I have excerpted from the speech portions dealing with medical manpower. I urge my colleagues to read and carefully consider his remarks.

PRESIDENT OF MOUNT SINAI MEDICAL CENTER DISCUSSES HEALTH MANPOWER

I would like to address the medical manpower issue as the principal theme of my discussion with you today. I am not alone in my concern with regard to this thorny issue. Good and thoughtful men, dedicated public servants, representatives of many aspects of public and private life have given serious consideration to the medical manpower problem. It is a problem which centers in medicine and involves all of society. The deans of our medical schools, the accreditation authorities for medical education at the various levels, the federally and locally sponsored agencies which regulate medical care, the licensing organizations, the health agencies, private foundations, economists and concerned individuals in many other areas have given thoughtful consideration to the medical manpower problem, each perhaps with a different perspective and a different agenda. I can tell you that I have shared my own views with the deans of the twelve medical schools in the State of New York who represent 10 percent of the nation's medical educational capability. I have discovered that there is at least unanimity in the opinion that a plan of approach to the manpower problem must now be enunciated by the concerned parties. I have also spoken with the Commissioner of Health, Dr. Axelrod, who agreed that the issue is of paramount importance because it bears upon the publicly sustained cost of medical care. I have had a frank and amicable discussion of points of agreement and disagreement with the Chancellor of the Board of Regents of New York State, Mr. Genrich, a fine and dedicated gentleman who is genuinely devoted to the public interest. It is my sincere hope that what I say here this afternoon will provoke a tripartite discussion of the medical manpower problem between the three elements most concerned: our medical schools (the educators), the responsible public authority (the Commissioner of Health and his colleagues), and the licensing and credentials authority for physicians (our Board of Regents).

First, to summarize, let us acknowledge certain facts relative to medical manpower in the 30 years from 1950 to 1980. Our capacity to educate physicians has almost tripled, from approximately 5,500 graduates 30 years ago to some 16,000 graduates this past spring. Medical schools have increased from about 80 in number to 127 accredited schools at this time. In 1982, there were nearly 483,000 licensed physicians in the United States, an increase of 3 percent over 1981. If we continue at this pace, we will see a doubling of the number of physicians in the nation over the next two decades.

In 1970, there were 168 physicians for every 100,000 people in the United States; today, there are nearly 200 physicians per 100,000 population, and by 1990, the ratio will be 250 doctors for every 100,000, considering the trainees who are now in the educational pipeline.

This past year, there was a small decrease in the number of students entering medical schools, triggered by budget cuts, spiraling tuition costs, and cuts in federal aid. This reduction reflects the current state of the economy, as opposed to policy planning. It therefore may not prove to be a long-term trend and it should not be relied upon to solve the medical manpower problem.

At the highwater mark in 1974, over 42,000 people applied to medical schools in this country, but in 1983 there were under 36,000. Just over 30,000 of last year's 36,000 were first time applicants. The remainder were repeat applicants who had been rejected on prior occasions. Since there were over 17,000 students admitted to accredited medical schools in the United States, the chances of admission for a first time applicant were better than 50 percent—one student admitted to medical school for every two who applied.

What happens to the remaining applicants? Well, some are carried over to subsequent years when they reapply. Still, others abandon the thought of a medical career and enter other fields. A gratifying number select paramedical careers, where we generally have a shortage of personnel.

Unfortunately, however, a large number of rejected medical school applicants seek refuge in non-accredited medical schools of questionable credibility and capability. It is estimated that there may be approximately 12,000 to 18,000 United States citizens enrolled in 56 foreign medical schools. Ten of these schools are in the Caribbean Islands and 16 in Mexico. United States authorities have not seen fit to accredit any of these institutions. Nonetheless, a significant number of these students—certainly as many as several thousand United States citizens each year—will find their way back into the licensed practice of medicine in the United States by one mechanism or another. Whether they are capable or competent is not in the central issue. The issue is that they add to an already inflated pool of physicians who bear the ultimate responsibility for expenditure of the health-care dollars in this nation.

The high cost of medical education in the United States reflects the problem of providing adequate laboratory and bench space, lecture hall accommodations, and faculty resources for students. Here at Mount Sinai, a facility of over 1,200 beds with more than 100 basic science full-time faculty, more than 200 full-time clinical faculty and a host of outstanding voluntary physicians, we still strain our resources to provide an appropriate educational experience each year for 100 students who are in the first two years of school, 130 students per year who are in the last two years of medical education. In contrast, the offshore schools accept vast numbers of students. At last report, there were 9,000 students in Monterrey. Recent press reports say that St. George's Medical School in Grenada admits 384 students annually, compared to our own class of 100. Virtually every study of medical manpower has indicated that we are in a posture which will produce an overabundance or glut of physicians.

In 1980, the Graduate Medical Education National Advisory Committee (GMENAC), sponsored by the Department of Health and Human Services, projected a rather massive surplus of physicians by 1990. This oversupply primarily involves the medical specialties, the surgical specialties, radiology, and even some of the primary care specialties. The only projected potential shortages were in the fields of adult and child psychiatry, rehabilitation medicine, and emergency medicine.

Without quibbling, it can be stated that there will be an excess number of physicians available in this country very soon. The Department of Health and Human Services has even recommended that the entering class size in U.S. medical schools be reduced by 17 percent and that the inflow of foreign trained physicians be severely restricted.

Why is this so important? What difference does it make if we have too many physicians? Will not the laws of supply and demand work to lower the cost of medical care if we have more physicians than we need? Unfortunately, the answers are not simple. The societal costs of training a physician are almost incalculable. It begins with preparatory schooling, it continues through four expensive years of college education, it is maintained through four years of medical education (now at a level of over $43,000 per student per year here at Mt. Sinai) and it extends into a period of post-graduate training that ranges from 3 to 8 years depending on the specialty. Society bears the cost of this long and expensive educational process. Indeed, the student may pay tuition—which is in many instances extremely high—but

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

society incurs a debt as well, because public agencies and public dollars underwrite the educational process in many ways.

But even the costs borne by the individual medical student are staggering. Virtually every one of them has some type of debt by the time he or she completes the four years of medical education. The debt can be as much as $100,000. This financial burden discourages some talented students from applying to medical school in the first place. The cost makes a career in research and academic medicine undesirable since the rewards will not be as great. It causes many physicians to seek specialties with the highest possible fee structure in order to pay their debts. In the long run the price of education results in greater costs of medical care to the public in general. We must modulate the number of physicians we train—but would it not also be intelligent to subsidize medical education here within the State of New York, in order to prevent the unfortunate consequences of these terrible debts?

Upon completion of training, the physician enters the pool where he or she controls the expenditure of health care dollars for modern technology and treatment. It has been estimated that every physician accounts for the expenditure of over $300,000 per year in public funds. Our patients do not know and cannot be expected to know what technologies should be employed, what studies should be ordered, what tests should be done, or when hospitalization is required. The physician must make the judgments and decisions which are the basis for the financial impact of any illness or disability. Indeed, the three parameters of medical costs seem to be available technology, public utilization, and physician availability. The laws of supply and demand work in reverse.

The medical schools of the State of New York, operating in a high-cost environment, meet the expenses of educating their students largely through their own abilities to generate practice income and to attract grants and contracts. Nonetheless, most schools operate on the razor's edge of financial survival. At the same time, nearly $1.7 million a year of New York State public funds are paid in subsidies to out-of-state medical schools. There are now 228 residents of New York State studying in institutions outside of the State. Many of these students are minorities whom we would desperately like to keep here in New York for the educational process, because the educational locus of the student is the most certain determinant of his or her future selection of practice site. Clearly, we must address this issue of New York State funding of out-of-state medical education for it is intimately connected with the overall manpower question.

We are in trouble. We cannot afford the luxury of ignoring the medical manpower problem any longer. We have reached this point—despite the studies I have cited which have warned us of the problem—because of our individual dedication to our own points of view. Physicians have long maintained that the practice of medicine is none of the government's business, but, indeed, it is government's largest business with the exception of national defense. The scientific community has been bent upon ever-increasing expenditure for costly and, fortunately, productive research. Economists have warned that medical care consumes too much of our gross national product, but have not offered viable alternatives. Students of the social scene argue that medicine must be organized and regulated, but at the same time they deplore the fact that medical teaching may not be sufficiently innovative. Our patients want more "old-fashioned doctors" but they simultaneously demand the ultimate technology and expect the universally perfect result. Our political leadership takes the position that more doctors will mean better distribution and happier voters, but we also know that 80 percent of our citizens live within ten miles driving distance of a physician, 98 percent within 25 miles, and the remaining 2 percent of our population lives in areas which are so sparsely populated that they could not possibly attract or sustain a physician. In short, our legitimate concerns and special interests have led to confusion and misconception.

I take a positive view. I believe that there are both challenges and opportunities in the current situation. I believe that a tripartite dialog in New York State involving our medical schools, the Department of Health and the Department of Education can result in solutions to our problems. I believe that we can plan for quality medical care at reasonable cost through rational decision-making about medical education, controlling numbers of students, numbers of schools, and numbers of specialists. I believe that we can develop a coordinated and cooperative system of primary, secondary, and tertiary care which will be based upon accurately perceived medical manpower needs. I believe that we can involve the public by making everyone aware of medical costs and by providing incentives through participation in the decision process by our patients. I believe that we can modulate medical manpower in a positive and effective fashion, insuring the highest quality of medical care through providing the best trained physicians to the public. I believe that men of goodwill in the public and private sectors, in medical education and medical care delivery, in government and in industry, can join together in a comprehensive and constructive planning effort. I pledge that my tenure at The Mount Sinai Medical Center will be dedicated to that effort.●

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY RETALIATION

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, today the European Community will increase tariffs on methanol, vinyl acetate, and burglar and fire alarms imported from the United States at an average increase of 6.5 percent, a revenue increase of about $3.7 million. Further, it will establish quotas on styrene, polyethylene, sporting guns and rifles, gymnastic and athletic equipment, and snow skis from the United States, at an estimated $30 million loss to U.S. exporters.

Those actions were taken, under GATT, to retaliate against U.S. quotas on specialty steel products imposed last July.

There seems to be an attitude by many in this House that we can pass trade restrictions, or by the administration that we can bargain for trade restrictions in lieu of remedy under our usual trade laws, without fear of foreign retaliation. The industries pursuing the trade curbs have little concern regarding retaliation either. If there is retaliation, chances are it will occur in another sector. As the House passed its domestic content bill last year, its sponsors promised, there will be no retaliation.

Thats what was said when we restricted steel, too. The trouble is we got retaliation and we may get more. In the specialty steel case, the Europeans were entitled to compensation under the GATT for that import relief action taken by the United States. It is true that countries do not always request compensation or retaliate against such actions, but the Europeans did, mostly due to what they see as an increasing number of import restrictions by the United States, with the likelihood that they will increase in an election year.

The specialty steel people got what they wanted. But those in many other industries will be losers.

I hope this example of retaliation will remind my colleagues that we should look at the possible consequences before we take trade-restrictive measures of our own. And how can we eliminate trade barriers in other nations when we have so many existing and pending barriers of our own?●

A PROGRESS REPORT ON THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SCIENCE PARK

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the University of Texas Science Park, located in the 10th Congressional District of central Texas, was authorized by the 62d Texas Legislature in 1971. The science park is a component of the University Texas System Cancer Center, headquartered in Houston, which also includes the U.T. M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute.

The Research Division of the U.T. Science Park, located on 717 acres of land near Smithville, is a major center for the study of environmental causes of cancer.

The Veterinary Resources Division of the U.T. Science Park, which sits on 430 acres about 20 miles away near the town of Bastrop, produces a wide variety of animals for research at educational and scientific institutions throughout Texas.

U.T. SCIENCE PARK—RESEARCH DIVISION

If one event was the turning point in the development of the research division, it was receipt of a $1.25 million construction grant from the U.S. Economic Development Adminstration. Until that grant was awarded in 1974, little progress had been made toward building the scientific laboratories needed for the sophisticated basic science research that goes on today.

Funds from the EDA grant were matched by funds from the University of Texas System. With philanthropic support from Houston Endowment, Inc., and other foundations and individuals, construction of a state-of-the-art scientific center was assured. Research division facilities now total 55,000 square feet.

Scientific investigation began at the research division in September 1977, with a staff of 3 scientists and 22 employees. Today, the division includes a staff of 29 scientists and 76 employees, all focusing their energies on unraveling the mysteries surrounding how environmental influences may contribute to the development of cancer.

The research effort is led by Dr. Thomas J. Slaga, who became director of the division in January 1983. Dr. Slaga was recruited by the U.T. Cancer Center from his former post as head of the carcinogenesis research program at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee.

Under Dr. Slaga's leadership, groups of scientists are addressing the problem of carcinogenesis from three directions. One group is examining the ways in which cells repair or reverse the damage that may be done by external influences, such as chemicals, X-rays or ultraviolet light. A second group focuses its research on how cells are changed or modified in response to damage. The third group is concerned with how these altered cells may spread or proliferate. These processes—cell damage, modification, and proliferation—are all part of the disease process of cancer.

Research conducted at the division has produced new scientific information in the form of 113 articles published in professional journals since 1977—67 of these articles in the last 2 years alone. Currently, research is supported by more than $2,100,000 in grants, and the staff has prepared and submitted proposals for an additional $1,680,000 in support.

Future plans at the research division call for expansion of the research effort into chemical modification of the steps of carcinogenesis and identification of the genetic information responsible for the malignant state. The division also plans to increase training opportunities for graduate students and begin a series of conferences on cellular, molecular, and tumor biology, as well as on other pertinent topics.

U.T. SCIENCE PARK—VETERINARY RESOURCES DIVISION

Throughout the history of science, laboratory animals have played a crucial part in advancing medicine through research. Knowledge gained in research is ultimately applied to improving human health and welfare. The veterinary resources division was established in 1976 to provide specialized animals for research at both the U.T. Cancer Center and other institutions in Texas and the Southwest.

Today, the veterinary division includes a staff of five veterinarian-scientists and 59 other employees involved in the supply and production of animals, research in animal disease and ecology, and the training of veterinary medical students. The division is directed by Dr. Michale E. Keeling and is an integral part of the U.T. Cancer Center's Houston-based Department of Veterinary Medicine and Surgery, which is headed by Dr. John H. Jardine.

The division's rural location allows the production of a wide range of animal populations on a large scale under controlled conditions, a task that would be impossible in the environment of urban research centers. Veterinary division facilities now total more than 104,000 square feet.

The current population exceeds 6,900 animals—ranging from specialized strains of rodents to cattle and swine—that are sold to investigators on a cost-recovery basis. During the last fiscal year, high-quality animal models for comparative research were sold to 34 institutions. In addition, the division markets 20 varieties of quality-controlled biologics. Biologics are blood, blood components and other animal products required for laboratory tests and procedures.

The veterinary resources division also includes one of the Nation's largest centers for chimpanzee breeding, maintenance, and rehabilitation. The program is designed to help sustain the existence of this endangered species and provide the animals for use in nonsacrificing medical research. Because the chimpanzee's immune system most closely resembles that of humans, it is critically important for research in human diseases such as hepatitis. Since the program began in 1977 under a contract from the National Institutes of Health Division of Research Services, a total of 95 chimpanzees have been secured and 26 have been born at the center.

Veterinary scientists here also conduct a number of research endeavors in laboratory animal medicine, cancers in animals, and animal ecology. Research is supported by more than $2,340,000 in grants and contracts, with proposals for an additional $2,900,000 in awards submitted to funding agencies.

The division also provides training opportunities for undergraduate, graduate, and veterinary medical students from several universities, and maintains a close working relationship with the College of Veterinary Medicine at Texas A&M University.●

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF IRA DRAYTON PRUITT, SR.

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, Sumter County, in Alabama's Seventh Congressional District, suffered a great loss recently with the death of Ira Drayton Pruitt, Sr., 79, of Livingston, Ala. It is my privilege today to offer a tribute to the memory of this wonderful man.

Not many people achieve the measure of admiration and respect that Ira Drayton Pruitt, Sr., enjoyed. He earned that admiration and respect because he genuinely cared about the people and about the welfare of his community.

He was a rarity—a man who had the vitality and know-how to be extremely effective in getting things done, yet warmth and sensitivity that made him a beloved leader.

Following is an article about this great man that appeared in the Home Record, written by Howard Turner, Jr., that I would like to share with my colleagues in the House:

It is unfortunately the general rule that you can live your entire life in a small community and know someone all of that time, yet, not realize the true magnitude of their good works and the fruit of their total dedication to a better life and world.

Such a man has lived in my lifetime, Mr. Ira Drayton Pruitt, Sr. He was just this type of person.

Plain spoken and unpretentious, he had the air of being straight forward and the look of dignity and dedication to his goals in life.

Mr. Ira, a long time resident of Livington, was a native of Pine Hill in Wilcox County. He was born there on March 4, 1904.

The reason for Mr. Ira's zeal for education was that his father died when he was fifteen years old, leaving him with four sisters to help raise and educate. He was determined to see that they received their formal education, while postponing his own.

This indelibly imprinted upon his mind that everyone's educational needs should be met.

He was graduated from Marion Institute and then went on to the University of Alabama.

In 1934, Mr. Ira was graduated from the University of Alabama Law School and became a member of the Alabama Bar Association.

That same year he moved to Livington and started his law practice, which he continued until his retirement in 1979.

This original practice has now culminated into the law firm of Pruitt, Pruitt, Watkins and Robinson. His son, Ira Drayton Pruitt, Jr., now carries on the family tradition of the law practice.

In 1944, Mr. Ira threw his hat into the local political arena and served as our state representative until 1974.

This thirty year tenure in office could in itself serve as a tribute to his memory as a political feat in itself.

Not only was Mr. Ira's stay in office lengthy, it was very active and productive for the area in which we live and the state itself.

During the turmoil of the sixties, he single handedly prevented the legislature from cutting off funding to Tuskegee Institute.

On another occasion, President Frank Rose of the University of Alabama while speaking at Livingston University, stated that "when Ira Pruitt digs a trench you can stand up in it."

While in the Legislature, Mr. Ira played the major role in not only saving Livingston University from being closed or forgotten, but he transformed Livingston State Teachers College into a full fledged University.

Legislature sponsored by Mr. Ira established Livingston University as a free standing University with its own Board of Trustees, thus ending the operation of the school under the State Board of Education.

Mr. Ira's unselfish work through the Legislature for Livingston University and its betterment is almost too numerous to mention, but we will do our best not to leave out too much.

The University as it stands today is a testament in itself to one man's determination and well set goals.

Mr. Ira was a Charter Member of the Livingston University Board of Trustees from 1967 to 1980. He was also the Chairman of the Board of Trustees from 1972 to 1980.

He also led the movement to establish the Ira D. Pruitt School of Nursing at Livingston University. It became a reality and was named for him on June 3, 1974, perhaps this was his proudest moment.

It was a much needed and most beneficial addition to the University and the area in which we live.

On May 29, 1982, Livingston University chose to pay tribute to him with an honorary doctorate degree. A befitting gift in return for all that he'd done for the University.

Mr. Ira also had a personal side that was as kind and as generous as his public one. There are many stories of his helping college students at LU and students at Sumter Academy who were in need.

Mysteriously, tuition payments were met and power bills simply vanished.

As one of his grand children stated "He would give them help when they needed it."

The true mark of those noble deeds were that the beneficiaries never really knew who it was that was helping them.

This thought was still fresh in my mind while attending Mr. Ira's funeral at Roy Chapel.

While standing there I met two distinguished gentlemen who were there not only as friends of the man, but as representatives of the University of Alabama's School of Law.

In our small crowd standing outside the door of the Chapel, due to the fact that standing room only had turned to no more room at all for late comers, these two gentlemen spoke of Mr. Ira in kind admiring terms.

They told us of his many contributions and hard work that he had done for the Law School while serving in the State Legislature.

They spoke of Mr. Ira's sponsorship of Legislature for the Law School that not only helped to build the new facility at Tuscaloosa, but his assistance in acquiring additional permanent funded that aided the Law School immeasurably.

Mr. Ira's concern for better education and the availability of it to young people went far beyond the boundaries of Sumter County.

Livingston University now plays a vital role in our community and offers a better future to many young people as it follows in his well laid foot steps.

Locally, Mr. Ira served as a member of the Livingston City Council for many years and as a member and as Chairman of the Sumter County Board of Education.

He also served as County Solicitor (District Attorney) for a lengthy tenure.

While in the Legislature he served on the Rules, Ways and Means Committee and the Banking Committee among others. He was also Speaker Pro-tem of the House for four years.

Livingston University President, Asa N. Green stated that " his (Mr. Ira's) support through the years has encouraged all of us and his pride in this University challenges all of us to give it our best efforts."

President Green further stated, "Livingston University and its students will benefit from his efforts for all the years to come and from Mr. Ira's great service. For all of these reasons, but most of all because we have lost a friend. I know that I speak for all of us here—students, trustees, faculty and staff—in conveying our sympathy to Mrs. Pruitt and other members of the family."

Even with such an active law practice and political career he found time to rear a fine family and to be renowned as a doting grandfather.

Mr. Ira's hobbies included deep sea fishing, reading and flowers. He was especially known for his love of orchids.

Most people would call him a true Renaissance Man, an old dear friend of his simply stated that

Mr. Ira was a true Southern Gentleman. That is about the highest compliment I know of around here.

At the age of seventy nine, after a full and long life, Mr. Ira died on February 6th at Rush Memorial Hospital in Meridian, Mississippi.

This past Thursday of the same week, the complete Alabama House of Representatives co-sponsored a resolution mourning the death of former Rep. Ira Drayton Pruitt, Sr. and recognizing the invaluable service he had provided his state in several different areas

In particular of these areas were the judiciary aspect and the field of education.

Mr. Ira, himself, has gone on to better things, leaving all of us with the job of seeing that his good works are continued, to better not only our own lives, but those of everyone else.

Dr. Ira Drayton Pruitt, Sr. indeed left an excellent role model for the young to aspire to.

Surviving are his wife, Elise C. Pruitt of Livingston; a son, Ira Drayton Pruitt, Jr., of Livingston; three sisters, Bernice P. Banks and Jewel Pruitt, both of Pensacola, Fla.; and Mary P. McGraw of Andalusia.

Ira Drayton Pruitt, Sr.'s life should serve as a memorial to him for all time in Livingston, Sumter County, and the State of Alabama, for he truly devoted it to serving the people that he loved and cared for. He left many fond memories and I am sure that this fine outstanding gentleman will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor for me to share this tribute with my colleagues in the House of Representatives. He will be missed by me and all others who were touched by his wonderful life.●

"EQUAL ACCESS" LEGISLATION—THE RELIGIOUS SPEECH PROTECTION ACT

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, the issue of religion in public schools is particularly sensitive because it often places the constitutionally protected rights of free speech and the free exercise of religion in conflict with the establishment clause. Currently, the Senate is bogged down in a heated debate over the controversial school prayer amendments. I have introduced equal access legislation which provides a constitutionally sound means of protecting religious speech in public high schools without running afoul of the first amendment's establishment clause.

This legislation is based on the notion that when a school opens its facilities to student groups during noninstructional periods, it should not be allowed to discriminate against student groups who wish to meet voluntarily for religious purposes. In other words, the bill would insure that student religious groups would have the same right to meet on campus as other student groups.

This is the position the U.S. Supreme Court took when it applied the equal access principle to student meetings at a State university. In *Widmar* v. *Vincent*, 102 S.Ct 296 (1981), the Court held that, absent a compelling purpose, a public university may not deny the use of its facilities to student groups which wish to meet and speak on religious subjects if the university makes its facilities generally available to student groups for nonreligious subjects.

The Court based this holding not on the free exercise of religion clause but on the freedom of speech clause of the first amendment as made applicable to the States through the 14th amendment. The Court explained that once the university "created a forum generally open for use by student groups," the university could not "discriminate against student groups and speakers based on their desire to * * * engage in religious worship and discussion." I wholeheartedly agree with this holding and believe it should be applied to public secondary schools by enactment of equal access legislation.

The legislation which I am reintroducing today is limited to public secondary schools and includes a number of safeguards to prevent school or Government involvement in the student-initiated religious meetings. A companion measure in the Senate enjoys broad bipartisan support.

It is inequitable to prevent high school students from meeting voluntarily for religious purposes during noninstructional periods when the school permits student meetings for virtually any other legitimate purpose. Such a double standard is inconsistent with the principles of free speech and Government neutrality toward religion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, the text of which follows:

H.R. 4996

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Religious Speech Protection Act".

SEC. 2. No funds appropriated to the Department of Education to provide financial assistance to State or local educational agencies may be obligated or expended to any State or local educational agency, if the State or local educational agency, or any public secondary school for which the State or local educational agency is responsible, violates the prohibition described in section 3.

SEC. 3. It shall be a policy subject to the penalties in section 2 for a public secondary school receiving Federal financial assistance, which generally allows non-school-sponsored groups of students to meet, to discriminate on the basis of the religious content of the speech at such meetings, if—

(1) the meeting is voluntary and student initiated,

(2) there is no sponsorship of the meeting by the school, government, or its agents or employees, and

(3) no activity which is in and of itself unlawful is permitted.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to permit the United States or any State or political subdivision thereof to—

(1) influence the form or content of any prayer or other religious activity,

(2) require any person to participate in prayer or other religious activity, or

(3) expend public funds beyond the cost of providing the meeting space for student initiated meetings.

SEC. 5. The provisions of this Act shall supersede all other provisions of Federal law that are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 6. As used in this Act the term "secondary school" means a public school which provides secondary education, as determined under state law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.●

CITIES INCREASING TAXES AS FEDERAL AID DECLINES

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add the following recent article from the Associated Press to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article offers further testimony of the stark reality imposed by the disguised savings to the American taxpayer which are so often lauded by the current administration.

The drastic reductions in aid to municipalities by Federal and State governments have caused local property taxes to increase and given rise to a host of miscellaneous charges and taxes. Clearly, what we are seeing is not a savings to the taxpayer but in fact a transfer of the tax burden to the already strained local and municipal governments.

CITIES TAPPING OTHER INCOMES AS TAXES, FEDERAL AID DECLINE

WASHINGTON, D.C.—City governments are turning to special fees and charges to raise money as federal aid declines and property tax income grows slowly, according to a Census Bureau study released yesterday.

And spending on police continues to close in on education as the biggest cost for municipalities, the study shows.

For each resident, cities currently spend $72.14 for education and $70.12 for police protection annually, according to the report "City Government Finances in 1981-82."

Miscellaneous revenue was the fastest growing portion of city income between 1981 and 1982, jumping 17.8 percent to $22.7 billion, the study showed.

At the same time, property taxes, long the largest local source of income for municipalities, climbed 6.7 percent to $19.5 billion. And over the past decade, the share of city income provided by property taxes has dropped from 31 percent to 21 percent, the study showed.

For 1982, the report said, miscellaneous charges brought nearly one fourth of all the money received by the cities, while property taxes brought in about 21 percent.

PUBLIC AID ON DECLINE

As recently as 1979-1980 property taxes had been the largest source of city funds, but since then they have been outstripped by miscellaneous charges.

Meanwhile, federal aid to cities dropped 2.5 percent to $10.9 billion in 1982, and state assistance was off 6.8 percent to $18.9 billion, the report showed.

While details of income and spending vary from city to city, the growth in miscellaneous charges has been a general trend in recent years, explained Larry MacDonald of the Census Bureau's government's division.

Property taxes can only be increased so much, said MacDonald, and in effect have held about steady in recent years, while state and federal aid has dropped off.

As a result, he said, cities have sought other sources of income. The miscellaneous charges include such things as interest earnings on city money, fees for trash collection, parks, and recreation use, sewers, sanitation, hospitals, and parking in city lots.

On the spending side, education remains the biggest expense for cities, but police protection continues to close in and could easily become the top item within a couple of years.

Cities spent $9.9 billion on police in 1982, up 10.4 percent from the year before, while education climbed only 2.6 percent to $10.2 billion, the report shows. Police accounted for 8.8 percent of city spending in 1982, and education 9.0 percent, the report states.●

TUITION TAX CREDITS

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce legislation today which will provide a tax credit for the amount of tuition expenses incurred by an individual for the primary and secondary education of his or her dependents. This tuition tax credit bill will provide individual taxpayers with up to a $100 tax credit in 1984, a $200 credit in 1985, and a $300 credit in 1986 for each dependent enrolled in a privately operated, full-time elementary or secondary school which meets the tax-exempt requirements described in sections 501(a) and 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, including any church-operated school to which subsections (a) and (b) of section 508 do not apply.

This credit will be available in full to those taxpayers whose adjusted gross income is less than $50,000—$25,000 in the case of a married taxpayer filing a separate return—and will be phased out gradually for those taxpayers who claim an adjusted gross income of greater than $50,000 and less than $75,000—$37,500 for a married taxpayer filing a separate return. The credit, then, will be available only in part to those taxpayers earning between $50,000 a year and $75,000 a year, and it will not be available to those taxpayers reporting an adjusted gross income of over $75,000 a year.

Also, this credit will be made refundable; that is, to the extent that an individual has a tax liability less than the amount of tuition tax credit available to him or her, he or she can be refunded the amount of the credit minus the taxpayer's liability. In addition, this tuition tax credit will not be treated as Federal assistance of any kind with respect to the taxpayer who is allowed the credit or to the educational institution in which the dependent is enrolled.

It seems clear, Mr. Speaker, that the implementation of a tuition tax credit system would indirectly benefit both private and public school systems. This credit is merely a limited form of aid for those parents who pay for both public schools and their private schools. By instituting this system, parents will not pay a smaller amount of money to support local public schools than the amount they contribute now; rather, they will simply receive a worthwhile credit should they decide to support both a private school as well as their local public school system.

It has been argued that a credit would subsidize the wealthy at the risk of segregating our children by family income. As the sponsor of this proposal, I resent this suggestion. In order for this to be the case, one must assume that only the wealthy use private schools. Yet, as of 1982, 51.4 percent of students attending nonpublic schools are from families earning less than $15,000 per year; 71 percent were from families earning less than $25,000. At the beginning of the current school year, minority students in New York City Archdiocese's school system outnumbered white students by more than a 2 to 1 margin. Currently, 87 percent of the elementary school students in more than 60 Manhattan schools are black, Hispanic, or Asian.

In addition, my bill insures that no taxpayer who claims an adjusted gross income of over $50,000 a year can claim the entire credit; indeed, no taxpayer who claims over $75,000 a year can use any part of the credit. This phaseout, combined with the fact that this credit is refundable despite one's income—given that the taxpayer qualifies for the credit—orients this bill toward those taxpayers in the low- and middle-income brackets.

Also, a recent report in the New York Times (August 21, 1983) illustrates just how far off the mark the allegation that only the wealthy use private schools really is: In the "Summer Survey on Education," Gene I. Maeroff reports that of the 90,000 students in the Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn—which includes Brooklyn and Queens—almost 40,000 of the students are recent arrivals to the United States. This figure includes 18,000 from Latin America, 10,000 from Italy, 7,000 from Haiti, 1,000 from Hong Kong, and almost 1,000 from South Korea. Very few of these children's families can be classified as wealthy.

And, as a matter of fact, many of these young students are great scholars. For example, Mary Wei, a Vietnamese immigrant who was unable to speak English when she arrived in the United States, recently graduated as the valedictorian of St. Frances Cabrini School. Also, in 4 of the 11 schools which comprise the diocese, the winners of last year's spelling bees were recent Asian immigrants. It is plain to see that America's religious-sponsored schools are continuing their historic function of bringing children of immigrant families into the mainstream of American life.

Finally, a tuition tax credit would combat the decline of middle-class populations in our urban centers. In many cases, families move in order for their children to attend what the parents perceive to be better schools. Allowing these families a tax credit would give them an incentive to remain in the cities and to continue to contribute to the local tax base, which would benefit all public institutions, including the local public schools. Also, private schools in New York and in other cities perform a function which is much broader in scope than just providing an education. These schools are part of a community and are highly involved in neighborhood activities, whether they are raising funds for projects or participating in anticrime programs.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is clearly in our best interest to enact this important proposal. It would benefit both those families who make use of private schools and those whose children attend public schools. It would contribute to the economic base of our cities. Clearly, it is justifiable to support those families who seek alternative learning environments for their children through this tuition tax credit system because parents will continue to pay taxes to support the public school system.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this proposal and to work hard to insure its passage.●

NEWARK CIVIC ASSOCIATION PAYS TRIBUTE TO EIGHT

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday I had the privilege of attending the fifth annual brotherhood award breakfast sponsored by the Kenneth A. Gibson Civic Association.

The highlight of this event was the recognition given to eight outstanding individuals, the recipients of the 1984 brotherhood awards. Each of these people has, in his or her own way, made a difference in the community and in the lives of those around them. For their contributions to the city of Newark—and their dedication to the ideals embodied in the brotherhood awards—I offer my most sincere congratulations to: The Honorable Pearl Beatty, who was the first woman ever elected to the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Essex County; Dr. Elayne Brodie, an influential advocate on education issues; Luz Miriam Hernandez de Sanchez, who for 3 years has headed the Puerto Rican statewide parade of New Jersey; Jesse Jones, a community activist who has played a major role in numerous civic organizations; Father John P. Nickas, pastor of St. Rocco's Church; Jean Palumbo, a dedicated public servent with the office of planning and grantsmanship who is involved with many human rights causes; Brenda Joyce Veltri, personnel director for the city of Newark and former president of Municipal Career Women of Newark; and A. Irene Patterson Yearwood, who has, through her volunteer work and civic activities, worked tirelessly to improve conditions for the youth of Newark.

All of these very special people have helped to make the community they live in a better place, and I am very proud to know them all.

The program was opened by Eleanor Newman, chairperson of the Civic Association, and the master of ceremonies was president of the association, Elton Hill. In addition to delightful music provided by Prof. Albert Lewis, Brenda Watts, Lisa Banks, and Glenis Oatman, the program was graced with the eloquent speech of the mayor of Philadelphia, Wilson Goode. The brotherhood award breakfast gave us all the opportunity to recommit ourselves to the principles of humanity and compassion. I commend all of the people involved with this special event, particularly the honorees and, of course, the guiding force behind the Civic Association, Mayor Ken Gibson.●

GREAT LAKES CONSUMPTIVE USE STUDY

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, along with Representative HENRY NOWAK of New York, which would authorize the Federal Environmental Protection Agency, in cooperation with other Federal agencies and the Great Lakes States, to undertake a comprehensive study of all possible control measures which can be implemented to reduce the quantities of Great Lakes water consumed.

One of the objectives of the Clean Water Act was to provide for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and to provide for recreation in and on the waters of the Nation. Those of us who live in the northeast and midwest regions of the country have traditionally enjoyed plentiful supplies of fresh water from the Great Lakes that surround our borders. We want to insure that we will always have this resource readily available.

During the past two decades there have been dramatic populations shifts taking place in this country. Many regions are experiencing rapid growth and development that far outstrips their capacity and resources to handle this increase. One of the most basic necessities essential for life is that of water. The southwest and western regions of this country in the very near future will face a severe water shortage as their growth and development continue. The Great Lakes of Michigan, Huron, Superior, Erie, and Ontario comprise the largest body of fresh water in the world. Up to now the Great Lakes region has not had to worry about its water supply. We must take steps to prepare for the future generations' needs and to insure that their quality of life will be protected and enhanced.

Recent studies by the International Joint Commission have indicated that future consumptive uses will put a serious strain on the ability of the Great Lakes system to maintain those water levels and flows necessary to maintain ecological productivity and to avoid serious losses to important Great Lakes interests such as hydropower production and navigation. The Commission has projected a fivefold increase in the amount of Great Lakes water that will be consumed over the next 50 years. Most of the increase in water consumption will be due to growth in the manufacturing and thermal power generation industries. In 1975, the consumptive use of Great Lakes water was estimated at 3.2 billion gallons per day. By the year 2035, it has been estimated that consumptive uses will increase to over 16.4 billion gallons per day. There will be a corresponding drop of 9 inches in water level on the lakes with this increased usage. The economic losses and direct costs to navigation and hydropower interests alone are projected to exceed $200 million annually by the year 2035.

These findings clearly show that there is an urgent need for further studies on the consumptive uses of Great Lakes water. We must begin to develop rational, environmentally and economically sound management policies to protect this most precious resource.

The idea of a study of Great Lakes consumptive uses was endorsed by the Council of Great Lakes Governors at a conference last November. It is vital that our region develop a unified position on the use of our water. As this precious resource becomes more valuable, we must be prepared to effectively stop any other region from diverting any of our water. In addition, we must determine for ourselves, as a region, what our future water-supply needs will be and how best to distribute them. This study will take into account the past and future water requirements and uses that will have to be met, to insure our region's ability to remain economically viable. I urge my colleagues to join with me in cosponsoring this important legislation that will chart the course for further growth and prosperity in our country.●

IN PRAISE OF TWO SOVIET REFUSENIKS: BORIS CHERNOBILSKY AND SIMON SHNIRMAN

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, as I stand before my colleagues today, during the 1984 Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil for Soviet Jewry, the words of Albert Camus come to mind. He once said that:

> The nobility of our calling will always be rooted in two commitments difficult to observe: Refusal to lie about what we know, and resistance to oppression. By this yardstick, refuseniks, Soviet Jews who apply for an emigration visa and are refused, represent just that kind of commitment.

Despite an ever-increasing amount of Soviet sponsored anti-Semitism, these brave Jews refuse to lie about their faith by assimilating, by denying their belief in God, or by refusing to repress their convictions.

Soviet Jews are, in general, oppressed. Traditional Russian/Soviet anti-Semitism has become increasingly vicious in recent months; recent articles in Pravda, the Communist Party's official daily paper, have stepped up their attacks on Israel and have tried to link Zionism with nazism. By applying for an emigration visa, Jews become the targets of increased oppression. Yet by going ahead and applying, knowing that they are courting more oppression than if they did not apply, these Jews are simultaneously demonstrating their resistance to oppression.

Two refuseniks whom I have adopted, Boris Chernobilsky and Simon Shnirman, have demonstrated their commitments to Camus' notion of nobility.

Boris Chernobilsky and his family first applied for an emigration visa in 1975. After his request was denied in 1976, Boris lost his job. Instead of losing all hope in the face of the Soviet system of repression, Boris took part in a peaceful protest demonstration in October 1976. This effort landed Boris in prison for 15 days. Upon his release, he worked at a number of odd jobs to support his family and his wife Elena continued to teach Hebrew, which is in itself a perilous pursuit in the anti-semitic Soviet Union. Participation in an activists gathering in the Opalikha woods outside of Moscow in May 1981 resulted in Boris' being accused of "beating a policeman." Chernobilsky, maintaining the charges against him were false, refused to appear in court, but submitted the following statement to then Soviet President Leonid I. Brezhnev:

> The trials of Jewish activists conducted during the last years have shown that we cannot count on the objectiveness and fairness of the Soviet court. It is obvious that false charges are being fabricated in order to intimidate the Jews wishing to emigrate to Israel and trials are turned into acts of reprisal.
>
> There cannot be any doubt as to the outcome of my forthcoming trial although there are dozens of witnesses who could testify that the charge that has been presented against me does not in any way correspond with reality. Having no wish of becoming another KGB victim and having no other way of protecting myself against this reprisal, I decalre my refusal to appear of my own free will at the performance called a trial.

Not surprisingly, Boris was convicted and sentenced to 1 year in a labor camp. In early 1983 Boris was released from prison and he has returned to Moscow. It is also not surprising that Boris and Elena Chernobilsky have continued their efforts to obtain an exit visa.

Simon Shnirman has been a refusenik since 1959, when his father, David, applied for exit visas for his family. Finally, in 1976 David was granted a visa, but it was for him alone. With assurances from the Soviet officials that his wife and two children would be allowed to follow in 2 years, David set off for Israel. In 1978, wife Faina and daughter Emma were told that they could leave—the day before Simon was to stand trial for "draft evasion." Although the decision was difficult, Emma decided to go and Faina stayed with her son. That was 8 years ago.

Since that time, Simon served his sentence, married, and fathered a child. Incredibly, Simon was again arrested in February of last year and charged for the second time with draft evasion, the prohibitions against double jeopardy in the Fundamentals of Criminal Procedure of the U.S.S.R. and Union Republics (article 1, paragraph 1, items 9 and 10) notwithstanding. Simon, knowing that entrance in the army and exposure to "state secrets" would further prolong his ordeal once his military obligation was fulfilled, refused to enter the army.

Earlier this year, David Shnirman passed away. If Simon is allowed to leave the U.S.S.R. he will never realize his dream of joining his father in Israel.

Both of these cases are quite tragic, and even more tragic is the probability that the lives of Soviet refuseniks will not improve in the near future. The activities of the "anti-Zionist Committee," the nondelivery of mail to refuseniks, the harsh treatment of Prisoners of Conscience, and the increased harassment of long-term refuseniks further illustrate that the Soviet regime seeks to eliminate any vestige of Jewish culture within its borders. In light of this Soviet campaign of intimidation, the actions of Boris Chernobilsky and Simon Shnirman are all the more admirable. If these refuseniks, and countless others like them, have the courage to continue their resistance to oppression, the least that we in the West can do is continue our campaign to gain freedom for Soviet Jews.

I strongly believe that the issues of emigration and human rights should remain high on the agenda in all relevant forums, including the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe's followup meetings and the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. The rapidly deteriorating situation, however, indicates that new avenues must be explored to ameliorate the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union. We must encourage further participation of our Western allies and neutral and nonalined nations in this effort.

America has long been a symbol of freedom for the oppressed peoples of the world. It is important that we reaffirm our commitment to this basic principle at this critical time for Soviet Jews. With the recent change in power in the U.S.S.R., now would be a timely opportunity to renew our efforts.●

A TRIBUTE TO CARL WIDEN ON HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, March 8 will be a red letter day in the history of Austin, Tex., as the Downtown Founders Lion's Club honors one of our own, Mr. Carl Widen. Carl Widen is celebrating his 100th birthday on that day, and I want to pay special tribute to this gentleman who has contributed so much to our city.

Carl Widen's list of accomplishments in community service are immense. He earned his living as a banker and part owner of an Austin department store. But even in his early college days, you could tell he was going to eventually become a civic leader.

Mr. Widen is the oldest living graduate of the University of Texas at Austin. His life-long interest in music was cultivated by joining the Longhorn Band as one of its original members. During the university's centennial celebration last year, Mr. Widen was honored as the only surviving member of the original band on campus.

Several years after joining the Longhorn Band, Mr. Widen's musical talents struck a responsive chord again when he helped found the Austin Symphony Orchestra in 1911. He played the cello in the very first concert and still faithfully keeps up with the symphony today.

Austin is an education-oriented city, and Carl Widen shares that respect for education. He served on the Austin Independent School Board from 1933-45 and helped to increase the emphasis on music education in the schools. Besides his connection to the University of Texas, Carl Widen has long been active as a member of the development board of Texas Lutheran College in nearby Seguin. His love of history and knowledge of the early Swedish communities in central Texas are admirable.

Carl Widen is an exciting character. Ten years ago, he joined the Lion's Club, in response to a membership drive to "bring in some younger people!" Imagine a 90-year-old freshman.

Today, Carl Widen still walks with a cane. He attends the Lions Club functions every week, goes to the symphony and even took the time on a recent cold December evening to attend a reception in my honor. I assure you I was immensely proud to see Carl Widen there—smiling and greeting friends by the hundreds. He adds a special sparkle and excitement to any gathering.

Carl Widen has led a harmonious life for a full century. His smile, enthusiasm, and zest bring music to all our lives. All Austin and the University of Texas salute our most enduring and endearing citizen—Centurian Carl Widen.●

CHEMICAL EXPERT DOUBTS SOVIETS USE YELLOW RAIN

HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I commented here about growing claims that the Soviet Union was using chemical weapons against Southeast Asians and Afghans. At that time, I cited damning evidence that had been reported in a Parade magazine article of June 26, 1983, and urged that we seek answers to some profoundly disturbing questions.

Those questions have not been answered, of course. For one thing, our access to credible information is limited to accounts filtering out of the affected areas. We are still examining all the evidence that is available to us, but, quite frankly, it is hardly sufficient to say for sure that all the charges of "yellow rain" are true.

For instance, a chemical warfare expert, Saul Hormats, added to the debate February 26 in an article in the Washington Post entitled, "A Chemical Warfare Expert Who Doubts the Soviets Used Yellow Rain." Mr. Hormats, who until his retirement from Edgewood Arsenal in 1973 directed the development of chemical warfare munitions for the U.S. Army, makes some impressive, if not altogether persuasive, arguments.

Believing that we should always examine both sides of the coin, I would like to enter Mr. Hormat's article in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

A CHEMICAL WARFARE EXPERT WHO DOUBTS THE SOVIETS USED YELLOW RAIN

(By Saul Hormats)

There has been considerable evidence put forward to support the Reagan administration's assertion that the Soviet Union violated arms control agreements in using chemical weapons such as "yellow rain" in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan. The evidence has been sufficient to persuade the U.S. Senate, which earlier this month passed a resolution condemning the Soviets for their conduct, with not a single dissenting vote.

Thus far, the debate over yellow rain has focused less on whether the Soviets are using chemical weapons than on how they are doing it. Unfortunately, most of the testimony in the controversy has come from diplomats, politicians, analytical chemists and scientists with academic backgrounds. Almost completely lacking has been an assessment based on a military appreciation of chemical warfare agents, the munitions used to deliver such agents, and the logistics involved.

Such a military assessment raises grave questions about whether the Soviets have, in fact, engaged in the chemical warfare activities with which they have been charged.

In its report to Congress, the administration declared flatly that the Soviets had broken international agreements. It charged Moscow with "repeated violations" of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and of the 1972 Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. Chemical weapons were reported to have been used against the anti-Soviet guerrillas in Afghanistan, but primarily against Hmong villages in Laos. The chemical warfare agent is said to be a mold, fusarium (popularly called "yellow rain"), found naturally in infected crops and poorly stored grain.

The evidence supporing these allegations consists of a large number of interviews by State Department officials with Hmong refugees, and "solid evidence" in the form of blood samples, twigs and leaves, rock scrapings and a contaminated Soviet gas mask purchased in Kabul, Afghanistan.

But the evidence seems less than solid to one who has worked in the chemical weapons field for 37 years.

To begin with, why would the Soviets or their allies have chosen chemical attack? Hmong villages are very small; 15 to 20 houses cover the equivalent of a city block. There are many conventional munitions (such as the antipersonnel shells used in Vietnam and Beirut) easily capable of destroying all the villagers. White phosphorus shells of the kind used in Beirut would not only destroy the villagers but the village itself. The Soviets must certainly have large quantities of these in their arsenal. Why, then, would they risk world condemnation by using chemical weapons?

Let us assume that the Soviets wanted to escape responsibility for attacking a village. They might then use a weapon that would not leave evidence of its use. This would rule out nerve agents and similar devices that leave unmistakable effects. As a result, they might choose a device whose effect could be construed as resulting from naturally occurring food poisoning. Yellow rain would be one choice—but not a very probable one. Whether evading responsibility was the attacker's intent—or whether the intent was overt terror—there are cheaper and more effective techniques at hand.

There are many substances, well-known and available to weapons designers, that fill this bill. For example, an aerosol container the size of the smallest found on a supermarket shelf, slightly strengthened and modified and containing a solution of botulinal toxin type A, would kill everyone in a village if the poison was released in or near it. Deaths would appear to have been caused by botulism food poisoning. The weight of such a munition might be less than half a pound.

Should the Soviets wish to incapacitate rather than kill Hmong villagers, an effective agent might well be staphylococcal enterotoxin. A munition quite similar in size and appearance to a paint spray can could cause a number of villagers to become extremely ill for a day or two, presumably from common "staph" food poisoning. Three or four of these devices would likely affect most of the villagers.

The above are chemical agents. Should the Soviets decide to engage in biological warfare, the agent might well be the microorganism coxiella Burnetti, which causes Q-fever and is found in most parts of the world. The agent is easy to produce. Chills, fever, fatigue and weight loss can last for a month or longer and would be attributed to inadequate pasturizations of milk or milk products. Domesticated livestock and poultry would also be infected. The munition to do all this might weigh as little as two ounces.

Compared to these agents, yellow rain presents tremendous logistical problems. Yellow rain itself has been reported by the State Department to contain only very small percentages of the supposed toxic ingredient, called T-2. Since one part yellow rain is reported to contain only one ten-thousandth part or less of T-2, and T-2 is only one-fiftieth as toxic as our present lethal chemical agents, it would take some 500,000 times as much fusarium mold to attack a given target than if a standard lethal chemical agent were used. At a minimum, about 3,000 *tons* of yellow rain would be required to attack a village. To place this quantity on the target would require 20,000 to 30,000 shells—some two hours of fire from a full Soviet artillery division—or a minimum of 8,000 tons of bombs dropped from the air.

It is true the Soviets believe in massive air attack and artillery fire, but would they adopt this tactic in a remote mountain village of 15 to 20 families? A six-gun, 122 mm howitzer battery of the kind attached to a Soviet infantry regiment, firing one salvo of conventional shells weighing in all about 1,000 pounds, would leave little of the village.

Since none of the State Department reports of yellow rain incidents give any indication of such physical destruction, one might assume that the agent was delivered as a cloud from large transport or cargo planes. However, fusarium is a solid and not a gas or volatile liquid. To be effective, it would have to be dropped from an aircraft as very finely divided particles and then inhaled by the people in the village. But if the necessary 3,000 tons was dropped in this way over a village, very little of the light, fluffy material would reach the target. Most of it would be carried away by the wind.

Evidence of chemical or biological attack is unmistakable to an experienced observer. The level of casualties decreases with the distance from the point at which the munitions are released, as does the severity of symptoms. Indeed, an experienced observer can come close to describing the munition and probably the agent used just from a description of the attack. However, the descriptions provided by State Department interrogators give no patterns whatsoever fitting any known type of chemical or biological attack.

Initially, the department's allegations dealt with clouds of a yellow granular substance delivered by shell or bombs. However, a careful examination of the incidents described in State Department publications indicate a wide variety of other agents and munitions.

For example, the Laotian village of Long Tienne was reported to have been attacked by aircraft dropping rectangular boxes releasing clouds of green and yellow gas. Victims were said to have suffered from dizziness, tension and dysentery.

A gas attack on Houi Xang was reported to have involved rockets emitting red and green clouds and tanks spraying large yellow drops, causing the people in the target area to suffer convulsions, vomiting and blisters in the upper torso.

Phu nam was said to have been attacked with artillery and bombs emitting yellow smoke and dust. The victims suffered bleeding from their nostrils and mouths.

Pxu-Txoent was subjected to an attack in which small plastic bags broke in the air releasing a wet yellow substance that caused coughing, vomiting and yellowing skin and eyes among those exposed to it.

These are but four of hundreds of reported incidents. Taking these all together, a very large number of different munitions would have to have been employed. Agents giving very different symptoms and effects are described. The colors of the toxins are not just yellow, but almost the entire spectrum. Delivery is by a variety of means, including plastic bags opened above the target, spray tanks, shells, bombs, grenades and rockets. The clouds of agents are composed of large granules, liquid drops, and very fine and at times invisible clouds.

Taking the State Department evidence at face value, several hundred combinations of agents and delivery systems seem to have been used. But it is unlikely that the Soviet Union has such a large number. Judging by U.S. experience, it takes 10 years or longer to search for a new agent, research its toxicity and methods for dissemination, and develop, test and produce it. Given the number of munitions and agents that the Soviets are said to have employed, they must have devoted several thousand years to the development and production of them! This would seem more than a little improbable.

A very important part of a weapons development program is assuring reliability in combat. This involves extensive and prolonged tests to assure the ability of the munitions to withstand the rigors of storage, transport and delivery to the combat line. These are long time-consuming programs that cannot be significantly speeded up without seriously degrading the munitions' combat reliability. Even under the best conditions, there are always a certain amount of malfunctions and duds. If the State Department allegations are accepted and the Soviet program had indeed been speeded up, it would be most surprising if their dud and malfuntion rates were less than perhaps 5 to 10 percent.

Judging from the very large number of incidents that have been reported, there should be a very large number of duds and malfunctions that could serve as indisputable proof of Soviet chemical weapons activities. Yet the best evidence put forward for the use of these weapons are moldy twigs, leaves and rock scrapings.

State Department officials say the lack of more substantive evidence is due to the danger of entering the combat zone to collect it. The danger is real. However, the Central Intelligence Agency has many techniques for information gathering of this kind.

There are grave doubts, to say the least, about the validity of the allegations on which the administration's report and the Senate resolution rests. Certainly, individuals at the Defense Department and CIA also must have expressed their doubts. So it is difficult to understand why the secretary of defense and the director of the CIA persist in their positions given the absence of acceptable evidence suggesting the Soviets have been or are engaged in chemical warfare. The State Department's allegations appear to be based on imaginative responses to naive and gullible interrogators.

Our country would be better served if the Senate reconsidered its resolution condemning the Soviets and turned its attention to another question: Has Congress been misled, and, if so, by whom?●

VETERAN CORRESPONDENT COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIVE BARBER CONABLE'S RETIREMENT

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I know we were all shocked by the announcement that our highly respected colleague and good friend, BARBER CONABLE, was going to retire at the end of his present term. Seldom has the Congress experienced such widespread expressions of regret at the loss of such an able servant—expressions of regret from both sides of the aisle.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, were those genuine expressions of regret confined to the Members of this body. A number of reporters, commentators, and columnists noted Mr. CONABLE's announcement with a similar reaction. I was particularly struck, however, by the comment of one of the most distinguished reporters ever to cover the Congress. I refer to your good friend, and mine, Joseph F. McCaffrey. Throughout his 40-year career as a reporter, correspondent, and commentator on Capitol Hill, Joe McCaffrey won wide respect for his astute, penetrating, and informed reports on the

Congress. Although retired from his Capitol Hill post, Joe McCaffrey still is in the news business as editor and publisher of the highly respected Culpeper News in Culpeper, Va., Joe's retirement home.

In a recent column in the Culpeper News, Joe McCaffrey expresses in his usual succinct, but penetrating fashion what the loss of BARBER CONABLE means to him. I ask that it be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues may have the benefit of the view of a veteran of 40 years reporting on Capitol Hill.

A personal note. I was saddened this week to learn that Barber Conable, New York Republican, was retiring at the end of his present term in the House of Representatives.

Several years ago we talked about his packing it in, but then he decided to run again. Once that happened, I guess I thought he'd be there forever.

Barber Conable is, without doubt, not just one of the most outstanding members of the current Congress, he is one of the best I have known in my 40 years experience.

There is nothing wrong with the U.S. Congress that a few dozen more Barber Conables would not cure. Unfortunately, there aren't any others and now we lose the original.

His leaving is a loss not just for his upstate New York district, but for every American citizen.●

OLYMPICS WORTH $1 FROM EACH OF US: CONGRESS PONDERS OLYMPIC HELP

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I am today submitting for the RECORD an editorial by Ken Denlinger which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post.

In this editorial, Mr. Denlinger joined a growing list of reporters and newspapers throughout this country who have endorsed the Olympic Checkoff Act.

Mr. Denlinger's editorial was particularly timely because our distinguished winter Olympic team was in Washington yesterday to meet with the President and to lobby Congress for passage of this critical legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to review this editorial and to join with me in solving the financing problems of the U.S. Olympic Committee by enacting the Olympic Checkoff Act, H.R. 1984.

The passage of this bill is as good as gold.

The text of the editorial follows:

OLYMPICS WORTH $1 FROM EACH OF US: CONGRESS PONDERS OLYMPIC HELP

(By Ken Denlinger)

When President Reagan greets the U.S. Olympic team this afternoon, he ought to save a special squeeze for the hockey players. The country had at least a small hand in their Sarajevo swoon. It also owes every young athlete in the land, Olympian or novice, some serious thought before the summer Games begin in Los Angeles.

Lack of money had nothing to do with the Americans faring so badly, a couple of Washington Capitals from the U.S. team were saying yesterday. Equipment and facilities were first rate; the $1,500 per month was more than generous. Lack of money has a lot to do with our overall fitness, Olympic and otherwise, and the sooner Congress gets cracking with that tax checkoff bill the better.

For years, Americans have been searching for ways to underwrite our Olympians—and their sports—without the government being directly involved. So many financial angels hopped onto the ice after Lake Placid that such as Gary Sampson and Bob Mason experienced few hard times before those ego bruises against Canada and the Czechs three weeks ago.

His most affectionate memory, Sampson was saying after a Capitals' game day skate-around yesterday, was how hard the Soviets played *off* the ice. This was during the pre-Games games, the series in the States last year when Communist Hornungs could be seen in early-morning merriment after escaping bed check.

"Wish I'd done more socializing with athletes from other countries (in Yugoslavia)," he said, adding: "the attitude when we got back was not as bad as I expected. There was a banquet for us (he and Mason are from International Falls, Minn.), and most everybody said: "That's okay. Nobody disowned us or anything."

Still, most poke-checked them with questions.

"There was a point in the game against Canada," Mason said, "when a shot hit the post with us behind, 3-2. They came right back and scored. In '80, a shot like that went in against Sweden (in the final seconds) and we got a (2-2) tie. The '80 team took off from that (critical) shot; we couldn't seem to do anything right after ours. Didn't play our style, took a lot of penalties."

When they honor the U.S. team, White House and congressional thinkers might question the American style of sport, whether we have subsidized professional athletic entertainment too much and cared too little for participatory activities that happen to be included in the Olympics.

Specifically, how come H.R. 1984 and S. 591 have been ignored for so long? Those are the bills that would allow Americans to direct a buck or two from their refunds toward the Olympic movement. Judging from a poll USA Today conducted in early January, most of us have thought about the issue—and approve.

The poll asked: "should the United States government allow taxpayers to donate $1 of their refunds ($2 if filing jointly) to support the American Olympic teams simply by marking their tax returns?"

Seventy percent answered yes.

"If it passes," said Mike Harrigan, president of a sports consulting firm in Alexandria and former executive director of a presidential commission that helped restructure amateur athletics in the late-'70s, "the funding problem for Olympic sports is over."

He estimates the checkoff would generate $20 to $40 million each year; it has caused longer debate than why the hockey gang played so well in exhibitions against Canada and the Soviets and so uninspired once the torch was lit. Off and on, somebody, including Reagan's buddy Paul Laxalt, has sponsored such legislation; usually, it has been beaten back.

It seems straightforward enough. Anyone who cares for such as Sampson, Mason and hundreds of jumpers, throwers and skiiers simply does so with money coming to him. Administrative costs would be deducted before the money is given to the U.S. Olympic Committee.

The government is out nothing, Harrigan said.

"There are 59 cosponsors in the Senate," he added, "and 262 in the House."

Hearings in one committee, the House Judiciary, are expected within a week; the bill is stalled in Ways and Means, presumably by the immediate and very reasonable hurdle known as "floodgates."

Or, if the U.S. Olympic Committee gets such a favor, why shouldn't every other charity? The United Way, The American Cancer Society and others who certainly benefit Americans more often and more dramatically than Gary Sampson and Bob Mason.

Besides, isn't there enough tax-exempt money already flowing to the USOC? One can scarcely flick on the television without being pitched by an "official sponsor of the U.S. Olympic team." If Hilton and Snickers want to boost Olympians, why not let them?

Because, Harrigan insists, much of that corporate support will end after the L.A. Games. Funding that eventually trickles down to casual joggers ought to be more consistent.

"The USOC also has been an instrument of American foreign policy," he said, alluding to the 1980 boycott of the Moscow Games, "so why shouldn't the American people be given a chance to support its effort? There are special-interest considerations all over the tax code."

Sampson and Mason know that while hockey does not necessarily need the money the checkoff would bring, most other summer and winter Olympic sports do. Put me down for $1 too; earmark it for team handball.●

"NEO-PACIFISM" IS ANTI-PEACE

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of you and my other colleagues in the House a thoughtful and scholarly article which appeared in the January issue of Army magazine. This article entitled "Neo-Pacifism is Anti-Peace" was written by Robert H. Spiro, Jr., a former Under Secretary of the Army and chairman of the advisory board for the Center for International Security. He has also been a consultant in higher education and national defense matters. Robert Spiro, one of my constituents, holds views which are of particular interest at this time as he becomes the new executive director of the Reserve Officers Association on March 1. He is a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, having achieved an outstanding record in combat and returning in postwar years to hold high positions at Mercer University in Georgia and the presidency of Jacksonville University of Florida.

The article follows:

"NEO-PACIFISM" IS ANTI-PEACE

(By Robert H. Spiro, Jr.)

The operational deployment of cruise and Pershing II missiles is under way, despite frantic Soviet resistance. Its opposition ranges from ominous threats of counter deployment in Warsaw Pact countries to waging a massive propaganda campaign in Western Europe to persuade parliaments and populations that U.S. deployment is war-mongering, provocative and irresponsible. Yet, the Soviet buildup of SS 20 missiles deployed against the West since 1979 has almost trebled—from 126 to 360.

Regrettably, a sizable minority among people in NATO countries has, for a variety of reasons, fallen for the Soviet line and drifted into a modern version of traditional pacifism, which may properly be styled "neo-pacifism." By dictionary definition, pacifism is "the principle or policy of establishing and maintaining universal peace or such relations among all nations that all differences may be adjusted without recourse to war."

President Reagan and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher are among the foremost political spokesman for world peace. They are classical pacifists whose goal is world peace and security, a world without war. With true world peace they could abolish expensive armies and armaments, and thus provide infinitely more social services for all citizens, save lives, reduce taxes, win the everlasting gratitude of their constituents and all mankind, win elections and bask in undimmed glory.

Most human beings, it seems to me, are pacifists by the above definition. We do not want war, because it causes indescribable suffering and harm. It results in terrible destruction, interrupts education and careers, separates families, and inevitably causes crime, fear, hate and death.

I am a senior Naval Reserve officer, and know personally most of the senior generals and admirals of the uniformed services, plus many others of varying ranks and rates. I do not know even one military officer who wants war, who wishes for military conflict. Better than most they know the pain, devastation and death of war, and the nagging hurt of long separation.

By definition, they are pacifists; yet, they know that this is a world in which a minority of humanity in 25 or 30 nations maintain democratic societies while the vast majority, living in 130 nation-states, are held in thralldom by force. Their governments are repressive and totalitarian regimes of the left or right, violating all basic civil and human rights.

Domestic tranquillity cannot be maintained by reducing or abolishing police or milita. Such a course of action can only lead to increased criminal activity in society. Only when justice, goodness and equity prevail on earth can the vision of Isaish be fulfilled: beating swords into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks, and permitting the lion and the lamb to lie down together.

Unfortunately, unilateral disarmament and a nuclear freeze by the democratic nations contribute not to peace but to war. Such actions only convince communist and fascist dictatorships that the democracies are weak, irresolute and vapid. Many thoughtful historians are convinced that the Western democracies in the 1930s, by their disunity, hesitancy and vacillation combined with a growing domestic pacifism, actually encouraged Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini to embark on aggressive adventures in Africa and Europe, and the Japanese to do the same in the Far East.

Perhaps that is why today the French are the least infected by the virus of pseudo-pacifism. They recall vividly that French weakness in the late 1930s led to their total collapse in 1940. Thus, even the Socialist French president, Francois Mitterand, said in Belgium in October, "Pacifism is in the West and Euro-missiles are in the East."

Neo-pacifism in Europe today is more than an unfortunate and transitory phenomenon. It is a recurring virus that waxes and wanes, often induced and encouraged by subversive elements whose loyalties transcend frontiers, and whose aims are the weakening of the state and its ultimate subservience to another.

European neo-pacifism is at its zenith now, largely stimulated by the deployment issue. The movement is undoubtedly pluralistic in composition and motive. Some neo-pacifists support NATO, others oppose it; some, particularly horrified by the thought of nuclear war, oppose nuclear weapons but support heavy deployment of conventional forces; some support their governments, others call for radical political change; some advocate a phased and balanced freeze or drawdown, others advocate immediate and unilateral disarmament; many neopacifists are violently anti-American, others are both anti-American and anti-Soviet. Many are simply honest people, fed up with frequent wars and lashing out at military preparedness which they deem conducive to war.

Many, it seems, use the cause of neopacifism to oppose governments in power. Some seek to confuse and put their governments in disarray. And not a few, it appears, wish to weaken and discredit democratic governments and capitalistic societies and to promote the Soviet Union and the cause of communism. Thus, the cry by a motley body of neo-pacifists in Europe today: "Stop deployment by the United States and NATO!"

The movement is strongest in the Netherlands and Sweden, strong also in Norway, Belgium and Iceland. It is weaker in Denmark. In general, labor parties—the Social Democrats—and many church groups oppose deployment. Even the Dutch Army's trade unions have taken a stand against deployment.

In West Germany, it is said that some 1,000 groups, from a wide spectrum of society, actively oppose depolyment of new American missiles. These include a rainbow of activists ranging from Greens to Reds; some church groups, especially Protestants; many women and students and labor groups. The Social Democratic Party very recently voted overwhelmingly against deployment, with Chancellor Helmut Schmidt eloquently favoring it and Willy Brandt opposing. German communists, or course, form a solid group with the neo-pacifists.

A minority in the Federal Republic of Germany advocate violent, direct action for "peace." On 22 November the Bundestag, after animated debate, voted 286 to 226 to approve deployment.

In Great Britain, the campaign for nuclear disarmament is strong. A group styling itself the European Nuclear Disarmanent (END) group is supported by some churches, unions, professors, women and youth. The Trade Union Congress, strongly left-wing, favors unilateral disarmament, as do the majority in the Labour Party now dominated by the left.

In France, as noted, neo-pacifism is less popular and vocal. France is not scheduled to deploy U.S. cruise and Pershing II missiles, but has its own Force de Frappe. The French communist and radical parties support the neo-pacifist movement.

In southern Europe, the movement is weaker, almost nonexistent in Turkey, stronger in Italy (especially as deployment near Comiso is imminent), small but growing in Spain and Portugal. The PASOK government in Greece is strongly anti-American, having campaigned on disengagement and the elimination of U.S. bases. The growing crisis in Cyprus presents the Greek government with a confusing problem in this context.

Neo-pacifism in Europe is a significant issue, although most of the democratic regimes of Western Europe are solidly committed to the policy of deterrence following heated election contests in which the issues were fully explored, including the deployment of nuclear weapons. Neo-pacifism presents a negative image, a left-wing and anti-establishment image, aligned with the political left. Many honest neo-pacifists are troubled that in the face of Soviet imperialism and violent threats they have no viable alternatives to support. The greatest problem faced by the neo-pacifists is that their strongest ally, now almost hysterical about deployment, is the Soviet Union, openly committed to a campaign of manipulation and disinformation.

Also staunchly allied with them are the communist parties of Western Europe. If their cause is just and humane, why the support of an unjust and inhumane Soviet Union?

Two British women are in the vanguard of a rational alternative to neo-pacifism. Lady Olga Maitland, a London journalist, viewed 12,000 women forming a human fence, a nine-mile perimeter around Greenham Common Air Base. Noting their emotional conduct, she wrote: "After talking to them, I could see that they had been completely manipulated by the Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. They were truly, completely sincere in their fears, but I felt they had been whipped up into a frenzy about nuclear weapons based on deliberate misinformation, and they were being preyed upon by their ignorance."

Lady Maitland has formed "Women and Families for Defence," which now numbers more than 5,000. She seeks to establish chapters in the 15 NATO countries and in the United States.

Prime Minister Thatcher told the Conservative Party conference on 14 October: "The so-called peace movement may claim to be campaigning for peace, but it is NATO and the Western Alliance which have been delivering peace in Europe for more than 30 years. . . . We were elected to secure the defense of the realm. We have made clear through word and deed, to friend and foe alike, our resolve to keep Britain strong and free. . . . The first duty of government is to make our future and our way of life secure."

Neo-pacifism is sadly misinformed, misguided and confused. At best, some adherents are honest yet naive; some are muddle-headed and irrational, having little understanding of the outspoken communist threat and the danger it poses to civilization; and still others are simply wrongheaded and blind to danger.

At worst, some neo-pacifists are violently anti-American, unaware or forgetful that it was the United States that twice in this century has come to the aid of Western Europe, contributing mightily to its survival, sacrificing blood and treasure for its salvation. Then, by means of the Marshall Plan and other programs, America helped rebuild and restore all of Western Europe, including the Nazi and Fascist states.

And also at worst, there are the communist parties and allies who favor Soviet totalitarian government and are willing to see their homelands enslaved.

Let the West pursue tenaciously a balanced and verifiable nuclear arms agreement. Let us support the NATO 1979 twin-track decision on intermediate-range nuclear forces. Let us understand that since the NATO 1979 decision the Soviet Union has almost trebled the number of SS 20 missiles it has deployed. We know that Soviet communism cannot be disinvented.

But, in the words of Mrs. Thatcher, "We have to live together on the same planet and that is why, when the circumstances are right, we must be ready to talk to the Soviet leadership. That is why we should grasp every genuine opportunity for dialogue and keep that dialogue going in the interests of East and West alike."

The foremost hope for peace in our time remains the resolution of the free peoples to take those steps necessary for their defense, while seeking with equal resolution the attainment of an equitable and verifiable nuclear arms agreement.●

FLYNN'S PEOPLE

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a touching example of American voluntarism at work, as well as a fine demonstration of the wonderful interaction between senior citizens and children.

In Stockton, Calif., a class of fifth graders began collecting money to contribute to the repair of the Statue of Liberty in response to President Reagan's appeal for voluntary donations. Mrs. Alice Harness, who is 81, read about the children's effort in the Stockton Record. Touched by their example, she sent them a contribution of her own, along with a very moving letter. The text of her letter and the rest of the story are well worth our attention. As the beginning of the story makes clear: "Connections * * * that's what life is all about."

FLYNN'S PEOPLE

(Compiled by staff for Helen Flynn, who is recovering from a fall)

Connections, that's what newspapering, that's what life is all about.

A story in the Record has connected 81-year-old Alice G. Harness with a bunch of fifth graders at Madison School. The story told of a connection the students had made with another elderly lady—the 97-year-old Statue of Liberty.

The students began collecting money to help pay for repairs to the statue after their teacher, Marilyn Segarini, told them about the need for reconditioning work on the statue that has become the nation's symbol of freedom, and of President Reagan's belief that Americans as individuals ought to finance the restoration instead of the federal government.

Touched by their response, Harness sent a contribution to them, along with the following letter:

"Congratulations to Marilyn Segarini and students. I was so happy to see the picture and the story of your project in the Stockton Record. Although I do not personally know any of you, I am very proud of you for what you are doing.

"I, too, am proud to be an American. Several of my ancestors fought in the Revolutionary War and the Civil War. One of my nephews and my oldest son, Bill, gave their lives in World War II, and my other son was in the Navy in the South Pacific. Fortunately he came home, but with psychological scars which will never be completely healed.

"All these men fought to help to keep our country free. As long as we have our country we must remain strong and willing to defend our ideals with our lives if need arises.

"I have never had the good fortune to see the Statue of Liberty. I had always hoped I might see her some day but I am now 81 years of age so I may never see her. The donation I am sending is of necessity small but it is sent with my blessing and a very great love.

"May God keep our country safe and a good place for girls and boys to grow up. Remember, she will only be as strong as we help to make her by our own ideals and our own conduct. Let us keep our minds and our thoughts and actions clean and honorable that we may carry our end of the load.

"I wish we had more teachers like yours, and we do have many. In this busy world there seems to be a tendency to overlook the small but vitally important things that go into the making of a fine upstanding American.

"I reared two boys and two girls, have seven grandchildren, an even dozen great-grandchildren and two great-great step-grandchildren.

"Love and blessing to you all."

The letter from Harness touched not only Segarini and her students, but Madison principal Barbara J. Chan, who paid a visit to Harness, snapped the snapshot shown here, and came away warmed by her school's connection with the caring octogenarian.

The reaction of Harness to the fifth grade project (the kids hope to collect $600 by the end of this year) will not surprise those who remember her as the founder of the halfway house that bore her name. This was largely a one-woman effort to bridge the gap between prison and society for ex-convicts.●

RAILROAD RETIREMENT EQUITY

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that will improve on the current railroad retirement law passed by Congress last year. My bill is modeled after S. 1934 introduced by my Pennsylvania colleagues in the Senate, Senators HEINZ and SPECTER.

Last year, with the imminent threat of benefit cuts for nearly 1 million railroad retirees looming, Congress fast-tracked legislation to avert drastic cuts. Although this legislation was recommended by both rail labor and management, one particular provision of that legislation has had a harmful effect which we should correct.

In developing a proposal, labor and management decided that the employees, the employer, and retirees would have to make some sacrifices in both revenues coming into the system and benefits going out. For retirees, the bill included a provision that would take the next 5 percent of tier 1—social security—cost-of-living increases, and reduce the tier 2—railroad retirement—benefits by that amount. Since the social security cost-of-living increase on Janaury 1, 1984 was only 3.5 percent, another 1.5 percent remains to be offset and that 1.5 percent will have to be cut from the tier 2 benefits in 1985, according to the law.

The problem with this provision is that people may have to make sacrifices that are not necessary for the solvency of the system because the employment estimates used last year were too low. Employment levels in the industry have not dropped as much as was assumed. After dropping to a low point of 388,000 in March 1983, employment climbed to 405,000 in June 1983. This level is well above the assumptions used in developing the bill last year. Unfortunately, the bill, and now current law, does not allow for any relief from the social security offset in the event railroad employment strengthens. Retirees will still face this 1.5-percent cut in their tier II benefits. Certainly we should only take away social security cost-of-living adjustments and use them to reduce a private pension under the most extreme circumstances unless absolutely necessary.

The bill I am introducing, like the Senate bill, would stop the 1985 COLA offset from taking place unless the reserves available for the payment of railroad retirement benefits fall below a reasonable amount—less than 30 percent of the 1985 benefit payments and administrative costs needed to pay annuities. Under the actuaries' best present estimates, reserves should be above the 30-percent level in December 1984. In that event, we should be able to protect both retirees and the pension system as well.

I urge the Members of the House to join me in pressing for enactment of this bill in order to restore these benefits to the Nation's 1 million railroad retirees if the reserves are adaquate to support them.●

THE REPUBLIC OF TEXAS WAS BORN ON MARCH 2, 1836

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, March 2 marks a significant date in the history of this country—the date in 1836 that Texas declared its independence from Mexico. March 2, 1836, witnessed the birth of an independent Texas Republic.

In a scholarly essay titled "Texas Declaration of Independence," Dr. Rupert N. Richardson, who is widely regarded as the dean of Texas historians, captured that momentous event in these words, which I would like to read into the RECORD.

The men selected (for the constitutional convention) were mainly from the old South: twelve of the 59 natives of Virginia; ten natives of North Carolina; and nine of Tennessee. Most of them were young men in their thirties . . .

The new town of Washington, some fifty miles up the Brazos (from San Felipe) (was) the official meeting place for the Convention . . . The building had not been finished; windows had not been inserted, and cotton cloth nailed over the openings only helped a little to keep out the wind when the group convened with the mercury at thirty-three degrees. A visitor described the setting thus: "A long rough table extended from near the front door to near the rear wall, and was equadistant from the side walls. On this table the public documents and the papers of the Convention were laid and the delegates seated around it . . . Spectators entered the chamber at will, but they walked gently so as not to annoy the delegates."

But in spite of the unpromising setting, the men who assembled in Washington-on-the-Brazos that cold March morning in 1836 had determination and a pronounced sense of urgency. Indeed they had cause to have, for they knew that a hundred and fifty miles to the west Santa Anna's legions were closing on Travis' little band in the Alamo and they must have conjectured that a contingent of cavalry could leave San Antonio, reach Washington in three or four days, and make the last one of them prisoners. There were frequent rumors and reports of such a Mexican advance, and before they finished their work they had many alarms and excursions.

Their accomplishments were stupendous. Probably no deliberative body in history every did more in so short a period—seventeen days. Ahead of them was the task of deciding the question of independence, framing a Constitution to be ratified by the voters after the enemy had been beaten and a semblance of order restored, and of establishing a strong government ad interim for the emergency . . .

This they accomplished. The men in the Convention at Washington-on-the-Brazos did not secure Texas independence, but they declared it effectively and made possible its realization. Amidst terrifying reports of destruction and death wrought to the slender Texas arms and with their own lives in peril, these champions of freedom stayed at their task until they had assured the Revolution more stamina, had strengthened the cause of Texas abroad, and under sturdy President David G. Burnet had set up a government ad interim that could prevent anarchy.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Richardson's account well captures the desperate spirit of those fateful days in March and April of 1836.

In 1986, Texas celebrates the sesquicentennial of that independence, won by force of arms on the battlefield of San Jacinto.

As Dr. Richardson closes his account:

When at San Jacinto, on April 21, 1836, Houston attacked and destroyed the spearhead of Santa Anna'a armies, the dream of independence, so dear to the men at Washington-on-the-Brazos, became a reality.●

INTRODUCTION OF BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION CONVENING RESOLUTION IN U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. KEN KRAMER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, this week, along with Senator WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG, I introduced the balanced budget constitutional convention convening resolution.

This measure, unique in that it marks the first time a resolution has been introduced in Congress calling for the convening of a constitutional convention for a specific purpose, is designed to force Congress to approve a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. In effect, it gives Congress an ultimatum—either act now or have a constitutional convention automatically convened if two or more State petitions are received for a constitutional convention.

Throughout our history, few issues have been as urgent or as important to the survival of our great Nation as this one. This is so because, although we have laid a good foundation for economic recovery, continued huge deficits will make impossible our chances for long-term prosperity.

In recent years, the national debt has exploded. At the beginning of 1968, the total debt from our Nation's first 192 years of existence was $350 billion. By 1978, the year I first campaigned for Congress, the debt had doubled. Since then, it has doubled again, this time in only 5 years. And, given current deficit projections, the national debt will top $2 trillion during fiscal year 1986 and could exceed $3 trillion as early as 1990.

The message is clear: Unless we act—and act soon—to halt this exponential growth, we will see a return to days of high inflation, high interest rates and high unemployment—and worse. No matter how much people in elected office might will it otherwise, huge deficits mean the Government either must print or borrow money, which in turn causes inflation or high interest rates, or both, which in turn ultimately means high unemployment. Yet, Congress has shown time and time again that it is incapable of bringing runaway spending under control.

President Reagan alluded to the serious problem of high deficits in his fiscal year 1985 budget message to Congress when he stated:

All signs point to continued strong economic growth, vigorous investment, and rising productivity, without renewed inflation—*all but one* [emphasis added]. Only the threat of indefinitely prolonged high budget deficits threatens the continuation of sustained noninflationary growth and prosperity.

To solve this serious problem, the President called for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. In doing so, it is important to note that he looked not to Congress, but to the American people, to bring this about, saying, "I encourage our citizens to keep working for this at the grassroots. If you want to make it happen, it will happen."

Last year, Missouri became the 32d State since 1975 to petition Congress to call a national constitutional convention for the purpose of drafting a constitutional amendment mandating a balanced budget. This is just two shy of the number of States required under article V of the Constitution in order for a constitutional convention to be convened. Moreover, the National Taxpayers Union, which has spearheaded the grassroots drive for a balanced budget amendment, reports that strong efforts are underway in seven additional States—Kentucky, Vermont, Michigan, California, Montana, Ohio, and Washington.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Limit the duration of the convention to 120 days; and

Provide for ratification by State legislatures.

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

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

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

> That useful alterations [in the Constitution] will be suggested by experience, could not but be foreseen. It was requisite therefore that a mode for introducing them should be provided. The mode preferred by the Convention [in 1787] seems to be stamped with every mark of propriety. It guards equally against that extreme facility which would render the Constitution too mutable; and that extreme difficulty which might perpetuate its discovered faults. It moreover equally enables the general and State governments to originate the amendment of errors as they may be pointed out by the experience on one side or on the other.

Indeed, in 1787 who could have predicted budget deficits of the magnitude that we are experiencing today?

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

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

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

Currently, the Federal Government spends $1.5 million dollars every minute, every hour, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. For every $7 the Federal Government takes in, it spends an additional $2 which contributes to the deficit, a practice that would soon bankrupt the average family or small business;

Last December, the Senate Finance Committee held 3 days of hearings on the deficit. By the time the witnesses had finished testifying, the deficit had increased by another $1 billion;

Based on the current national debt of $1.4 trillion, the resulting liability figures to approximately $6,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. For the average family of four, the debt comes to nearly $25,000; and

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

On numerous occasions the last couple of decades, both Congress and Presidents have sought to restrain spending and limit deficit spending—each time without success. Most notable of these were: (1) Five separate proposals to limit Federal spending which Congress approved between 1966 and 1973, (2) the impoundment battles initiated by President Nixon; (3) congressional adoption of the 1974 Budget Act, which proponents argued would give Congress the necessary tools to put its financial house in order; (4) the series of spending vetoes by President Ford; and (5) passage of the Byrd amendment of 1978, which statutorially provided that outlays shall not exceed receipts, beginning in 1981.

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

Clearly, there is a spending bias inherent in the legislative practice, which has been accentuated by built-in increases in the budget of the last couple of decades. Members of Congress win praise, and often votes, for "bringing home the bacon" in terms of projects for their districts and programs which benefit their constituents. Conversely, those who try to hold the line on expenditures, much less cut major spending programs, often incur the wrath of this group of voters or that. As author Allen Schick, who has analyzed the Federal budget process in some detail, observed, "The process of budgeting comes to be 'whose ox is to be fattened,' a much more agreeable task than deciding 'whose ox is to be gored.'"

Given these facts, it becomes apparent that a constitutional amendment is the only feasible way of achieving a balanced budget. This fact was underscored by Senator STROM THURMOND, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, when he stated during debate over a balanced budget amendment 2 years ago:

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

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

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

Grassroots lobbying finally forced Congress to take up a balanced budget amendment in 1982. However, even though the Senate approved a balanced budget amendment on August 4, 1982, by a vote of 69 to 31, the House Judiciary Committee successfully kept the issue bottled up in committee until the last day of the 97th Congress. Although supporters were successful in using a discharge petition to force it out of committee, the measure was brought to the floor with only a couple hours notice. Even though a majority of the House—236 to 187—voted in favor of the amendment, it fell short of the two-thirds vote necessary to send the amendment on to the States for ratification.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the time to enact a balanced budget amendment is now. I would urge that we do so without further delay.

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

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

SNUBBING SYRIA DIDN'T WORK

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, as we witnessed the withdrawal of our marines from Beirut last weekend, I pondered the circumstances which led to the failure of the President's policy in Lebanon. I have always advocated that in order to bring about a just settlement in the Middle East, we must deal with all countries and factions who are parties to the dispute. I feel strongly that we committed a major diplomatic blunder by not consulting Syria during the negotiation of the May 17, 1983 Israeli-Lebanese agreement.

I would like to insert into the RECORD an article which appeared in this past Sunday's Washington Post by Jonathan C. Randal. I believe that the reasons we should have included Syria in the negotiations is spelled out quite clearly and eloquently and I feel that this should be brought to the attention of my colleagues, our Secretary of State, and the American people.

The article follows:

SNUBBING SYRIA DIDN'T WORK

(By Jonathan C. Randal)

DAMASCUS.—So confused and tortured has been the Reagan administration's Lebanon policy that even its collapse failed to get Washington's desired message across to the intended party, Syria.

"Do you really think the Marines are going to leave?" asked a worried official in Syria's presidential palace the other day. His question reflected the Syrians' often dumb-founded sense of wonder at the spectacle of the world's greatest power floundering in a whirlpool of its own contradictory statements and actions.

The sudden collapse of the American-trained Lebanese army—the bulwark of the Reagan administration policy of support for President Amin Gemayel—surprised even the Syrians. But if Assad has positioned himself ingeniously to dominate his American, Israeli and Lebanese Christian adversaries, he has yet to achieve his main objective. That is to eliminate totally every trace of political or military advantage that Israel gained with its invasion of Lebanon in June 1982.

That objective brought Assad into conflict with the United States, because in Syrian eyes, the Americans adopted Israeli goals when they decided to follow Ariel Sharon's lead and try to rebuild a Lebanese central government based on Christian Phalangist power. In Syrian eyes, that policy amounted to rewarding Israel for its aggression against Lebanon.

The Syrians have always been concerned that Israeli and American machinations would leave them entirely isolated in the region, facing clearly superior Israeli military power with no Arab allies in the neighborhood. A successful Israeli-Lebanese rapprochement would have been another step along this path, so Assad was determined to prevent it. The May agreement negotiated by George Shultz calling for mutual Syrian and Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon naturally became Assad's first target. With his considerable capacity for brutal direct action, what happened next should not have been a surprise.

When Secretary of State Shultz first went to Damascus to present the May 17 deal, the Syrians were taken aback. After all, the same George Shultz had said publicly that the United States should not pay too much attention to the Middle East for fear of neglecting the world's other—and by inference more important—problems.

But when faced with President Reagan's displeasure at the slow pace of Israeli-Lebanese negotiations, Shultz had rushed to the Middle East and conducted a Kissinger-like shuttle which his closest advisers had discouraged as unnecessary.

According to palace insiders here, when he come to Damascus Shultz seem unfamiliar with the details of the agreement he was selling. Shultz's own advisors had to correct him on major and minor points, these Syrian sources said.

When Assad rejected the agreement, Shultz decided not to take his decision seriously. Thus was born perhaps the most disastrous cross-cultural misunderstanding in recent U.S.-Mideast relations, a breakdown in communication that could bedevil American interests for years to come.

Yet American diplomats throughout the Middle East had warned Shultz that Syria would never accept a deal negotiated by others, much less one seeking to reduce Syrian influence in Lebanon.

But Shultz and the successive American special negotiators who have dealt with Syria never seemed really to accept that if for only geographic and historical reasons, Syria has special interests in the country next door. Instead, they disregarded the diplomats and remained adamant, apparently reflecting the Washington view that a debt-ridden nation of 9 million people dependent on handouts from Saudi Arabia and the other pro-Western Arab oil states could be pressured into giving way.

Neither Shultz, nor National Security Adviser Robert McFarlane, nor especially Donald Rumsfeld, the present special envoy, seemed to believe that a small determined state, convinced its back was to the wall, could stand up to a superpower. It was as if the lessons of Vietnam had been forgotten.

At the State Department, Shultz came to share the same passionate dislike of the Syrians which in 1981 had led his predecessor, Alexander Haig, to snub Assad by avoiding a Damascus stopover during a Mideast familiarization tour. Reagan's two secretaries of state apparently forgot the dictum of their predecessor, Henry Kissinger, that no war was possible in the Middle East without Egypt, and no peace possible without Syria.

Assad must have realized that he could sit tight last spring, when—despite the coming of the dry season in the Bekaa Valley—the Israeli army made no forays into Syrian-held territory. Once he saw that Israel had lost its stomach for its Lebanese adventure, Assad knew he had little to worry about.

The United States ceased to be a threat when, along with the other nations contributing troops to the multinational force, Washington refused to protect its soldiers by committing many more men to securing the first ridge line above Beirut.

Without credible assets, McFarlane and Rumsfeld nonetheless tried to bluff the Syrians. The guns of the Sixth Fleet fired from September on. But despite American claims that the Syrians got the message and began behaving, the most visible result of these artillery barrages was the conversion of great segments of the Lebanese Moslem community to a strongly anti-American orientation. The big guns also attracted great numbers of Shiite Moslems to the radical, pro-Iranian camp.

Some people in this part of the world claim that this first premeditated use of American firepower against Arabs in this century helped provoke the Oct. 12 kamikaze raids in which neary 300 American and French troops were killed.

Last month the battleship *New Jersey* fired almost 300 one-ton rounds in a barrage so apparently mindless that Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger decried the whole affair and his department refused to evaluate its effectiveness publicily. In Damascus the Syrians wondered out loud about what kind of a government had a defense minister who by his own admission didn't know what, precisely, his warships were doing.

No strangers to random shelling themselves, the Syrians issued denounciations and basked in the reflected glory of once again playing Arab heroes persecuted by the frustrated superpower. Playing that role is what earns Syria millions in petrodollar largesse from its sister Arab states.

The Syrians insist that they have bent over backwards to avoid humiliating the United States, ceaselessly spelling out their minimum acceptable conditions to anyone willing to come to Damascus. But they express exasperation at the fact that the Americans repeatedly withdrew their special envoy and brought in a new one just as the Syrians thought they were getting their message across.

Last month, the Syrians followed up their release of Navy flier Robert Goodman by suggesting a possible honorable exit for the administration. They seemed to accept the idea of a United Nations force to replace the western contingents in Beirut. The Syrians reasoned that the sooner the Marines left the better for Reagan, who in any case looked like a second term shoo-in.

"The Syrians figured Reagan would be around for five more years and didn't want to insult the future" a western diplomat said. "Trouble was, Washington showed no such understanding of Assad's durability."●

TONY AND LUPITA RAMIREZ DAY

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, today, when so many people are worrying only about themselves and their ability to make ends meet, it is heartening and refreshing to learn of the efforts of many to share what little they have to help others in need. Often operating on only a shoestring budget, and counting on the good intentions and support of others like themselves, these volunteers organize the citizenry to offer whatever help they can. Their efforts are particularly important today because Government funds for many social assistance programs have been cut. The volunteer spirit is, I am glad to say, more alive than ever.

Whenever people are challenged to help those affected by unemployment and natural disaster, there are always a few generous people who can be counted on to do what needs to be done, without expecting any credit. They offer their talents and whatever resources they have because of their fundamental commitment to their fellow man. Just knowing that they have helped others is sufficient reward for them.

I am pleased to have two of the most generous volunteers in America living in my congressional district. In fact, their efforts are so appreciated by the many they have helped that the Cameron County Commissioners Court in south Texas has declared March 1, "Tony and Lupita Ramirez Day." This honor is public recognition for their many thousands of hours of work during the last 15 years to help the poor of the Rio Grande Valley.

Tony, a former truck driver and county employee, and Lupita have been married for 30 years and have five wonderful daughters. They had no personal wealth to share, but had the most important gift of all to share, the gift of themselves, which has made their efforts through the years all the more meaningful.

The Ramirezes began their community service in 1969 by opening up their home and offering their automobile to help transport the poor to medical appointments. They galvanized their friends and neighbors into helping, and before long had a fleet of 20 cars and drivers willing to help those without transportation. They did not have any Federal grants or a huge expense account. Rather, they used Tony and Lupita's house and telephone and gave of their own time.

Not content to merely serve their fellow man in this limited way, the Ramirzes founded a family medical clinic offering services to low-income people. Knowing that the elderly, too, had special needs, Mr. Ramirez helped found Amigos del Valle—"Friends of the Valley"—a valleywide, nonprofit, umbrella organization that provides social services to the elderly, including housing, transportation, hot meals, and recreation.

As the organization and efforts of the Ramirezes grew, and as more and more people sought their assistance, they organized the "Harlingen Community Committee and Concerned Citizens" and expanded their efforts to include vocational education classes. Mr. Ramirez, who obtained his GED from the Texas State Technical Institute, recognized the importance of language and job training classes to the Mexican-American community in the valley.

As appreciation of and recognition for his efforts grew, Mr. Ramirez successfully convinced the city of Harlingen to provide a new facility for his operation. An unused firehouse was donated and renovated by the city and is now the hub for the Harlingen Information and Social Services Organization, Inc.

Most recently, the Ramirezes provided urgently needed relief for the victims of the December freeze which devastated the agricultural crops in the valley and cause enormous hardship for many migrant farmworkers. The Ramirezes galvanized the people of Harlingen into donating enormous amounts of clothing, household goods, and food. Local businesses, already familiar with the efforts of the Ramirezes and their organization, responded enthusiastically and cooperated fully. Some 1,500 families received assistance to tide them over until Federal and State disaster assistance could reach them.

Tony and Lupita are a living testament to the fine efforts of countless, nameless volunteers throughout the Nation. So many give of their time with no expectation of praise or public recognition. However, when individuals are honored, as Tony and Lupita are today, all volunteers are really being recognized.

This Nation has a strong tradition of helping others—a tradition which I am glad to see alive and well today. While it would be easy to step aside and wait for the Federal Government to meet the needs of the poor, volunteers know that their ability to respond quickly means that their efforts are at least as effective as those of Government. They do not need to wait for countless forms to be filled out and filed with the appropriate Government agencies. When disaster strikes, as it did at Christmastime in south Texas, the people were willing and ready to help. It just takes someone like Tony and Lupita to organize the efforts of volunteers. The community was responding to the freeze disaster before the ink was even dry on the State's request for Federal aid.

Volunteers will continue to exemplify speed and simplicity in meeting the needs of those less fortunate. Their contributions to this Nation and to our individual communities are immeasurable, but each one of us who has been touched by their activities is richer for their efforts. The people of south Texas are fortunate to have had people like Tony and Lupita Ramirez care enough to give of their time and efforts for more than 15 years.●

COMPUTER CRIME

HON. BILL NELSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to bring to your attention, an editorial by the influential Washington Post on the subject of computer-assisted crime legislation.

H.R. 1092, the Federal Computer Systems Protection Act, to which the Post refers, makes crime by computer a specific Federal offense. It provides our prosecutors with adequate tools to convict this new sophisticated criminal—who is stealing upward of $100 million to $300 million each year with the use of computers.

The bill has received the generous support of trade associations in the industry, including the American Society for Industrial Security, Computer and Business Equipment Manufacturers' Association, Data Processing Management Association, American Bankers' Association, Association of Federal Investigators, Electronic Data Processing (EDP) Auditors, and others. We have 118 cosponsors and a resumption of hearings held in November is expected early next year before Chairman DON EDWARDS' Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights.

I invite my colleagues to join me in the effort to combat burgeoning criminal activity by computer. At this point in the RECORD, I respectfully request insertion of the December 2, 1983, Washington Post editorial, "Computer Crime":

The article follows:

COMPUTER CRIME

The computer hotdoggers, whose invasions of remote data bases arouse both admiration and concern, have drawn attention to a serious and growing problem. Among the many things that computers have made easier are the stealing and destruction of other people's property. And current law is not well-suited either to deter or to prosecute such offenses.

Many existing federal or state statutes could be involved in the prosecution of specific offenses, depending upon their circumstances. But since none of these laws deals specifically with the types of unauthorized access made possible by computer networks, law enforcement agents and prosecutors must try to stretch these statutes to cover situations never envisioned by their drafters. Because courts tend—properly—to interpret any ambiguity in the law to favor a defendant, it is only too possible that a person who has, for example, stolen valuable trade secrets or willfully destroyed irreplaceable records might escape conviction because of gaps in the law.

To remedy this situation, Rep. Bill Nelson has introduced a bill that would make it a federal crime to use computers for fraudulent purposes where these computers were federally owned or used by organizations involved in interstate commerce. The measure—patterned after successfully used statutes in Florida and California—has won the endorsement of numerous trade associations.

The Justice Department has also supported the bill with minor qualifications and the added suggestion that simple unauthorized access to a computer be made a misdemeanor. That seems a useful addition. Computer "hackers" may mean no harm, but amusements that can result in the destruction of, say, irreplaceable medical records ought to be firmly discouraged.

There is, of course, a strong presumption against littering the federal criminal code unnecessarily. But both the private sector and the federal government have come, belatedly, to realize that computer crime is now a multi-million-dollar enterprise operating within their borders. Better built-in security measures for computer systems are obviously the surest protection, but passage of a strong federal law would have an important deterrent effect. Although several states have enacted computer-crime statutes, their coverage is uneven, and a uniform federal law would be a far more effective way of dealing with a type of offense that is, by its very nature, no respecter of state boundaries.

Computer virtuosity is surely to be admired. But tampering with information, whether done for gain or amusement, can deprive other people of property far more valuable than the contents of a Brinks armored truck. The law that seeks to deter and punish such thievery should be firm and unambiguous.●

REVERSING THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today the United States and the Soviet Union together possess more than 55,000 nuclear warheads, enough to destroy each other and the entire world many times over. The Reagan administration is committed to producing thousands of more nuclear weapons. No doubt, the Soviet Union will simply match this nuclear expansion as they have in the past.

Further escalation in the nuclear arms race can only produce greater global tension, deeper instability, and a heightened danger of nuclear weapons accidents.

Steps should be taken immediately to build contacts between the United States and the Soviet Union in an effort to negotiate a nuclear weapons reduction. The leaders of both nations should declare that a first use of nuclear weapons is repugnant to both. Bilateral arms control negotiations should be resumed. Both nations must find a way to freeze their existing nuclear weapons stockpiles and halt further production, while serious negotiations can be conducted.

Two years ago I offered during debate on the Federal budget an amendment to freeze further testing, production, and deployment of new nuclear warheads and weapons. That was a first effort in bringing together the idea of a nuclear freeze and the attempt to cut off further funding of nuclear weapons production. While that effort did not succeed, I am convinced that further congressional action this year along similar lines can prove effective.

In order to better understand the nuclear arms race, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point three articles published by The Center For Defense Information in Washington, D.C. These articles provide the most concrete picture of the dangers posed by a stepped up nuclear arms race.

The articles follow:

[The Defense Monitor, 1982]

DEFENSE MONITOR IN BRIEF

President Reagan and his advisors appear to be preparing the United States for nuclear war with the Soviet Union.

President Reagan plans to spend $222 billion in the next six years in an effort to achieve the capacity to fight and win a nuclear war.

The U.S. has about 30,000 nuclear weapons today. The U.S. plans to build 17,000 new nuclear weapons in the next decade.

Technological advances in the U.S. and U.S.S.R. and changes in nuclear war planning are major factors in the weapons build-up and make nuclear war more likely.

Development of new U.S. nuclear weapons like the MX missile create the impression in the U.S., Europe, and the Soviet Union that the U.S. is building a nuclear force to destroy the Soviet nuclear arsenal in a preemptive attack.

Some of the U.S. weapons being developed may require the abrogation of existing arms control treaties such as the ABM Treaty and Outer Space Treaty, and make any future agreements to restrain the growth of nuclear weapons more difficult to achieve.

Nuclear "superiority" loses its meaning when the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. both possess far more nuclear weapons than the number required to destroy one another in all circumstances.

This Monitor features a status report on all U.S. nuclear weapons programs, an inventory of the U.S. nuclear stockpile, and information on locations of nuclear weapons in the U.S.

President Reagan has announced his hopes for reaching agreements with the Soviet Union on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe and in newly revived negotiations on strategic weapons (START talks). Both the United States and the Soviet Union have recently stepped up their propaganda campaigns to sway public opinion. Whether any practical achievements will flow from the war of words remains to be seen. What is already clear is that President Reagan has approved the most ambitious build-up of nuclear weaponry in U.S. history. The danger of nuclear war is increasing, despite attempts to revive confidence in negotiations.

President Reagan and his advisors appear to have psychologically declared war on the Soviet Union. Some officials believe the U.S. is in a "pre-war" situation and that there is a good chance of nuclear war with the Soviets. They want to prepare our country to fight and win this approaching nuclear war.

This dramatic, if not apocalyptic, presumption is what underlies the new nuclear weapons program of the Reagan Administration. It is an attempt to acquire a full-fledged nuclear war-fighting capability. As Frank Carlucci, Deputy Secretary of Defense, has admitted, "that is a very large order." It is a very expensive and very dangerous order as well.

The Reagan Administration is planning a major expansion of U.S. nuclear forces over the next six years. The programs involve land, sea and air-based missiles, new bombers, space weaponry and missile defense systems, among others. The implied purpose of this $222 Billion effort is to gain nuclear "superiority" over the Soviet Union. The new nuclear weapons program, coupled with programs already funded and under development, will result in 17,000 new nuclear weapons over the next decade.

Contributing to the dangers of deploying thousands of new nuclear weapons is an unsettling change of emphasis in U.S. strategic doctrine that may make nuclear war more probable in the coming decades. These changes in doctrine gained much public attention when an outline of Presidential Directive 59 was first leaked to the press in August 1980. PD-59 codified the strategic doctrine known as "countervailing strategy" which evolved during the 1970's. In effect, it expands the capabilities required or demanded of U.S. nuclear forces in a nuclear war and attempts to give the President a wider range of choices.

Emphasis has shifted from conceiving of nuclear weapons as deterrents to how they can be used as war-fighting weapons.

The Reagan Administration appears to be carrying the countervailing strategy one step further. It plans to incorporate both the "limited nuclear options" of the Carter strategy and its own ill-conceived notions of nuclear superiority into the nuclear weapons build-up.

No one in the Administration has bothered to produce a realistic definition of nuclear superiority in an age when both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. have thousands of nuclear weapons and the ability to effectively destroy one another. However, it appears that a major component of such a drive for superiority will be the ability to wage "limited" nuclear war. Through tremendous expenditures for both new nuclear weapons and the systems to deliver them, the Administration intends to build the capacity to fight nuclear wars that range from limited use through a protracted conflict to an all-out attack.

These recent developments in strategy and doctrine also have serious implications for attempts at arms control. So long as our leaders emphasized concepts such as assured destruction or sufficiency, fixed criteria could be arrived at for determining the size and characteristics of U.S. nuclear forces. But war-fighting concepts remove all constraints on the number, variety and complexity of new nuclear weapons and their delivery systems.

This new phase of the arms race is being pushed along by technological advances, which when added to war-fighting doctrine and vast numbers of new nuclear weapons, make their use more plausible. Advances in the technical sophistication of this new generation of weapons support war-fighting concepts that are becoming part of the strategies of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

For example, through advances in propulsion, guidance, and engineering, our intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's) and other nuclear delivery systems are developing the accuracy to destroy small hardened targets such as missile silos and command bunkers. This accuracy, when incorporated into all our delivery systems (cruise missiles, SLBM's, ICBM's, etc.) will give the U.S. a counterforce capability that could soon threaten Soviet nuclear forces.

Our leadership, both civilian and military, have consistently emphasized that we seek only a nuclear force capable of deterring our opponents. Yet, when first strike capabilities and threats are weighed what really matters is how the other side views our intentions.

U.S. nuclear forces long ago surpassed the criteria of "minimum deterrence" or "assured destruction." The U.S. public is being mistakenly led to believe that the continued expansion of our nuclear forces enhances deterrence. In fact, if it contributes to Soviet insecurities about the safety of their own nuclear retaliatory forces it may be doing just the opposite.

Several other features of the Reagan nuclear weapons programs are particularly troubling. The exemption of strategic programs from budgetary restraint will cause an imbalance in our armed forces, depriving much needed funds from conventional forces. Second, there is no evidence that the Reagan Administration has seriously incorporated a role for arms control into its national security plans.

In October 1980, candidate Ronald Reagan stated that there was, indeed, an ongoing nuclear arms race, but that only the Soviet Union was participating. This is simply not true. The U.S. is not now nor ever has been "strategically inferior" to the Soviet Union. As the survey below of U.S. nuclear weapons programs demonstrates, the enhancement and enlargement of U.S. nuclear forces has continued unabated throughout the 1970's and will be accelerated in the 1980's.

The Reagan Administration's effort to prepare to fight a nuclear war is a dangerous and futile objective that must be reconsidered. The record of the arms race shows that each advance will be met by the other side, probably sooner than later, and that neither nation can gain a significant advantage.

Nuclear weapons should serve only one purpose, to deter war. The only true test for the sufficiency of our nuclear forces is that they be able to meet any Soviet attack in a way that denies the Soviets an advantage for having made the attack. Our present capability to deliver over 12,000 nuclear weapons on the Soviet Union more than meets this test of sufficiency.

UNITED STATES–U.S.S.R. STRATEGIC NUCLEAR FORCES

[September 1983]

	United States	U.S.S.R.
Total weapons:		
On ICBM's	[1] 2,145	[4] 5,578
On SLBM's	[2] 5,152	[5] 1,874
On long-range bombers	[3] 2,876	[6] (200) 290
Total	10,173	(7,942) 7,742
Total launchers:		
ICBM's	[1] 1,045	[4] 1,398
SLBM's	[2] 568	[5] 944
Long-range bombers	[3] 334	[6] [7] 145
Total	1,947	(2,487) 2,487

[1] U.S. ICBM levels include 45 Titan II, 450 Minuteman II and 1,650 (550 × 3 MIRV) Minuteman III weapons. Titan retirements began in October 1982 and will continue at a rate of one every 30–45 days until September 1987.

[2] There are 34 submarines which carry ballistic missiles: 19 carry 16 Poseidon C–3 missiles each with an average of 10 weapons per missile; 12 carry 16 Trident I C–4 missiles each with an average of 8 weapons per missile; and three Trident submarines carry 24 Trident I C–4 missiles each with an average of 8 weapons per missile. Five Polaris submarines (80 missiles) are excluded as they are designated as attack submarines. Five of the Polaris submarines have been or are in the process of being dismantled.

[3] U.S. bomber levels include 298 B–52 and 63 FB–111 bombers in the active inventory, of which 274 B–52's and 60 FB–111's are operational. Three squadrons of B–52D's (44 aircraft) were ritired in 1982 and the remaining 35 will be retired by October 1, 1983. There are approximately 2,636 nuclear weapons for the B–52's (1,232 gravity bombs, 1,020 SRAM's and 384 ALCM's). The first B–52G squadron carrying 12 external ALCM's on each of 16 planes went on alert in December 1982 at Griffiss AFB in Rome, New York. The second squadron at Wurtsmith AFB, Oscoda, Michigan was ready in the spring of 1983. Each FB–111 average weapon loading is two SRAM's and two gravity bombs for a total of 240 weapons. U.S. strategic weapons ready for immediate launch against the U.S.S.R. number approximately 5,900. These include all those on ICBM's, 55 percent of those on Lafayette-class and 65 percent of those on *Ohio*-class submarines and 30 percent of those on bombers.

[4] Some estimates range as high as 5,900–6,000 which assumes full MIRVing. An approximate weapons loading for ICBM's would be:

[5] Soviet SLBM levels include 25 operational Yankee-class and 36 Delta-class modern submarines as well as 1 Golf-class (with 6 missiles) and 5 Hotel-class (with 18 missiles). One Typhoon submarine is now in service. A second is undergoing sea trials. An approximate loading would be:

[6] Soviet bomber levels include 100 TU–95 "Bear" type, 45 M-type "Bison" and 100 "Backfire" aircraft deployed with Long Range Aviation. Assumes two weapons per aircraft, either bombs or air-to-surface missiles.

[7] 100 Backfire.

	Missiles	Nuclear weapons
SS–11 (X 1)	550	550
SS–13 (X 1)	60	60
SS–17 (X 1)	20	20
SS–17 (X 4 MIRV)	130	520
SS–18 (X 1)	28	28
SS–18 (X 8 MIRV)	115	920
SS–18 (X 10 MIRV)	165	1,650
SS–19 (X 1)	30	30
SS–19 (X 6 MIRV)	300	1,800
Total	1,398	5,578

	Missiles	Nuclear weapons
SS–N–5 (X 1)	12	12
SS–N–6 (X 1)	384	384
SS–N–8 (X 1)	292	292
SS–N–17 (X 1)	12	12
SS–N–18 (X 3 MIRV)	100	300
SS–N–18 (X 7 MIRV)	100	700
SS–N–18 (X 1)	24	24
SS–N–20 (X 6-9 MIRV)	20	150
Total	944	1,874

Defense Monitor in Brief

Nuclear weapons and preparations for nuclear war are very expensive.

Under present plans, the Reagan Administration will spend $450 Billion in the next six years preparing for nuclear war. This is approximately 22 percent of all military spending and considerably higher than the 10 to 15 percent usually cited by Administration officials.

In the next decade the U.S. will build about 17,000 new nuclear weapons.

The costs merely to develop and buy fifteen major nuclear weapon systems now in production or being planned for the 1980's and early 1990's are $335-$400 Billion. Operating costs will add to the total.

Spending on nuclear weapons has more than doubled since Ronald Reagan became president.

Spending on nuclear weapons is going up much faster than overall military spending. Between fiscal 1983 and fiscal 1984 funding for nuclear weapons will increase 25 percent.

If it is the national policy of the U.S. to prepare to fight and win a nuclear war, the Reagan military budget is appropriate. If the American people support arms reductions instead of a nuclear buildup, hundreds of Billions of dollars are being wasted.

After its initial years in office the Reagan Administration has realized that its talk about fighting and prevailing in a nuclear war has frightened the American and European people and mobilized resistance to U.S. policies. The Administration is now retreating from inflammatory warfighting talk to more soothing language. This new rhetorical approach comes through in Department of Defense (DOD) reports and speeches and in appearances before Congressional committees.

This shift in rhetoric would be more reassuring if there were corresponding changes in the budget for nuclear weapons. Nothing has changed and ever larger amounts are proposed. Over the next ten years the composition of the U.S. nuclear arsenal will undergo dramatic quantitative and qualitative changes. Approximately 17,000 new nuclear weapons will be fabricated for use by U.S. land, sea, and air forces. During this same period plans call for the retirement of 6,000 older weapons. If our NATO allies agree to accept new 8-inch and 155mm neutron artillery shells an additional 5,000 could also be retired. Many of the weapons being sought and the reasons given for their necessity fit a nuclear war-fighting strategy.

Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger has minimized the nuclear buildup by pointing to its relatively modest cost when compared to the cost for non-nuclear forces. Mr. Weinberger says that 85 percent of the military budget pays for non-nuclear forces, claiming only 15 percent or less goes for nuclear forces. The Department of Defense regularly understates both the real and relative costs of nuclear forces and obscures the increases.

What percentage of military spending goes for nuclear forces? Some research and purchase costs for certain weapons are well known. For instance, one B-1B bomber will cost between $300 and $400 million. Less well known but significant are associated expenses—about $5 million a year per plane for maintenance, training and other costs. These other costs must be computed for our present forces as well. For example, it costs as much as $7,500 an hour to operate a B-52 bomber; annual operating cost for the entire B-52 force is $1.9 Billion.

For Fiscal Year 1984 U.S. costs for preparations for nuclear war will be approximately $65 Billion. For the six year period fiscal year 1983-88 the cost will be over $450 Billion. This is approximately 22 to 23 percent of the military budget (see chart p. 3). The costs merely to develop and buy fifteen major nuclear weapons systems now in production or being planned for the 1980's and early 1990's are $335-$400 Billion (see chart p. 9). The costs for fiscal year 1984 are $29 Billion. Operating costs will add to the total. The increases for nuclear war preparations are dramatic, rising over 200 percent from 1980 to 1988.

As we debate the best allocation of our national resources, we should have a solid understanding of the total costs of our nuclear forces. This issue of The Defense Monitor helps bring these costs into perspective, evaluates the scope of the nuclear buildup, and assesses the need for certain programs.

THE MILITARY BUDGET

The military budget is a complicated document. Concealing from the Congress and the public almost as much as it reveals, it intimidates the casual reader and by its size alone almost defies understanding.

The $280.5 Billion in military funding Mr. Reagan wants this year is nearly double the $146 Billion Mr. Carter requested in 1980. No nation in the world, save the Soviet Union, has an entire governmental budget larger than the Pentagon's. The U.S. Army's budget alone is approximately the same as the whole budget of Italy. The U.S. Navy's budget is larger than the governmental budgets of all twelve South American nations combined. The U.S. Air Force budget exceeds that of all forty-six African governments combined.

It will be difficult to spend wisely the $280.5 Billion Mr. Reagan has requested this year. If approved by Congress the Pentagon will be required to spend $786 million a day, $32 million an hour, $533,000 a minute.

Using Mr. Reagan's own projections, by 1986 the Pentagon will be spending nearly $1 Billion a day, $41 million an hour, $700,000 a minute. A Billion dollars would represent a stack of one dollar bills 67 miles high. By fiscal year 1989 Mr. Reagan's projections soar to $1.3 Billion a day. Prior to the Reagan buildup the Pentagon spent at an average rate of $257 million a day during the 1970's, $156 million a day during the 1960's, and $106 million a day during the 1950's. Over the coming year the Pentagon will spend more than it did at any time during the Vietnam War (in constant dollars).

The budget conceals by obscuring how much is spent on nuclear forces, directly and indirectly. More specifically what is lacking is a true accounting of the scope and cost of the Reagan nuclear buildup. When Reagan announced the "strategic" part of his buildup in October 1981 he stated the six year costs would be $180 Billion. While this is a sizable sum it is by no means the total figure. Translated into current dollars the figure was actually $222 Billion. Excluded were six years of Department of Energy (DOE) costs to produce the warheads and bombs, as well as the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) civil defense and federal preparedness programs. Also excluded were the majority of costs for such weapons as the "stealth" bomber and Trident II missile which are to be bought later in the decade.

To get a better grasp of what is spent on nuclear forces, we must understand the federal budget in general and the military budget in particular. The federal budget is divided into 13 categories, overseen by various congressional committees which produce 13 separate appropriation bills each year. Monies from five bills have military purposes, and when combined by the Office of Management and Budget as the National Defense Budget, add up to the total dollars to be spent on the military. Four of the bills have monies in them that directly or indirectly support nuclear forces. These bills are those for the Department of Defense, Military Construction, Energy and Water Development (DOE), and Housing and Urban Development (FEMA). Minor amounts—about $75 million—are included in the Treasury, Postal Service and the General Government Appropriation Bill for maintaining a reserve of special metals and other items. Following is a breakdown of the spending in each bill for nuclear forces.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Generally, the Department of Defense and the Military Construction bills combined are considered the Pentagon's budget. When presented to Congress the military requests are broken down in two basic ways. The most common is by eight appropriation titles (Procurement, Research and Development, Operations and Maintenance, Personnel, etc.). The second way is by ten Major or Mission Programs (Strategic Forces, General Purpose Forces, Intelligence and Communications, etc.). The best estimate is that 100 percent of the Strategic Forces category, 5 percent of the General Purpose, 40 percent of the Intelligence and Communication, 30 percent of the Research and Development and 10 percent of all other mission programs are devoted to nuclear weapons. The DOD share of the military budget for nuclear forces is $58 Billion for fiscal year 1984 and $414 Billion for six years (see chart above). Of course, any across the board breakdown has its problems. Dual-use aircraft such as the F-16 carry conventional and nuclear bombs. Reconnaissance satellites observe Red Army Troops as well as ICBM silos. Communication systems could transmit orders to tank commanders or for the firing of nuclear weapons.●

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I am again reintroducing legislation to authorize tax-deductible contributions to the United Nations and other specialized agencies of which the United States is a member.

The United Nations has recurring problems in its efforts to stay financially solvent—efforts which would be substantially alleviated if American foundations and individual taxpayers were permitted to make tax deductible contributions to the United Nations and its agencies. At the present time, deductions for contributions of this sort are not permitted under the Internal Revenue Code.

Even the Reagan administration recognizes the continuing need for the United Nations as a world forum for the peaceful resolution of international problems. While the U.N. does indeed need some basic reforms, it is nevertheless performing many important and some indispensible functions. These include not only many crucial international functions but providing a forum for defusing the wider tensions between the East and West.

One way of retaining the good will of the developing nations of the world, and of impressing upon them the sincerity of our commitment toward the peaceful resolution of global problems, is to permit American foundations and citizens to make tax-deductible contributions to the U.N. As a practical matter, most of the contributions are likely to come from foundations, which are already tax-exempt, so the revenue impact of my bill would be negligible. The potential benefits would, in my judgment, far outweight the minor costs associated with my bill.

The text of the bill and a list of agencies which would be eligible for tax-deductible contributions follow:

I. U.N. AGENCIES

U.N. Headquarters.

U.N. Office at Geneva.

Economic Commission for Europe (ECE).

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP).

Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA).

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

World Food Council (WFC).

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF).

United Nations Development Program (UNDP).

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR).

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA).

United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD).

II. SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

United Nations Development Organization (UNIDO).

International Labour Organization (ILO).

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

World Health Organization (WHO).

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD).

International Finance Corporation (IFC).

International Development Association (IDA).

International Monetary Fund (IMF).

International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

Universal Postal Union (UPU).

International Telecommunication Union (ITU).

World Meterological Organization (WMO).

Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO).

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO).

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). (This was established "under the aegis of the United Nations"; it reports annually to the general assembly.)

H.R. —

(A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for any contribution, bequest, or gift to the United Nations)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (c) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining charitable contribution) is amended by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) The United Nations or an instrumentality or agency thereof of which the United States is a member, but only if the contribution or gift is to be used exclusively for the purposes for which such organization is established."

(b) Section 170(b)(1)(A) of such Code (relating to percentage limitations for individuals) is amended by striking out "or" at the end of clause (vii), by inserting "or" at the end of clause (viii), and by inserting after clause (viii) the following new clause:

"(ix) an organization referred to in subsection (c)(6),".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2055(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses) is amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (3), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) to or for the use of the United Nations or an instrumentality or agency thereof of which the United States is a member, but only if the contribution or gift is to be used exclusively for the purposes for which such organization is established."

(b) Section 2006(a)(2)(A) of such code (relating to transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses) is amended by striking out "or" at the end of the clause (ii), by striking out the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

"(iv) to or for the use of the United Nations or an instrumentality or agency thereof of which the United States is a member, but only if the contribution or gift is to be used exclusively for the purpose for which such organization is established."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 2522 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to charitable and similar gifts) is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) the United Nations or an instrumentality or agency thereof of which the United States is a member, but only if the contribution or gift is to be used exclusively for the purposes for which such organization is established."

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 2522 is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) The United Nations or an instrumentality or agency thereof of which the United States is a member, but only if the contribution or gift is to be used exclusively for the purposes for which such organization is established."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to any gift or contribution payment of which is made after the date of the enactment of this Act, in taxable years ending after such date. The amendments made by section 2 of this Act shall apply with respect to the estates of decedents dying after such date. The amendments made by section 2 of this Act shall apply with respect to gifts and transfers made after such date.●

BUDGET COMMITTEE STAFF REPORT ON FISCAL YEAR 1985 BUDGET

HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on a recent statement by one of our colleagues, the gentleman from New York, Mr. KEMP.

Mr. KEMP's statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 29, 1984, was a very curious one. He seemed to question the ethics of the House Budget Committee in printing a staff document which criticized President Reagan's 1985 budget because of its large deficits.

Some conservatives have started saying they no longer "worship at the shrine of a balanced budget." Well, as a fellow conservative, I must confess that I still find the oldtime religion good enough for me. So does Chairman JIM JONES of the Budget Committee. JIM has been against big deficit not only during this administration but during previous ones as well.

If JACK KEMP disagrees with JIM JONES on this subject, that is certainly his privilege. But Mr. KEMP should be aware that he is also disagreeing with quite a few people who are not on the House Budget Committee payroll—people like David Stockman, Director of OMB; Dr. Martin Feldstein, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and Paul Volcker, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. These men have said, and said loudly, that deficits are dangerous.

Mr. KEMP complains that the staff analysis does not make clear his disagreement with it. But this document has been prepared annually since the Carter administration, and the notices and disclaimers have remained the same. Mr. KEMP has been on the Budget Committee 3 years, and has not seemed to have a complaint until now.

Chaiman JONES sent a letter inviting Mr. KEMP to identify substantive errors, or discuss the matter with him. Maybe that would have been a better way to handle things than putting a protest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Anyone is free to agree or disagree with the specifics of the Budget Committee analysis. But the central problem of deficits is something that worries liberals and conservatives alike. It is not a problem that lends itself to partisan solution. All of us will have to go beyond traditional partisan politics if we are going to reduce the Federal deficit. That is the only way we will get Government to start living within its means again.●

NATIONAL DAY OF THE SEAL

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, March 1 has come to be recognized as National Day of the Seal. This commemorative day was first established to celebrate the birth of the harp seal off the coast of Newfoundland and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and to bring attention to the annual killing of these animals for their pelts within the first 2 months of their lives. Today is again a day of celebration, not only for the birth of this year's pups but also for their survival. At this time last year the European Economic Community, through the efforts of many House Members and citizens around the world, imposed a 2-year ban on the importation of products from baby harp seals. As a result, the estimated harvest of harp seals this year is expected to be only one-third the historical average.

This year's observance of National Day of the Seal is especially fitting as the United States will soon be joining its partners in the Interim Convention on the Conservation of the North Pacific Fur Seal to renegotiate the terms of their treaty on the harvest of fur seals in Alaska. The North Pacific fur seal in recent years has experienced an 8 percent yearly decline in population. The causes of this decline are not fully known but it has been found that as many as 50,000 fur seals are lost each year to entanglement in discarded fishing nets and other ocean debris.

Once again, we are seeing the effects of our sometimes careless use of the ocean on innocent sea animals.

The recent decline in the fur seal population and evidence that shows an increasing number of other marine mammals, sea birds, sea turtles, and noncommercial fish being killed due to entanglement, underlines the fact that we cannot disregard the ocean environment in the pursuit of our endeavors. From commerical fishing to offshore oil and gas exploration, we can coexist with the ocean's inhabitants but it requires careful and responsible regard to the ocean ecosystem.

In this year of renegotiation of the Interim Convention on the North Pacific Fur Seal and reauthorization of the Marine Mammal Protection Act, which will come before the House, it is only right that we celebrate National Day of the Seal. This is a day to recognize not only the seals, but all marine animals.●

VILLA—DOG HERO OF YEAR

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the life-saving actions of the bravest dog in America. Yesterday, Villa, a black Newfoundland owned by Mrs. Lynda Veit of Villas, N.J., was named the Ken-L-Ration Dog Hero of the Year for 1983 for her selfless courage in rescuing a young girl lost in a blizzard last February. Barbara Bush, wife of Vice President GEORGE BUSH, bestowed the award upon Villa in a unique ceremony at the Vice President's mansion.

More than 300 dogs entered the competition, which marks the 30th anniversary of this annual recognition of man's best friend. To qualify, a dog must have demonstrated outstanding bravery, loyalty, and intelligence by performing acts leading to the saving of life or property.

Villa's rescue of her 11-year-old neighbor, Andrea Anderson, last February undoubtedly fits those criteria. During a severe blizzard, 60-mile per-hour winds drove Andrea into a large snowdrift. Disoriented, blinded by the blowing snow, and unable to pull herself out, she desperately began to scream for help.

Hearing Andrea's cries, the 1-year-old Villa leaped over the 5-foot fence surrounding her run. Villa ran to the snowbound girl, licked her face reassuringly and circled Andrea to clear the snow entrapping her. The dog positioned herself so that Andrea could grasp her and be pulled out of the snowbank.

Once Andrea was free, Villa continued to clear a path for the girl through the blinding snow. A short while later, Andrea's mother found her daughter holding onto the dog's neck outside the front door of the home.

Villa joins the ranks of 29 other courageous canines who have been awarded the title "Dog Hero of the Year" since the program was initiated in 1954. Together these dogs represent 19 States and are credited with saving the lives of more than 600 people and animals. Their heroic feats have averted almost every type of tragedy.

I think it is appropriate that Congress recognize the courage and devotion of Villa and her colleagues. Their brave actions prove that, despite enormous societal changes during the past 30 years, the special relationship between humans and dogs remains untouched.

Therefore, in appreciation of Villa and the countless other dogs who have exhibited true loyalty and devotion by risking their own lives to save others, I ask you to join me in extending warmest congratulations to Villa and her owner, Lynda Veit.●

THE PERSECUTION OF THE BAHA'IS IN IRAN

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues attention to a recent editorial which appeared in the New York Times.

As the editorial points out, the Baha'is in Iran are innocent victims of the terrorism of the Khomeini regime. Historically the Baha'i community in Iran has suffered constant persecution and harassment. Following a decree issued last spring by the Iranian attorney general, all Baha'i religious activity was effectively banned. This edict provides the legal foundation on which all members of the Baha'i faith could be charged with crimes. In fact, over 550 Baha'is are currently languishing in Iranian prisons.

I urge my colleagues to raise their voices in protest against the unjustified persecution of the Baha'is and to add their names as cosponsors to House Joint Resolution 226 which declares that Congress holds the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all its citizens, including the Baha'is and requests President Reagan to continue his efforts on behalf of the Baha'is.

THE DARKNESS CALLED IRAN

Some of our most poignant letters are from Wilmette, Ill., headquarters of the Bahai faith. They bear the names of men, women and children killed in Iran for "crimes against God." They recount a campaign to eliminate Iran's largest religious minority, 350,000 Bahais, whose nonviolent faith had its origins in Islam a century ago. They beg for concern, especially at the United Nations.

But the U.N. has no time for Iran's crimes. A few months ago, an Iranian exile gave delegates a list of 7,746 names, most of them leftists slain by the Ayatollah's firing squads. No one would sponsor a resolution. Third-world nations won't turn on a nonaligned partner; Europeans, West and East, find it expedient to avoid quarrels with Iran.

President Reagan has done the minimum by speaking out for the Bahais. Congress has passed a resolution. What speaks louder is the silence among so many who used to denounce the Shah as a tyrant and pleaded for patience when Ayatollah Khomeini replaced him five years ago.

At that time, an article on the opposite page castigated the press for depicting the Ayatollah as a fanatic. Princeton's Prof. Richard Falk wrote that this "seems certainly and happily false." Indeed, the Ayatollah "may yet provide us with a desperately needed model of humane governance for a third-world country."

Iran is a dark place. Its economy is a shambles, its youth die in a holy war against Iraq. Its executioners are overworked, its despotic mullahs are ignorant of the world. But not too loud, please. Voices that might sway Iran—on the left and among the nonaligned—need to become audible.●

REAFFIRMING THE BROAD STRENGTH OF TITLE IX

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday's Supreme Court decision in Grove City against Bell was a grave setback for the equal educational opportunity for girls and women. In spite of Congress' attempts to clarify to the Supreme Court and to the Nation last November that title IX was meant to outlaw sex discrimination in any educational institution receiving taxpayer support, the Supreme Court turned a deaf ear. Unless we act again to clarify the broad scope of title IX, which we reaffirmed last November by a vote of

414 to 8, we can expect no uniformity in our efforts to insure equal educational opportunity in America.

Moreover, we must not think of Tuesday's decision as one which is merely a setback confined to our schools. By denying equal educational opportunity to our children, we are limiting their future as adults. In short, equal educational opportunity is the necessary precedent for equal opportunity in the labor market. Without it, women can look at Sally Ride's historic trip to the new frontier as just a one-time shot.

My honorable colleague, CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER, has introduced legislation today to insure that title IX will continue to be the effective guarantee of equal educational opportunity that we have always intended. I am pleased to cosponsor this legislation, and I urge each of you to join me in support of this bill.●

PENTAGON VETOES SENATE TESTIMONY ON DEFENSE SPENDING

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, there was an incredible development which occurred this morning during hearings before the U.S. Senate Committee on Government Affairs. I believe all of the Members of this Chamber should take note of the significance of this event.

Senator ROTH convened hearings today as part of an ongoing series of hearings he has held to investigate problems in the Pentagon's defense procurement procedures. At this session, the Senate committee was to have received testimony from various witnesses on the subject of defense contracting regarding the inability of the current systems at the Pentagon and the Defense Contract Audit Agency to prevent overcharging by defense contractors.

The leadoff witness to the committee was supposed to be Mr. A. Ernest Fitzgerald, Deputy of Management Systems with the Air Force. Mr. Fitzgerald is a Pentagon employee who has, during his career, blown the whistle on waste and abuse in defense contracting.

Just this past September, Mr. Fitzgerald provided my Subcommittee on Oversight and Renegotiation a very insightful presentation on defense procurement which included an explanation of why the current system is not sufficient to prevent contractors from reaping huge and excess profits at the expense of the taxpayers. Today, however, Mr. Fitzgerald was prevented by his superiors at the Pentagon from giving similar testimony to the Senate committee.

This decision not only is surprising but would seem inconsistent with recent efforts by the President to eradicate waste and abuse in Government spending. For this reason, I find today's development particularly disturbing and worthy of consideration by the members of this body.

Three months ago, after months of arduous work, the President's private sector survey on cost control, better known as the Grace commission, released its voluminous report of proposals to reduce wasteful expenditures at every level of the Federal structure. Twelve task forces under the Commission examined national defense programs and made 112 recommendations that could potentially save taxpayer's $94 billion over a 3-year period in the defense area alone.

Today, however, in a committee which is chaired by a very dedicated Senator from the President's own party, the Secretary of Defense apparently felt that the committee was not entitled to current information about procurement procedures. Without explanation, the Pentagon prevented the Senate from benefiting from Mr. Fitzgerald's experience.

The President's statements regarding the curtailment of waste and abuse in Federal spending, combined with the Grace Commission recommendations indicates, that this administration is serious about reducing needless spending. Yet Pentagon officials do not appear to have gotten the message. Today, they gagged a very valuable source of information on this subject. The inconsistency is perplexing, but the ramifications are far more disturbing.

Congress is responsible for the manner in which the taxpayers' dollars are spent. Yet, wasteful spending cannot be eliminated unless information concerning current procurement procedures is available for examination. Nowhere is this more true than in the area of defense contracting, where evidence indicates that profits are at alltime highs, and the Pentagon is getting less for the dollars they spend.

I commend Senator ROTH for his efforts. He has said he will press forward, and will subpena the Pentagon to come forth with information, if necessary.

This session, in the Oversight and Renegotiation Subcommittee, I will continue to look into wasteful defense spending that only benefits defense contractors. At the end of these hearings, I will produce legislation to give the American people an effective accounting procedure over defense spending and a recapture mechanism to correct the instances of profiteering.●

NATIONAL DAY OF THE SEAL

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the birthday of thousands of baby harp seals on ice floes of the Atlantic in observing March 1 as the National Day of the Seal. As someone who has fought to protect this precious and vulnerable creature from the unnecessary brutal slaughter to which it is often subjected, I am pround to take part in commemorating this important day.

I must note that it is not only the harp seal which has inspired so much public concern that needs the help of humane and conservationist policy makers. The North Pacific fur seal has been hunted using U.S. taxpayers' dollars for decades. This year an estimated 20,000 fur seals will die under the hunter's club in Alaska, in spite of a disturbing decline in their population. This flies in the face of the widespread public support for protection of marine mammals. I sincerely hope that all efforts can be made within the administration to minimize and finally eliminate this unfortunate practice which is so inconsistent with U.S. sentiment and economic good sense.

I want to take this opportunity to laud the efforts of the many environmental and animal welfare organizations fighting to protect seals—of whatever species. I fully support continued work to restore this valuable part of the marine ecosystem to its rightful place.●

THE 106TH ANNIVERSARY OF BULGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, March 3 marks the 106th anniversary of Bulgarian independence. I want to take this time to recognize the bravery and strength of the Bulgarian people in their steadfast pursuit of freedom and independence.

On this historic occasion in 1878, after five centuries of domination by the Ottoman Empire, and following the tragic failure of the 1876 revolt that cost the lives of 15,000 of their people, the Bulgarians succeeded in gaining autonomy from the Turks. For the next 66 years, the Bulgarians enjoyed a period of great hope and confidence, as they were able to freely develop their own culture and heritage.

These years of independence and liberty, however, were to come to an abrupt halt at the end of World War II. In September 1944, the Soviet Union invaded this small Balkan State and made her a part of the Soviet sphere. This brutal action was particularly reprehensible as well as incomprehensible to the Bulgarian people, for they were the only Axis Power to refuse to participate in the invasion of Russia. In addition, Bulgaria was the only East European country to prevent the Nazis from exterminating its sizable Jewish population. The invasion was followed by mass arrests and the imposition of a totalitarian government in a pattern that had become all too familiar in Eastern Europe.

The Bulgarians, nevertheless, have refused to abandon their pursuit of freedom and independence. I want to join with the Bulgarian National Front, which will gather in New York this weekend, and with Bulgarians around the world, to pay special recognition to the patriots who have lost their lives in the last 40 years in their struggle for freedom from Communist control. By remembering this important day, I want the Bulgarian people to know that they do not stand alone in their daily struggle for individual and national dignity and freedom.●

TRIBUTE TO HARRY DIEHL

HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the outstanding accomplishments and dedication of one of my constituents—Harry Diehl. His contributions to the education of the young people of Ohio are, without a doubt, commendable.

Over the years, Harry has been a football coach, basketball coach, athletic director, teacher, and bus driver. To the people of my congressional district, however, Harry will be remembered more for his success has a track and field coach during the past 20 years.

In 1964, Harry came to the Ohio Valley and built a track and field squad from scratch. His boys were known throughout the Ohio Valley and the entire State of Ohio as a power to reckoned with. In 20 years, Harry's teams were undefeated in dual track meets 9 consecutive years—1967-76—and 11 years in all.

His teams won an outstanding 68 dual meets in a row. Overall, Harry's career is one to be admired by any sports fan. In his career, his dual track meet record was 111 wins and 19 losses. In 20 years, Harry's record was 129 wins and only 19 losses. In addition, he also sent 66 young men to participate in the Ohio State track meet.

For some, these accomplishments may have been enough—but not for Harry Diehl. His dedication started early. During his college days, Harry was a top-notch athlete at West Virginia University. After leaving college, he joined the U.S. Air Force and became a navigator.

Over the years, Harry has been mayor of Irondale, Ohio, and active in the community. The most important thing about this man is his strong commitment to our youth and his family. Harry turned down many prestigious coaching positions so that his family would not have to be uprooted. This, to me, represents the true spirit of an American.

At the end of the 1983 track season, Harry retired. But I am sure he will continue to play an active role in and around his community. On April 7, Harry will be honored by his friends, family, and community. I am very honored to have Harry Diehl as one of my constituents. His achievements and contributions to his community, State, and Nation are to be commended. I, most certainly, wish him the best and thank him for his service.●

REA BILL IS BAD ECONOMIC POLICY

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 3050 as currently written. This bill, which amounts to a bail-out of the Rural Electrification Administration, will add an estimated $20 billion to the Federal deficit. At a time when America's economic future is threatened by the onerous deficits created by President Reagan's misguided, undisciplined budget programs, we can ill afford to be giving such massive handouts to cooperatives which have made irresponsible investments of public money, or to encourage these cooperatives to make similar unwise investments in the future. I will unfortunately be absent from today's vote on the REA bill, but if present, I would support the Bethune amendment, and oppose final passage of the bill unless so amended.●

A TRIBUTE TO HANS FREY

HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an American success story, one of my constituents, Mr. Hans H. Frey. Hans is the owner of Frey Beer Distributing of Stockton, Calif., where he is a pillar of the community. He has now sold his distributorship and I would like to honor this community leader upon his retirement.

Hans Frey was born in Karlsruhe, Germany, in 1928. In 1950, Hans received a Fulbright scholarship through the State Department under the Institute of International Education. He attended Washington University in St. Louis where he majored in economics and took on a summer job with Anheuser-Busch in St. Louis where he worked for 23 years.

In 1974, Anheuser-Busch held 11 company-owned distributorships, the smallest being in Stockton, Calif. Anheuser-Busch was not interested in keeping the Stockton operation so Hans applied to purchase it and was successful.

When Hans Frey took over in 1974, the company was located in a small warehouse. With three trucks, one panel van and three salesmen, Frey Distributing sold 150,000 cases of beer in 1974.

Ten years and 16 route trucks later, Frey Distributing sells in excess of 2 million cases of beer a year. Three tractors and nine trailers handle the delicate job of hauling the six California-brewed Anheuser-Busch beers to Frey Distributing from the Fairfield brewery.

Sixteen driver/salespeople, four area supervisors, two draught men and two sales managers make up the core of the Frey Distributing sales team. Office and data processing staff, warehouse personnel, along with special projects and community involvement people round out the 50-member sales team. Working together, that team has seen Budweiser become San Joaquin County's No. 1 beer.

Hans Frey and Frey Distributing have taken an active role in supporting charitable organizations like the Muscular Dystrophy Association, the American Cancer Society, Mother's Against Drunk Driving, the annual Bacon Bash Charity Football Game and many more. That active role means more than just monetary contributions, it includes hours of volunteer work done by Hans and many of the employees of Frey Distributing.

One of the many organizations Frey Distributing has been associated with is the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC). Since 1981, Frey has provided a $1,000 college scholarship for young LULAC scholars.

"I came over to this country on a scholarship," Hans said recently. "It changed my life entirely. I have always felt that if I would ever be in a position to reciprocate by offering scholarships to others, that would be one of my greatest ambitions. Stockton and its people have been good to me and I want to give something back," Frey said.

Hans Frey has given a great deal back to both the community of Stockton and to his country. I am proud to be associated with him and to consider him one of my personal friends. I wish him the best of times in his retirement.●

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, DR. SEUSS

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 80th birthday of Theodor Seuss Geisel. While few might recognize that name, there are millions of people throughout the world who know Mr. Geisel by his nom de plume, Dr. Seuss.

I doubt that there is anyone who has been in the presence of children for any length of time who is unaware of the work of Dr. Seuss. As an author and illustrator extraordinaire, Dr. Seuss has taught several generations of children that reading can be fun—and a number of important lessons about life as well. By creating the Grinch, Horton the Elephant, and the Cat in the Hat, Dr. Seuss has established a comic menagerie that has introduced countless children to the joy that can be found between the covers of a book. With his works now translated into almost 20 languages, Dr. Seuss enjoys an international audience and is, I suspect, one of the most widely read authors of all time.

Mr. Speaker, Ted Geisel was raised in my hometown of Springfield, Mass. The people of Springfield have been honored to have some of the areas of their city depicted in certain of the Dr. Seuss stories, and they like to think that the sketches he made of animals at the Forest Park Zoo may have been the genesis of characters like the Lorax and Thidwick the Big-Hearted Moose. We have been proud of his success, thankful for the hours of delight he has brought to children of all ages, and pleased that he came from our midst. I believe that I speak for all the citizens of Springfield in wishing Dr. Seuss a happy birthday and many years of good health and happiness to come.●

WHAT THE PRESIDENT DOES NOT PUBLICIZE

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, in his folksy Oval Office talks to the Nation, the President, is fond of reading letters from various citizens, letters attesting to the good works of his administration, the compassion, the personal sensitivity. As do our colleagues, I receive a lot of mail also, much of it much different from that publicized by the White House.

Recently, I received a letter from a constituent and enclosed was a clipping from the letters to the editor column of a Pennsylvania newspaper. I have since found out that the writer of the letter to the editor sent a copy to the President. It was unanswered. I suspect he never saw it. I could send it to him, but I do not think he would see mine, either.

Perhaps some of our colleagues with better connections to the Oval Office will recognize the importance of the President's being aware of how representative this message is of too much of our Nation, the millions of Americans far removed from the comfortable seclusion of Camp David and the Santa Barbara ranch, far from the gaiety of entertainment celebrities, far from the Presidentially admired captains of industry and lieutenants of government. It represents too much of every congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, with the hope that this message will reach the President, I would like to enter the following letter in the RECORD. As requested, I have omitted the person's names.

The letter follows:

COLD STATISTICS

When President Reagan reads the unemployment figures, what does he see? A number? A statistic? Let me tell him about one man—one part of that cold statistic—my son * * *

Four years ago, when Reagan took office, my son loved life, loved his country, was proud of himself and the work that he did. He served his country during the Vietnam war and received many commendations. He was a handsome man—handsome enough to consider modeling as a career. He had many friends, a good job and hope for his future.

A week ago, * * * took his life.

I should say what was left of his life because 2½ years ago he lost his job. In that 2½ years, he applied for many, many jobs. Each time he was turned down, a little piece of him died. Slowly, day by day, he lost his pride, his self-respect, and finally his will to live.

There is something desperately wrong with a country that can spend billions to buy weapons of destruction all over the world, yet cannot provide jobs for its own people. This country turned its back on my son and millions like him.

The next time you see a statistic, remember my son * * * a proud man, a human being, who took his life needlessly because his country didn't give a damn.●

1984 CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL FOR SOVIET JEWS—THE PLIGHT OF ILYA KATZ

HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate, once again, in the congressional call to conscience vigil for Soviet Jews, yet I deeply regret that the continuing disparaging situation for Soviet Jews makes yet another year of the vigil necessary, and even more crucial than before.

I take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the story of Ilya Katz and his family. Mr. Katz, his wife, two daughters, and his grandson first applied to emigrate to Israel in 1979, but were refused permission on grounds of insufficient kinship.

A lawyer, Ilya Katz has been unable to practice law for the past 5 years, and thus denied the ability to support his family. Both daughters, Marina and Irina, have been trained in the medical profession but are likewise unable to work in their fields due to their desire to emigrate.

Life for the Katz family, like that of thousands of Soviet refusniks, has been difficult. They live with the threat of persecution, without the means to adequately support themselves.

As we usher in new Soviet leadership, let us attack this problem with renewed zest. Let us implore Soviet President Chernenko to look anew at the plight of Soviet Jews and the value of respecting human rights. We must show the Soviet leadership that we will not forget the plight of the Katz family and others like them.●

THE UNITED STATES IS THE ARMS MERCHANT OF THE WORLD

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration is once again renewing its futile—even dangerous—policy of keeping all sides armed in the Middle East. The President has not yet learned that an ally is an ally only as long as we maintain our end of the bargain.

The administration's intent to sell Stinger antiaircraft missiles and launchers to Jordan and Saudi Arabia flies in the face of our spoken commitment to the security of Israel. These missiles could easily be used against American-made Israel planes in the event of another Arab confrontation with Israel. In addition, the small size of the Stinger makes it an ideal terrorist weapon—not an unlikely scenario given the Palestinian presence in the Jordanian Army.

A recent conversation I had in Israel with an Israel pilot presented in dramatic terms the foolishness of playing to all sides in the Middle East. While walking through an Israel air hangar, I talked with the pilot about his American-made F-14 plane. He spoke about the capabilities of the plane and the various improvements the Israelis make to it which vastly improve its performance in combat. I asked him if the American military heeds their suggestions and modifies the aircraft accordingly. Much to my surprise, he said the Israel improvements are kept secret. "We used to tell you about the performance of the plane and how to improve it," he said, "but not any more. Now we know that you very well might turn around and sell a better plane to one of our enemies."

We need to develop a more consistent policy in the Middle East. Our current policy of appeasement to all parties is producing a region of well-armed countries, none of whom trust us as a reliable ally.●

NATIONAL VOCATIONAL TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. WAYNE DOWDY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to call to the attention of my colleagues the accomplishments of one of my constituents, Michael Hataway, an outstanding commercial design teacher and chairman of the graphics communications department at Hinds Junior College district in Raymond, Miss.

Mr. Hataway was recently selected as National Vocational Teacher of the Year by the American Vocational Association. This award is given to an outstanding vocation education teacher who has developed exceptional classroom programs in his/her curriculum. The award was announced by the American Vocational Association (AVA), the 50,000 member professional association of vocational teachers, directors, supervisors, guidance counselors, and others at the AVA convention in Anaheim, Calif., on December 2.

A teacher for 15 years, Mr. Hataway has prepared students to enter graphic arts and art-related careers. He is actively involved as an adviser and helped organize the Hinds Junior College chapter of the Vocational Industrial Club of America (VICA).

Mr. Hataway's efforts have made it possible for students to receive advanced training from local industry. Scholarships for students are also awarded by the greater Jackson Ad Club and the Mississippi Association of Advertising Agencies. They also have work place experience through cooperative programs and design and production work for local community organizations.

Actively involved in community organizations in Jackson, Miss., Mr. Hataway has received recognition for his service. In 1982, the commercial design and advertising program that he directs was selected as the outstanding postsecondary program of the year by the Mississippi Association of Educators.

He has given so much of his time and energy to others and I believe he should be commended for his outstanding contributions to his profession. I know that he will be successful in whatever he undertakes, and I wish him the very best in all his future endeavors.●

BULGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 106th anniversary of Bulgaria's independence, achieved after five centuries under Turkish rule. Today, much to the displeasure of all free men, Bulgaria is not a free country. It is occupied against the will of the majority of its citizens by the Soviet Union. In Bulgaria, as in many other Eastern bloc countries, the Soviets continue to deny individuals the right of free speech and liberties afforded by a democracy.

But the voices of Bulgarian nationalists continue to be heard. For the past four decades, thousands of men and women have died fighting the Communists repressive government. Many have disappeared in the middle of the night never to be seen again. The Soviet Union has also imprisoned political activists in the very same style employed by the Nazis during World War II. To speak out against the government is to risk suicide, or worse, endanger ones family and friends. These Bulgarian patriots have tasted freedom and carry its message into battle with them.

In the United States, the Bulgarian National Front reports on the abuses which take place on a daily basis in Bulgaria. Members of this organization, Bulgarian emigrants who have escaped Soviet oppression, advance the hopes that democracy will return to their homeland.

I would like to commend Dr. Ivan Docheff, the honorary president of the central executive board of the Bulgarian National Front, and Dr. George Paprikoff, president of the central executive board of the New York chapter, as freedom fighters dedicated to organizing Bulgarians all over the world in speaking out for human rights which the Soviet Union has proved to place as a low priority in Bulgaria and other countries as well.

Mr. Speaker, Bulgaria is not unlike Poland, Hungary, or Romania where a large percentage of people living under puppet Soviet Governments reject the principles of communism. As Dr. Docheff said, 40 years of Soviet occupation has not worn thin the spirit of the people and their hopes at restoring a democracy. We must take heart in the goals of these men and speak out against such nations that seek to deny human beings their basic rights of freedom.●

NORMA ERVIN, CONSERVATIONIST, PASSES AWAY

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the loss of a close friend and devoted conservationist, Norma Ervin, who passed away recently at the age of 67. For over 30 years, Norma devoted her life to the protection and preservation of Fire Island, one of this Nation's great natural treasures.

Stretching 32 miles long, Fire Island lies precariously between the south shore of Long Island and the Atlantic Ocean, offering protection to the waters of the Great South Bay and the mainland. Much of this narrow strip of sand and scrub pine makes up Fire Island National Seashore, although 17 thriving communities dot the beach. In spite of our best efforts, though, Fire Island stands in constant danger of misuse through careless planning and devastating erosion by North Atlantic winds and surf.

Through the work of Norma Ervin, Fire Island is better prepared to stand the test of time. For over 30 years, this remarkable woman devoted countless hours to protect the beach she loved. Active in the government of her village, Saltaire, Norma held a variety of official positions, including mayor. She also played an important role in the codification of local zoning ordinances which are vital to the maintenance of the beach's integrity.

I knew Norma, though, mostly through her work as president of the Fire Island Association. Her commitment to the preservation and protection of the beach and its villages and parks was more than inspirational. As head of the Fire Island Association, Norma led the fight for intelligent and sensitive land-use policies for Fire Island. She brought expertise to countless other issues affecting Fire Island, including mosquito control, tax assessment, and shoreline erosion. Her leadership and wisdom will be missed by all who knew her.

The legacy Norma leaves behind is the beach itself. I know on the next visit I make to Fire Island, I will stop and admire the golden stretch of sand opening before me and turn to the sparkling Atlantic and thank Norma Ervin for the work she did to help keep Fire Island so beautiful.●

MADE IN AMERICA SYMBOL

HON. BOBBI FIEDLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an innovative idea two businessmen in Los Angeles pursued.

Last July, Murray Garrett, president of Diener Industries of Chatsworth, and Sheldon Kirshner, president of Anes Auto Security Systems of Marina del Rey, launched a nationwide competition seeking a universal "Made in America" symbol that could be affixed to U.S.-made products.

This campaign was motivated by the belief that employees and manufacturers should have a new sense of pride in the term "Made in America" and should promote it visually with a symbol that consumers see at a glance.

More than 500 entries were submitted from design students at more than 50 universities and art institutes. The winner, Joan Nielsen, is a 22-year-old student at the Art Institute of Seattle. Her simple design which won the $2,000 first place prize is the silhouette of a hand, with the index finger and thumb touching to form the "OK" gesture. Instead of the usual circle, the fingers form a star.

The symbol will be used on Mr. Garrett's and Mr. Kirshner's products and they are offering the symbol to all other producers of American-made products for the cost of a photostatic copy.

With imports rising at an alarming rate, I gratefully commend their efforts.●

TRIBUTE TO MORTON SILBERMAN

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to a man whose leadership will long be remembered by those who were privileged to know him as the president of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee and as an outstanding citizen from my home State of Florida.

I am speaking of Morton Silberman, who passed away February 28, 1984, here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Silberman leaves behind him a long record of involvement in Jewish communal affairs. From 1976 to 1978, he served as president of the Greater Miami Jewish Federation. From 1970 to 1976, he was vice president, and during this time he was the chairman of the Federation's Planning and Budget Committee in 1973, 1975, and 1976, and general chairman of the Combined Jewish Appeal-Israel Emergency Fund Campaign in 1974.

Mr. Silberman was also the founding chairman of the Federation's Community Relations Committee and the founding president of the Jewish Federation of Palm Beach. He was on the board of directors of the Council of Jewish Federations, regional chairman of the United Jewish Appeal and the recipient of the Human Relations Award from the American Jewish Committee.

From 1979 to 1981, Mr. Silberman was vice president of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee and, in May of 1982, he was elected president.

Morton Silberman's dedication to fostering a strong United States-Israeli friendship and his achievements will not be forgotten.●

MR. WORTLEY SALUTES THE THURSDAY MORNING ROUNDTABLE'S 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GEORGE C. WORTLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, 170 years ago, in 1814, Thomas Jefferson wrote "Let us freely hear both sides."

The give and take in this Chamber on the merits and disadvantages of proposed legislation and the dialog on issues and policies affecting our Nation, would, I am convinced, please our third President. Nowhere in the world do the representatives of the people have a better forum.

My constituents in the 27th Congressional District of New York State are similarly fortunate as the result of regularly held, public service forums sponsored by the University College at Syracuse University.

Known as the Thursday Morning Roundtable and skillfully managed by Dean Lee Smith of University College, these forums have become a tradition in the city of Syracuse and the other communities I am privileged to represent.

The roundtable hosts prominent national, State, and local speakers who inform our civic leaders and citizens. Participants exchange views on timely issues and other matters. As a result, the knowledge of guests, attendees and the central New York public is enriched.

On March 29, the roundtable will observe its 20th year of public service programs. The two decades will be commemorated at a dinner dance at the Hotel Syracuse and by appropriate ceremonies.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to share this event with my colleagues.

To Dean Smith and the others who make the roundtable possible, I say "Thanks and well done."●

A RARE AWARD FOR A RARE HUMAN BEING

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1984

● Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, a constituent of mine, Bob Atwater, will be honored for his efforts in rescuing two people from a burning car. Atwater, of New Lenox, Ill., will receive the Boy Scouts' rarest award, the Honor Medal for Lifesaving. This medal, Mr. Speaker, was 1 of only 28 such medals awarded by the Boy Scouts last year.

Atwater was on his way home from church last September 18, when three cars ahead of him collided in a violent accident. Two of the vehicles immediately burst into flames. Atwater stopped his car, ran to a burning station wagon, and pulled the injured driver free of the flames. He then crawled into the same car and tried, at first unsuccessfully, to free the passenger, who was pinned against the dashboard.

Despite the explosion of the vehicle in front of the station wagon, Atwater and two other passersby unloaded the rear of the wagon, forced the front seat back, and were then able to remove the injured young man.

Mr. Speaker, the bravery and courage displayed by Bob Atwater on that September day is truly remarkable. As his Congressman, I am exceedingly proud of him and wish to congratulate him for receiving this most esteemed award.●