

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

UNITED STATES-MEXICAN
RELATIONS

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor has been running a four-part series on Mexico this week by reporter Dennis Volman. I am inserting in the RECORD part three of that series.

From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 30, 1985]

GROWING UNEASE IN RELATIONS WITH US
(By Dennis Volman)

MEXICO CITY.—Carlos, a successful young Mexican painter, explains the anti-Americanism felt by many Mexicans this way:

"Ever since I've been a child we have been told about US invasions and interventions. We have been brought up with it," Carlos says. "One can't deny that among the Mexican population as a whole there is a general feeling of anti-Americanism, and every time the US puts more pressure on Mexico, that sentiment increases."

Today that is precisely the perception—that the Reagan administration is putting increasing pressure on this country.

At the same time, Mexico's economic crisis is making the country increasingly dependent on the United States—a development that adds to the discomfort many Mexicans feel towards their relationship with the US.

Mexicans are aware that US attitudes—governmental and public—toward their country have changed considerably since the late 1970s. Then, Mexico felt the US was more cooperative about issues such as trade and immigration and less likely to interfere in Mexico's relations with Central America.

But the international economic uncertainty of the 1980s has prompted US concern over a variety of issues; immigration, drug traffic, trade relations, potential Mexican instability, and how such instability might affect the US.

ISSUES DIVIDING THE US AND MEXICO

Many prominent US and Mexican academic analysts feel the Reagan administration is translating these concerns into a more conservative, nationalistic, and interventionist approach in Mexico than has been seen in many years. Mexican views on most of these issues are often the antithesis of US views.

Every year 4 to 6 million unemployed Mexicans illegally cross the border to work in the US. For Mexico this represents a crucial escape valve. It lessens otherwise intolerable population pressure and produces a needed influx of dollars, since the migrants send money to their families back home.

The US reaction, however, is more complex. US labor unions denounce US workers' loss of employment, and Congress has passed a series of law attempting to stop illegal immigration. But these laws are difficult to enforce, because the cheap labor provided by illegal immigrants serves the pur-

poses of an important sector of the US economy.

Mexico's relations with Central America particularly concern the US. The US considers left-wing subversion and Soviet maneuvering to be the main problems in Central America. The US says that poverty is at the root of much of the area's political unrest. But it believes that poverty can be overcome with time, money, and the free-enterprise system if only the left-wing subversion is controlled.

Mexico views the key problem in Central America as social injustice, which can be lessened by, among other things, profound social change. Only when social injustice is substantially reduced, Mexican leaders say, can the region become less explosive.

Mexico's ruling party, the Institutional Revolutionary Party (known by its Spanish initials, PRI), has traditionally been more inclined to sympathize with radical Central American revolutionaries than with the conservative oligarchies and the military.

Having experienced its own revolution in 1910, Mexico believes other countries have the right to revolution.

Throughout the '70s, as the Mexican government's policies remained distinctly non-radical at home, the more liberal elements of Mexico's ruling elite were partially mollified by Mexico's increasingly militant foreign policy. This ambiguous situation prompted some cynical observers in the region to state that Mexico promoted revolution in Central America in order to avoid it at home.

Many Mexican analysts stress that divergence on basic issues between the US and Mexico is nothing new.

"There is a large history of issues in which, for basic structural reasons, the interests of both countries are contradictory," says Lorenzo Meyer, a Mexican academic expert on US-Mexican affairs.

"If unchecked, this US desire to more actively shape and manipulate Mexican foreign and domestic policy will become a key source of tension between Mexico and the US in the remainder of this decade and beyond," says Wayne Cornelius, director of the Center for US-Mexican Studies at the University of California in San Diego.

However, "the relationship is not bad [between the US and Mexico]," one Western diplomat says, "It is just going through one of its phases of misunderstanding. Most people in Washington don't understand Mexico and most people in the Mexican government don't understand 'the crazy gringos.'"

"The Mexicans don't really want to have to deal with us. They don't understand [the US] system, which is different from what they know," he says. "If they understood it, they would have a lobby in Congress to make their case. But they have a lot of psychological hang-ups which stem from their history and have to do with excessive national sensitivity and the fear of appearing to approach the US hat in hand. So they don't have any lobbyists, and this holds them back."

US-Mexican relations reached a low point last spring after the murder in Mexico of

US drug enforcement agent Enrique Camarena.

Most Mexicans believed that Washington used the issue of drugs entering the US from Mexico as an excuse to flex its muscles and make clear to Mexico the immense leverage which the US has on that country's economy. Many Mexicans were convinced that Washington was sending their country a message to back down from its Central American policy, which does not line up with US policy.

Also last spring, before Mexico's July midterm congressional and gubernatorial elections, the PRI became increasingly distressed with the US because it feared that the US had a new view of what it wanted in Mexico.

MEXICAN VIEWS OF US AIMS

Mexican leaders believed that, after decades of accepting the Mexican system as it is, the US wanted to change the basic rules of the political game here. Based on their interpretation of actions taken by Washington and what they say as interventionist public statements by the US ambassador to Mexico, John Gavin, Mexicans came to believe the US wanted to change Mexico from a one-party to a two-party state—a change favoring the right-wing National Action Party (PAN) and its conservative allies in the private sector.

But a Western diplomat here denies that this was the US aim. "The idea that Mexico should become a two-party system was being discussed in Washington . . ." this diplomat says. "This, however, was the talk of individuals and did not reflect any real official policy sanctioned by the Reagan administration."

What Mexico sees as deliberate policy, this diplomatic analyst suggests, is simply the reflection of a widespread mood of nationalism and political conservatism in the US.

"Many Americans feel that unless the Mexicans support US-style democracy and the private sector, the US should not help Mexico out," he says.

Since the elections, the main concern has become economic, especially Mexico's repayment of its \$96 billion debt, most of which it owes to the US. The debt issue came to new prominence earlier this year when oil prices fell and a new round of inflation damaged the Mexican economy and its ability to pay back the money owed.

THE UNSPOKEN INFLUENCE

In one way, the most important US influence on Mexico is one that is almost never explicitly stated.

In many ways, the US helps define the basic rules of Mexico's economic and socio-political structure, say some analysts here. Specifically, it limits the ways structure can be altered. When Mexico's leaders consider ways Mexico's economic and political system can be changed to work better, some alternatives must be ruled out because of the US.

After Mexico's economic crisis peaked in 1982, newly elected President Miguel de la Madrid Hurtado decided to ease the situation by encouraging an export-oriented

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

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

economy based on renewed foreign—largely US—investment. Many Mexicans criticize this policy as one that increases dependence on the US without raising the living standards for most of Mexico's population.

If the Mexican economy becomes more open to foreign trade, if trade barriers are lowered, if tariffs fall, critics say the US will benefit. US goods will flood the Mexican market. Many Mexicans fear that the jobs produced by Mexican industries, which export goods to the US will not be balanced by the jobs destroyed by the import of American-made goods.

These critics, many of them within the ruling PRI, want a more radical but non-communist alternative that involves greater economic self-reliance and stricter economic controls to prevent the private sector from shipping its money abroad.

But ultimately, even proponents of this approach doubt that Washington would ever "permit" Mexico to take such a course. They know that the US possesses enough economic leverage to express its displeasure by reducing the Mexican economy to a shambles.

The issue of Mexican private-sector money leaving the country exemplifies how the US limits Mexico's alternatives.

In 1982-83 when Mexico was faced with an economic crisis, José López Portillo, then President, shook private-sector confidence by nationalizing the banking system. Mexico's upper and middle classes sent about \$28 billion in savings and investments abroad, mostly to the US. It would have taken tremendous efforts by both governments to control capital flight from Mexico to the US.

Even if Mexico continues on its present course, some analysts at the San Diego Center for US-Mexican Relations say, excessive US concern with Mexican economic stability and a conservative ideology in Washington might prevent Mexico from taking the kinds of populist measures (wage hikes and more expansionist economic policies) necessary for political stability as it begins recovering from its economic crisis.

These observers expect US opposition to become more intense if the government takes measures that would address long-standing popular demands for fairer income distribution in Mexico. This could lead to a serious situation in the long run, because, as Wayne Cornelius says, "Most independent analysts of modern Mexico concur that this problem [of fairer distribution] must be addressed forthrightly and effectively by future Mexican governments if serious social disorders and militarization of the political system are to be prevented."

MEXICO'S STABILITY

"The US is forgetting where the stability and basic legitimacy of the Mexican political system comes from," says one moderate Mexican columnist and political analyst. "It comes not just from the private sector and the other powerful interest groups represented in the ruling PRI coalition, but also from the great mass of the Mexican people."

Much of the US impulse to intervene in Mexican politics stems from a basic fear that the Mexican political system is headed for rough times and possibly even disintegration. Some sectors within the Reagan administration fear that the kind of political instability and guerrilla warfare occurring in Central America could spread to Mexico.

US critics do not look at longstanding structural problems with the Mexican development model when analyzing Mexican

weaknesses. Instead, as Mr. Cornelius says, they "focus on weaknesses within the Mexican state: corruption, misallocation or inefficient use of resources, irresponsible political leaders . . . the ossified ruling party, etc."

"As in the past, the US will be tempted to take advantage of this situation: to turn Mexico into a virtual ward of the US, denying the need for major structural changes to correct imbalances in the Mexican economy and society, and rejecting the legitimacy and domestic political importance of a Mexican foreign policy that is independent of Washington," Cornelius says.

Economic issues are a possible source of controversy between the US and Mexico. A Mexican academic expert says that the US has, especially under the Reagan administration, been pressing Mexico to open up its market to more trade with and investment by the US, a strategy that might entail a severe political cost for President de la Madrid.

If de la Madrid's export-oriented recovery strategy is to succeed, there will have to be a continued strong growth of the US economy and increased access to US consumer markets. But the trend in US-Mexican trade relations has been, and probably will continue to be, toward greater rather than less protectionism in the US, say US and Mexican academic and diplomatic analysts.

Next: Mexico and Central America.

THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHIROPRACTIC HEALTH CARE

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, we recently marked the 90th anniversary of the practice of chiropractic health care. On September 18, 1895, the first chiropractic patient, Harvey Lillard, of Davenport, IA, was examined and treated by Daniel David Palmer, the father of chiropractic health care. Since that time chiropractors have been making invaluable contributions to the physical well-being of many Americans. I appreciate this opportunity to salute the members of this fine profession in connection with this important milestone in their history.

Those who have ever suffered with spinal problems or back pain and have sought chiropractic treatment know how important their contribution to American health care has been. This chiropractic profession could not have survived and thrived over the years without the courage and dedication of those of its profession. Today, chiropractors are licensed to practice in all 50 States and their education consists of a total of 6 academic years following high school graduation. In my home State of Michigan alone there are 1,800 chiropractors who serve over 1.5 million patients.

I think the outstanding work of chiropractors for the last 90 years is an excellent example of how one group can make a significant difference in our society. Their commitment and devotion to excellence in health care is worthy of our highest praise. It is with great admiration that I congratulate

late the chiropractic doctors and their professional associations on their 90th anniversary.

I am also proud, at this point, to include in my statement an excellent letter by Dr. Nikolas K. Dreliozis, DC, of Muskegon, MI, the largest city in our ninth congressional district, which appeared in the *Muskegon Chronicle*. Dr. Dreliozis presented very interesting information on this special 90th anniversary. His letter follows:

CHIROPRACTIC CELEBRATES 90TH ANNIVERSARY

Chiropractic is 90 years old this month, but the benefits of chiropractic were foreseen before the turn of the century.

Although chiropractic was in its infancy at the time, having been founded in 1895, Thomas Edison saw its method as a dynamic new approach to healing. When you consider the fact that spinal adjustment was a new concept and the world had a tendency to be prejudice against anything new and different, you realize it took men of great scientific mind to understand the benefits of normal nerve functions.

Thomas Edison predicted chiropractic's role in the healing arts when he said, "The doctor of the future will give no medicine, but will interest his patients in the care of human frame . . . and in the cause and prevention of disease."

Over 90 years ago, when the first chiropractic adjustment was made, the average male's life expectancy was 44 years. Today it is 73 years.

With strides being made in health care, thanks to research and technology, our average life span will be greatly expanded. Indeed, it is probable that within the next 75 years the average male can look forward to living to be 100 years old.

Despite optimism toward the healing profession's ability to lengthen the individual's life span, I am concerned over mass "killing" factors.

Our society is faced with several counteracting dangers which must be corrected if we are able to enjoy the benefits of modern scientific advances. We must do away with the poisons of air pollution, water pollution and body pollution.

Body pollution which results from the careless intake of drugs and medications is as great a hazard to human life as air and water pollution. The chiropractic profession does not depend on drugs for treatment.

Thousands of doctors of chiropractic throughout the world are using this 90th anniversary year to rededicate themselves to the health needs of humankind. I urge the public to pay more attention to their health and seek the benefits of advancements made in health technology.

MR. PRESIDENT, NO ARMS TO JORDAN

HON. H. JAMES SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion in this body and in the media about the President's decision to pursue strategic arms sales to Jordan.

I have joined many Members of the House in expressing our opposition to this

sale through a resolution. However, I felt it was important to share my personal views with the President. I would like to share with my colleagues the following letter I sent to President Reagan regarding this sale:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 24, 1985.

HON. RONALD W. REAGAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, DC 20500

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Congress has received the notification of your intention to sell some of our most advanced aircraft and air defense systems to Jordan. I have been pleased to support many of your efforts in the House, but I must inform you that, with all due respect, I am distressed with this particular request.

Mr. President, I believe that selling a major weapons package to Jordan undermines the search for peace. I oppose this measure for several reasons: (1) It reduces the incentives for King Hussein to enter the peace process. (2) It escalates an already staggering arms race in the region and heightens the likelihood of conflict. (3) Until King Hussein makes peace with Israel, a Jordanian arms buildup adds to the threat to the Jewish state. (4) It narrows Israel's margin of security and weakens the Peres government's ability to take risks for peace. (5) It deepens Israel's dependence on West Bank facilities to insure her security and it adds to the burden on Israel's economy.

Mr. President, I am joining many of my colleagues in cosponsoring a resolution opposing this sale. This resolution is being introduced today, and it serves as an indication of how widespread this opposition is in Congress. Furthermore, I wanted to make this personal appeal to you to reconsider this matter. The most vital of all U.S. foreign affairs objectives is peace in the Middle East. I will continue to work with you for constructive solutions, but I feel strongly that selling sophisticated arms to Jordan is the wrong way to go.

Sincerely,

H. JAMES SAXTON,
Member of Congress.

SCOTSDALE PUBLIC LIBRARY
MARKS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I have no greater admiration than for those exceptional individuals blessed with the vision to see beyond their time who leave behind a legacy to enrich the lives of their fellow citizens for generations to come.

Such a man must have been Mr. A.L. Keister of Scottdale, PA. Seventy-five years ago this gentleman presented his community a gift, a gift of inestimable value—a public library.

Mr. Keister will be remembered by the citizens of Scottdale on Thursday, November 7, when the library holds an open house to commemorate the anniversary of its founding and the man who made it all possible.

Although Mr. Keister was responsible for establishing the library it was not long before local school officials recognized its value and agreed to supplement its operation. Still later, as the use of the library grew, the Borough of Scottdale voted to support it and in 1921 a share of the local tax revenue was allocated toward the funding of the library.

From the outset Mr. Keister's gift to the people of Scottdale was a success. Library records show that within a month of its opening it was circulating more than 2,600 books. Today, there are more than 18,000 volumes on its shelves and the library offers a variety of services to the public, including record albums, films, and so forth. All this in a community of less than 6,000 people.

The initial prosperity of the library was due, of course, to Mr. Keister and its first librarian, Miss Daisy Mary Smith. Its continued expansion, however, reflects with great credit upon their successors, up to and including the present officials: Joanne E. Guesman, librarian; Jean Snyder, assistant librarian, and the board of directors—Eugene J. Beran, president; Mimi Finnerty, secretary; Reva Jane Beadling, treasurer, and Mary O'Laughlin and Judith A. Ermine.

Mr. Speaker, former President John F. Kennedy once said of libraries:

Good libraries are as essential to an education and an informed people as the school system itself. The library is not only the custodian of our cultural heritage but the key to progress and the advancement of knowledge.

I like to think President Kennedy had libraries such as Scottdale's in mind when he made that statement for the Scottdale Public Library has become much more than just a circulation center for books. It is a community center—owned by the people, rendering services to all.

A DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM FOR
TRADE

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, in 1985, the U.S. trade deficit is expected to reach a staggering \$150 billion. Tens of thousands of U.S. jobs have been lost to imports. And, only a severe restructuring of wages and working conditions has spared—at least temporarily—tens of thousands of other jobs.

I share the impatience and frustration of labor and industry alike at this state of affairs. Government needs to do something to help. But, here's the rub: what should it do?

Enactment of rigid import barriers, like those included in H.R. 1562, the Textile and Apparel Trade Enforcement Act, is not the answer. Even the staunchest advocates of protectionism privately agree that it is not a satisfactory approach. Such measures offer, at best, short-term relief. But, long term, such measures invite retaliation from

other nations and lead to a loss of more jobs than they save.

But, Government cannot, either, do nothing and let U.S. jobs dry up, allow factories to dim and workers to go on relief.

There is, however, an approach which lies between the extremes of protectionism and total free trade.

Congress must adopt and the administration must implement a comprehensive trade policy which moves against the problem of the imbalance in our export-import trade on several fronts.

An excellent outline or blueprint for such a policy is contained in the recommendations of the House Democratic trade task force issued October 17.

It deftly takes a middle course between the Scylla and Charybdis of foreign trade: doing nothing in a blind adherence to free trade and doing too much in a futile effort to protect failing and inefficient domestic industries and products.

I understand legislation which incorporates many of the legislative suggestions of the task force report will soon be introduced. I will proudly cosponsor the Democratic program for trade and I feel that if it is adopted and implemented vigorously, this comprehensive trade package will go far to return America to a competitive position among the world trading nations and to do it with fullest safeguards and protections to the men and women whose jobs are on the line.

I ask permission to include, at this point in the RECORD, an article which I have written describing the trade problem and also to include the trade task force's October 17, 1985, report on recommendations.

CONGRESSMAN RON MAZZOLI DISCUSSES
AMERICA'S TRADE POLICY

The unfolding drama of trade policy occupies center stage in Washington these days. All the spotlights converge on it. Unfortunately the actors in this drama are either ardent free-traders or committed protectionists. I think we need a new script and some new actors so this drama can have a happy ending.

No matter what stance on the trade issue one takes, there is general agreement on this: the stakes are sky high. Whatever the Federal Government does—or fails to do—on trade issues will profoundly affect America's economy for decades to come.

It is not apocalyptic ranting to suggest that wrong choices today could produce a second Great Depression tomorrow.

For our discussion, let's frame the extreme on the trade policy issue.

One side argues that Congress must protect American industry at all costs from lower-priced imports otherwise, millions of American jobs will be lost. America's manufacturing and industrial base will be destroyed, and, as a consequence, it will lose its position as the world's leading economic and military power. Protectionists also argue that free-traders are insensitive to the human factor of unemployment and factory shut down.

The other side argues that the United States has always been a mercantile nation, that it must continue its historical policy of free trade or our trading partners will resort to retaliatory counter actions. Free traders

also argue that protecting inefficient, non-competitive domestic industries stifles competition which, over our Nation's history, has given U.S. consumers the highest quality goods at the lowest possible price.

In my opinion, neither of these arguments offers the answer. A new policy is needed. And the seeds of a new trade policy can be found in the dusty pages of a 25-year-old document: The Democratic Party platform of 1960, a platform on which John Kennedy ran successfully for President of the United States.

Here are a few quotes from that platform: "World trade is more than ever essential to world peace . . . world trade raises living standards, widens markets, reduces costs . . . and builds political stability and international economic cooperation.

However, . . . the Democratic administration will help industries (and communities) affected by foreign trade . . . our Government should press for reduction of foreign barriers to (American) products . . . (we) will seek international agreements to assure fair competitive and fair labor standards . . . for our workers . . . and workers elsewhere.

To sell we must buy. We, therefore, must resist the temptation . . . to deny American producers and consumers access to world markets . . ."

I believe this document provides the blueprint for a trade policy which incorporates elements from both extreme arguments but which offers a vision and a flexibility which neither offers. This new policy will advantage the United States over the long haul even though it cannot completely avoid some painful domestic dislocations and retrenchments.

Speaking of the short term situation: the Federal Government, in my judgment, has a solemn responsibility to cushion the impact on the U.S. work force of the transition our national and the international economy are now undergoing. They need and deserve Government help in finding comparable new jobs, in training for new types of jobs, in receiving extended and enhanced unemployment compensation, medical benefits and the like until they are gainfully back at work.

The trade policy outline included in the 1960 Democratic platform contemplated a world which would grow even more interdependent and interconnected. That's just what has happened during the 25 years since it was written.

Today, what happens to our most geographically distant, most socially diverse trading partner inevitably affects our own economy. And, it affects it sooner rather than later because of the speed-of-light communications net which girdles the globe, and the supersonic jet and the ubiquitous computer.

America cannot for these technological reasons—and political ones too—run and hide. It cannot withdraw into a redoubt (the old "fortress America") and wait out the trade storm. America cannot—and should not—attempt to solve the trade problems by protecting its people and businesses from foreign competition.

Protectionism risks economic calamity for the Third World—the emerging nations in Central and South America, in Asia and Africa. They must acquire dollars, earned through trade with the United States, in order to pay their U.S. creditors, mostly the banks. Cut off the export income of these LDC's (less developed countries) and default could result—default which would collapse

the debtor and threaten the stability of the creditor.

There is another clear and convincing reason why I believe a trade policy molded along the lines of the 1960 Democratic platform is the answer rather than free trade or protectionism.

If the U.S. erects a trade "picket fence" to keep out foreign goods and protect domestic producers, LDC's will lose markets. And, they will lose jobs and opportunities for their people. Their teeming populations (fertility rates are typically higher in LDC's than developed nations) will be prey to the rhetoric of rebellion and revolution. The resulting political and social unrest would be far costlier to the United States than allowing LDC's continued access to U.S. markets.

Where does this discussion lead us? Does the United States actually face stark and irreconcilable choices as some argue: open our doors to foreign goods and lose U.S. jobs and industrial base; or, close our doors to foreign goods and consign U.S. consumers to higher prices and lower quality and workers abroad to bleak futures.

I believe that our options are not so limited. As I have suggested earlier, there is a third alternative: A trade policy which encourages world trade but assures that our trade is based on principles of fairness and reciprocity.

Such a farsighted trade policy outlined in the 1960 platform document was augmented, and updated in a report released last month by a House Democratic task force, chaired by Congressman DON BONKER of Washington.

Key elements of the Democratic trade plan are: (1) to place the U.S. dollar—now much over-valued—on a better balance with foreign currencies so American products can compete at home and abroad; (2) to encourage American exports by providing attractive financing and other Government assistance to U.S. exporters; (3) to move aggressively and unapologetically against any trading partners which maintain barriers against U.S. exports, which "dump" their products in our markets or which grant their companies illegal subsidies and concessions; and (4) to provide expanded retraining, relocation and trade adjustment assistance to U.S. workers who lose their jobs as a result of imports.

If you wish a copy of this task force report, please call (582-5129) or write me (551 Federal Building, Louisville, Kentucky 40202).

This recommendation offers a real breakthrough in the increasingly emotional and largely unavailing debate over trade policy. I intend to work extra hard in the remaining months of the 99th Congress to secure adoption of this program.

America opened the West. It built a continental network of railroads and canals against daunting obstacles. Had Liberty ships in the water only days after Pearl Harbor. Put astronauts on the moon. Explored space. Invented the computer. Conquered disease. In short, America can do what it resolves to do.

America can resolve to retreat from world markets and hunker down behind import barriers. That would be a serious mistake.

Or, America can resolve to compete for world markets and make the changes and adopt the techniques necessary to get the job done. This is the correct choice. And, it is the choice I hope Congress and the Nation makes before it is too late.

REMEMBERING EL SALVADOR

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the October 30 edition of the the Christian Science Monitor ran an editorial on the present state of affairs in El Salvador.

The editorial stated that President Duarte should resume peace talks with the Salvadoran left. It goes on to lay out the conditions and the issues to be discussed at such talks. I believe the Monitor offers a clearheaded assessment of what ought to take place between the warring factions in El Salvador. I submit it to the RECORD for my colleagues' perusal:

DISORDER'S COST IN EL SALVADOR

After six weeks of negotiations to secure the return of his kidnapped daughter, El Salvador's President José Napoleón Duarte can finally turn to other pursuits. The main one should be to move vigorously to resume peace talks with the guerrillas, originally held a year ago.

The ball is in the President's court. But in offering to hold new meetings he should not accede to power-sharing conditions laid down by the guerrillas.

Preconceptions about possible talks have altered over the past two months.

The foremost change is in the viewing of prospects for success. Both sides apparently bargained in good faith to obtain the release of persons kidnapped by the guerrillas or captured by the Salvadorean Army. Prisoners were released by both sides, largely as expected.

If they could strike a deal on this particular issue, could the government and the guerrillas not use the increased trust as an aid in negotiating a agreement on something more basic, an accommodation in the draining war?

The guerrillas would move into any such talks in a somewhat strengthened position. Their ability to kidnap Inés Guadalupe Duarte Durán, and to mount several recent guerrilla assaults, makes clear that their forces are not on the verge of collapse, as had been thought.

President Duarte, on the other hand, is slightly weakened by the kidnaping affair: He expended political capital to get the military to go along with the release of guerrillas in order to obtain the return of his daughter and former local government leaders.

There are some issues on which the government, in bargaining, should accede to rebel demands. One is land reform, begun but far from complete. Another is a complete end to death squad activity, diminished but not ended. A third is shrinking the still-strong power of the landowners, a major ultraconservative force in the nation, and of the Army.

For their part the guerrillas ought in return to forswear violence and contribute not to rendering the nation but to unifying and strengthening it.

None should be naive about the difficulty in reaching agreement. And if accommodation is attained, the actions of some of the far-left rebels should be watched closely, to keep them from seizing power. Nothing would be gained from replacing the past

authoritarianism of the right with dictatorship of the left.

KNOW-NOTHING LEGISLATION

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Hobart Rowen in the Washington Post summarizes many of the weaknesses and flaws of the proposed Gramm-Rudman amendment to balance the Federal budget by 1991. I urge my colleagues to think carefully about Mr. Rowen's observations before rushing to judgment on this ill-conceived piece of legislation.

KNOW-NOTHING LEGISLATION

If you ever wondered what the Gramm-Rudman balanced-budget proposal is all about, take a look at the American Economic Association's 1974 Directory of Members. There, in response to a routine request to list is "current research project," economist (now Texas Republican senator) Phil Gramm let it all hang out. His goal, Gramm said, is "How to Get Rid of Government."

Not how to get government off your backs, mind you. Just: Get rid of it.

That has been Phil Gramm's long-term interest in life—as an academic, as a Democratic congressman who switched parties to make the grade in Texas politics, and now as the co-author of one of the most irresponsible pieces of legislation ever to surface in Congress: the Gramm/Rudman proposal to mandate annual budget-deficit reductions of \$36 billion until a balanced budget is reached in 1991.

No one can doubt the urgent need to cut back sharply on the deficit. But to do it by rigid formula, without regard to the relative importance of programs or to the actual state of the nation's economy, is sheer madness. And who says that the budget must be actually balanced, rather than brought down to decent proportions?

The president would be required to submit a budget that meets the Gramm/Rudman targets, and Congress would be required to pass a budget resolution conforming to the same targets. If it didn't, automatic spending reductions enforcing the targets go into effect—come hell or high water, prosperity or depression.

But there are exemptions: Social Security benefits, contracts already agreed to (which shields big-ticket weapons systems accounting for 38 percent of the defense program), interest payments on the national debt, and "tax expenditures" (read that tax loopholes). These exemptions throw a disproportionate share of the spending cuts on everything else.

Most reductions that are made in defense would fall not on hardware but on operations and maintenance monies—which already get the short end of the stick. Moreover, as Robert Greenstein, director of the nonpartisan Center on Budget Policy and Priorities, points out, the starting point for Gramm/Rudman cuts is a defense budget with 3 percent real growth built in, whereas many civilian programs are frozen. So while there would be some impact on defense, the real burden of moving toward a balanced budget would continue to fall heaviest on nondefense programs.

But Congress' slickest trick, if it buys Gramm/Rudman, will be bragging to the voters that it has balanced the budget when in reality it bucked responsibility for enforcing the cuts to the president.

Senate Republicans Pete Domenici of New Mexico and Bob Packwood of Oregon, as well as Democratic liberals Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts and Paul Simon of Illinois, support Gramm/Rudman in the mistaken notion that if President Reagan is faced with a legal mandate to cut the deficit, he finally will opt to raise taxes rather than cut defense.

They underrate Reagan's anti-tax, pro-military fervor—and endorsement of Gramm's "Get Rid of Government" philosophy. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger has warned, plainly, that Reagan "would have to retain the authority to request the amounts" that he considers vital to national security.

Let us not be naive: there would be plenty of ways out for the president, who could pressure Congress with a declaration of national emergency. He also gains enormous leverage because of the automatic-reduction feature of Gramm/Rudman.

As Greenstein put it on a National Public Radio broadcast, "He can say to Congress, 'If you don't give me a budget plan I can approve, I'll veto it, triggering the automatic reduction, which will hit housing or health care for the elderly hard.' So if Congress wants to avoid that, they have to give him a very light hit on defense, and no tax increases."

The worst part of the whole Gramm/Rudman deception is that House Democrats, who understand that it is bad economics to cut spending automatically if a recession is under way or in prospect (and that's what the legislation requires), were trapped by their gutless colleagues in the Senate. "Once Teddy Kennedy caved in," says a key House committee staffer, "we were licked. Now, we can't get 217 votes for anything, unless we have a zero deficit at the end of the line."

Otherwise, some 90 House Democrats have concluded, their Republican opponents will mount devastating radio and TV campaigns against them in next year's election.

That's why Gramm's dream of getting rid of government is coming to fruition: the first priority of legislators—including many Democrats who helped Reagan create the massive budget deficit by voting for and expanding the tax giveaway act of 1981—is to save their jobs. Saving the country from know-nothing legislation is less urgent.

OLD BERGEN CHURCH IN JERSEY CITY MARKS 325TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, this week, New Jersey's oldest religious institution, the Old Bergen Church, in Jersey City, is celebrating its 325th anniversary.

This magnificent edifice, whose pastor is Rev. Dr. E. Royden Weeks, has seen the birth and development of our Nation, and has witnessed the very beginning of America, working with those who laid the foundations, rearing the soaring arches of our

great Republic with vigorous, indomitable and all-encompassing faith in God. They have helped develop a solid rock which stands unmoved sparking the minds and actions of freedom-loving men and women.

Its parishioners have gone to the four corners of the Earth, preaching and living the need for dignity of all individuals.

Pastor Weeks, with the assistance of Ms. Elizabeth Foley, of the Jersey Journal, has provided me with the history of this grand heritage.

During the week of October 27, 1985, the congregation of Old Bergen Church in Jersey City will pause to celebrate the 325th anniversary of its witness and work in the same neighborhood where Dutch forebears founded the first permanent European settlement in New Jersey. It has been the custom of the people of the church for over a century to mark each 25 years of their continued life with a time of special thanksgiving to God for His continued help and favor.

Convinced that "Because we look to the future, we have a past to celebrate," the congregation is grateful to God for the steps it has been led to take over the past quarter century to insure its continuing vitality in Christian ministry. A special service of Thanksgiving will be held on the morning of October 27 at morning worship and later in the week on Reformation Day, October 31, a festive banquet for many friends will take place.

The dramatic changes in urban life over the past 25 years have called for both strength and vision in churches and their leaders. Under the pastoral guidance of the Reverend Dr. John J. Soeter, the congregation at Old Bergen moved, in 1968, to explore a union with Trinity United Presbyterian Church, which was serving the same area of the city. In a recognition of their greater unity in Jesus Christ, the two congregations formed a union in 1970, committed to throwing their common resources into the struggle to enhance the quality of life for the people within the boundaries of the parish and beyond. The Presbyterian Church and the Reformed Church heartily supported this work by supplying supervisors like the Reverend Dr. Gordon Markey and the Reverend Gerard C. Pool.

The union congregation called, as its pastor, the Reverend Dr. Emrys Royden Weeks, who was charged by the congregation to broaden its ministry to the community. Under his leadership, the doors of the church were opened to various groups in the neighborhood which were committed to serving the needs of the people. Through grants and loans, the church tried to help worthy organizations and programs to stay in the immediate community so that all could benefit. It provided space and opportunity for community meetings and political debate. It served as dormitory and training center for 60 young men and women who staffed the Christian Neighborhood Summer Program for 6 weeks each summer. Over the years, the church has sought out and joined with other congregations in organizing such services as a local

center for "Contact," a telephone helpline, and "Let's Celebrate," a group of 23 churches in the city which supplies 13 emergency food pantries and runs a soup kitchen 5 days each week. The people of Old Bergen have also formed a close association with other Reformed churches in the city for mutual support and common purpose.

This sense of the close relationship between a church and its community is a thread which ties the last 25 years to the previous 300; Old Bergen has always been closely involved with the settlement, then village, then town, and finally the city which has grown around it.

Under the evenhanded but cautious administration of Peter Stuyvesant, Director-General of the New Netherlands, permission was granted in August 1660 for the establishment of a fortified settlement near an old Indian maize field in the hills overlooking the Hudson River. The place was named "Bergen" after a small town in the Netherlands, and was inhabited by November of that year, and worship was begun around that time. A burying ground was set aside and about 4 acres of land was designated for the church. The stockade was completed in April 1661, and already the people were petitioning the Director-General for the regular ministrations of a "Dominie," as the Dutch clergy were called. By 1662, 417 guilders had been raised by taxation for the erection of a church.

The church grew along with the village, and in 1680, a octagonal, sandstone church was built to house the congregation of 134 persons. The small number of ordained clergy in this new land meant that the people saw a Domine only a few times each year. Regular services were conducted by a lay leader called a "Voorleser." The Bergen Church lived with this arrangement for over 90 years. It was not until 1753 that the congregation called its first pastor, Dominie William Jackson. Under this powerful preaching, the congregation continued to grow, and soon needed a larger building, which was erected on the same spot in 1773. During the Revolutionary War, Jackson was an outspoken patriot. On one occasion, he was arrested for his inflammatory remarks, and taken before Lord Howe, the British Commander of New York. Howe dismissed him with a rebuke, but noting more serious. Dominie Jackson continued to serve the congregation until 1789, when illness forced him to retire.

He was succeeded by John Cornelison who remained as pastor until his death in 1828. Cornelison is well remembered for the great interest he took in nurturing young people and in ministering to the black slaves who lived in the neighborhood. He held services for the slaves in his home, and taught several of them how to read. Some were admitted to the communion of the church.

A few months after the death of Cornelison, the Reverend Benjamin C. Taylor was installed as pastor of Old Bergen Church. Under his leadership, the church continued to grow, and the first formal Sunday School was organized. By 1840, the build-

ing was once more too small for the number of people, so a third building was erected, this time about 100 yards away from the first two edifices. It is this church building which the congregation continues to use to this day.

After a short period of leadership under the Reverend James L. Ammerman, who left to become a missionary to Japan, the congregation called the Reverend Dr. Cornelius Brett, who would serve the congregation for the next 42 years. Dr. Brett was also a powerful and persuasive speaker; as a young man, he had supported Lincoln's candidacy for a second term and had gone on the stump for him throughout central Jersey. Taking up the pastorate at Old Bergen in 1876, Brett continued the church's commitment to young people through the founding and support of various organizations guiding them into constructive adulthood. He also served as a chaplain in one of the local Army regiments.

Dr. Brett retired in 1918, and was followed by two pastors who served the congregation for relatively short tenures: Dr. Willard P. Soper and Dr. James S. Kittell.

In 1927, another dynamic leader came to the pulpit of Old Bergen in the person of the Reverend Dr. F. Raymond Clee, who would serve the congregation through the Great Depression and into the years of World War II. Under Dr. Clee's enthusiastic guidance, the church became a place where people found strength and hope and a sense of personal worth in an otherwise discouraging period for millions in our country. Each Sunday, Dr. Clee led a Men's Bible Class which came to number 3,000 members, representing every religious persuasion. With the coming of our involvement in World War II, the congregation sent 189 of its young men and women into the services, and in 1943, after 16 years at Old Bergen, Dr. Clee accepted a call to serve the First Church in Albany, NY.

It was for the Reverend Thomas Lamont, a Canadian born in Ireland, to take up the task of leading the congregation into the postwar years. He was installed in 1944 and kept the church in touch with its people, then serving all over the world. He, too, was a dynamic preacher, and led the congregation until called to another pastorate in 1957.

In the autumn of 1957, the Reverend Dr. John J. Soeter was installed as pastor, and began to lead this people into the present period of their life and work, facing the problems of the changing urban community.

The congregation of Old Bergen Church is no longer large. It has learned to bear the burden of its heritage lightly while taking its responsibilities for the present and future seriously. It continues to believe that the life of church and community are closely woven together. Hence, their slogan for this 325th anniversary: "Because we look to the future, we have a past to celebrate."

It is my pleasure to present to Pastor Weeks and parishioners of Old Bergen Church a framed copy of the Great Seal of

the United States of America. With the 13 stars enclosed in the ring in the light above the eagle, symbolically it represents the religious freedom sought by our Nation's founders. America was born out of faith in God and its freedom will continue to exist as long as that faith remains forthright and strong. It must remain unmoved—like a solid rock, despite the many sliding sands throughout the world.

It is awesome to remember that Old Bergen Church existed long before George Washington prayed in the snow at Valley Forge, and Ben Franklin, when he suggested a Continental Constitution, urged that we have prayers every morning.

I am certain that all my colleagues here in the House of Representatives want to join me today in this salute to Old Bergen Church, its pastor, and its members. Their services over the years indeed echoes the words of James Russell Lowe who wrote in "America's Gospel":

Our country hath a gospel of her own
To preach and practice before all the world—
The freedom and divinity of man
The glorious claims of human brotherhood,
And the soul's fealty to none but God.

ANTHROPOLOGY IN LIMBO

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD an article transmitted to me by Mr. John B. Fisher, a constituent from Maitland, FL. The article discusses the existence of a number of anthropological films which have been lying unused at the Smithsonian Institution's Museum of Natural History. These films, according to the article, could uncover untold information about the social patterns and practices of fast-disappearing cultures such as the Jyapu people in Nepal and the Canela Indians of Amazonia in Brazil.

I am sure that others will find this an interesting piece.

[From Science, July 19, 1985]

UNIQUE ANTHROPOLOGY FILMS LIE IN LIMBO—SMITHSONIAN'S RECORDS OF VANISHING CULTURES ARE UNFINISHED, UNFUNDED, AND INACCESSIBLE TO SCHOLARS

(By Constance Holden)

A unique repository of anthropological films—which will soon be the only source of knowledge about aspects of social behavior in fast-disappearing cultures—has been lying unused for two years in the bowels of the Smithsonian Institution's Museum of Natural History. Created by anthropologist E. Richard Sorenson, the collection has not been edited or annotated, and under terms of agreements with various countries, access to the films is denied to scholars until the work is complete.

The films were mostly made during the 7-year existence of the National Human Studies Center, which was disbanded in 1982 for budgetary and bureaucratic reasons. They are now in limbo: although Sorenson, who

quit the Smithsonian in 1973, owns the data, the institution owns the films. Until descriptive material is incorporated with them, they will be nothing but "Rorschach tests," open to any interpretation, says Sorenson. Time is of the essence because additional material must be gained from the people in question before their cultures are dissolved by the tide of modernization.

Sorenson has been filming remote societies around the world for almost 20 years. He discovered his calling while serving on an epidemiological team in Papua New Guinea that was sent by the National Institutes of Health to investigate kuru, the brain disease that was subsequently found to be spread by cannibalism. Sorenson was intrigued by the fact that the children of the tribe almost never cried, so he started carrying a camera around with which he recorded a wide range of childhood interactions and behavior. It was there that he spawned the notion that the islanders' approach to child development produced rather serene children with "innovation-ready" personalities quite distinct from the "innovation-questing" personality of the Western world. (The cannibalism, by the way, was of an unusual "familial" type unrelated to hostility and aggression.)

Sorenson subsequently got a doctorate in anthropology at Stanford University and, with the support of the late anthropologist Margaret Mead, moved his work to the Smithsonian. The current situation is the result of a protracted internecine battle at the institution in which the museum anthropologists, whose priorities are more oriented toward the maintenance of material culture collections, prevailed over the Margaret Mead faction. The Smithsonian, which has been getting anxious letters from the countries involved, has proposed making videotapes of some of the films and sending them to the countries for editing. But Sorenson claims this violates the original agreements and is technically unworkable.

The films—1.5 million feet of them—are records of the manners, gestures, expressions, and social adaptations of traditional cultures in Asia, New Guinea, and Brazil. They represent a pioneering approach to anthropological film-making, providing detailed records of nonverbal behavior that no other medium can supply. Moreover, they offer detailed glimpses into societies many of which are no longer accessible, either for political reasons, or—more often—because they have already been contaminated by modern civilization.

Some developed nations have come to recognize the importance of preserving the remnants of indigenous societies, not only for humane reasons but because of their cultures and special knowledge of their environments. Sorenson carries this concept a step further, pointing out that these groups have, over millennia of developing in isolation, evolved unique patterns of social as well as environmental adaptation. Just as scientists are storing gene banks of indigenous forms of crop plants that are being replaced by new varieties, he says, so too should they be taking measures to document "the behavioral and expressional potential of our own human species." While modern societies cannot expect to learn to eliminate crime or family strife, traditional ones can offer new insights contributing, for example, to early childhood intervention programs.

"Every society I have visited has a special aspect of human potential they've refined," says Sorenson. Some examples:

Adaptation to an exceedingly harsh tropical environment with severe dietary and health conditions in Papua New Guinea.

A form of highly industrious, and at the same time highly social, productivity among the Jyapu people in Nepal—where children much preferred the stimulation of working in the fields to going to school. ("Everybody in the world is interested in productivity," notes Sorenson.)

An unusually cohesive social pattern of mutual personal regard and respect among Tibetan stock people.

Strong social solidarity coexisting with a high degree of individuality and personal freedom among the Canela Indians of Amazonia in Brazil. The two concepts tend to be mutually exclusive in Indo-European languages, says Sorenson; yet among the Canela they are mutually reinforcing.

Patterns of mutual respect and interpersonal harmony among even densely populated groups in the Western Caroline Islands of Micronesia.

Sorenson has a somewhat Rousseauian view of the virtues of traditional societies. Nonetheless, one need only look at the facial expressions of young monks he has photographed during rituals at Tibetan monasteries—expressions reflecting various mixtures of awe, pensiveness, and rapture—to perceive the extraordinary range and subtlety of culturally conditioned emotional expression. People are beginning to recognize that environmental diversity must be preserved if humankind is to keep its options open. Sorenson's message is that the same principle applies when it comes to preserving knowledge about the emotional and behavioral diversity of human beings.

Sorenson has been described as a "genius," and a "lone wolf" type whose uncompromising approach to his work does not stand him in good stead when it comes to attracting political support. Smithsonian official Wilton Dillon, an anthropologist, also observes that his work stands outside the trends in modern anthropology which, "like other disciplines, has become so specialized that it has become divorced from its humanistic past." Sorenson is planning to sell his collection of Asian and New Guinean artifacts to finance further travel. Says Dillon: "if there was anybody who ever needed a patron, he is that."

A TRIBUTE TO E.G. GUENTHER

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of my good friend, Ed Guenther, leaves a void in my heart and in the hearts of the people of my hometown, Kingsport, TN and the entire area. He was a great American and a dedicated individual to the cause of others. He was not only a neighbor, but a close friend and advisor over the years. He will be sorely missed, but the footprints he leaves are landmarks of greatness for others to follow.

To his wife, Lillian, his son, Larry, and his daughter, Linda, and their families, my deepest condolences.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD the following article describing the many achievements and contributions to society made by Ed Guen-

ther, which appeared in the Kingsport Times-News on October 31, 1985:

E.G. GUENTHER

E.G. Guenther, a retired Tennessee Eastman executive, died Tuesday morning at Holston Valley Hospital & Medical Center. A native of St. Louis, Mo., Guenther came to Kingsport in 1918 after earning a B.S. degree and professional degree in mechanical engineering from Case Institute of Technology. He served the city of Kingsport as an alderman and as vice mayor, and served on the City Planning Commission and Library Commission.

Guenther was a member and Fellow in the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and was a member of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, American Society of Lubrication Engineers, National and Tennessee Societies of Professional Engineers and the American Defense Preparedness Association. He was also a licensed professional engineer in Tennessee.

He was an executive vice-president and works manager for Tennessee Eastman Company at the time of his retirement on April 1, 1975.

In 1958, Guenther was appointed general superintendent for the Filter Products, Kodol Fiber and Plastic Processing Divisions. He became assistant works manager of Tennessee Eastman Company in 1966, was named vice-president and works manager in 1969, and became an executive vice-president and works manager in 1974. He had also served as a director, vice president, and president of Bays Mountain Construction Company.

He had been a member of the Executive Board of the Sequoyah Council, Boy Scouts of America, and had received Scouting's Silver Beaver Award. He was also a member of the First Broad Street United Methodist Church and an associate member of Moorings Presbyterian Church in Naples, FL.

Surviving are his wife, Lillian Guenther, Kingsport, a son, Dr. Anthony L. Guenther, Frederick, MD.; a daughter, Mrs. Linda Christopher, Charlotte, NC.; three grandchildren.

Services will be conducted at 2 p.m. Thursday at the First Broad Street United Methodist Church with Dr. Ralph Mohny and the Rev. Steven P. Lorimer officiating.

Entombment will be at Oak Hill Mausoleum.

Memorial contributions may be made to the First Broad Street United Methodist Church.

Hamlett-Dobson Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.

GETTING TOUGH ON TRADE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, protectionist fever, national pride—call it what you will—is at a flash point in Congress.

In the face of a trade deficit heading toward \$200 billion, more than 200 bills have been introduced in this Congress to get tough on trade; to stop the slide toward America's economic colonization and industrial domination by foreign interests.

As one who has long fought to impose controls on the import of any foreign prod-

uct that endangers domestic industries or the jobs of their workers, I take no satisfaction in the crisis that has precipitated the demand for strong, tough trade legislation. I support the need for such measures but I do so knowing it would not be necessary had our Government enforced the Nation's trade laws in the past.

Instead, the Government stood by, turning a deaf ear and a blind eye, to blatant violations of four trade laws as some of our major industries—steel, auto, glass, footwear, electronics—fell one after another before the onslaught of uncontrolled, cheaper products from abroad.

Those of us who early recognized the danger and who attempted to sound the alarm were ignored or ridiculed. We were called protectionists, isolationists, and even "trade warmongers." Trading partners, our critics claimed, would retaliate by barring U.S. products from their home markets.

Such charges are ludicrous in the face of facts. Our goods already are effectively barred from many world markets through antitariff barriers and other restrictions. And the American market, even under the most stringent of the trade law proposals now before Congress, would remain the freest in the world.

The dictionary defines a war as "any active hostility, contention, struggle or conflict." War is not limited to armed military operations. There are many kinds of wars: Wars against disease, wars against injustice; wars against a nation's economic and industrial base.

The president of a major domestic auto company last year made headlines by declaring America was in a trade war and in danger of losing it. He was right, of course. But, he was not the first to recognize it or publicly say so.

American industry and American workers have been at war for more than two decades. Specifically targeted by foreign competitors, they have been the victims of illegal dumping—selling below cost—Government subsidies and other weapons utilized by our trading partners.

More than 14 years ago in an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I stated, in part:

The American worker * * * knows we are in a trade war. He knows we are losing the battle today and will lose the war tomorrow if we continue to pursue our antiquated trade policies. His job and his future are at stake and he will lose both if we continue to permit foreign manufacturers to glut the American market without regard for the ultimate consequences.

I repeated the warning in a newsletter sent to residents of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania in 1977. Entitled, "The Silent War," the newsletter observed:

For nearly 20 years, the U.S. has been at war. A silent war. One fought not with weapons but with wares. The struggle is economic, not military. It is a trade war. And, we are losing it.

What has happened in the ensuing years?

The United States has lost 25 percent of its steel market to imports. It has lost 70 percent of its shoe market, 60 percent of its

radio and TV market and nearly 30 percent of its car market.

Two-thirds of every IBM personal computer is made in Japan or Singapore. Half of all our machine tools come from overseas. Eastman Kodak, under the Kodak name, sells copier machines made by a Japanese firm. General Motors and Chrysler have joint ventures with Japanese and Korean companies to import parts for cars assembled here.

Even the high-tech industry, thought by some to be the Nation's economic cure, is under assault from imports. Domestic plants are closing, workers are being laid off and the job market in that relatively new field already is becoming limited.

And, this year, for the first time since World War I, America became a debtor nation. That means it now is dependent upon foreign governments and foreign investors for the financing of its national debt. The economic future of our country is in the hands of foreign interests.

Confronted with such irrefutable facts, the present administration recently announced a new, headline policy on trade. It would not, the administration vowed,

Stand by and watch American businesses fail because of unfair trading practices abroad * * * (it) would not stand by and watch American workers lose their jobs because other nations do not play by the rules.

The announcement was dramatic—but does it have any substance? Does it signify a new commitment on the part of the Federal Government to protect and defend American industry and American jobs? Or is it merely an echo of what has been heard before from this and other administrations?

Although they have the obligation to enforce the Nation's laws, including its trade laws, recent administrations, regardless of political persuasion, have not exercised their responsibility in this area. Consequently, I have doubts about this latest pronouncement from the White House.

After all, it comes from the same administration which last spring refused to press for an extension of voluntary controls on Japanese auto shipments to the United States. Naturally, Japan increased her exports here. It is the same administration which last summer rejected quotas on foreign shoes, despite a recommendation for such restrictions from the United States International Trade Commission.

It is the same administration which in 1984 scuttled my bill proposing mandated quotas on foreign steel in favor of voluntary agreements that promised to reduce steel imports to 18.5 percent of the domestic market. Today, more than a year later, the foreign share of the American steel market is 25 percent.

And, it is the same administration which has not yet acted on a petition for relief from imports filed by the National Tool Builders' Association more than 18 months ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am not anti free trade. I never have been. The world is too small today for any nation to delude itself into thinking it can live along behind a brick

wall of restrictive trade legislation. But, neither do I believe in myths or fairy tales—and that is what the international practice of free trade is today, a fairy tale.

We must get tough on trade. If the administration will not willingly enforce our trade laws—and the track record has been dismal in this respect—then Congress must force it to do so through legislation. And, the time to get tough is now.

SPEECH OF JOSE NAPOLEON DUARTE TO THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday El Salvador President Jose Napoleon Duarte spoke to the National Press Club.

The entire speech is noteworthy but I especially commend to my colleagues the President's comments regarding Nicaragua.

SPEECH BY JOSE NAPOLEON DUARTE, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF EL SALVADOR BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Good morning ladies and gentlemen. I am pleased to be at the National Press Club once again. I am in Washington to tell the American people of a new situation that has come about in El Salvador, whose problems have worsened by the commitment of the Salvadoran subversion to anti-humanistic principles waged by international terrorism, which have frequently in the recent past, been felt deep in the hearts of many Americans.

Events of the past years have led to brutal actions of the past weeks, making it crystal clear that in El Salvador a battle is being fought between diametrically opposed principles: Humanism and terrorism.

Terrorism has grown as a world wide cancer. With few exceptions democratic nations have been unable to eliminate or significantly reduce its criminal consequences and disastrous effects.

I must make clear here today, something that no well-meaning individual can dare reject. There is a symbiotic relationship between totalitarianism and terrorism. This is possible thanks to those who promote, use, protect and guarantee its impunity. Moreover, totalitarianism feeds endlessly on terrorism.

As a counterpart to totalitarianism, there exist in open societies laws and principles based in humanism: A frame of reference within which the human beings can develop as individuals and as members of society. Nonetheless, open societies are susceptible to threats. To danger and to the thirst for power of those who profess totalitarian doctrines. To attempt against these rights, is to attempt against humanity.

The language used by totalitarians and terrorists who are one and the same, may at times sound suggestive, but I invite you to bear in mind at all times that those who preach and practice hatred and violence cannot or will not ever be champions of justice.

No one is free from the risk of terrorism. Terrorists are not concerned with age, condition, gender, or any other characteristic of

a potential victim. Their sole objective is to reach power through that criminal methodology, terrorize the community or destroy the will to defend freedom, democracy and humanism. Humanism is the essence and the back bone of democracy; because a political system that does not have the individual as beginning and end of its purpose, cannot be democratic. To consider a different purpose for the activity of a state would necessarily result in totalitarian doctrines that disregard human condition. When this takes control and becomes more important than the government, the political parties or the state's security, we return to the dark ages when a human being was ignored, his rights disregarded, and all hopes for fulfillment of humanity destroyed.

Thus, in no way could we allow the human being to lose its essential condition to become a mere link in the political machine. We must understand that in democratic nations the state and its political components exist by the people and for the people. That its purpose is to search the improvement of the human race and will always be limited by a human dimension that should never be invaded, trampled or abused.

Terrorism is irrational, inhumane, indiscriminating. Today any individual, anywhere, any time may be victimized. Today men, women, children, the elderly, and the handicapped have no protection, nor the least respect for their being. Universal rights that the world has adopted on the basis of religion or ideology through centuries of consideration are questioned and ridiculed. Victims do not matter; what is really important is how much fear they can inflict, and how much publicity they can achieve. This is the dialectic of terrorism, the theory of power at any price, the politics of violence, the doctrine of indiscriminate destruction and of public intimidation.

We need to reflect upon the conditions that allow terrorism to proceed unpunished. It would not be possible or viable for terrorists to carry on with their activities if they did not have sanctuaries and did not receive material and economic support. Those sanctuaries which are part of the international network of terrorism, must be publicly and universally denounced.

To better understand the process that has brought my country to the present confrontation between humanism and terrorism, let me remind you that the extreme left in El Salvador has gone through three different easily identifiable stages.

In the first stage, it publicly declared war against what the subversives termed the "national oligarchy," and the extreme left expressed its intent to fight for a democratic and representative government. These positions won them the support of leaders of parties within the Socialist International and of some free-thinking intellectuals around the world. However, when the Salvadoran Government enacted the land reform which turned over large land holdings to campesino cooperatives and the rented land to the tenant farmers, when it nationalized the banks and foreign trade, the extreme left turned to assassinations of campesino leaders, to burning crops picked by the cooperatives. When the first free elections in national history were held, the guerrillas shot against civilians who were in line to cast their ballots, burned ballot boxes and put fire to city halls and schools where balloting was taking place.

The people of El Salvador confronted the threats of the Marxist guerrilla and in the

midst of bullet fire turned out to cast their votes in larger numbers than ever.

In the second stage, faced with the will of the Salvadoran population, the extreme left changed its objectives and stated that its fight was against the armed forces and the Government who it considered "puppets of Yankee imperialism." The guerrillas then, besides their military operation, committed themselves to the merciless destruction of our infrastructure—blowing up bridges, schools, health care centers, city halls, railroads, electric pylons, water reservoirs, roads and anything in their path—that, to a poor nation as mine, required the efforts of generations to build. In indiscriminately denying the population of the basic services such as water, education, health, electricity and telephones, the Communists, in saying that these were military objectives were damaging the majority of the Salvadorans that not only have turned their backs to subversion but had defied it openly in the elections. During that period, the violent actions of the extreme left, in their alliance against democracy, joined with the violence of the extreme rightist individuals who bluntly and in the name of Nazi inspired anti-communism and fascism tortured and killed civilians through their infamous death squads.

Two facts altered the strategy of the extreme left and of their foreign allies. The people of El Salvador enacted a new Constitution, elected freely a President and a new Congress in an electoral contest that gave a resounding victory to the Christian Democratic Party to which I am proud to belong. At the same time, the armed forces increased its capacity through unprecedented technical improvement and demonstrated its commitment to law and the Constitution.

As the air we breathe and the freedom we enjoy, peace can only be appreciated in its full context when it is missing, when it is lost. The fight for national peace was not only the result of my devotion for the human being but a mandate that the people had given me at my election. Because of that mandate, on October 15, 1984, as the world witnessed our fervent desire for peace, I called in the United Nations for a serious and honest dialogue with the subversives to serve as a vehicle for them to become part of the democratic process and to compete for power through elections.

I left our meeting at the church in La Palma feeling optimistic and satisfied that my idealism had been vindicated. Among other factors, had the dialogue continued only among Salvadorans, if the guerrillas had not had so many commitments to their patrons in Cuba, Nicaragua, Bulgaria, the Soviet Union, Libya, the P.L.O., and others, then, even in the midst of the storm, we would have found a rainbow of peace.

Criticized by national and international opinion, stunned by the improvement of our soldiers and weakened by the will of the people, the Salvadoran guerrillas accepted Yasar Arafat's thesis of terror as submitted to the Palestinian leadership. In this third stage they have joined the criminal fanatics who believed they could obtain their goals by murdering a handicapped old man aboard the *Achille Lauro*, those who kicked to death a young sailor in the TWA flight, and those who have placed bombs in airports.

This is not different from what is happening in El Salvador. The guerrillas have begun this third stage by spraying bullets on innocent people in a sidewalk cafe and by terrorizing families, including my own. They

kidnapped many Salvadorans among which were 33 mayors and municipal employees of small villages, young Ana Cecilia Villeda Sosa and my daughter Ines Guadalupe—mother of three young children, arguing that they too were military objectives. I will not speak today about my suffering. I have vivid memories of the tears in my grandchildren's eyes when they asked about their mother.

Obviously, these kidnappings were not only a declaration of war. They had a well-defined objective: To provoke repression, introduce disagreement within the armed forces and my government, and to frighten the civilian population by showing that no one, not even the President was safe from terrorism.

I rejected the idea to capture the families of the guerrilla commanders, because of my Christian and humanitarian convictions.

The spontaneous solidarity nationally and internationally in rejecting the condemnable act of kidnapping was so overpowering that the ex-guerrillas and now terrorists at first even denied the act, as P.L.O. terrorists initially denied the murder of Mr. Leon Klinghoffer.

This crime against helpless individuals underscored the irrelevancy of the F.M.L.M.'s political arm, the "Democratic Revolutionary Front" (FDR). The President of the F.D.R., when interviewed by reporters and members of the International Socialist, answered that we did not know anything about the kidnapping and later that he could not order or propose the release of the kidnapped. But a year ago, on October 15, 1984, in La Palma, the same president of the F.D.R. maintained that the guerrillas and the F.D.R. were the same thing, indivisible.

To prove that their crime was not an isolated case but a new stage of terrorism, the FMLN-FDR in El Salvador kidnapped last Saturday Colonel Omar Napoleon Avalos, the Director of Civil Aviation, when he was with his children, and thus unable to defend himself without endangering their lives.

In Central America, in my own country, countless persons from all walks of life, and in the case of my family, my daughter Ines Guadalupe, would not have been victims of the merciless violence of the terrorists if terrorists did not have the support, direction, approval and timely protection of the terrorist dictatorship in Nicaragua. Nicaragua is the Central American source for totalitarianism and violence, and is the sanctuary for terrorists.

The Salvadoran guerrillas, whose headquarters is in Managua, have been trained, sheltered, armed, helped by the totalitarian governments of Nicaragua and Cuba with the support of the P.L.O. and countries such as Libya.

I ask if terrorism could be possible without the assistance given by governments that, like Nicaragua, show total disregard to all the principles and rules of international law.

Besides international terrorism, it is important to single out other political forces for their irresponsible positions on terrorism. These forces preach their commitment to democratic pluralism, participate in the political action of open societies, enjoy the welfare of the Western World and, nonetheless, come to the defense of terrorists in international fora and governments like that in Nicaragua. I believe that the time has come for international political organizations to reflect on this evil that is being spread upon all of humanity.

I stress that while there are still governments such as Cuba, Libya, Nicaragua, or groups as the terrorists within the P.L.O. that not only tolerate but also support, train, arm, and direct terrorists without international disapproval, the democratic nations have to act effectively, without endangering the principles of democracy and the rule of law, to defend themselves and act against terrorism.

Civilized governments on Earth, the democratic organizations, the churches, and all men of good will must reflect and unite to confront the dangers that threaten mankind.

To the members of the press here this morning I must say this: As terrorists seek publicity for their crimes to terrorize nations, the press in the Free World must assume a responsible role and should not allow the pages of their newspapers, their television and radio stations to be manipulated by terrorism. We must remember that terrorists are not Robin Hoods, they are not Joans of Ark, they are sick individuals acting diabolically against humanity.

The FMLN/FDR have ironically claimed a victory for the kidnapping and murder of innocent women, children and civil authorities. Ladies and gentlemen, this is not the case. If these criminal acts were to change my commitment to establish in El Salvador a pluralistic democracy with a full participation of all political ideologies, then the terrorists could claim victory before the world.

If these actions from terrorists of the extreme left and the violent right were to decrease our love for the poor and our will to reduce to a minimum social injustice, then, and rightly so, they could consider us defeated.

If we were to abandon our efforts to achieve peace, to re-establish brotherhood among Salvadorans and respect for our ideological differences as part of democracy, then the terrorists and their allies in the F.D.R. would have the right to consider themselves the winners.

I say that we have won, that the principles of humanism have prevailed, that democracy has been strengthened, that all men of good will who shared my ordeal can take heart because we accept a divine will that assures that good always prevails over evil.

I declare to you today that terrorism in El Salvador is being defeated by humanism. Building schools, health centers and creating employment is superior to sabotaging the economic infrastructure and destroying existing schools and municipal buildings. Promoting cooperation and brotherhood is greater than kidnapping and assassination. The vast majority of the Salvadoran people and my government are committed to establishing firmly our system of constitutional democracy and to improving the living standards and welfare of our people. We are winning our battle. Humanism and love for mankind will triumph over terrorism. I invite all the nations on Earth and all men of good will to join with us in this struggle so vital for freedom and prosperity.

Thank you.

THE CONTINUING SIDESHOW OVER THE ABM TREATY

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, as my friend from the other body, ORRIN HATCH, points out in his essay from the October 31 Washington Times, it is indeed quite an unseemly spectacle being played out on the interpretation of the ABM Treaty. The usual parties take the usual sides both within and outside the administration, while the Soviet Union blithely presses on with its own, well-established SDI Program.

Indeed, as Senator HATCH says, "The Soviets must be laughing their heads off inside the Kremlin as they watch U.S. policymakers" trying to come to an agreement on the meaning of a treaty which the Soviets have virtually rendered meaningless through their violations. The best way to respond to this Soviet behavior is to press on with the kind of research and development which is clearly permitted under the proper interpretation of the ABM Treaty, and to cease the pointless internal squabbling over this vital program. I urge my colleagues to read Senator HATCH's essay and to consider the points that he makes:

A SIDESHOW OVER THE ABM TREATY

The administration's recent about-face on the interpretation of the ABM Treaty is a serious setback for the Strategic Defense Initiative. On the Oct. 6 segment of "Meet the Press," Bud McFarlane explained what was then the administration's view, namely that the ABM Treaty does not prohibit the testing or development of new technologies such as laser beams and kinetic or directed-energy weapons associated with SDI.

Eight days later, George Shultz reversed Mr. McFarlane's position. While acknowledging that the administration is legally justified in applying a "broad interpretation" of the treaty, Mr. Shultz stated that the president has decided to continue to abide by a "restrictive interpretation" of the treaty.

This "restrictive interpretation" supposedly does not interfere with the current SDI research program. However, if the administration chooses to continue to tie its own hands by adhering to this line of reasoning, the future development of the SDI will be effectively shelved.

Practically speaking, the "restrictive interpretation" limits future SDI testing in at least three ways: (1) tests must be conducted at reduced power levels (thereby limiting the information obtained); (2) the development of prototypes or "breadboard models" is prohibited, and (3) a number of technical restrictions apply, such as a prohibition on automatic reloading.

The critics of the so-called "broad interpretation" of the ABM Treaty argue that the development of advanced technology systems and components is prohibited by Article V, section 1, of the treaty, which states: "Each Party undertakes not to develop, test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based."

The key to interpreting this section is the definition of the term "ABM systems or components." Article II of the treaty de-

fines "ABM systems or components" as those technologies used in ABM systems at the time of the 1972 treaty. Therefore, Article V does not apply to the development of weapons based on post-1972 technology, such as the advanced or "exotic" technologies contemplated for the SDI. The proponents of the so-called broad interpretation point out that these technologies are dealt with in another ABM Treaty provision, "Agreed Statement D," which provides that ABM systems "based on other physical principles . . . created in the future" would be subject to discussion between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

While the U.S. press has been focusing on the "knock-down, drag-out meeting" in the Oval Office between George Shultz and Cap Weinberger over the interpretation of the ABM Treaty, the Soviets continue to develop their own strategic defense program, which has been proceeding for decades, and to enhance their offensive nuclear arsenals. The Pentagon reports that in the past 20 years, the Soviets have spent about as much on strategic defense—including missile defense, civil defense, and air defense—as they have spent on strategic offense (about \$40 billion a year). According to a recently released, unclassified publication entitled Soviet Strategic Defense Programs, co-authored by Secretaries Weinberger and Shultz, important Soviet activities in developing a system of strategic defense include:

Upgrading and expansion of the world's only operational Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) system around Moscow;

Construction of the Krasnoyarsk ballistic missile detection and tracking radar in violation of the 1972 ABM Treaty.

Maintenance of the world's only operational anti-satellite (ASAT) system;

Modernization of their strategic air defense forces; and

Extensive research into advanced technologies for defense against ballistic missiles, including laser weapons, particle-beam weapons, and kinetic-energy weapons.

The Soviets' own research efforts into SDI technologies such as high-energy lasers, particle-beam, radio-frequency weapons, and kinetic-energy weapons, long antedate our own. In fact, some of the Soviet scientists most active in signing declarations against our SDI program are themselves leading the Soviet military research in the same technologies. The Soviets must be laughing their heads off inside the Kremlin as they watch U.S. policymakers once again urge "unilateral restraint" while they continue to develop their own version of Star Wars and to enhance their offensive capabilities.

If the administration continues to adhere voluntarily to a "restrictive interpretation" of the ABM Treaty, President Reagan's plan to develop a purely defensive system designed to destroy weapons—not people—could end up on the scrap heap of history.

We must not allow that to happen. The best way to ensure our own national security interests and to deter the Soviets from even thinking about nuclear blackmail is to continue research and development of the SDI and stop the internecine sideshow over the interpretation of the ABM Treaty.

When Secretary Weinberger testifies before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this week, he will probably be asked how the future development of the SDI will be limited by the administration's restrictive interpretation of the treaty.

Many of us in the Senate are anxious to learn his answer.

SUPPORT FOR ARGENTINA

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the other day the Christian Science Monitor ran an editorial on Argentina's most recent crisis. As the Monitor's editorial clearly points out, President Alfonsin has shown that, "Democracy, like authoritarianism can be strong when it has to be."

The people of Argentina have been supportive of their President. Thus far, he has earned their support. The United States has also committed itself to support the Argentine democracy. It deserves our support now more than ever, as it faces this most recent crisis. I am submitting the Monitor's editorial for the RECORD in solidarity with President Alfonsin and the people of Argentina.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 30, 1985]

ORDER'S PRICE IN ARGENTINA

When the elected head of a struggling state is supported by a wide majority of his countrymen, but is bitterly, even violently, opposed by a handful of the powerful, how can order best be retained?

That is the problem now being dealt with in Argentina, in a situation with some similarities to El Salvador and other third-world nations.

The response by Argentine President Raúl Alfonsin is to attempt to show that democracy, like authoritarianism, can be strong when it has to be. Through controversial legal maneuvering, including declaring a state of siege, he is attempting to jail 12 persons, on the political right, whom his government holds responsible for a month of terrorism and threats, often against people involved in human rights activities.

A prime challenge to Mr. Alfonsin now is to employ the restraint he has promised, in applying the state of siege and detaining suspects. Although some critics call it over-reaction, he insists the effort is necessary to preserve democracy. His future conduct will determine the way the world sees his actions.

In other nations such suspensions of human rights have too often been widely applied, thus leading to the demise of democracy from within. Argentina's siege should be lifted as quickly as possible, perhaps shortly after Sunday's elections.

For weeks the right has been trying to stop these legislative and regional contests. Alfonsin is determined that the balloting shall be held as scheduled.

The President's backers are expected to do well in the voting, and the far right badly, which may indicate why the latter resorted to violence. The right has little popular support. Recent polls indicate that Alfonsin is extremely popular, largely owing to his success in dampening inflation and reining in military excesses.

The right, including both military and police elements, objects to the progress Alfonsin has made in reforming the military. Recent violence indicates that he may not have gone far enough.

The right also objects to Alfonsin's insistence on trying nine of the previous regime's top military leaders on human rights

charges. The verdicts are expected in a few weeks.

The military is unlikely to try to overthrow Alfonsin, at least while he retains popularity. In the past it has revolted only after civilian leadership has lost popular support.

DAY-CARE PROGRAM FOR ELDERLY

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to call to the attention of my colleagues a program in my district which meets the needs of a large and special segment of our society.

Recently, the town of Huntington has established a day-care program for the elderly. Through a variety of activities and interaction with peers, the program has literally brought new life to seniors, as the following letter from a constituent, Doris Johnston, will attest.

Mrs. Johnston's letter also speaks to another important facet of the program. While the great majority of us would willingly assume the significant duties involved in the care of elderly loved ones, it would be less than honest to suggest that this constitutes a trivial undertaking. Great expenditures of time and effort are required to meet the needs of our elderly loved ones, a commitment which cannot be taken lightly.

The value of this program, as Mrs. Johnston points out, can surface in many ways, including mental stimulation, physical activity and social interaction. Indeed, Mrs. Johnston's mother-in-law seems to have undergone a virtual metamorphosis following her participation in the day-care program.

I offer this information, Mr. Speaker, in hopes that my colleagues will pass along the idea to municipalities in their own districts. Two of my constituents, Maurice Gaughran and John McDonald, were highly instrumental in establishing this program in the town of Huntington, and I have only the highest praise for their efforts. I'm certain that both Mr. Gaughran and Mr. McDonald would be pleased to provide information on the program to interested parties, and I will be happy to help facilitate this exchange of information.

To Maurice Gaughran and John McDonald, I offer my congratulations for the implementation of a brilliant concept, as Doris Johnston's letter suggests:

HUNTINGTON, NY,
July 19, 1985.

ADELAIDE SILKWORTH,
Director, Suffolk Office, County Office for Aging, Central Islip, NY.

DEAR MS. SILKWORTH: The town program for the frail elderly is one of the finest and best and most needed programs in Huntington.

I have been taking care of my mother-in-law for 3 years. When I got her the family was involved in seeking a nursing home for

her as they could no longer handle the burden of a zombie-like-little lady. Through physical therapy, nutrition and almost complete withdrawal of drugs my husband and I were able to get her out of the wheelchair and able to get her out to restaurants, movies and shopping. As I work for Merrill Lynch Realty, Carll Burr, Inc. I was able to set up an office in my home. Thank goodness, as Agnes requires much care. I have to bathe, dress her and take her to the bathroom. I have become an efficiency expert. There is never any freedom from the schedule than an older person imposes on you. She is unable to walk unassisted and for obvious reasons—however at least she is walking.

I tried games with her, painting—blocks—as I work this was not consistent.

The new frail elderly program for Agnes (86 years) has been fantastic and achieved what my time could not. She now reads newspapers, discusses news with us, talks about the past and plans what dress she is going to wear to the club. We call it her club as anything with senior citizen just annoys her.

June 27th and 28th she attended her grandson's wedding and rehearsal dinner in Conn. She amazed everyone. She was happy and contented and even toasted the Bride and Groom. She also participated in the church service (getting up and down) and when she marched down the aisle with my husband and myself—behind the Bride and Groom I had to keep myself from crying as it was such a triumph for her to have made such a comeback. She also presented 20 wrapped presents for the immediate family—presents she had made at the club or won using her mind. She was a total amazement to all at the wedding.

She has become one of the champions of words at the club and it is not unusual for her to make 80 words from one word.

I guess what my point is—that for all the nutrition and love it wasn't enough. The club has provided her with an outlet and makes her feel wanted and vital. She looks forward to going and is so happy all the time. The relief to my system is incredible. It is also great knowing that instead of sitting in a chair all day long in my kitchen—she is out having a ball and giving us relief on the homefront.

So I really say thank you for the marvelous program and do keep up the good work. Carmie and her ladies are the best. The love given by them is marvelous and so generous. This is a real factor in Agnes's willingness to go and participate. The bus drivers give me 2 hours (coming and going) to my day and are so good with the frail elderly. Joe, of course, our regular, is our favorite.

There is such a need in the community and the need will grow in time. Carmie says this is a pioneer program and I say it's long overdue. Please do everything in your power to keep the program vital, growing and there.

Thank you for reading this.
Sincerely yours,

DORIS JOHNSTON.

RAILROAD SERVICE RETIREMENT CREDIT ACT OF 1985

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, on October 29, I introduced H.R. 3638, the Railroad Service Retirement Credit Act of 1985 which, if passed, will rectify an inequity involving employees who worked in the railroad industry and later in the Federal Government.

Five agencies of the Federal Government employ a small number of experts hired from the railroad industry specifically because those individuals have special technical railroad knowledge. These employees make contributions to the railroad retirement system and then make contributions to the civil service retirement system. When they retire, they receive an annuity for each system. However, the total amount of the two annuities is often significantly less than if a single annuity were computed on the total years of service under both systems.

This inequity was widened by the Social Security Amendments of 1983. The tier I railroad retirement benefits—Social Security—will be offset after 1985 by civil service retirement benefits. Certainly, this was not the effect Congress intended when it passed the 1983 Social Security Act Amendments nor when it passed numerous other statutes recognizing the Government's need to employ persons whose technical expertise was gained through years of railroad employment.

The Congress has long recognized the need to employ individuals in the Federal service who are highly knowledgeable in the construction, maintenance, repair, and operation of railroads. Since 1911, the authority to employ experts to promote the safe transportation of employees and travelers upon railroads has been granted to the Interstate Commerce Commission [ICC], the Department of Transportation's Federal Railroad Administration [FRA], and the National Transportation Safety Board [NTSB]. Further, the National Mediation Board [NMB] and the Railroad Retirement Board [RRB] have been authorized to employ experts from the railroad industry in order to accomplish the missions assigned those agencies. There is now a group of about 500 employees in these five agencies who have a uniform background of work experience in the railroad industry and who are now responsible for carrying out a multitude of programs established by the Congress.

Most of the employees in this group are employed as safety inspectors at the GS-12 grade level in the FRA. That agency, along with NTSB—accident investigators—is frequently faced with the need to recruit highly trained individuals for staffing headquarters and performing field assignments essential to the pursuit of agency missions. When the need to recruit arises, the agencies turn to the railroad industry,

the historical source of personnel trained in disciplines not available elsewhere. In reality, in every section of the country, the accomplishment of agency functions is vastly facilitated by reliance on staff not trained at Government expense. But, those who embark on a civil service career and contribute their unique knowledge to public service, are disadvantaged in their retirement years.

While in the railroad industry, these employees contributed to and, after 10 years, are vested in the railroad retirement system. Then in the Federal sector, they contributed to and, after 5 years, are vested in the civil service retirement system. Employee contributions to both of these Federal retirement systems have been substantially the same over the years.

Since these employees subscribed in serial fashion to two Federal retirement programs having substantially equal contributions, it is only reasonable to assume that benefits at retirement age should likewise be equal. However, the net impact is that an employee is considerably less well off receiving annuities from the two systems than he would be with service either wholly railroad oriented or entirely under the civil service system.

Congress has already established a special relationship for certain Federal employees in the Railroad Retirement Act. It is only fitting that this relationship assure comparative rewards for these employees and their families in their retirement years. Equality of retirement annuities would be achieved if service years in the railroad industry is made portable to an employee that is vested in the civil service retirement program. The bill I have introduced will facilitate such equality.

The number of persons who could be affected by this legislation is less than 500 and the cost would, therefore, be insignificant. I urge all who are concerned with this important matter to actively support this measure and help bring about this much needed change.

TRIBUTE TO THE MOUNT STERLING, AL, COMMUNITY

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives a story that appeared in the Mobile Press Register, written by Darla Graves.

It is a fascinating story about the Mount Sterling, AL, community, and its history. Following is the article as it appeared in the paper.

TRIBUTE TO THE MOUNT STERLING, AL, COMMUNITY

(By Darla Graves)

MOUNT STERLING, Ala.—It used to be a thriving community in Choctaw County. Today, Mount Sterling is now a laid-back kind of town with only the outer shells of

two of the old stores and the original Methodist church building.

Mount Sterling, with a population over 300, once boasted a post office, several stores, two doctors, two academies (one for boys and one for girls), a Baptist church, a Methodist church and several fine homes.

Located about five miles east of Butler, Ala., Mount Sterling's rich history dates back to the days when the Choctaw Indians ruled the land. The community is within the old Choctaw Indian Domain and is claimed to have been the capital city of that tribe. It was at Tuscahoma Landing, four miles to the east on the Tombigbee River, that an Indian treaty for free trade was made with Pushmataha, chief of the Choctaw Indians.

The first white people to enter the area landed at Tuscahoma Landing, where they lived for a short time before moving west to the old Indian settlement that was to become Mount Sterling. Tuscahoma Landing became one of the regular stops made by steamers carrying passengers and freight to and from Mobile and Columbus, Miss. The Indian trail from Tuscahoma Landing to the Indian settlement, later became the old stage coach road from east of the Tombigbee River to Meridian, Miss. Mount Sterling, therefore, became the gateway to the west from Tuscahoma Landing on the Tombigbee River.

One of the first white settlers here was Sanford E. Catterlin, who was born in Hamilton, Ohio, in 1810. Catterlin came to Marengo County, Ala., in 1828. He had nothing so far as property was concerned, but plowed and worked for farmers in the vicinity at the rate of \$12 a month until he had accumulated some money. He then moved to Washington County and married a daughter of James Mills in 1831. He built a home and established a post office on Oct. 26, 1838. The post office was named Mount Sterling; presumably for Mount Sterling, Ky., where Catterlin bought mules and horses to be used on his plantation. He also built a sawmill that gained him wealth in the lumber industry.

Treaties signed by the Choctaw Nation of Indians in 1805 and 1830 ceded Indian territory to the white man. Choctaw County was carved from this territory.

In 1847 the town was surveyed and laid out. A public square was left for a courthouse; many thought Mount Sterling would be selected as the seat of the new county.

Also in 1847, the Gilead No. 81 Masonic Lodge of Mount Sterling was issued to Jacob Boyd, George Washington, Benjamin J. Brown, J. McCarty, Jr., Robinson Kidd, J.T. Foster, William Brown, David M. Dunlap and John W. Overstreet. This lodge used the upper story of the male academy, Choctaw County Seminary for its meetings.

In 1854 the academy was purchased by a group of Baptists. The Baptists organized a church. The Baptists built a new academy and G.F. Smith chartered the institution.

The Methodist church was constructed in 1859 and held services until 1976, when it was closed because membership was steadily decreasing. According to Charles Heffernan, a member of the Choctaw County Historical Society, until 1976, the Methodist church withstood the ravages of the Civil War, the Great Depression, numerous hurricanes and the destructive nature of man intent on making way for more modern structures.

The land on which the church building is located was deeded to the trustees for the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, by Sanford E. Catterlin and Mary A. Catterlin,

in 1985. This is the same Catterlin who named the town of Mount Sterling.

After the church closed, it stood idle and without attention for a number of years. The grounds became unruly and overgrown; the church building began to show the results of neglect. In 1980, the Methodist Conference deeded the church building and two acres of land to the Choctaw County Historical Society.

The society is now working toward restoring the interior of the church, but work is at a standstill until more funds are made available to the historical society. Work on the exterior is already complete. When restored the building will house and display books, manuscripts, pictures, artifacts and other materials collected by the society. It will be available for weddings, receptions, meetings, special church services, family reunions and other civic gatherings.

Behind the church building are the tombstones of four graves. The oldest is a flat sandstone slab over the grave of David Gregg, who died March 2, 1814. Another stone bears the name John W. Manning, who died August 18, 1863. The back side of this stone bears the inscription, Robert Milton, son of John W. and F.J. Manning, who died Feb. 11, 1866. Another stone bearing the letters A.B. McN, but with no dates or inscriptions, has been unearthed.

All these stones have been cleaned and reset in concrete. According to Heffernan, other stones must be buried in the area, as many of the old timers remember when there were 20 or more stones standing near the existing stones.

"A missing link in our search," Heffernan said, "is the source of this cemetery. Remember, the church was not constructed until 1859, yet, one of the graves dates to 1814. It is believed that some sort of religious meeting place existed in the area prior to the construction of the existing building, as the names on the tombstones do not hint that it was a family burial place."

The third and final church in Mount Sterling is St. John's Christian Methodist Episcopal Church and cemetery. St. John's recently celebrated its 115 anniversary. It was established in 1870.

Residents of present-day Mount Sterling speak fondly of recollections and stories told by family members about the town in its heyday.

One resident, Virginia Singley, said, "This was a booming town at one time. We had a hotel and two doctors; and they (townsmen) were even going to put the courthouse here. The community still owns a piece of property right out here that we call the square."

Although only five of the town's original homes are still standing, many residents recognize and appreciate the historical significance of these homes.

The oldest Mount Sterling home is the Roach Home. At one time it served as the girls' dormitory for the Mellen Academy.

Another old residence is the McAllister Home. Plunk Adams built the home as a hotel; the year of construction is not known. The second owners were two brothers, Forest and Watters Allen. The third owner was Gross Turner. The fourth owner was Charles McAllister (from which the house got its name). The fifth owner was James Buckalew. The sixth and present owner is David C. Parten. Plunk Adams was a relative of Mrs. Parten.

The three other homes that have historical significance are the Linder Home, the Jackson Home and the Mills Home.

Most of the people who now live in Mount Sterling are employed by either James

River Corp. (Naheola Mill), Vanity Fair Mill, MacMillan-Bloedel, Inc., American Can Corp. or C.F. Littlepage Lumber Co., Inc.

At one time cheap land, mild climate and good timber attracted people who cultivated the fertile sandy loam. They raised corn, oats, peas, peanuts, cotton, wheat, sweet potatoes, hay and vegetables. But now there are no more farmers in Mount Sterling. The main industry today is tree farming.

Connie F. Littlepage of Littlepage Lumber Co. Inc. is from one of the first families in Mount Sterling. He's been running his mill since 1956.

It used to be "When the mill ran full blast we employed about 58 people. But now we're mechanized and have modern equipment. It used to take about 12 to 15 people in the mill. We can run that mill now with eight men in there and everything else is operated mechanically. Altogether, we employ about 26 people," Littlepage said.

Mount Sterling has one grocery store owned by Wayne Turner. According to Turner, the best time of the day for his business is quitting time at Littlepage's mill.

Mount Sterling has no educational facility today. The children of the community attend school in Butler, Ala. The fact that Mount Sterling has no school does not bother most residents. What does bother them is the fact that the young people have nothing to entertain them other than school-related events.

This, according to Louise Heffernan, is a problem in the community.

"When I was a little girl we had to work in the corn fields until we were too tired to do anything but rest. On Saturdays we usually had a fish fry or chicken fry and invited friends over and danced or sang to the piano. Now young people don't have anything to do around here. That usually means they entertain themselves by gathering in parking lots and standing around with time on their hands."

The water system servicing 265 families in the Mount Sterling area was installed in 1984. It is known as the Mount Sterling Water and Fire Protection Authority. This system enabled residents to have their own personal fire hydrants installed on their property at a cost of \$1,000 per hydrant. Some residents chose to share the expense with other neighbors, but most all are protected. Residents have fire hydrants because there is no town fire department.

Many Mount Sterling residents are considering incorporation. Others think Butler would like to annex Mount Sterling, but general consensus leans toward incorporation.

Mr. Speaker, Alabama's history is full of interesting stories and places such as this fine community and its citizens. It is an honor for me to share this story with my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

ENSURE FAIR TAX REFORM

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving letters from hundreds and hundreds of individuals from the State of Kentucky and from my First Congressional District about the proposed tax reform simplification plan.

I would like to share with my colleagues the excellent letter that I received from a fellow Kentuckian, attorney Paul L. Humphrey of Louisville, KY, who has contacted me about his suggestions to ensure our tax system is fair to all Americans.

As you know, our colleagues on the House Committee on Ways and Means are currently considering tax reform legislation. I urge my colleagues to read the timely views of Paul L. Humphrey about his concerns on fair taxation.

The letter from Mr. Humphrey follows:

SEPTEMBER 9, 1985.

THE PRESIDENT,
HONORABLE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: A great opportunity now exists for a revolutionary overhaul of the incomprehensible hodgepodge known as the Internal Revenue Code. A better word than "overhaul" is "replacement."

This great nation is founded on the principle of equality and fairness, including fair taxation. Such is not the case under the existing tax code. The time has come, indeed it is long past, when the Congress of this great nation, the elected representatives of *all the people*, must address their responsibility to enact fair tax laws.

We begin with the premise that all taxes must and do derive from income and the tax base, to be equitable and fair, must include *all income from all sources and from all people*. For example, the taxes paid by the factory worker from his income, include not only the direct tax withheld from his wages but also the tax paid by him at the gasoline pump.

The time has come when the elected representatives of *all the people* must face up to their responsibility to represent the true "special interests" of this country, i.e., the workers who earn a living for themselves and families, who go to the polls and vote for candidates who they hope will represent all the people, who give freely of their time, talents and material goods to help their less fortunate neighbors and who have historically *paid more* than their fair share of the cost of government—the so called "middle class."

The existing tax code and implementing regulations, which I understand fills more than 10,000 pages, can be replaced with an equitable document of less than one hundred pages.

Starting with the proposition that all taxes must and do derive from income, the matter of fair taxation becomes relatively simple:

1. First there must be protection for low income people. This can be accomplished by exempting from taxation an amount sufficient to provide the necessities of life for the individual and family.

2. All other income, from whatever source, above the exempted amount, would be taxed on a graduated scale at three to six levels with the percentage of tax increasing from level to level to a maximum rate.

3. There would be no deductions from taxable income, from whatever source derived, because once the fringe is removed from the dike of deductions, the flood gates open and we would soon be back in the same mess we are now in.

I am a lawyer, not an actuary, so will leave the computation of exempt income and percentage of taxable income needed in the various tax brackets to the experts in that

field. However, the principle is sound and such tax system would be productive.

Application of the necessary tax rates to all of the taxable income of all the people, whether natural or corporate, would not only balance the Federal Budget forthwith, but would in reasonable time retire the national debt.

Our country is blessed with the most productive people, the greatest natural resources, the most advanced technology and the greatest wealth of any nation on this earth. There is no excuse for our "living on credit" and leaving our descendants with a financial burden beyond the comprehension of the average man.

I am aware that it is the policy of the Administration to not increase taxes. That policy is laudable considering the welfare of present taxpayers. But who is looking out for the interest of future taxpayers? We have no right to incur annual deficits upwards of two hundred billion dollars and charge them to the account of future generations, born and unborn.

Mr. President and Honorable Members of Congress, I implore you to seriously reflect on the ideas set forth herein. Our great country must be saved from chaos.

Respectfully,

PAUL L. HUMPHREY.

**CITY COLLEGE OF NEW YORK
CLASS OF 1937 YIELDS UNHER-
ALDED THREE NOBEL PRIZE
WINNERS**

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as the senior New York member of the House Education and Labor Committee as well as the New York congressional delegation, I have great reason to be proud today. I wish to bring to my colleagues' attention two recent developments to come out of public education in New York City.

When this year's Nobel Prize winners for chemistry were recently announced, a truly unheralded honor was pinned upon the City of College of New York in uptown Manhattan. This year's winners, Dr. Herbert A. Hauptman and Dr. Jerome Karle, became the second and third Nobel Prize winners from City College's 1937 graduating class. Another of their classmates, Dr. Arthur Kronberg, was awarded the coveted prize for medicine in 1959. Never before have three Nobel Prize winners emerged from one single graduating class of any college. In addition, this year's two winners now meritoriously bring to seven the total number of Nobel Prize winners City College has produced—a total unmatched by any other public institution in the Nation.

I'm sure my colleagues can understand my enthusiasm. The mid-1930's were lean years. Many students who attended then were offspring of poor immigrants, those who ardently pursued education as a ticket out of the ghetto. City College was able to provide this ticket for future success by way of challenging, rigorous academic standards—all for 50 cents a semester.

With these examples before us, there can be no greater argument for our continued support for public education. When a taxpayer-financed institution invests in and produces seven people who turn around and advance the course of mankind, the payoff is great and all of us as citizens are clearly the winners.

The second development I wish to bring to the fore is one which exemplifies the effectiveness of private participation in the educating process. Five years ago, a truly philanthropic industrialist, Eugene Lang, told sixth-graders at Harlem's Public School 121 that he would pay their college tuitions provided they finish high school. Mr. Lang, having grown up in East Harlem, as I did, unilaterally sought to save these youngsters from the prevailing dropout rate in their economically depressed neighborhood. At a very young age in their lives, he instilled in them the promise of higher education. He harnessed their young and not-yet-jaded dreams of success. He delivered it all by monitoring and providing for their academic achievement, counseling them and their families, and putting money aside for each. This past Sunday, the Washington Post lauded this man and reported that 51 youngsters remaining in New York are now in the 11th grade and only one does not plan on attending college.

Mr. Lang must be commended for his patronage and commitment to these children and their families. He has given them something not always available from their immediate surroundings—hope and motivation. The extraordinary perseverance they have demonstrated in these last 5 years of their young lives will provide them with a college education which in turn will open up thousands of possibilities heretofore unavailable.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply impressed by these two educational milestones discussed today. I believe the two together demonstrate the necessity for public and private partnerships in grooming the next generation of well-educated Americans. Together, the public and private sectors can encourage educational incentives by providing funds and resources which allow a young student to grow to his or her absolute potential. We must remember what we are doing when we give a youngster the opportunity to receive an education. We are investing in our own future. A public college has given the world seven Nobel Prize winners by 1985. A private industrialist's promise in 1980 in now buttressing 50 Harlem youngsters and laying open huge possibilities for them, their families and community 4 or 5 years from now. I hope my remarks today will serve to illustrate the importance of public and private participation in our educational institutions. In conclusion, let me not forget to extend my congratulations to Drs. Hauptman and Karle and my deepest gratitude to Mr. Eugene Lang.

**A TRIBUTE TO DR. AARON E.
HENRY**

HON. WAYNE DOWDY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the distinguished career of a fellow Mississippian, Dr. Aaron E. Henry. For the last 25 years Dr. Henry has served as the state president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. As you know, these years have been trying for our State and through them Dr. Henry has proven a strong and effective leader.

Dr. Henry is a graduate of Xavier University in New Orleans, LA, and is the recipient of three honorary doctor of humanities degrees. He is married to the former Noelle Michael and they have one child, Rebecca Elizabeth.

Throughout the past quarter of a century, Dr. Henry has made a historical contribution to the advancement of racial equality in our State and Nation. His leadership in the NAACP, the Mississippi State Legislature, and the United Methodist Church has truly improved the lives of many.

I know you will want to join me in paying tribute to this outstanding American.

A DESPICABLE ACT

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, Alex Odeh, the California director of the Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Committee, was recently murdered by a terrorist's bomb. Any murder is horrifying, Mr. Speaker, but we in Congress have a particular duty to speak out when murder is committed for the furtherance of political ends. Our society is based on the notion that one should only advance one's political goals through non-violent means. This is a fundamental principle, the common bond between all of us in Congress, and indeed between all Americans, with the exception of some disturbed individuals. No matter how strong our commitment to particular political goals, our first responsibility is to denounce those who use terror to advance their ends.

In particular, many of us in this country have a strong emotional involvement in the problems of the Middle East. That involvement may be strong, but our attachment to the principle above is always stronger. Mr. Speaker, I ask that an editorial by the Near East Report be reprinted here. The Near East Report is a pro-Israeli publication which is substantively in disagreement with the Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Committee and has disputed its contentions on many occasions. On the matter of Alex

Odeh's tragic death, however, the Near East Report, and all good citizens, join with the committee in solidarity. Our political differences are transcended by our opposition to terrorism.

A DESPICABLE ACT

The murder of Alex Odeh, California director of the Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Committee, is a tragedy for his family (including three small children), his friends, and his community. However, even beyond those who knew him, the reverberations of Odeh's murder can be felt. Alex Odeh was killed because of his political views. He was murdered because he exercised his Constitutionally-protected right of free speech.

This type of murder strikes at more than just one man. It strikes at what this entire country is about. In much of the world, individuals do not dare speak out on political issues because they fear a violent response. But the United States is different. Here, radio call-in shows and letter-to-the-editor columns give all Americans the opportunity to express themselves as citizens of a free country. People call and write letters safe in the knowledge that their views (even if they are wrong) will not land them in prison or on someone's hit list.

Alex Odeh's killing is a tragic reminder that this precious right to free speech can be taken away by thugs. Terrorism is not limited to Israel or Lebanon or any of the other places where terrorists have struck. It can happen here—and it has. The killer or killers of Alex Odeh—who destroyed a man but threaten a whole way of life—must be apprehended and brought to justice quickly. Terrorists must not be permitted to rob us of freedoms, we must never take for granted.

THE ILLINOIS NATIONAL GUARD

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, next year will mark the 350th anniversary of the U.S. National Guard, an organization of citizen-soldiers whose members have defended this country since before its independence. To honor this remarkable record of service, I recently cosponsored a resolution (H. Res. 245), introduced by Representative THOMAS HARTNETT, of South Carolina, which would call upon the Postmaster General to issue a commemorative stamp to honor the National Guard.

The National Guard was organized in Boston in 1636 as a local militia. Later, of course, the Guard defended the colonists against the British during the American Revolution, and has fought in every war, and almost every battle, since. But although I support this effort to celebrate the National Guard's anniversary, I am sure my colleagues agree, it is insufficient honor to mark such an illustrious history.

We in Illinois can share in our Nation's pride on the National Guard's anniversary, for the Illinois National Guard is very nearly as old. It also boasts two former Presidents of the United States among its ranks.

The Illinois National Guard was born in 1712 as the Provincial Militia of the Illinois District of the Province of Louisiana, when the territory still belonged to the French. It was organized by Pierre Duque Boisbriant in Cahokia and Kaskaskia. Territorial militiamen joined the fight against the British in the Revolution, and our State National Guard has served in every American conflict since.

The Illinois Military and Naval Department, which comprises the Illinois National Guard, has published a fascinating account of the National Guard careers of two of our State's most famous citizens, Abraham Lincoln and Ulysses Grant. A pamphlet authored by Dr. Wayne C. Temple highlights the contributions they made through their service in the Guard.

Abraham Lincoln and a group of his friends answered the Governor's call for volunteers to fight in the Black Hawk War, and Lincoln was appointed captain of his rag-tag regiment near Pleasant Plains, IL, on April 21, 1832. The regiment immediately set off for Beardstown, but their planned encounter with the Indians never materialized. In fact, later in his career, Lincoln joked that mosquitoes caused his only loss of blood in the Black Hawk campaign.

Although Lincoln remained a member of the Illinois National Guard for the rest of his life, his next promotion, according to Dr. Temple, came on March 4, 1861, when he became President and Commander-in-Chief of the entire U.S. Army Forces. Certainly, that was the biggest promotion in U.S. history.

Ulysses Grant began his service in Springfield, at the outbreak of the Civil War. Gov. Richard Yates, impressed by the fact that Grant had attended West Point, made Grant his military aide and gave him a desk job in the adjutant general's office. Grant, however, wanted to see combat, and in June 1861, Governor Yates gave Grant his commission, as colonel of 21st Infantry Regiment of the Illinois State Militia. Grant proved himself well, and rose quickly through the ranks. He was promoted to brigadier general later in 1861, and took command of the entire Union Army less than 3 years later. Surprisingly, though, Grant was not made a full general until 1866—after the Civil War had ended. In 1869, he too became President of the United States and Commander-in-Chief.

Today, the Illinois National Guard is at the disposal of the Governor and the President, and helps to maintain order in time of storm, public disorder, or other emergency. The State spends about \$4 million annually for the National Guard, while the Federal Government contributes more than \$52 million. Men and women between the ages of 17 and 35 are eligible to join, and serve one weekend each month and 2 weeks each year.

The National Guard also offers a full college scholarship and job training to high school students, age 17 and older. Students are eligible in their junior year, and can receive immediate pay and training one weekend per month while they finish school. Upon graduation, they continue

weekend service, but also can receive a full 4-year scholarship to any Illinois State-run college or university.

The National Guard provides an excellent opportunity for national service, and represents the highest ideal of the citizen-soldier.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1985

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, JIM COURTER, for giving us this opportunity to focus attention on the continuing human rights violations taking place in the Soviet Union. The timing is crucial; our representatives are presently meeting at the cultural forum in Budapest with the representatives of the other 34 countries who signed the Helsinki Final Act, and we are on the threshold of the meeting in Geneva between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev. We have also recently heard encouraging news about the possibility of a 3-month exit visa for Dr. Elena Bonner for medical treatment.

I interpret the news about Dr. Bonner as a possible sign that perhaps the Soviets do not wish to appear as intransigent as they have in the past. However, I think we, as a people, must be careful not to be taken in by Gorbachev's apparent charm, facility with words, and ability to deal with the press. The Soviets finally have someone in power who knows the value of good public relations but we cannot let an affable demeanor and a Western attitude toward the press cloud the real issues. We need to see real progress in the area of human rights before we can even think about any agreement.

This is why linkage is so important. Any agreement we enter into with the Soviets must be predicated on a prior and concurrent condition of tangible human rights efforts. Dr. Bonner's exit visa may appear to be a kind act, but it is no more than what any civilized country would have done years ago. I must also point out that this is only one visa, and there are hundreds of thousands waiting to leave. Dr. Bonner's visa is only temporary, and even if it were permanent, it would be valueless without a corresponding exit permit for her husband, Dr. Andrei Sakharov. And one for Anatoly Shcharansky and one for Ida Nudel and one for Iosef Begun and one for Vladimir Volvovsky and one for each of the hundreds of thousands of refuseniks and prisoners of conscience, Christian and Jewish and any other ethnic or religious minority. And one for each individual who would wish to leave but feared the reprisals of a punitive and repressive system.

NATIONAL AUTISM WEEK

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with 38 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, a resolution which would designate December 1 to 7, 1985, "National Autism Week."

It is altogether fitting that such a commemoration take place and that this resolution receive the support of all Members of the Congress. Autism is a physical brain disorder which afflicts over 350,000 children and adults in the United States. This resolution would help in dispelling the myth that autism is a form of mental illness. It is not.

National Autism Week would also coincide with the 20th anniversary of the National Society for Children & Adults With Autism. Founded in 1965, NSAC has been dedicated to the education and welfare of all persons with severe disorders of communication and behavior. Along with other committed individuals, NSAC has helped to bring autism out of the darkness of despair and into the daylight of education, training, and rehabilitation.

Autism is a severely incapacitating, lifelong, developmental disability whose symptoms include unusual sensory responses, lack of understanding of speech and visual language, extreme emotional responses, and social withdrawal. It occurs in approximately 15 of every 10,000 births and is four times more common among males than females. Although there is no known cure for autism, with continued research it can be treated. NSAC is at the forefront of promoting such research and treatment.

It is for these reasons I am urging my colleagues to support this resolution commemorating December 1 to 7, 1985, as National Autism Week. The time has come for each one of us, as responsible public servants, to recognize the enormous contributions of NSAC and to bring autism further into the light of education and understanding.

BAPTIST MINISTER
CHALLENGES ROMANIANS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in today's edition of the Washington Post, reporter Jackson Diehl has written a story detailing the extent of religious repression in Romania as experienced by Buni Cocar, a Baptist minister seeking to hold religious services in Bucharest.

Last summer, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of meeting with this courageous man as the leader of a congressional delegation to investigate human rights in Romania. The treatment Buni Cocar has re-

ceived at the hands of the Romanian Government stands as a tragic testament to the true status of church-state relations in Romania.

Contrary to the image Romania has so carefully cultivated in the West, religion is systematically suppressed within that country. As the Post reporter states, "In austere, ruthlessly regimented Romania, even the quiet reshaping of a chapel on a disheveled back street is a glaring exception to state controls over religion and its practice."

I urge my colleagues to read this excellent article relating the chain of events leading to the state demolition of the Holy Trinity Church in Bucharest. I think they will be shocked to learn that life in Romania as a practicing Christian or Jew does not resemble the rosy picture the Romanian Government has painted for us.

Having witnessed this repression with my own eyes, together with Mr. HALL and Mr. WOLF, we have introduced legislation to temporarily suspend MFN status for Romania for 6 months in the hope that they might reconsider their policy of harassment and repression. After 6 months, the President can make a determination as to whether MFN status should be granted again.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that those who learn of the extent of religious repression in Romania, as I have, will agree with me that the U.S. Congress must no longer condone these practices by routinely extending MFN status to Romania. Once again, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the article, which follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 1, 1985]

BAPTIST MINISTER CHALLENGES ROMANIANS
(By Jackson Diehl)

BUCHAREST.—Baptist minister Buni Cocar insists that he never meant to challenge Romania's Communist government. He never wanted to break the law, he says, and he certainly never expected that in the end he would be cornered by bureaucrats, bulldozers and police in the ruins of an old backstreet chapel.

All he ever wanted, the Rev. Cocar says, was to rebuild his Holy Trinity Church.

"We were growing, and there was no room for all the people anymore," Cocar explained one recent morning, pacing restlessly atop the rusting tin roofing of Holy Trinity, a one-room concrete structure tucked between small family homes in northeast Bucharest.

"We wanted to do something nice, to make a proper building. We didn't want to make a revolution. We just tried to put up a new roof."

Such a project might seem common in a capital where thousands of old buildings and whole neighborhoods are being flattened and reconstructed. But in austere, ruthlessly regimented Romania, even the quiet reshaping of a chapel on a disheveled back street is a glaring exception to state controls over religion and its practice.

As a result, helmeted militia and demolition crews arrived at Holy Trinity one Saturday morning this summer, tore down its new roof and annex, and prohibited its volunteer builders from putting up so much as a canvas to cover the gaping hole left in its side wall.

Cocar, the church's pastor, was fined heavily and ordered to leave Bucharest, and

the church's two deacons were fired from their state jobs after being detained and beaten by police.

Now, Cocar and his congregation find themselves in a test of wills with government authorities. They have resolved to remain in their church through the winter, and the 33-year-old clergyman, who left Bucharest briefly, has defiantly returned. "We'll get by somehow," Cocar said. "But we won't abandon the church. These people here have nothing more to lose."

The standoff has little political significance in a country whose Communist president, Nicolae Ceausescu, has consolidated a formidable structure of personal power and eliminated virtually all signs of dissent. Yet Cocar's crusade illustrates how some Romanian churches have become the homes of independent-minded communities willing to challenge the government aggressively on issues of expansion, proselytism and control over religious organizations.

"The churches are becoming more appealing, and the more aggressive they are, the more people they attract," a western diplomat here said. "It is a reaction to the stagnant and hopeless situation the regime has brought people to."

Romania has the largest church attendance among Eastern European countries after Poland, and many church leaders believe membership has been growing in recent years. While the Orthodox Church, followed by approximately 70 percent of all Romanians, generally avoids all confrontation with the government, many of the country's 13 other recognized denominations show more independence despite state controls over their finances and activities.

The Baptists, whose growing numbers have been estimated variously between 100,000 and 300,000, have sought in recent years to expand churches or build new ones all over the country, often in defiance of official restrictions.

Authorities often have responded toughly. Several churches, like Holy Trinity, have suffered from official demolitions, and international human rights groups have reported a number of instances of persecution of Baptist activists.

At the same time, western diplomats here say, government repression of church activities often has been restrained carefully, perhaps in deference to the interest taken in Romanian Protestant churches by fundamentalist groups in the United States.

"It's a game that's played here," a diplomat well acquainted with church activities said. "The churches try and get away with things, and the authorities sometimes let them. The times when the authorities react more violently are those when they perceive a direct provocation."

In Cocar's case, the provocation seemed to arise from the very energy of a young minister intent on multiplying the numbers of his followers and impatient with formal restrictions. The son of a pastor from the interior town of Medias, Cocar finished divinity school in Bucharest in 1978, then was licensed by authorities to live and work in the oil-mining town of Petrosani.

Cocar took over a Baptist church there with 70 members and more than doubled the size of its congregation in a yearlong campaign. Then, in 1980, he decided to return to Bucharest and revive the Holy Trinity Church, which had stagnated for years while its congregation sank from 150 to 20.

Authorities refused to grant the ambitious young preacher permission to live in the

capital and stripped him of his religious license. But the determined Cocar stayed anyway, making his own contract with Holy Trinity's remaining members.

For several years, his presence in the poor, aged neighborhood of Giulesti was tolerated. Attendance at Holy Trinity grew until up to 500 persons were crowded into its chapel and tiny side yard for thrice-weekly services.

Even before Cocar's arrival, Holy Trinity had been denied permission to expand its chapel or even to repair structural damage from a 1977 earthquake. But Cocar quietly led volunteers in building expansions that extended the chapel by a third and widened it across the yard.

Finally, Cocar and church leaders decided last February to launch a definitive renovation. Using plans drawn up by a friendly architect and materials bought from state construction companies, 100 church volunteers worked in teams with 20 moonlighting specialists to put up a new, arching roof 35 feet high at its peak—the beginning of a local landmark.

The project was already well into its fifth month and new interior walls for the church were being prepared when Bucharest's mayor called in Cocar and told him he had gone too far. Shortly afterward, the demolition crews arrived and went to work despite the occupation of the chapel by several dozen members of Holy Trinity.

Fined more than 30,000 Romanian lei, or about \$2,000, for offenses ranging from living in Bucharest to violating zoning codes, Cocar was forced back to Petrosani. But he came back to the city in September, and shortly afterward, a large tent appeared alongside the damaged chapel, covering the partially disassembled side wall.

Authorities soon appeared and ordered the tent removed. But Cocar has remained in Bucharest and doggedly gone on planning for the coming winter.

"We'll buy some overcoats," Cocar said. "Maybe we'll find another canvas to cover the side. The old ladies will have to stay home and wait for spring. But the majority will stay here, whatever happens."

ARMED FORCES RESERVE—AN INVALUABLE ASSET FOR NATIONAL STRENGTH

HON. WAYNE DOWDY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct our attention today to the invaluable service to our country performed by the men and women of the Armed Forces Reserve. Over 1.5 million of these dedicated people spend their time and talents to help ensure that America has adequate manpower on which to rely in the event of military conflict.

In August of this year, one of these committed servicemen brought his long and distinguished career to an end. Earnest L. Cockrell served a total of 42 years in the Armed Forces. His service included the U.S. Army, the Enlisted Reserve Component, and the Army Reserve. For his distinguished career, Mr. Cockrell was recently awarded the Meritorious Service Medal.

Let us make no mistake in assessing the strengths of our military capability.

In all our striving to attain a technologically-advanced system of defense, we must not lose sight of the fact that protection of our Nation will always depend on the willingness of men such as Mr. Earnest L. Cockrell to devote their lives in the maintenance of our peacetime and wartime military.

SAVE AMERICA'S SYNFUELS PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, rarely has more misinformation and hyperbole surrounded a seemingly concrete public policy question than the future of the U.S. Synthetic Fuels Corporation. Opponents of the SFC make the spurious claim of immediate and vast budget savings if the Corporation were abolished and supporters wax philosophic on the energy security of our Nation. Closer to the middle of these arguments lies the truth; abolishing the Corporation would lead to some short-term budget savings but the effects on U.S. energy security could be dramatic and efforts toward energy independence may be severely crippled.

Back in July, the House of Representatives voted to effectively kill the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. Unfortunately, surrounding that legislative battle was a campaign of misinformation asserting that the immediate budget impact of scuttling the SFC would be savings of the total \$7.9 billion reserved for the program or at least of the \$744 million slated for action by the Board. I do not believe our President or the Senate will be deceived by these claims. The Congressional Budget Office reports that abolishing the SFC now would yield a savings in fiscal year 1986 of only \$14 million and over 5 years of possibly \$332 million. The key element most often ignored by opponents of SFC is the type of financial aid given by the Corporation to synfuels project sponsors. The assistance given is not an immediate outlay of funds. Projects receive price supports and loan guarantees which occur over a period of years, in many cases over the course of a decade. Those who claim an immediate \$7.9 billion deficit savings are simply not correct.

Another major argument leveled against the SFC is that it has been wasteful and guilty of administrative bungling. No one can deny that there have been flaws in the program but opponents of SFC seem to be struck in the past, dismissing two important events which have helped to put the program back on the track. First, last year Congress and the administration took the initiative to cut the program by 45 percent. This has led to a significant scaling back of projects supported by the Corporation, saving taxpayer dollars and moving away

from the "subsidy-starved white elephants" cited by SFC detractors. For example, the Union Oil oil shale project originally slated for two separate plants demonstrating divergent technologies has been condensed into a single project at a far lower price tag. Congress further provided that 50 percent of the savings from scaling down projects would be returned to the Treasury. The point is that we have already used a scalpel to carve a more efficient U.S. Synthetic Fuels Program. That action was barely 1 year ago. Abolishing the SFC before those reforms have been allowed to work would be wielding a butcher knife on the energy security of the United States.

The second factor in SFC's reform is the new Board of Directors and their comprehensive strategy for the Corporation. The Board has cut their staff, exercised more direct control over the operations of the Corporation, and has shown a hands-on determination to approve projects, many of which have been on drawing boards for years, to get a visible, operating Synthetic Fuels Program in place.

In addition, the comprehensive strategy is designed to provide a diversity of synfuels technology on a commercial scale but at more cost-effective and efficient levels than ever before. These factors are particularly important. Although opponents of SFC deride the commercial scale of SFC supported projects and would opt for more research and development, the ability to scale-up these small commercial projects and the variety of technologies available become critical in the face of a petroleum supply disruption. That is one of the most compelling reasons to support the reorganized SFC and it demonstrates the Board's responsible and effective approach to our Synthetic Fuels Program, taken at the explicit direction of Congress last year. Are we willing to so quickly forget the oil embargoes of the 1970's and waiting in gas station lines at dawn? How likely is it, then, that we will be vulnerable to energy supply disruptions similar to those of the last decade.

The desire to eliminate the SFC, crippling a commercial scale synfuels program, and to ignore the lessons of the past is a prime example of looking to the short-term rather than to the long-term security brought by energy self-sufficiency for the United States. If anyone doubts the necessity for a viable, commercial scale synfuels program in the United States, we need only look at the increases in U.S. domestic consumption of petroleum products in 1984—they were up 5 percent. In addition, U.S. oil imports were up 8 percent during the same period. And when we talk about the deficit, it is important to note that oil imports contribute a full \$60 billion to our enormous trade deficit. Consumption is up, imports are up and at the same time the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment reports that domestic exploration and finding rates are down, along with a sharply declining offshore reserve base for oil and gas. Simply put, we cannot afford the luxury of waiting until another energy

supply crisis occurs. We have to take steps now to ensure our future.

Opponents of SFC point to adequate supplies of low-cost oil available now in world markets. What this line of reasoning fails to recognize is that dropping prices do not necessarily mean guaranteed supply. Some of our best oil analysts conclude that by 1990 we can expect over half of our oil imports to once again come from OPEC nations, and most of that is produced in the Middle East. The high degree of risk associated with that region is readily apparent and the lessons of the 1970's should not be ignored. If we do not develop a cost-effective alternative to imported petroleum we will allow ourselves once again to be vulnerable to the supply disruption crises. That is why the commercial scale projects supported by SFC are so important.

In the next few weeks, the President and the Senate will be making decisions on the future of the U.S. Synthetic Fuels Program, not just on the SFC. Our Nation has the opportunity to be proactive, taking steps to avoid future crises. The alternative is to be reactive, acting in haste to future supply disruptions. We cannot afford to repeat the mistakes of the past. A responsible, cost-effective Synfuels Program is now in place and the President and the U.S. Senate can show some cost-effective vision by supporting a leaner, meaner, more efficient SFC.

TWELVE YEARS OF NIGHT IN CHILE

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues attention an article recently published in the New York Times by our respected colleague, Robert F. Drinan S.J. During his service in the House, Father Drinan distinguished himself as a champion of human rights. Today, as a professor of law at Georgetown University and prolific writer and commentator on the important issues of our day, Father Drinan continues to speak out on these topics of concern.

Following a recent trip to Chile on a mission for the International League for Human Rights, Father Drinan authored the following essay which outlines the vast problems facing that nation, and the responsibility and opportunity before us.

Father Drinan continues to be a bold and moral voice for human rights, and I commend his article to my colleagues' attention.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 11, 1985]

12 YEARS OF NIGHT IN CHILE

(By Robert F. Drinan)

WASHINGTON.—What will opposition forces in Chile do today, the 12th anniversary of the coup that brought Gen. Augusto Pinochet to power? I found no clear answers to that question during a visit last month. But I saw water cannons waiting to quell demonstrators. I saw, too, deep frustration among the 11.8 million people, who are humiliated

by the torture, murders, harassment and the exiling of citizens who are heirs to one of the richest democratic traditions in Latin America.

I do know the United States has an important role in Chile's future. The arrival shortly of a new ambassador offers the Administration an opportunity to change its policy, in which pieties about a democratic transition are coupled with acts that bolster General Pinochet. We must now press unmistakably for civilian rule.

President Reagan owes Chilean citizens no less. The disintegration of freedom in the last dozen years has been appalling. In 1973, more than 50 percent of all workers belonged to labor unions; today, only 8 percent. In 1973, the external debt was \$4 billion; today, \$22 billion. The media are censored. Torture touches hundreds each year but intimidates millions. Political parties are suspended.

Aside from the United States, about the only source of hope in Chile is the Roman Catholic Church. At a dinner in the home of Raul Silva Henriquez, the 78-year-old retired Archbishop of Santiago, this venerable figure reviewed his efforts to deter terror from 1973 to 1983 and concluded by saying that the Government's oppression of the church is as bad as persecution of the church in the Roman Empire in the early centuries of Christianity. Chile is harassing the church because, almost alone among social institutions, it represents the tortured, the exiled, the unemployed and the poor.

Nearly everyone in Chile wonders when the dark night will end. Now 68 years old, General Pinochet will not go voluntarily because he has no place to go. If he remains in Chile, he could be tried for countless crimes just as generals and admirals of Argentina have been tried. If he wants to go abroad, there is no place to go except possibly Paraguay.

I have hundreds of memories of the people I talked with. But the one I shall never be able to forget is a man I met in a line outside a jail in Valparaiso while waiting to visit 42 political prisoners.

He told me he was waiting to visit his two sons, both imprisoned on unspecified charges of subversion. After two years, no trial date had been set. Torture had been used, but he obviously did not want to talk about it. As I moved out of the line into the prison, he ended our conversation by stating, "What happens to my sons depends on decisions to be made by the President of your country."

WILL THE PRESIDENT TAKE SOME SOUND ADVICE ON THE ORIGINS OF THE DEFICIT?

HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the attention of my colleagues to a column by the syndicated conservative columnist, George F. Will, an acknowledged adviser to the Reagan team. It appeared in the Saginaw News on October 27.

The fact that Mr. Will is an ardent conservative and Reagan supporter lends added credibility to his remarks. I think

that Mr. Will is to be applauded for his integrity in making these remarks.

BLAME THE PRESIDENT, PLEASE—HE'S RESPONSIBLE FOR RUINOUS DEFICIT, AND MAKING IT WORSE

(By George F. Will)

WASHINGTON.—It is said we owe to the Middle Ages humanity's two most destructive inventions—gunpowder and romantic love. But let this be said for the Middle Ages: People understood government. They especially understood that kings (read: presidents) not parliaments (read: Congress) are the principal impediments to reasonable public finance.

Kings were constantly siphoning off the nation's wealth to build palaces, or liberate Jerusalem or, even more peculiarly, to explore what was to become Florida. Parliaments tried to pull the purse strings.

After 500 years of enlightenment, there is less understanding. Americans think Congress is the big deficit-maker. Never mind Lyndon Johnson's guns-and-butter choice, and never mind Ronald Reagan's guns-and-tax cuts choice. And never mind that while Reagan has been presiding over the production of more than half of this nation's federal debt, he has not found much to veto on budgeting grounds. This is because Congress has spent about what he has requested. And Congress has enacted as many balanced budgets as he has submitted.

Of course, presidents veto for other than budgetary reasons. Still, it is indicative that FDR averaged 43 vetoes a year, Eisenhower 23, and Reagan in his first term only 10 a year. Ten of this century's 15 presidents have used the veto more regularly than Reagan. But as this written he is threatening to veto something, in part because of a provision that would reduce the deficit and cancer.

In 1951, the tax on a pack of cigarettes was put at 8 cents. In 1982, it was raised to 16 cents, which because of inflation was much less in 1982 than 8 cents was in 1951. The 1982 law stipulated a return to 8 cents. However, one provision of the current deficit-reduction effort is to keep the tax at 16 cents. This provision was included in exchange for lavish tobacco subsidies.

Much of the deficit-reduction bill rests on cooked books yielding fudged numbers. The reduction number of \$85.6 billion over three years is highly suspect. The \$4.9 billion from the tobacco tax is real. But Reagan regards tax cuts the way Mark Twain regarded bourbon: "Too much is barely enough." Hence his insistence on cutting the tobacco tax. This will increase the annual cost of smoking-related diseases, which now stands at \$35 billion.

This is tax folly compounded. The administration's tax-reform plan is, by supply-side criteria, an irrational rearrangement of burdens. It would cut \$25 billion from taxes on consumers, who demand goods and service; and it would increase taxes on businesses, which supply goods and services.

Folly is compounded, then cubed. The administration knows taxes alter incentives and believes they should be used to encourage behavior that is socially useful, such as saving and investing. Yet it wants to drive down a tax (on cigarettes) that discourages a behaviorally related disease.

H.R. 1145

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have recently joined many of my colleagues as a cosponsor of H.R. 1145, the Information Dissemination and Research Accountability Act of 1985. If enacted, I believe this legislation will go a long way to ensure the humane treatment of animals in our Nation's laboratories and to reduce the waste of taxpayers' money caused by repetitive experiments.

Thousands of animals die each year because of unnecessary duplications in experimental research programs, even though sufficient data on the results of these experiments have already been collected.

And if that is not bad enough, we, the taxpayers, have been paying for this fatal duplication through research grants awarded each year by the Federal Government.

My support for this bill is based on the idea that we can save countless numbers of animals and reduce the Federal deficit at the same time.

This bill creates a National Center for Research Accountability in the National Library of Medicine to collect and store the results of thousands of experiments already conducted.

Any requests for Federal research grants would be screened for duplication and rejected, if sufficient data have already been collected.

A centralized data system would benefit the scientific community by streamlining their experimentation efforts, saving time and making it possible to build on pre-existing research efforts.

Although the exact amount of savings is not known, I am confident that the savings will more than outweigh the cost of creating the centralized data bank, estimated to be \$300 million over 10 years.

In addition to the dollars-and-cents savings involved, the time saved by creating the data bank could be a critical factor in our search for lifesaving treatments in a number of areas.

I have received letters and cards from hundreds of people in Essex, Morris, Sussex, and Warren Counties who are very concerned about the unnecessary deaths of thousands of animals. This bill will go a long way toward finding the full scope of the problem and taking steps to prevent this unfortunate situation.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in cosponsoring this humane and economical sound legislation—H.R. 1145.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE 100TH MEETING BETWEEN
THE AMHERST AND WILLIAMS
FOOTBALL TEAMS**HON. SILVIO O. CONTE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, November 9, in the beautiful Berkshire hills of western Massachusetts, a football game will be played. Not just an ordinary football game, but the 100th meeting between the greatest small college rivals in the country—Amherst and Williams. The opening kickoff will take place at 1:30, marking the 100th such kickoff since the first meeting between these two schools in 1884.

In that first battle in 1884, Williams won 15 to 2, and has gone on to win 52 games, while Amherst has won 43. The two teams have tied four times. But Amherst has won the last four Williams-Amherst contests, and this year's meeting promises to be an exciting, bitterly fought contest.

What is so special about this event, however, is not the game itself but all that it represents. For these two schools, athletics—while viewed as an important component of the schools' programs—have always been of secondary importance to academics. At a time when there has been a great hue and cry about the overemphasis on athletics in schools throughout the Nation, Amherst and Williams have kept their athletic programs in perspective. These two small schools place emphasis on participation in athletics, rather than specialization. In fact, over half of the students at these schools participate in intercollegiate sports. And at the same time, these two highly selective colleges have maintained topnotch liberal arts programs ever since their founding.

Williams College was founded in 1793, which makes it the second oldest college in Massachusetts. In 1821, the president of Williams, Zethaniah Swift Moore, left the secluded town of Williamstown with a number of Williams' faculty members, and headed down to the Connecticut Valley to found a new college. That new school became Amherst College in Amherst, MA; and ever since then, the two schools have maintained a fierce—yet healthy—rivalry.

At the turn of the century, Dartmouth College in New Hampshire joined Amherst and Williams to form the original "Little Three," but this football rivalry was short-lived. Dartmouth began placing too much emphasis on its sports' programs for the more academically minded Amherst and Williams. So in 1910, another small New England school, Wesleyan University in Middletown, CT, which more closely reflected the priorities of the two western Massachusetts colleges, joined them to form a new "Little Three." Currently, Williams also leads this Little Three competition with 30 wins to Amherst's 24, Wesleyan's 12 and five triple ties.

The beautiful setting for Saturday's 100th meeting between Amherst and Williams

November 1, 1985

will be Weston Field at Williams. For most of the football season up at Williams, the field is surrounded by trees ablaze with Berkshire fall foliage. Unfortunately, however, this Saturday's game is late in the season, so the colors have dulled and the leaves fallen. But the crowds of alumni, parents, and friends will still come—over 10,000 people enjoying tailgate parties and reunions with old friends, telling stories, talking politics, and even watching a little football.

I wish that all of my colleagues could come up to this beautiful spot in the Berkshire hills of western Massachusetts to view this historic contest—a contest between two great rivals: The Lord Jeffs of Amherst, led by Jim Ostendarp in his 27th year of coaching, and the Ephmen of Williams led by Coach Bob Odell in his 15th season. As the proud representative of both of these fine institutions, it would be impolitic for me to take sides in this upcoming battle; but the real winners are the fine students of both schools who are participating in this historic event. In any case, may the best team win.

FRUSTRATION VERSUS
CONVICTION**HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, Jr.**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to Gramm-Rudman it seems that one either loves it or hates it. On the one side are the doomsayers. They are clearly in the minority today.

On the other side are the euphorics, who think a law patterned after Gramm-Rudman would guarantee a balanced budget, one way or another—that is, either by normal legislative procedures, or by force of law as implemented by sequestration orders.

Mr. Speaker, both sides are wrong. As law, Gramm-Rudman would carry significantly more clout than our usual toothless budget resolutions. But we have passed other laws and we have changed the rules of the Congress before, and we have made bold promises to the American people before, only to find that the leadership is lacking to implement either the letter or the intent of the law.

I'm reminded of the Humphrey-Hawkins legislation, which also required and mandated certain actions to reduce unemployment. I remember 1980, when Congress adopted a balanced budget resolution, which made some people, but not many actually believe Congress would balance the budget. And year after year, we pass reconciliation instructions in a budget resolution only to see them ignored.

Mr. Speaker, I do not stand here today to tell my constituents we are about to balance the budget should this legislation pass and be signed into law. Gramm-Rudman carried a very limited warranty.

There's only one way to truly balance the budget, and that's to actually vote for spending reductions as opportunities present themselves, which are no infrequent.

The Founding Fathers did not, in my opinion, want a Federal Government put on auto-pilot.

The hard fact is that it takes little gumption to vote for something like Gramm-Rudman; it will take a lot more to let it work. And notwithstanding the overriding intent of the Gramm-Rudman approach—to force the Congress and the President to do their duty and thereby avoid the mindless hit of sequestration orders, historical evidence teaches that the political courage in Congress to assure implementation of Gramm-Rudman may be as lacking as are the votes to cut spending.

This is not to argue that Gramm-Rudman, as the law of the land, would rank as a minor nuisance. In the short run, it could fundamentally change the way legislation is considered at the Federal level. In the longer run, however, I fear business as usual and support it as much out of frustration as conviction.

THE WALKER PLEA-BARGAINING DECISION: A TRAVESTY OF JUSTICE

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly distressed by the Government's decision to plea-bargain with spy John Walker and his son Michael and I have written both the Attorney General and the Secretary of Defense in protest of this outrageous travesty of justice.

My letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 1, 1985.

HON. EDWIN MEESE III,
Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I was shocked and appalled to read of the government's decision to plea-bargain with spy John Walker and his son, Michael.

I understand the importance of gleaning information about the extent to which the Walker gang's treacherous activities compromised the nation's intelligence and defense capabilities, although I, for one, seriously doubt that we will ever really know all the damage done.

But, there are certain crimes which when committed—and treason is one such crime—deserve only one response: stern, resolute, and harsh punishment. No more, no less.

I cannot fathom how an Administration which holds itself out to be "tough on crime" would even contemplate plea-bargaining on this heinous crime—a crime which endangered the lives of thousands of American service men and women and perhaps even the entire U.S. population. A crime where a citizen sold out his country!

Secretary of Navy Lehman makes the point that the information John Walker gave the Soviets could have cost American lives during the Vietnam War.

To excuse this reprehensible, treasonous action to any degree is unacceptable. It sends the completely wrong and inappropriate message to others who may be involved—or are thinking about becoming involved in—similar acts of high treason.

It also sends the completely wrong and inappropriate message to our fighting men and women who risk their lives every day keeping the vigil over our freedoms—like those talented and committed fliers from the aircraft carrier *Saratoga* who intercepted the *Achille Lauro* hijackers and the thousands of others like them that the U.S. is fortunate to have posted all around the world.

The cheers, back-slapping and handshaking over the flawless and heroic performance of the Navy's fine pilots had hardly died down when the terribly unfortunate—really outrageous—decision was reached in the Walker case.

In all respect, but in all earnestness, I deplore and protest your action. If there is any way it can be reversed, it should be reversed and withdrawn promptly. Pure and simple, it is a travesty of justice.

Sincerely,

ROMANO L. MAZZOLI,
Member of Congress.

THE WAR AGAINST DRUGS IS AMERICA'S GREATEST CHALLENGE

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I spent the better part of 10 years as a drug counselor, as director of the Mahoning County Drug Program in Ohio. During my tenure there, I gained unforgettable experience and exposure to the tragic problem of drug abuse and drug dependence. In my estimation, drug abuse is America's No. 1 problem—because not only is it ravaging our youth and destroying people's lives; drug trafficking has reached uncontrollable proportions and the crime level associated with the drug trade has reached alarming levels. While our youth are being poisoned with deadly drugs, drug kingpins are masterminding drug deals and plotting against our law enforcement officers in the field.

Mr. Speaker, I am not alone in my concerns. A recent Roper Poll published in the October 29, 1985, edition of USA Today showed that 80 percent of those polled felt that the Government's No. 1 priority should be to solve drug problems and crime. The drug problem in America has reached epidemic proportions—both from a social and a criminal standpoint. As a drug counselor I have had a firsthand look at how drugs can destroy a young person's life and how drugs can tear families apart. Drug abuse is threatening the very social fabric of our Nation.

In addition to having extensive experience as a drug counselor, I also served as the sheriff of Mahoning County for 4 years. As sheriff, I was exposed to the very real threat drug trafficking poses to the civilian population and the law enforcement community. Invariably, more and more drug

busts across the country are uncovering huge caches of deadly automatic and semi-automatic weapons. In many cases the drug traffickers are better armed than the police. Tragically, the drug traffickers have been acting more brazenly in countering the heroic efforts of our law enforcement officers in the field. Earlier this year we were all outraged over the brutal murder of Drug Enforcement Agency agent Enrique Salazar Camarena at the hand of international drug traffickers. Simply put, our law enforcement agents fighting to combat illicit drug activity have become open targets for drug kingpins fighting to protect their turf and expand their volume of trade.

What concerns me the most is this increased volume of drug trade. With more and more deadly drugs on the market, our children are becoming increasingly exposed to the deadly drugs. With increased trade comes easier accessibility. The ever-increasing amount of narcotic drugs poses an immeasurable threat. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, stiff action is necessary to stem the drug trade, protect our law enforcement officers, and put away the vile drug traffickers. I recognize the fact that the Congress took significant steps last year to stiffen the penalties for drug traffickers. But the drug problem in America continues to grow at such a disturbing rate and is permeating every sector of our society that we need to build upon the framework that was set last year.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 2954, the Controlled Substances Penalties Act of 1984, that builds upon the excellent work that was done during the last Congress. H.R. 2954 would set a new category of penalties for drug offenses involving: First, 2 or more kilograms of cocaine; second, 1 kilogram or more of any other controlled substance in schedule I or II, that is, heroin; third, 1 kilogram or more of PCP; and, fourth, 25 grams or more of LSD. Those convicted for any of the later offenses would be subject to up to 30 years in prison and/or a fine of up to \$500,000. Second offenders would be subject to a maximum sentence of life in prison. Most importantly, my bill would require that those arrested on these charges automatically be denied bond—thus insuring that they stand trial. This last provision is quite important—because it would mandate that bond be denied in cases involving bulk transactions of illegal drugs—instead of leaving it to the judge's discretion. This provision would ensure that the drug kingpin—who usually has access to immense financial resources and international contracts—remains in custody and stands trial. All too often the powerful drug dealer is able to post bond—many times reaching over \$1 million—and then flee the country, only to return to continue poisoning our youth with deadly drugs. My bill would send out a powerful message to all those involved in the drug trade that America has had enough. America is going to take harsh action against those involved with drug trafficking and that those who threaten the

lives of our law enforcement agents will be dealt with severely.

H.R. 2954 is a measure that deserves every Member's close attention and support. Currently, 46 of my colleagues have signed on as cosponsors to this important bill. In addition, this legislative initiative has the support of the following police organizations: Fraternal Order of Police, International Association of Women Police, National Sheriff's Association, National Association of Police Organizations, National Association of Chiefs of Police, and the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

I urge my colleagues to lend their full support to H.R. 2954 and join me in the fight to save our society from drugs and protect our law enforcement community.

DOUBTS RAISED ABOUT PROTECTION AGAINST INSURANCE COMPANY INSOLVENCIES

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, insurance companies are unique among financial institutions in this country in that they are regulated almost exclusively at the State level. There is no dual system of Federal and State regulation of insurance such as there is with respect to the banking and securities industries. Nor is there any Federal system, like the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, established to secure the obligations of insolvent insurers.

Customers of insurance carriers are protected only if their State has an insurance guarantee fund, and then only if that fund covers the type of policy they were issued.

The following article written by a New York State senator discusses how the present incomplete system of State-sanctioned insurance guarantee funds is not protecting individual and corporate insurance consumers.

GUARANTEES OF SAFETY FOR THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY

(By John R. Dunne)

ALBANY.—A recent report from Washington disclosing that 10 percent of the nation's savings institutions are effectively bankrupt has further diminished public confidence in the nation's banking system. This revelation comes on the heels of the failure of state-sanctioned bank guarantee funds in both Ohio and Maryland to protect savings and loan depositors earlier in the year.

While the collapse of more thrift institutions would be bad enough, threatening the lifetime savings of many depositors, there is an even greater danger close at hand: the possible insolvency of some members of the biggest of all financial institutions—the nation's \$700 billion life and health insurance industry.

When the National Association of Insurance Commissioners checked the financial condition of 5,000 United States insurers at the end of 1984, it found that more than 1,100 companies were in questionable health and would require careful monitoring. That's a 68 percent increase over 1983, and

the list included an unusually high number of large companies.

Unlike banks, thrifts and securities firms, there is no Federal system to rescue a failed insurer. Because Congress has delegated to the individual states the primary authority to regulate the insurance business, policyholders must look for help to state-sanctioned insurance guarantee funds. Regrettably, however, these funds are based on an incomplete, uneven and disparate patchwork of state laws. Even more alarming is the fact that 15 states, including New Jersey, California and Ohio, have no laws at all to guarantee benefit payments to insurance companies' policyholders, even though the insurers are licensed and regulated by the states.

When an insurance company is declared insolvent, the delays and confusion spawned by conflicting state laws too often leave policyholders and claimants facing prolonged anxiety and, in some cases, even financial ruin. Two recent examples tell the story. Policyholders of the Iowa State Traveler's Mutual Assurance Company of Des Moines have had nothing but unfulfilled promises since the company was declared insolvent in 1983. Nearly \$50 million in claims have gone unpaid, and those policyholders residing in states without guarantee fund protection may ultimately receive only about 20 cents for each dollar of unpaid claim.

Similarly, the almost 100,000 customers who paid some \$3 billion for annuities from two insolvent Baldwin-United life insurance companies face an uncertain future. Arkansas, home to one of the insurance subsidiaries, has no guarantee fund law; meanwhile, some state guarantee fund laws don't cover the type of policies sold by Baldwin's subsidiaries.

Since 1941, when New York enacted the first life and health insurance guarantee fund law, the states have tried to build a comprehensive state-by-state guarantee network. Success, however, has eluded them. State insurance commissioners, acting through their national association, have failed repeatedly to agree on model guarantee fund legislation. Such legislation, if enacted in each state, would sew up the safety net and eliminate the gaping holes in coverage that now exist.

Recognizing the weakness in New York's own guarantee fund, state lawmakers moved this year to modernize the 1941 law, which, for example, protected California customers of New York insurers, but not New York customers of carriers in California. The Republican-sponsored legislation, which has been signed into law by Gov. Mario Cuomo, insures the protection of New York residents regardless of where an insurance policy is purchased. It also broadens the scope of the coverage and increases to \$500 million the financial resources that are available to protect policyholders.

What has been done in New York should be duplicated elsewhere. In California, for example, the insurance industry has managed to kill similar proposals, claiming that such legislation would be a "subsidy for bad management."

This attitude can only frustrate further reform. Moreover, the next big failure could lead to loud cries from individual and corporate consumers for a Federal guarantee system. The Ohio and Maryland episodes show how quickly state leaders will seek refuge in a Federal solution. Others will surely follow suit unless states that do not now have guarantee funds move rapidly to establish them, while states that do have such funds take steps to improve them.

IN SUPPORT OF MOAKLEY-DECONCINI

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the turmoil in Central America over the past 6 years has had a devastating effect on the people of that region and no where is this more prevalent than in El Salvador.

Not everyone in El Salvador is involved with that nation's political turmoil. Many want no more than to be able to live normal lives, raise their families in relative peace and security. Unfortunately, the situation in El Salvador prohibits them from fulfilling this simple desire. To a certain extent, our policy toward the region, and El Salvador in particular, has contributed to the disruption of the lives of hundreds of thousands of people. To the extent that we are responsible, we must begin to aid the innocent victims of the conflict in El Salvador.

Estimates run as high as 1 million displaced persons and refugees—20 percent of El Salvador's population—as a result of the conflict. Approximately half that total have come to the United States to seek sanctuary. Yet, most have not been granted political asylum; none have even been granted extended voluntary departure, that is, temporary asylum.

There is now pending in Congress legislation that would help these suffering masses, H.R. 822, more commonly known as the Moakley-DeConcini bill. Our colleague, JOE MOAKLEY, has worked tirelessly to see that justice is served in the case of the many Salvadorans in the United States who have come to escape the violence in their own country. The bill is simple in its intent: it instructs GAO to study the situation regarding Salvadoran refugees, and in the interim would permit them to remain here temporarily.

I urge my colleagues to support this worthwhile legislation, and I hope the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law will consider it expeditiously.

H.R. 3128, THE DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT OF 1985

HON. JIM ROSS LIGHTFOOT

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, although H.R. 3128 contained a Medicare provision which I have been fighting for since the beginning of the year, I voted against this bill because it is not a deficit reduction bill. This bill would create 10 new programs at a cost of \$2.5 billion over 3 years. I find it hard to believe that the House wants to create new programs when we are having a difficult time funding existing programs.

As I have stated, however, this bill does contain a provision which would help the hospitals in my district. This provision, which I strongly support, requires the Department of Health and Human Services to implement a new gross wage index for Medicare's prospective payment system, also known as the DRG system.

Since the enactment of this system in 1983, rural hospitals have been unfairly compensated for treating Medicare patients. The reimbursement formula which is now being used does not accurately reflect the costs of using part-time employees in rural hospitals. Because of this flawed formula and other yet uncorrected deficiencies in the system, hospitals in my district are receiving over 50 percent less in Medicare payments than nearby urban hospitals, although all are performing the same procedures.

In an effort to correct at least this inequity in the DRG system, my colleagues and I were successful in getting language added to H.R. 3128 which requires HHS to implement the revised index. I commend Congressman DAUB for his work in the Ways and Means Committee to make sure that this language remained in the bill.

Although the adoption of this provision is a step in the right direction, I firmly believe that further changes are needed in the DRG system to ensure that rural hospitals are compensated fairly for treating Medicare patients. I therefore urge members of the Ways and Means Committee to study the DRG system further and to adopt changes which would ensure that rural hospitals receive the same breaks as urban hospitals.

Unfortunately another little-debated provision included in the bill would adversely affect Iowa's rural hospitals. This provision calls for an extension of the transition from hospital-specific payments, that is the old system, to the new system of national rates. When Congress approved this new reimbursement system in 1983, a 3-year transition was established. Now, after 2 years into the transition, the Ways and Means Committee has called for a 1-year delay in the transition.

According to the Health Care Financing Administration, this delay will not help the hospitals in my district. Iowa is 1 out of 23 States which would not benefit from this provision. Iowa's hospitals are already feeling the effects of a poor agriculture economy and an unfair Medicare reimbursement formula, yet they are now being asked to stick with this inequitable transition for another year.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, while many of the provisions of this bill do call for constructive changes, I could not possibly support the bill because of the new programs. I hope that I will be able to support the House-Senate conference bill.

IN HONOR OF THE 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. WOOD, SR.

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a very special and joyous occasion which is to take place on November 10, 1985, at Mechanicsville Social Hall, in Maryland's First Congressional District.

On this proud day, Mr. and Mrs. John F. Wood, Sr. will join with friends and family to celebrate their golden wedding anniversary. In marking 50 years of blissful union, the Wood's will look upon an ever growing family, which now includes several great grandchildren, 26 grandchildren, as well as their 6 children, John F. Sr., James M., Lewis H., Margaret A. Hayden, Mary Virginia Tennison and Jeanne Bischo.

It is with great pleasure that I express these few words of praise to Mr. and Mrs. Wood. I congratulate the Wood's on this happy occasion and wish them both continued happiness.

THE 350TH ANNIVERSARY OF
THE U.S. NATIONAL GUARD

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, next year will mark the 350th anniversary of the U.S. National Guard, an organization of citizen-soldiers whose members have defended this country since before its independence. To honor this remarkable record of service, I recently cosponsored a resolution (H. Res. 245), introduced by Representative THOMAS HARTNETT of South Carolina, which would call upon the Postmaster General to issue a commemorative stamp to honor the National Guard.

The National Guard was organized in Boston in 1636 as a local militia. Later, of course, the Guard defended the colonists against the British during the American Revolution, and has fought in every war, and almost every battle, since. But although I support this effort to celebrate the National Guard's anniversary, I am sure my colleagues agree, it is insufficient honor to mark such an illustrious history.

We in Illinois can share in our Nation's pride on the National Guard's anniversary, for the Illinois National Guard is very nearly as old. It also boasts two former Presidents of the United States among its ranks.

The Illinois National Guard was born in 1712 as the Provincial Militia of the Illinois District of the Province of Louisiana, when that territory still belonged to the French. It was organized by Pierre Duque Boisbriant in Cahokia and Kaskaskia. Territorial militiamen joined the fight against the

British in the Revolution, and our State National Guard has served in every American conflict since.

The Illinois Military and Naval Department, which comprises the Illinois National Guard, has published a fascinating account of the National Guard careers of two of our State's most famous citizens, Abraham Lincoln and Ulysses Grant. A pamphlet authored by Dr. Wayne C. Temple highlights the contributions they made through their service in the Guard.

Abraham Lincoln and a group of his friends answered the Governor's call for volunteers to fight in the Black Hawk War, and Lincoln was appointed captain of his rag-tag regiment near Pleasant Plains, IL, on April 21, 1832. The regiment immediately set off for Beardstown, but their planned encounter with the Indians never materialized. In fact, later in his career, Lincoln joked that mosquitoes caused his only loss of blood in the Black Hawk campaign.

Although Lincoln remained a member of the Illinois National Guard for the rest of his life, his next promotion, according to Dr. Temple, came on March 4, 1861, when he became President and Commander in Chief of the entire U.S. Armed Forces. Certainly, that was the biggest promotion in U.S. history.

Ulysses Grant began his service in Springfield, at the outbreak of the Civil War. Governor Richard Yates, impressed by the fact that Grant had attended West Point, made Grant his military aide and gave him a desk job in the adjutant general's office. Grant, however, wanted to see combat, and in June 1861, Governor Yates gave Grant his commission, as colonel of the 21st Infantry Regiment of the Illinois State Militia. Grant proved himself well, and rose quickly through the ranks. He was promoted to brigadier general later in 1861, and took command of the entire Union Army less than 3 years later. Surprisingly, though, Grant was not made a full general until 1866—after the Civil War had ended. In 1869, he too became President of the United States and Commander in Chief.

Today, the Illinois National Guard is at the disposal of the Governor and the President, and helps to maintain order in time of storm, public disorder, or other emergency. The State spends about \$4 million annually for the National Guard, while the Federal Government contributes more than \$52 million. Men and women between the ages of 17 and 35 are eligible to join, and serve one weekend each month and 2 weeks each year.

The National Guard also offers a full college scholarship and job training to high school students, age 17 and older. Students are eligible in their junior year, and can receive immediate pay and training one weekend per month while they finish school. Upon graduation, they continue weekend service, but also can receive a full 4-year scholarship to any Illinois State-run college or university.

The National Guard provides an excellent opportunity for national service, and repre-

sents the highest ideal of the citizen-soldier.

WYOMING VALLEY EX-POW'S

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, I had the opportunity to meet with 80 members of the Greater Wyoming Valley Chapter of the American Former Prisoners of War. I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to this fine group of men and their families.

Held as prisoner during World War II, these men represent the finest quality of heroism our Nation has to offer, and every American has them to thank for the freedom we all enjoy today. Too often we forget the sacrifices made by the members of our military in the service of our country. As I spoke with these men who endured unimaginable hardships while imprisoned, I was again reminded of the extraordinary valor they possess. One member of the famous 508th Parachute Infantry of the 82d Airborne Division shared with me the terrible experience of his drop into Normandy and his subsequent capture by the Nazis. He witnessed the massacre of scores of his fellow soldiers and miraculously survived 3 months of captivity in a harsh German prison camp.

As we debate weapons systems and defense contracts, let us not forget the true strength of the American military—those men and women who have dedicated their lives to defend our Nation. I take great pride in the quality of our Armed Forces, and I am proud to honor these veterans here on the floor of the House of Representatives. They have given so much to our Nation, and I would like to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues of how important it is for us to continue our support of them.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad I had the privilege of meeting these former prisoners of war. Led by Mr. Joseph Makar of Avoca, PA, the Wyoming Valley chapter of the American Ex-POW's is a group of veterans and their families who exemplify those qualities of the United States of which we can all be most proud.

HONORING THE WORKMEN'S CIRCLE

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, several Sundays ago I was privileged to be present at the dedication of a new wing of the Workmen's Circle Home for the Aged in the part of my district that is in the Bronx. It is not unusual for those of us in public life to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

help dedicate new wings, new buildings, new roads or new libraries.

But this was different. On October 13, the Workmen's Circle, the world's largest Jewish labor fraternal order, commemorated its 85th anniversary. About 80 years ago it dedicated the first sanatorium for workers afflicted with tuberculosis, which was then a scourge in America. No government aid, no big trade union donations, no industrial grants were involved. This was an innovative effort by Jewish workers, most of them sweatshop workers, to help each other. Many of them were victims of this dread disease or had family members or friends who were afflicted.

Innovation has been a part of their history ever since. There was no Medicare or Medicaid in existence when the Workmen's Circle initiated its own medical centers and doctors' panels with hospitalization plans. The centers, throughout the United States, are still in existence, and have been models for the many health plans now in operation. At a time when workers were forced to be buried in Potters' fields, its low cost funeral and burial services also became prototypes.

The greatest leader of Jewish labor, cultural achievements and the arts, including the great Sholem Aleichem, are buried in the Workmen's Circle Cemetery in old Mount Carmel in Queens, as well as the tragic victims of the infamous triangle fire. Sections of this particular Workmen's Circle Cemetery are known as Labor's Parthenon. Every major Jewish labor leader is buried there including Ab. Cahan, author of "The Rise of David Levinsky" and editor of the Jewish Daily Forward.

The Workmen's Circle has extended its fraternalism beyond its own membership. It has perpetuated Yiddish culture and, this year, the Folksbiene—a critically acclaimed theatrical troupe—recently celebrated its own 70th anniversary.

If you look back to the beginnings of the Workmen's Circle, some 85 years ago, when summer camps were unknown, you can thank the innovation of its young Jewish immigrants who built a network of such facilities in New York, California, Michigan, Illinois and Georgia. Many of these summer camps still exist today.

In the days of the fledgling labor movement in this country, the Workmen's Circle was "the Red Cross of the labor movement". It provided the havens for strikers in labor lyceums with soup kitchens and clothing and organization bases.

In the 1930's when Hitler was on the rise, the now faded pages of its periodicals were ablaze with warnings of the rising menace in Nazi Germany. Workmen's Circle was involved from the beginning of the anti-Nazi boycott movement to the rescue of Hitler's victims before, during, and after World War II.

In 1952, during the infamous Slansky trials and before, it signaled the plight of Soviet Jewry and the problem of Soviet anti-Semitic propaganda. Workmen's Circle has been in the forefront of many of the progressive social causes which we take for granted today. They were there carrying

November 1, 1985

the signs for the 8-hour day, for the minimum wage, for the rights of women, for the rights of minorities of all colors and ancestries. Their work, their dedication, and their vision has made a difference in all our lives today.

MATTIE WHITSITT HONORED FOR OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to salute Mattie Whitsitt, who for 40 years has graced the South Bay area with her selfless efforts toward community betterment. Mattie is to be honored at a dinner-dance in San Pedro on November 8.

The former Mattie Tubbs was born in Marion, AL to a farming family. As a child, work on the family farm limited her schooling to a few months each year, but she nonetheless began her education at a farm school in her hometown of Marion.

Alabama's loss was California's gain when, in 1945, Mattie—now Mrs. Clinton Whitsitt—came and first settled in San Pedro where she immediately went to work. While living in the housing projects in Wilmington, she saw firsthand the urgent need to promote fellowship, citizenship, and community spirit. Her work with the community council, the Community Chest and the United Methodist Church began a career of voluntarism which stands out even in the South Bay area, which has shining examples of such exemplary citizenship.

By doggedly attending evening classes after work, Mattie graduated from Banning High School. She worked for the Los Angeles Health Department in the physiotherapy department, retiring in 1974 from the Los Angeles County hospital in North Long Beach.

Mattie joined the Church of Jesus Christ in 1964, and since that time has been active in numerous church-related organizations. In addition to her participation through the church, she has donated her time and efforts unselfishly to a number of other organizations dedicated to community welfare, including the Women's Chamber of Commerce of Wilmington, the YWCA of Wilmington-San Pedro, the Coordinating Council of Wilmington, and Friends of the Library.

She has shown special dedication to the cause of bettering the welfare of the aging. She is on the Council of Aging for the City of Los Angeles, and has lobbied the State legislature in Sacramento as well as the U.S. Congress in Washington, DC. Her persistent efforts spurred the Congress to pass the All-American Act which now provides various programs for the aging.

I know that I speak for the citizens of our area in expressing the great admiration and affection we feel toward Mattie Whit-

sitt. My wife Lee joins me, as well as a host of our friends and neighbors, in wishing Mattie, her sons Luther, John, and Willie, and her four grandchildren and a great grandson all the best in the years ahead.

THE LOSS OF JACK PARADEE

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, the rail labor movement and the railroad industry recently lost a valued advocate with the passing of Jack Paradee.

Many of us knew Jack from his years of service as a legislative representative for the United Transportation Union, working with Jim Snyder, the UTU's national legislative director. In addition, Jack was the State director for the UTU from Delaware. He retired in 1982 after 42 years of railroad service.

During his years in Washington, Jack was a key adviser on many railroad issues. He worked on legislation to improve rail safety, preserve Amtrak and Conrail, and save the railroad retirement system. Even after his retirement, he provided valuable counsel, particularly on issues concerning the treatment of alcohol and drug abuse among railroad employees.

While Jack's efforts and advice will be greatly missed, his many contributions will live on.

NADEZHDA FRADKOVA

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, this month President Reagan will meet with Secretary Gorbachev. This meeting gives us an important opportunity to raise the issue of human rights and convey to the Soviets our concern about their treatment of the refuseniks, the Soviet Jews who wish to emigrate in search of a better life.

Four hundred thousand Soviet citizens have unsuccessfully asked for permission to emigrate. Often the Government has responded by harassing or incarcerating them. In spite of this intimidation, however, many refuseniks persist in their attempts to emigrate legally.

In particular, I would like to bring attention to one Leningrader Nadezhda Fradkova, for whom my wife Jane—through the Congressional Spouse's Committee of 21—has deep concern. Nadezhda, now 38, is a mathematical linguist who has endured two hunger strikes, job loss, and incarceration in her attempt to emigrate legally to Israel.

Nadezhda first applied for the right to emigrate in 1977. Permission was refused, apparently because her father works in the Soviet Space Program—an inexplicable reason since until recently she had had no contact with him since early childhood.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Following her application to emigrate, Nadezhda was dismissed from her job. She commenced a hunger strike in support of her application on March 1, 1983. Forty-five days later she was removed from her apartment, force-fed and kept in a hospital for 3 weeks.

That December, Nadezhda began a second hunger strike. In early January 1984, she was again placed in the reanimation ward of a city hospital, force-fed, injected with heavy tranquilizers and subjected to anti-Semitic abuse. In February, her father visited her in a vain effort to dissuade her from emigration.

In April she was released. She was taken back in July, and in a note she managed to get to friends, she spoke of threats and intimidation by authorities trying to get her to renounce her application.

Nadezhda is currently serving a 2-year sentence in a labor camp for parasitism.

Together with many of my distinguished colleagues, led by Congressmen LANTOS and KEMP, I plan to send a letter to President Reagan asking that he raise the issue of legal emigration in his discussions with Secretary Gorbachev. The text of my letter follows.

NOVEMBER 1985.

HON. RONALD REAGAN,
President of the United States, The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I hope you will be able to convey to Secretary Gorbachev in your upcoming meeting the concern that all of us share regarding the refusal of the Soviet government to allow the refuseniks to emigrate.

In particular, I hope you will bring to Secretary Gorbachev's attention the case of one Leningrader, Nadezhda Fradkova, for whom my wife Jane—a member of the Congressional Spouse's Committee of 21—has great concern. Fradkova has endured two hunger strikes, job loss and potential imprisonment in her attempt to emigrate legally to Israel.

Nadezhda first applied for the right to emigrate in 1977. Permission was refused, and Nadezhda was dismissed from her job. In March, 1983, Nadezhda commenced a hunger strike in support of her application. Forty-five days later she was removed from her apartment, force-fed and kept in the "reanimation ward" of a hospital for three weeks.

That December, Nadezhda began a second hunger strike. In early January 1984, she was again placed in a reanimation ward, force-fed, injected with tranquilizers and subjected to anti-Semitic abuse. In February, her father visited her in a vain effort to dissuade her from attempting to emigrate. After an April release, she was taken back in July. In a note she managed to get to friends, she spoke of threats and intimidation by authorities trying to get her to renounce her application.

Nadezhda is currently serving a two year sentence in a labor camp because of her conviction on charges of "parasitism."

We all share abhorrence of the continuing harassment to which the refuseniks are subjected. I hope you will be able to raise this important issue with Secretary Gorbachev and impress upon him the seriousness with which we view these continued violations of human rights.

ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORY AND THE INTEGRAL FAST REACTOR

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, when scientists around the world speak of Argonne National Laboratory, their words are filled with deep respect and admiration.

Since its foundation, and spanning nearly half a century, Argonne National Laboratory has risen to international prominence in many strategic fields of scientific research and development. Through its dedication to excellence in science and through its outstanding accomplishments, Argonne has reached what many consider the pinnacle. Creative vision, excellence, dedication, and innovation have become its hallmarks.

Argonne is the birthplace of civilian nuclear energy. It is where essentially every type of reactor that has proven practical for power or defense purposes was originally conceived and developed. And now, from this leading laboratory comes a new reactor concept called the integral fast reactor (IFR).

The IFR is the most innovative nuclear reactor concept of its kind today. It has great promise as the new leader in the next generation of nuclear reactors, and it is believed to have the potential to provide our Nation with an inexhaustible source of energy at a competitive cost, and all with vastly improved safety.

No other conventional energy source now in use is capable of supplying this Nation's long-term energy needs, and many see the IFR as the answer. Among them is the nuclear physicist and Nobel Laureate, Dr. Hans Bethe, who has given the concept and its development a strong personal endorsement. Even Energy Secretary John Harington has praised the IFR, calling it the best technology in the world.

The October edition of Nuclear News, the scholarly publication of the American Nuclear Society, features a special cover story on the integral fast reactor entitled: "IFR: A fresh look at an old concept." This well-written and in-depth article examines the promising new technology and discusses the many benefits that are certain to come with its eventual commercial development. I commend this article to my colleagues and will be pleased to make copies available upon request.

PUT A ZIPPER ON IT!

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the October 29 issue of USA Today carried a lead story on the first page of its business section

about the slide of the domestic zipper industry.

While American firms' share of their home markets was going down that of foreign competitors was on an upward surge. Using their tried and true method of undercutting domestic prices, zipper imports increased their hold on the American market from 1.9 percent in 1981 to 5.2 percent today.

But that is only part of the story. The article notes the dominant zipper maker in the country today is a subsidiary of a Japan based firm—and its share of the domestic market is 52 percent. The company in Japan makes the component parts and the zipper is put together here.

The domestic zipper industry knew it was in trouble 10 years ago. In 1975, it petitioned the U.S. International Trade Commission for relief from imports, according to USA Today, but no action was ever taken on its request. Because our zipper market remained open the situation grew worse. We had 50 domestic zipper companies in 1975; today we have just 8.

Domestic zipper makers were trying to retain their hold, using methods that have become common among American industries trying to fight the invasion. They are laying off employees, reducing production, and increasing productivity by eliminating jobs through automation of their facilities.

It is the same story Congress has heard from the steel industry, the textile industry, the footwear industry, the electronic industry, the machine tool industry, and a host of others.

But despite the mounting evidence of closed factories and lost jobs because of unfair trade practices and law enforcement of our trade laws, Congress is told: "Don't do this! Don't do that! You'll trigger retaliation and start a trade war! You'll hurt the feelings of our trading partners, et cetera!"

As one who supports strong trade laws and tough enforcement of them, I say: "put a zipper on it!"

**H.R. 3128, DEFICIT REDUCTION
AMENDMENTS ROSTENKOWSKI
AMENDMENT**

HON. GEORGE C. WORTLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from Illinois, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for the amendment he offered yesterday to H.R. 3128, the deficit reduction amendments, to reform the single-employer pension plan termination provisions of the Employee Retirement Insurance Security Act [ERISA]. Although I could not support the entire bill, I wholeheartedly support this provision.

Reform is sorely needed in the administration of ERISA, and this amendment is a step in the right direction. My only reservation about the amendment is that it not go far enough. What we really need is to give

the responsibility and power of administering and enforcing ERISA to one Government agency.

ERISA's annual cost to the Government is somewhat in excess of \$43.2 billion a year, yet there is no executive branch office or legislative committee with oversight duties.

ERISA contributions are the biggest single corporate tax deduction taken, yet we don't know whether real retirement income is actually being produced for workers.

The administration of ERISA is currently shared by three Government entities: the IRS, the Labor Department, and the PBGC. I realize this is hard to believe, but the three do not coordinate well. The IRS is not interested because ERISA does not generate revenue. The Labor Department says it doesn't have the manpower to oversee the program. The PBGC says it doesn't have solid regulatory power.

The magnitude of the problem is illustrated by a few quick facts. Sixty-five million workers currently participate in 785,000 private pension plans in the United States. The assets of these plans total approximately \$1 trillion, the largest single pool of capital in the world. It is estimated that ERISA funds own almost one-third of the equity in publicly traded U.S. corporations. These assets are expected to rise to \$2.2 trillion by the year 2000.

Mr. Chairman, my district is witnessing—and suffering—the consequences of the current system of overseeing and enforcing ERISA. Accurate Die Casting, a manufacturing firm in my district, stopped payments to its retirees without any warning in August. Since that time, it has become abundantly clear just how badly ERISA needs to be reformed.

Accurate Die Casting has blatantly failed to fund its pension plan since 1980. No one questioned its failure to file required reports, and no oversight was in place to discover its failure to fund its pension plan as required under ERISA. No one—at least no one outside the management of Accurate Die Casting—knew anything was wrong until retirees failed to get their pension checks in the mail.

The problems didn't stop there. After the deficiency was exposed, the responsible Federal agencies were extremely reluctant to step in. The Department of Labor said it had no oversight responsibility, and the IRS just wasn't interested. The Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation was at first uncertain whether or not the pension plan was insured. When it finally decided the plan was insured, it had to go through the courts to be able to take over benefit payments.

This is not an isolated incident. It is an illustration of how badly the administration of ERISA needs to be reformed.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI's amendment prevents a business from taking the easy way out by declaring bankruptcy by requiring an employer who terminates an underfunded plan—and does not go out of business—liable to the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation for the plan's guaranteed ben-

efits even if these exceed the current statutory maximum of 30 percent of the employer's net worth. It imposes a 5-percent excise tax on the payment of deficiency for employers who fail to fulfill their termination plan liability.

These steps are necessary, but reform must not stop here.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, due to circumstances beyond my control, I missed today's rollcall No. 388 on the rule to allow consideration of H.R. 3669 to prevent the disinvestment of the Social Security Trust Fund and other funds.

Because the Members' elevator nearest to my office was not in operation, although there was no sign to indicate it was malfunctioning, I reached the House floor after the vote was completed. I notified the superintendent's office about the problem and they apologized.

Had I had the opportunity to vote on rollcall No. 388, I would have voted with the majority agreeing to the resolution.

**DEFENSE CONTRACTORS AND
LONG-TERM CONTRACTS**

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, hidden in the larger debate over tax reform is a provision concerning the way defense contractors account for profits on long-term contracts. The present system, which has proven beneficial in bringing in tax revenues, faces elimination.

Defense contractors can now base their tax liability on completed contracts. The proposed accounting method would force the defense industry to estimate their profits or losses before a contract has been completed. This is at best a speculative proposition. These contracts involve many financial and technological variables which make it difficult, if not impossible, to determine with any degree of accuracy the amount of profit or loss for the contract as a whole. Thus, eliminating the completed contract method of accounting would force contractors to speculate on the final profit or loss of each contract, and to pay taxes based on their speculation.

The defense industry uses the completed contract method of accounting to defer tax payment until either a profit or loss is realized on the work. This tax deferral contributes to each contractor's ability to raise working capital to pay for research and development programs and new capital investment. Paying taxes based on speculative profits would drain the defense con-

tractors of this valuable capital requiring them to borrow money to pay taxes.

Critics, acknowledging this problem, have suggested that if the completed contract method were eliminated, progress payments received by many contractors could be used to help pay taxes. However, the vast majority of progress payments are cost based. Thus, the company receiving the money only is reimbursed for its costs. These payments are meant to give the contractor valuable working capital, taxing the very payments meant to provide this capital is counterproductive and will be far more expensive for the Government in the long run.

Reforms made in this area by the last Congress have increased Treasury revenue by \$5.6 billion. These reforms were so severe that they had to be phased in over a period of 4 years. They have however, been successful and now many former tax avoiders have become taxpayers. Indeed, a study of seven major defense contractors who use the completed contract method indicates that in the aggregate these companies started paying substantial taxes in 1983. I ask unanimous consent that this report be inserted in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

Finally, there is every reason to believe that with just a little fine tuning, the Government will be able to raise another \$5 billion from the defense contracting system over the next 5 years. I think that it makes more sense to tighten the rules and raise \$5 billion without affecting the cost of procurement than it does to eliminate the completed contract method of accounting and face higher procurement costs.

MILLER & CHEVALIER,

Washington, DC, September 23, 1985

THE COMPLETED CONTRACT METHOD OF ACCOUNTING DOES NOT PERMIT DEFENSE CONTRACTORS TO AVOID TAX

The completed contract method of accounting has been criticized as the means by which major defense contractors avoid paying tax, while at the same time they are reporting large financial earnings under the accrual or percentage of completion methods of accounting. *The facts do not support this criticism.*

On behalf of the Aerospace Industries Association we have compiled data supplied by seven major defense contractors who use the completed contract method of accounting. These companies represent a significant segment of the aerospace industry. They have reported over \$7 billion in pre-tax financial earnings over the past three years and have projected pre-tax earnings of over \$16 billion for 1985-1988.

The data collected show that the changes made by the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 have caused, and will continue to cause, defense contractors to report significant income for Federal income tax purposes. The information collected includes pre-tax financial earnings and taxable income before the net operating loss deduction. Taxable income before the net operating loss deduction has been used because tax losses of companies within this group which have a tax loss in any particular year have been used to reduce the composite taxable income amount of the group for that year. This avoids the issue whether the loss is carried back to a prior year or

only available to offset future income. It assumes that an immediate tax benefit is derived from the loss.

The following table reflects the composite book income and taxable income or loss for the seven companies providing information. The effective rate of tax has been derived by applying a 46 percent rate to the taxable income amount and dividing the computed amount by book income before tax. Thus, the effective rate of tax is expressed as a percentage of book income before tax.

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Book income before tax	Taxable income or loss	Effective rate of tax (percent)
1982	1,682,215	(801,037)	0
1983	2,422,996	1,331,504	25
1984	2,955,693	2,655,299	41
1985	3,549,977	2,157,431	28
1986	3,858,978	2,549,642	30
1987	4,178,055	3,987,702	44
1988	4,420,482	4,022,296	42
1989	(¹)	(¹)	44

¹ Partial data.

JOHN S. NOLAN,
ALEXANDER ZAKUPOWSKI, JR.

HONORING BERNIE MORAN

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues and to pay tribute to Mr. Bernie Moran, who is retiring after a lifetime of dedication and excellence in the service of his city and his country.

Members of the Pennsylvania delegation are already well aware of the dedicated service of Bernie Moran who for 35 years has had a knack for getting the job done and getting it done right. From his first days as a pipefitter on Navy submarines being overhauled in the back channel of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard to today, when, as a group superintendent of production, he holds one of the most important jobs in the shipyard, Bernie has been the kind of public servant who has kept this Nation great. No matter what the type of job, or the pay grade it carried, Bernie has served this Nation quietly and efficiently, making sure that the job of keeping our Navy fit, and our Nation safe, was done the best it could be done.

Mr. Speaker, there is no finer shipyard in the Navy than the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. When we go looking for the source of that quality, we should not seek it in the physical plant, or in any one shop. Instead, when we seek the source of PNSY's capabilities and skills, we should look to the people of the shipyard, people like Bernie.

I am proud to be saluting Bernie Moran, a man who has worked tirelessly as a leader, a manager, an arbitrator, a liaison, and a friend. An outstanding professional, Bernie was never too busy to help out with the little things and for that I am personally grateful. With the unbeatable combination of experience, knowledge, energy, and

a never ending sense of commitment, Bernie Moran has done an outstanding job at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard and I want to congratulate him on his most successful and distinguished career and wish him all the best in his well deserved retirement.

SUPPORTED EXTENDED VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE FOR SALVADORANS

HON. MIKE LOWRY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. LOWRY of Washington. It is my understanding that the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law plans to hold a hearing on H.R. 822 in the near future. This bill would require the Attorney General to grant extended voluntary departure to Salvadorans who have sought refuge in the United States because of the violence, human rights abuses, and danger in their own country. These individuals would return home when conditions there improve. I hope that the subcommittee and full committee will act swiftly on this important bill.

As long ago as 1983, Congress passed legislation that included a provision urging the Attorney General to take this action. Mr. Smith, and later Mr. Meese, refused. In response, a bipartisan coalition of Members introduced legislation to require the granting of extended voluntary departure to Salvadoran nationals.

At various times, extended voluntary departure status has been granted to people from Afghanistan, Cambodia, Cuba, Chile, Ethiopia, Iran, Nicaragua, Poland, Uganda, Vietnam, and other countries. We can be proud that our country was willing to use this temporary method of helping these people. I believe that we should live up to our Nation's humanitarian traditions by helping Salvadorans in the same fashion.

DETERRENCE: FROM FEAR TO INTERDEPENDENCE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the time when President Reagan and Secretary Gorbachev meet to discuss the relationships between our two nations, it is appropriate that we all reexamine the causes of the unstable and dangerous situation that exists today.

One respected observer who has done that is Edward F. Snyder, an attorney and the executive secretary for the Friends Committee on National Legislation. Mr. Snyder also serves as the cochairperson of the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy. His views are set forth in an

article published last month in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.

As a representative of the Friends, or Quakers, Mr. Snyder has devoted much of his adult life to helping achieve the conditions for peace in the world. He is a worthy follower of a tradition of Quaker concern for peace which predates the founding of our country.

Mr. Snyder's views may strike some as provocative because, in an effort to focus on the fundamental causes of our problems with the Soviets, he downplays the importance of the arms control negotiations now taking place. He makes a point that arms control, without a reduction in the climate of fear that now pervades our relationship, is unlikely to bring about the conditions for peace, and he suggests a more positive approach to changing that climate of fear.

I commend the article to all of my colleagues for their thoughtful attention.

The article follows:

[From the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, October 1985]

DETERRENCE: FROM FEAR TO INTERDEPENDENCE
(By Edward F. Snyder)

The fear underlying both the arms race and deterrence has overridden other powerful motives for accommodation, such as survival and economic self-interest.

The United States' survival, and even the fate of the world, now depend on the flawless operation of deterrence by fear of retaliation—the cornerstone of U.S. military and security policy. Much of the discussion about deterrence, however, concentrates too much on military hardware, or relies too heavily on legal formulas or on arms control and arms limitation measures. The psychological, political, and economic structures resulting from human frailties, and nearly 40 years of reliance on deterrence by fear, are so deeply entrenched that measures which do not alter basic assumptions will have little effect in reversing the arms race.

Observers from left to center to right confidently assert that "deterrence works." Their view is usually based on the fact that there has not been a nuclear war since 1945. But that pragmatic conclusion is questionable on several grounds. The passage of 40 years does provide some evidence, but 40 years is a very short time in human history to validate a doctrine. Drawing conclusions from the mere passage of time is especially hazardous when dealing with a policy in which the consequences of just one failure would be so catastrophic. Indeed, the deterrence doctrine has a built-in assumption that it may fail. If that possibility were not present, the party would cease to be deterred.

The thesis that "deterrence works" also overlooks the possibility that restraint may have been exercised by one or both parties for more positive motives than fear of retaliation. Further, this view of deterrence spares the homelands of the superpowers; they carry on their conflicts in conventional proxy wars, while the people of Indochina, Afghanistan, Central America, and elsewhere do most of the fighting and dying.

But the most persuasive evidence to me that deterrence is not working lies in the dangerous trend in international affairs. Thirty years ago, when the United States was in the midst of its first nuclear weapons buildup, many members of Congress, editorial writers, and others expressed the view that increased military forces were tempo-

rarily expedients necessary to "buy us time" and provide a "shield." Behind this shield and with this time, the United States and other nations would work toward world disarmament under effective international controls and international law. Today that rationale is seldom heard. More often, weapons systems are rationalized as useful to buy time to build more weapons. The vision of a disarmed world under law is receding further and further into a distant future, and we seem to be resigned to an endless arms race which we can only hope against hope will not end in disaster.

Even those international controls on nuclear weaponry which were put in place some 15 years ago, like the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the ABM Treaty, are weakening. The Threshold Test Ban, the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions, and SALT II Treaties have never been approved by the Senate. Nuclear proliferation is a constant danger. Few people today are even aware of the landmark 1961 McCloy-Zorin agreement on principles for general and complete disarmament under international control. Indeed many "freeze" advocates argued against reference to the McCloy-Zorin agreement in the 1983 House freeze resolution, fearing it would hamper chances for passage. In 1981 the House almost succeeded in deleting the word "disarmament" from the title of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Moreover, efforts to create international institutions and multinational alternatives are being undermined. The United States has restricted the role of the World Court in the Nicaragua dispute. It has withdrawn from UNESCO, has drastically reduced U.S. support for the World Bank affiliate, the International Development Association, and is now proposing a 50 percent cut in the U.S. contribution to UNICEF. At the same time, the Third World is increasingly militarized and impoverished by regional arms races.

How did we get into such a fix? How can it be that with skilled negotiators on both sides, with the survival of their own nations and even of civilization at stake, humanity continues to slide toward catastrophe? Reasonable people can differ as to the cause. I myself do not ascribe the primary cause to intransigence, malevolence, greed, technology, or power-hungry policies of either party. Rather, fear is the root cause of the current arms race; and the doctrine of nuclear deterrence by fear of retaliation, which lies at the heart of our national security policy, is the engine driving us toward destruction.

Fear is a corrosive emotion. It clouds good judgment and breeds suspicion, mistrust, and irrational behavior. President Franklin Roosevelt sought to rescue the nation from fear's grip on domestic policy in 1933, declaring: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Eight years later in his State of the Union message, he identified "freedom from fear" as one of the "Four Freedoms." To achieve this freedom, he called for "a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor anywhere in the world." We have retained that goal but are now using fear as an implement to achieve it.

The creation and maintenance of fear is what deterrence is all about. Reliance on deterrence became the centerpiece of U.S. security policy when the Soviet Union developed hydrogen bombs deliverable by intercontinental bombers, and then missiles. Since it was no longer possible for the De-

fense Department physically to prevent all Soviet bombs from being delivered on U.S. targets, it became necessary to devise a policy to prevent—that is, deter—them from being launched in the first place. The focus of U.S. defense policy thus shifted away from objective criteria for military adequacy and centered instead on the minds and perceptions of Soviet decision-makers. As the Scowcroft Commission report put it: "Deterrence is the set of beliefs in the minds of Soviet leaders, given their own values and attitudes, about our capabilities and our will."

The U.S. capability to inflict terrible retribution became available in the 1950s. Demonstrating a continued will or readiness to use these awesome weapons has been more difficult. The huge numbers of powerful weapons added to the U.S. and Soviet arsenals in the last three decades, the escalating military budgets of both countries, and the suggestion of ever more provocative policies such as "limited nuclear war" and "war-fighting" are more readily comprehensible when seen as part of this continuing demonstration of national will.

Ironically, short-run success of the nuclear deterrent breeds long-term problems. The fear created in the minds of the adversary nation's leaders may deter immediate attack or prevent intimidating threats, but it also brings mistrust and suspicion. The weapons which the builder intends only for its defense deterrent purposes appear to the other to be part of an aggressive policy. Not surprisingly, countermeasures lead to a spiraling arms race. The mutual fears generated by this process are very likely to breed dangerous misperceptions, denial of reality, and irrational behavior. Yet the deterrence theory requires leaders to respond with rationality and perceptivity, especially in time of severe crisis.

Perhaps most importantly, deterrence requires that a high level of fear and mistrust be maintained among U.S. citizens so they will pay taxes to buy ever more destructive weapons and support belligerent actions and policies which help to demonstrate a continuing will to use these weapons of mass destruction. But for citizens to be willing to accept responsibility for the enormity of the use of nuclear weapons, which would result in casualties in the tens of millions, they must be conditioned to regard the "enemy" as dehumanized. Hence reports of Soviet transgressions are almost always magnified, while reports of cooperative efforts are minimized. Having an enemy, an outsider, on whom to project our own frustrations and inadequacies is also a most useful rationalization to avoid accepting responsibility for our own internal failings and our own role in international conflicts.

This climate makes it extremely difficult to negotiate arms reductions. Even the modest SALT II Treaty, agreed to by generals and admirals in Washington and Moscow, was never approved by a Senate which was responding to that part of the public which had been conditioned by more than three decades of fear and suspicion.

The theory has been that it is possible to have a two-track, arm-while-parleying approach. Thirty years ago, even 10 years ago, one could have argued that such a policy might be successful in reversing the arms race. But this rationale is wearing thin. The record shows that the dynamics of deterrence give high priority to arming and a distant second place to parleying. We passed the point of a "stable" or "minimum" deterrent without even pausing to notice. Various

"gaps" and bargaining chips have come and gone. The arms race, having exhausted most earthbound aspects, is now moving into space. Meanwhile, the Geneva negotiators are settling in for a very long, frustrating, unproductive talk-fest on strategic, intermediate-range, and space weapons. The nearly completed talks on a comprehensive test ban have been shunted aside, and the chemical weapons race is heating up.

What is the alternative? We in this nuclear-space age are much like the bird transfixed by the snake. Our fear paralyzes us, and our fascination with the danger of nuclear weapons makes it almost impossible to avert our gaze and find a path to safety.

Certainly Soviet leaders must be deterred or, more accurately, dissuaded from launching an attack on the United States or using weapons of mass destruction for political intimidation. And our own leaders must be similarly dissuaded.

Perhaps a clue to how this may be done lies in the way the three Western nuclear powers—the United States, Britain, and France—avoid the deadly politics of fear. Each of these countries could use its nuclear weapons to obliterate completely or at least wreak terrible havoc on the others. But such acts are unthinkable. These nations have many conflicts, but the pressures they apply never include the nuclear dimension. The threat to use nuclear weapons on Paris, London, or Washington by any of these three is simply beyond any range of acceptable options. Each nation is effectively deterred, or dissuaded, by a relationship of interdependence and a sense of common security and common humanity.

The United States is, of course, far from such a relationship with the Soviet Union, but this model offers a clearer sense of direction. Survival and economic self-interest provide two powerful motives for accommodation, but so far they have been overridden by the politics of fear.

How do we create a relationship that moves toward common security? Specifically, a policy of deterrence—or dissuasion by interdependence—might incorporate the following points:

Maintain all existing arms control treaties and stop building or deploying new weapons which can be perceived as part of a first-strike policy.

Move current arms control negotiations to the back burner, reducing expectations for their success until the political atmosphere has improved. Meanwhile, support efforts by third-party nations to play a mediating role in U.S.-Soviet arms negotiations, and push ahead on various modest proposals for crisis-control centers and military confidence-building measures in Europe.

Give certain so-called "peripheral" or "long-range" aspects of U.S.-Soviet policy, which involve communication, cooperation, and attitudinal change, the high priority they deserve. These programs are sometimes belittled in comparison with arms control efforts. Yet, by any test, more progress has been made toward better relations via these programs in the past 30 years than through abortive efforts to reduce arms. These are important national security programs in their own right. With respect to this last point, the United States should seek to:

Increase communications and exchange of persons, including meetings between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev, members of Congress and Soviet political leaders, high-level military officers, regional and local government officials, scien-

tists, educators, youth—the whole range of professional, cultural, and private life. The need to understand the other side's world view must be stressed continually and with the highest priority, no matter how much one may disagree with it.

Expand the bilateral scientific and technical exchange programs begun under the Nixon-Brezhnev agreement of 1972 and publicize the many mutually beneficial aspects of these programs. Six are currently operative in the fields of medical science and public health, agriculture, environmental protection, housing, and peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Review the five programs which expired. These pertain to space cooperation, world oceans, energy, transportation, and scientific and technical cooperation.

Stop linking constructive programs to odious Soviet actions. The practice of terminating or postponing significant cooperative endeavors in order to express displeasure demeans the importance of these programs, which are essential in creating a climate for avoiding nuclear war.

Remove restrictions on trade in peaceful goods with the Soviet Union. U.S.-Soviet trade is clearly a political as well as an economic issue. Normalization of that trade is one important indication of progress toward better relations, as is currently being demonstrated between the United States and the People's Republic of China. Unfortunately, U.S.-Soviet trade is still inhibited by the Jackson-Vanik amendment of 1974 and the Stevenson amendment of 1975.

Recognize that Soviet and U.S. actions and reactions in Afghanistan, Indochina, the Mideast, Angola, Cuba, and Central America have played a dominant role in worsening U.S.-Soviet relations. A major effort should be made to develop a feasible U.S.-Soviet *modus vivendi* in the developing world. It should include bans on the use of combat troops outside national borders, on proxy states' combat troops, and on direct or covert mercenary, paramilitary, or "volunteer" forces. Military aid, advisors, and arms shipments should also be restricted. Self-determination, human rights, and the wishes of the people in the region must be respected.

Since deterrence by fear is leading us inexorably toward catastrophe, we must shift to a new goal of interdependence and common security. The first steps on that road require modest, but proven, programs of joint cooperation and mutual benefit. In an improved political climate, undergirded by a new psychological maturity, significant arms reductions can then take place.

BLACK PARENTS PREPARE THEIR CHILDREN FOR PRIDE AND PREJUDICE

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for my colleagues' review excerpts from an article published last Sunday in *The New York Times Magazine*. "The World Ahead: Black Parents Prepare Their Children For Pride and Prejudice" examines black parents and their changing responsibilities as teachers of racial and ethnic identity. It also describes the current

attitudes of black youth and their level of awareness of racial discrimination.

The article was of particular interest to me, since it features two of my good friends, Dr. Deborah Prothrow, formerly of Houston and her husband, Rev. Charles R. Stith, with their three children. The experiences they relate as a contemporary black family were most informative.

I urge my colleagues to read this thoughtful article. It provides invaluable insight into a little discussed problem.

The article follows:

[From the *New York Times Magazine*, Oct. 27, 1985]

THE WORLD AHEAD; BLACK PARENTS PREPARE THEIR CHILDREN FOR PRIDE AND PREJUDICE

(By Thomas Morgan)

The memory of the motel sign is still vivid despite the years. Neatly printed black letters on white spelled a puzzling message for a young black boy from suburban St. Louis traveling with his parents through sleepy Arkansas towns with the rural charm of Norman Rockwell paintings.

The sign read "Whites Only." When the boy asked about it, his mother answered resignedly, "It means we can't stay there, son."

Nearly 30 years have passed since I saw that sign and pondered its message. I have grown and prospered because my father, a postal employee, and my mother, a public-school teacher, sent me, like Moses through the bulrushes, to the shores of new opportunity created by the civil-rights movement. I was one of two blacks to integrate a suburban elementary school in 1958. Later, a White ninth-grade English teacher encouraged me to become a journalist because she saw a spark of writing talent.

After college, I served as an Air Force Lieutenant and White House military social aide under President Ford, which allowed me, in a position other than that of a servant, to see the gracious pomp and ceremony surrounding the First Family. In the late 1960's and early 70's, with the implementation of affirmative-action programs, I was among those blacks who found entry-level jobs in professions that, for the most part, had been closed to our parents.

Despite the advances in race relations that my life may exemplify and my close friendships with several whites, I cannot in good conscience tell a young black child he can succeed by merit alone. Nor could I tell a black child to expect, in general, the same opportunities as whites, because prejudice, though waning, lingers.

I still see the sign, "Whites Only," but it is not hanging from some Southern motel. The words "Whites Only" come to mind when I go as a journalist to cocktail parties and other events where crucial contacts and decisions are being made and I am the only black not serving the hors d'oeuvres. I see the sign when I hear racially insensitive comments by white acquaintances who profess a knowledge of black culture, love the 60's and the Motown sound and reject the idea of discrimination, but who have no real black friends or who do not socialize with blacks outside professional settings.

It is an enigma to me, a 34-year-old middle-class black man, because although I have benefited from civil-rights advances and better relationships with whites than my parents, the reality I see from my own experiences, and one that is supported by recent surveys and polls, is that America re-

mains a divided society outside the office. This reality is even more difficult for young, middle-class, professional blacks, who came of age in the 1960's and still feel racism of a subtler nature both at work and in recent Policy positions taken by the Federal Government. Although a recent New York Times-CBS News poll shows that President Reagan's approval rating among blacks has increased from 10 percent in 1982 to 28 percent this year, 60 percent of blacks still disapprove of his performance.

At social gatherings, church events and in the privacy of their own homes, black parents are discussing a dilemma: How to explain discrimination to their children, who have different racial experiences. Parents want to know how to help them establish a black identity and pride while they are learning white mainstream cultural values through the influences of television, popular music and friendships with whites. These parents, many better educated and more politically sophisticated than their parents, feel that they must prepare their children, the next generation growing up in integrated environments, for prejudice and teach them how to deal with it.

Dr. James P. Comer, Maurice Falk Professor of Child Psychiatry at Yale University Child Study Center, says that he co-authored a book, "Black Child Care," with Dr. Alvin F. Poussaint of Harvard University in 1975 because he had received repeated requests for advice from black parents. "I did it," he says, "because I was dealing with so many parents at cocktail parties who asked me questions like, 'The kid comes home and says, 'I wish I was white.'" Or, 'He comes home and says, 'The white kids called me names.'"

"It's hard to go around dealing with the race problem all the time. Some parents don't want to. The world tells you there is no race problem, the President tells you the same thing and says that black civil-rights leaders only want to keep their jobs. Schools don't talk about it, and for all different reasons, white school-teachers say that discussing the issue is too painful for them.

"I was a grown man before I could handle matters of race without consuming a large amount of energy," Dr. Comer says, "Much of it was frustration and anger about the whole racial situation.

"I realized that was hurting me, and as a consequence of that I really began to think about how that is a problem for blacks in general. The amount of energy consumed and the distraction that racial prejudice presents are enormous."

Dr. Deborah Prothrow Stith, a 31-year-old Harvard-trained Boston internist specializing in adolescent medicine, and her husband, the Rev. Charles R. Stith, pastor of the interracial 500-member Union United Methodist Church in Boston's South End, are raising three children. Both grew up in the South and met while he was at Atlanta's Interdenominational Theological Center and she at nearby Spelman college.

"I lived in black Atlanta," says Dr. Stith, "My parents went to a black college. Their friends were black. My father worked for a black company and his boss was black. And when I went to the white high school in eighth grade, it was not on the level of 'Let's go be friends with these people.' It was on the level of 'We've got to show them that black folks can be as good as, if not better than, they are.' It was a totally different dynamic."

Dr. Stith, who lives in Roxbury, a black community in Boston, says she asked her 7-

year-old son, Percy, when he was 5 who his best friend was. "He said, 'Evan,' his friend at school, Evan Pressman," says Dr. Stith, who also has a 3-year-old daughter, Mary Mildred (Mimi). "I said, 'But Percy, Evan's white.'" Percy said, "So what?" And I thought for a moment and said, 'Percy, you're right. So what?'"

"It really struck me because when I was 5 years old, I didn't have a white best friend," she says.

James (Trey) Edmondson, 15, the Stith's nephew and ward, listens to his aunt with an expression of amusement. Later, he says he has heard this all before. A sophomore at Boston Latin School, a distinguished preparatory institution, Trey says he has not encountered any racist situations at school. He dismisses racial epithets he has heard as jokes blacks tell about whites and whites tell about blacks.

"Older people talk too much about discrimination," observes Trey, shifting uncomfortably in an overstuffed chair in the Stith living room. "They talk so much about it because of their past experiences. I haven't seen any racial situations."

"But what about the play, Trey?" Dr. Stith asks.

"Oh yeah, the play," he says, his puzzled frown turning into a smile of recognition. "About two years ago, at the William Monroe Trotter school, there was a play, a school production, 'The Wizard of Oz.' None of the black kids had any of the major roles. The black kids played the role of monkeys, without masks. Only one white kid played a monkey, and he had a gorilla mask on."

Dr. Stith, who had taken Trey and Percy to the play, says she was livid and later wrote to school officials and a local newspaper protesting the casting of black children as evil characters or monkeys. She used the incident to teach Trey about discrimination. But even now Trey seems unperturbed.

All of the black parents I interviewed are basing the advice they give their children not on statistics, which show that blacks in general are not keeping pace economically with the white population, but rather on their perceptions of what is happening around them.

Charles Stith, who is also president of the Organization for a New Equality, an interracial Boston-based national civic organization, tells Percy and Trey that "in a society that is still race-conscious, black folks should be inculcated with a sense of self-esteem—that is a statement against discrimination.

"I tell the boys they are as good as anybody else, that they have a responsibility to help those who do not have the opportunities and options that they have, and that they really have to deal with people on the basis of their humanity, and that includes white people."

In sharp contrast to the vivacious and feisty manner of his wife, Charles Stith is controlled. His advice reflects his active involvement in trying to improve troubled relations between Boston's whites and blacks.

Raised in St. Louis, Stith says his earlier experiences influence his thinking about race. "My mother was very explicit about the race thing," Stith says. "She said, 'I expect you all to marry black women'. Her position had nothing to do with white folks being less than us, or our ability to deal with anyone's humanity. Her position was, 'I'm not going to work this hard to put you through school and do all that and not have you keep these things within the race.'

"Some of the stuff that comes down now is not racist, but part of that dog-eat-dog

ethic. It requires different strategies. And if the situation you are dealing with is the corporate dog-eat-dog thing and you go into your race thing, it's just not appropriate."

In spite of Percy Stith's friendship with Evan Pressman, his mother believes her son will eventually face racism. "My biggest worry is that he will internalize other people's low expectations of him," Dr. Stith says. "I always had black teachers who were supportive. When I got to Spelman, they were very clear about this: All you had to do was make a couple of A's, and they said, 'Let's grab her, she's got some talent. What do you want to do? Be a doctor? Let's try to get her into Harvard.'"

"We're telling our kids to deal with people as humans, that things are not always cut and dry," Dr. Stith says, "So much of what black kids see today that is new or good or takes money is all white and when they go into the black community, they see trash and things not looking as well. We've got to figure out how to help them feel good about being black and yet deal with white folks on a human level and go beyond that to a world that's inclusive. That's scary, because there is a part of me that says I still can't trust white folks."

AIDS RANKS WITH CANCER AS TOP HEALTH PROBLEM

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 1, 1985

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, ABC News just released a poll revealing that Americans rank AIDS along with cancer as the greatest health problem facing this Nation.

According to the poll, the AIDS epidemic has prompted U.S. citizens to approve something unusual. Poll results show that while Americans are usually adamantly opposed to tax increases to reduce the budget deficit, they are so concerned about AIDS that 71 percent say they would pay more in taxes if the money was used to find a cure for the disease.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the complete poll data which I insert here in the RECORD. The results send a clear signal that Americans want action on AIDS.

[From the ABC News/Washington Post Poll]

AIDS RANKS WITH CANCER AS TOP HEALTH PROBLEM—PUBLIC OK'S TRADE LIMITS

(By Peter Begans)

Americans now rank AIDS along with cancer as the greatest health problem facing this nation, according to the latest poll ABC News/Washington Post Poll.

And fear of the disease, much of it fed by wrong information, appears to be approaching epidemic proportions. Four out of five Americans feel AIDS now poses a threat not just to homosexuals and drug addicts but to the public as a whole. And a quarter are afraid they themselves will pick up the killer virus.

Americans are so worried that seven in 10 say they would pay more taxes if the money were used to find a cure for AIDS.

Methodology—The ABC News/Washington Post poll was conducted Sept. 19 through 23, 1985 by telephone among 1,512 men and women in the continental United States. The margin of error for the entire survey is plus or minus three percentage points and slightly higher for smaller subgroups.

Threat—Fear of AIDS has grown so much in the four years since the disease was discovered that 31 percent of the public now rank it as the nation's greatest health problem. Only cancer, cited by 32 percent of the public, is named by as many Americans. Heart disease, the nation's number one killer, is named by only seven percent as the country's greatest health threat.

That is rather remarkable when you consider that only about 13,000 cases of AIDS—mostly among gay males—have been diagnosed in the United States. Yet reported cases of AIDS have been doubling every year, and 79 percent of Americans believe AIDS is spreading so that it now threatens everyone.

Indeed, a large segment of the public—26 percent, representing about 44 million people—say they now fear they themselves will become victims. Young and old, men and women all seem about equally afraid.

Ignorance—Much of this fear has fed on ignorance of the the scope of the disease and they way it is passed. Almost three in 10 (29 percent) think that the number of cases of AIDS is closer to a million than to 10,000.

And even though most people know that AIDS can be contracted through blood transfusions, intimate sexual contact and sharing intravenous needles, many believe it can also be passed by kissing, drinking from the same glass, being sneezed on, sitting on a toilet seat or shaking hands with someone—ways medical experts say are impossible to pass the virus. In fact, 36 percent believe AIDS is just as contagious or more contagious than the common cold.

HOW TO CATCH AIDS

(In percent)

	Yes	No
Blood transfusions	95	2
Intimate sexual contact	95	2
Sharing intravenous needles	92	3
Kissing	50	36
Using same drinking glass	28	55
Being sneezed on	22	62
Sitting on a toilet seat	16	69
Shaking hands	7	85

Knowledge—most Americans are aware that AIDS has singled out certain groups in society so far. Seven in 10 Americans (69 percent) know that AIDS has predominantly affected homosexuals (about three-quarters of AIDS victims are gay men). Another 17 percent are aware that drug addicts and recipients of blood transfusions like hemophiliacs are disproportionately affected.

Our survey points out that a small percentage of the public—six percent representing 10 million people—say they personally know an AIDS victim. As might be expected, a disproportionate number of them are people who associate with gays on a professional or social basis or are gay themselves. But only 11 percent of those who have a gay friend say they are afraid they might catch AIDS from that friend.

Gay—The male respondents to our survey were asked if they themselves were gay. In response, three percent of men said they were attracted to members of their own sex,

and another one percent said they were attracted to members of both sexes.

Lifestyle—While most Americans—77 percent—are not doing anything to avoid catching AIDS, 22 percent of the public, representing about 37 million people, say they have changed their lifestyle in some way to avoid catching the disease. But many of the things they said they are doing will not help them avoid AIDS, according to medical experts.

The most mentioned action taken to avoid AIDS is not using public restrooms which the experts say accomplishes nothing when it comes to the disease. Very few mention the things the experts say are good preventative measures. For example, less than one percent of single people said they have started to use condoms.

Fear—Fear has become more epidemic than the disease itself. Two-thirds of the public say they are afraid to get a blood transfusion, even though tests have now been developed to screen blood from AIDS donors.

And more than a third of the public—36 percent—feel it is unsafe to associate with AIDS victims, even though doctors have repeatedly stated AIDS can only be passed through intimate contact.

Large segments of the public want AIDS victims removed from society. Twenty-eight percent favor quarantining AIDS victims away from the general public. In addition, 44 percent say they would be upset if a housing and treatment center for AIDS victims was set up in their neighborhood.

Schools—But more than anywhere else, AIDS has become a stick of dynamite in the schools, especially in New York City where parents have kept their children home from school this year because an unidentified seven-year-old girl with AIDS has been allowed to attend classes in Queens. (See New York Survey Below.)

Nationwide, Americans, by two to one, favor allowing children with AIDS to attend school if health officials say there is no danger. However, a quarter of the parents of school age children say they would keep their children home if a child with AIDS was assigned to the local school.

And Americans nationwide strongly feel (78 to 19) that parents should be informed if an AIDS child is attending classes. New York school officials have refused to disclose which school in Queens the little girl is attending.

A large percentage of Americans nationwide (47 percent) also favors removing school employees with AIDS from their jobs. It was reported in New York City that eight school employees came down with AIDS last year.

Nation vs. New York City—One-third of all diagnosed AIDS cases have come from New York City, and stories about the disease have been front page New York news for weeks now. In early September, WABC-TV and the New York Daily News surveyed 505 New Yorkers on the subject of AIDS, using many of the same questions posed in this September ABC News/Washington Post national poll. The results show America's cosmopolitan hub is wrestling with a bout of AIDS paranoia far worse than that found in the country as a whole.

Either due to ignorance or skepticism, New Yorkers are more likely than the public-at-large to say AIDS can be passed from casual contacts, including some specifically rejected by the medical establishment such as sharing a drinking glass or toilet seat and being sneezed on.

And, while a 57 to 36 percent majority of Americans nationwide agree that it is safe to associate with an AIDS victim as long as there is no intimate contact, New Yorkers split down the middle: 46 percent say that's okay—but 44 percent think there's a danger.

The result: over four-in-10 New Yorkers (42 percent) think they personally are in danger of catching the AIDS virus while only a quarter of the public-at-large (26 percent) express such a fear. And 35 percent of the New Yorkers surveyed admitted they were changing their lives to avoid becoming infected. Only 22 percent of our national cross-section are altering their lifestyle.

Not surprisingly, New Yorkers are more prone to advocate steps aimed at identifying and isolating those with the AIDS virus, including quarantining AIDS victims and barring them from public school employment.

Finally New Yorkers are three times more likely to know an AIDS victim—16 percent say they know one versus only six percent nationwide. And New York men are more likely to admit being homosexual or bisexual—nine percent compared to four percent nationwide.

Money and Research—The AIDS outbreak has caused the public to advocate something rare. Americans, who are adamantly opposed to raising taxes to reduce the budget deficit, are so frightened by AIDS that 71 percent say they would pay more in taxes if the money was used to find a cure for the disease. And a majority of 52 percent believe that the government would be spending more money to find a cure if AIDS did not primarily effect gay men.

Despite that, 41 percent approve of the job Reagan is doing handling the disease while 26 percent disapprove and a large 32 percent are not sure how they feel.

AIDS POLL AT A GLANCE

The following results are from an ABC News/Washington Post poll conducted Sept. 19-23, 1985 by telephone among 1,512 men and women in the continental United States. The margin of error for the entire survey is plus or minus three percentage points. The New York City comparative figures are from a New York Daily News-Eyewitness News poll of city residents completed Sept. 17.

	Percent
America's biggest health problem:	
Cancer	32
AIDS	31
Heart disease	7
Drug addiction/alcohol	3
Pollution	3
Cigarettes	3
Hunger/poverty/starvation	3
Health care costs/Medicare/Medicaid	3
Obesity	1
Fitness	1
Elderly health care and disease	1
Other mentions	5
Unsure	7
How much do you know about AIDS:	
Little or nothing	52
Good amount or better	48
What they really know:	
Less contagious than a common cold	56
Just as contagious	19
More contagious	17
Think number of cases near 10,000	63
Think number of cases near a million	29

(In percent)

	Yes	No	Unsure
You catch AIDS from:			
Intimate sex	95	2	4
Blood transfusions	95	2	2

	[In percent]		
	Yes	No	Un-sure
Sharing hypo needles.....	92	3	5
Kissing.....	50	36	14
Drinking glasses.....	28	55	16
Sneezes.....	22	62	16
Toilet seats.....	16	69	15
Shaking hands.....	7	85	9

	Percent		
--	---------	--	--

Who Gets AIDS? Three quarters (74 percent) say that certain groups in society are most likely to catch AIDS. The groups they named:

Homosexuals.....	93
Drug addicts.....	23
Hemophiliacs.....	23
Haitians.....	13
Other (includes prostitutes).....	35

Fears of AIDS:

AIDS is threat to everyone.....	79
AIDS is NOT threat to everyone.....	18
Not afraid they will get AIDS.....	73
Afraid they may get AIDS some day.....	26
Safe to associate with victims.....	57
Not safe to associate with victims.....	36
Oppose quarantining AIDS victims.....	65
Favor quarantining AIDS victims.....	28
NOT upset if AIDS Treatment Center set up in their neighborhood.....	53
Would be upset by a treatment center in their neighborhood.....	44
Afraid to get transfusion.....	67
Not afraid to get transfusion.....	31

AIDS and the Schools:

Favor allowing AIDS kids in schools.....	62
Oppose AIDS kids in schools.....	31
Parents should be told if AIDS kid placed in their child's school.....	78
Should not tell parents if AIDS kid placed in their child's school.....	19
Remove School employees with AIDS.....	47
School employees with AIDS can stay.....	45

AIDS Prevention—What Are They Doing?

Doing nothing to avoid catching AIDS.....	77
Changing lifestyle to avoid AIDS.....	22

What that 22 percent is doing:

Avoiding public restrooms.....	25
Avoiding homosexuals.....	17
Socializing less/avoiding strangers.....	14
Cutting down on sex.....	11
Avoiding blood transfusions.....	11
Sticking to one partner.....	10
Limiting number of partners.....	6
Not using hypodermic needles.....	6
Washing hands more/personal hygiene.....	5
Avoiding restaurants.....	4
Avoiding public athletics facilities.....	3
Stopped giving blood.....	3
Using condoms.....	2

	Percent
Avoiding all sex.....	2
Cleaning home/office more.....	1
Changing places I visit.....	1
Avoiding prostitutes.....	1
No oral sex.....	(*)
No anal sex.....	(*)
AIDS Politics and Government:	
Would pay more taxes to find a cure.....	71
Would NOT pay more taxes to find a cure.....	25
Government would spend more on AIDS if didn't mainly affect gay men.....	52
Government wouldn't be spending more on AIDS if affected all groups.....	39
Approve Reagan on AIDS handling.....	41
Disapprove of Reagan on AIDS.....	26
Unsure.....	32
Direct Contact:	
Know an AIDS victim.....	6
Have a gay male friend (but only 11 percent say they are afraid of catching AIDS from that friend).....	8
Describe themselves a gay male.....	3
Describe themselves as bi-sexual.....	1

WHO'S MOST AFRAID AND ILL-INFORMED?

Summary: Higher percentages of women and old people are ill-informed about how the virus is transmitted than are men and young people. Black people seem especially worried by AIDS. New Yorkers, who live in the city with the highest number of AIDS cases and who have been exposed to a constant stream of AIDS stories in the local media, are noticeably more upset by the AIDS situation. Some examples follow:

	[In percent]	
	Men	Women
AIDS is as contagious as a common cold:		
Agree.....	12	21
	Age 30 or less	Age 61 plus
Percent agreeing can catch AIDS from:		
Sneezes.....	19	30
Toilet seats.....	18	25
Drinking glass.....	27	38

	Percent
Percentage of following groups who are afraid they'll catch AIDS someday:	
Blacks.....	36
Less than High School education.....	33
Earn under \$12,000.....	30
Earn more than \$50,000.....	25
Whites.....	23
Some college or more.....	22

	White	Black
Doing something to avoid AIDS?		
Yes.....	19	38

	[In percent]	
	USA	NYC
Is AIDS now threat to general public?		
Yes.....	79	79
No.....	18	17
Afraid you may pick up AIDS virus?		
Yes.....	26	42
No.....	73	57
Safe to associate with AIDS victim?		
Yes.....	57	46
No.....	36	44
Favor or oppose allowing AIDS students to attend school?		
Favor.....	62	39
Oppose.....	31	55
If AIDS child in school, would you keep your children home?		
Keep them home.....	26	48
Send them to school.....	68	46
People with AIDS should be quarantined		
Agree.....	28	42
Disagree.....	65	48
School should tell parents if AIDS child attending school?		
Agree.....	78	79
Disagree.....	19	18
Public school employees with AIDS should be taken off the job?		
Agree.....	47	66
Disagree.....	45	26
Doing anything to avoid AIDS?		
Yes.....	22	35
Know anyone who has contacted AIDS?		
Yes.....	6	16
Homosexual or bisexual male?		
Yes.....	4	9