

E 3424

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

August 2, 1984

OUR INTELLIGENCE MESS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 2, 1984

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I introduced legislation yesterday, House Joint Resolution 633, to eliminate the House and Senate Intelligence Committee and create a streamlined Joint Committee on Intelligence. I want to share with my colleagues my reasons for this legislation.

I originally proposed this idea in my weekly district column on May 18, 1984 following the furor over the mining of the Nicaragua harbors (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD June 6, 1984, E2606). This debacle prompted me ask, "Is Congress capable of practicing responsible congressional oversight of intelligence activities, once those activities are viewed as an integral part of a foreign policy that has become controversial and the subject of partisan debate?"

I have shared my reasons in a statement today to the Senate Temporary Select Committee to study the Senate Committee System, and I quote from that statement:

We cannot afford to allow what presently masquerades as Congressional intelligence oversight to continue any longer. With politics intruding so heavily on the process, it is time to give serious thought to merging the existing intelligence committees into a joint committee composed equally of Republicans and Democrats who, in addition to the requisite trustworthiness, competence and responsibility, also possess the rare restraint to subordinate political considerations to the national interest.

A serious question with dangerous implications presents itself: Is our democratic form of government unable to keep any secrets, no matter how sensitive to our national interests? As we all know, the calculated, politically motivated leaking of highly sensitive information has become a Washington art form, and one that is not confined to Congress alone.

It appears the only way to mount a successful covert operation these days is for such an activity to have the nearly unanimous support of both Intelligence Committees and the involved agencies of the intelligence community. Anything short of that is doomed to failure, as opponents will selectively leak material to their acquaintances in the media with the expressed purpose of torpedoing the operation. Moreover, as recent press disclosures clearly demonstrate, you can count on a flurry of these leaks just before anticipated congressional action on the disputed issue.

What is especially disturbing is that those who are doing the leaking probably have never stopped to think what the short- and long-term implications of their revelations will be with respect to U.S. intelligence efforts, as well as to U.S. foreign policy. They are so preoccupied with scoring political

points that they do not even begin to realize how their action may be impacting on the lives of U.S. intelligence and foreign service personnel overseas or the thousands of people in the Nicaraguan resistance movement to which the United States has made a commitment.

Creating a new joint oversight panel along these lines would diminish the possibilities for partisan posturing and significantly reduce the number of individuals having access to sensitive information, thus minimizing the risk of damaging, unauthorized disclosures. At the same time, it would retain in a more effective and concentrated manner the essential of congressional oversight over the activities of our intelligence agencies and preclude the possibility of executive branch intelligence components playing one committee off against the other.

Practical considerations played into my decision also. The two committees reflect different perspectives, and they frequently do not focus on the same matters and there is hardly any interaction or coordination. Another thing to bear in mind in this connection is that Congress has increasingly insisted upon being consulted and briefed by the executive branch concerning national security and foreign policy questions. A consolidated oversight panel would provide one point of contact for consultation and briefings in those instances where time is of the essence in a fast breaking crisis situation.

A NEW BOOST FOR ALCOHOL FUEL PRODUCTION

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 2, 1984

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, "Out of Gas" and "No Gas Today" signs sprung up overnight across the Nation in 1978 in response to a second oil embargo, gasohol became widely known to the motoring public. Gasohol, a blend of 10 percent ethanol and 90 percent gasoline, helped satisfy our Nation's need for transportation fuel by extending limited supplies of gasoline. At that time, alcohol fuel was chiefly regarded by the general public as an important gasoline extender.

In time, as the supply of gasoline increased, the service stations signs which advertised gasohol disappeared. With this disappearance, many people incorrectly believed alcohol fuel had also vanished from the marketplace.

Alcohol fuel didn't disappear from the marketplace and in fact the demand and use for alcohol fuel increased. In addition to reducing oil imports and providing expanded and stable markets for our agricultural products, ethanol also proved to be an excellent octane enhancer.

From virtual nonexistence only 5 years ago, our domestic alcohol fuel

industry will produce a projected 400 millions of ethanol this year, a 40-fold increase since 1978. Increased need for higher octane motor fuels, as a result of newer high compression engines and lead-in-gasoline standard changes, has accounted for this increased demand and use of domestically produced renewable ethanol fuel.

The recently announced proposal by the Environment Protection Agency to reduce lead in gasoline from 1.1 grams to 0.1 grams per gallon, which recognizes the harmful environmental effects of lead in the atmosphere, provides another significant boost for alcohol fuel production because lead is primarily used in gasoline as an octane enhancer. Ethanol, of course, is not the only additive available to replace lead and increase the octane rating of motor fuels. MTBE, Oxinol, BTK and other so-called oxygenates, like ethanol, can also be used to increase fuel octane rating, but in comparison to these other additives, ethanol offers many advantages. Ethanol is environmentally benign and medically safe and can be produced from our abundant agricultural production. Getting the lead out, as the Environmental Protection Agency has proposed, provides an important new boost for fuel alcohol production and use.

HONK IF YOU LOVE ED DONOHUE

HON. MIKE LOWRY
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 2, 1984

Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I could not let the retirement of the most colorful pen in the Northwest's labor circles go by without extending my own words of congratulations. Ed Donohoe, the editor of the Washington Teamster, has kept the State of Washington's establishment on its toes. His weekly column has been chuckled over—usually by those not subjected to its coverage, vilified—often by those who are covered, but always read and enjoyed. I might add he has taken the hide off me a few times when I deserved it also.

I have had several opportunities to work with Ed and have the highest admiration for his work. While he will be missed as editor of the Teamster, I'm certain that Ed will continue to play an active role in the Northwest. To use Emmett Watson's words, another great Seattle area scribe, "We need guys like Ed. The city is too monochromatic." Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the Record the following article on Ed Donohoe's retirement from the Washington Teamster:

HONK IF YOU LOVE ED DONOHUE
(By Joe Mooney)

By a special proclamation of the Honorable John Spellman, governor of Washington state, Sunday, April 1, 1984, has been set

3

August 2, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

E 3423

IV. COMPARABILITY OF PAY OF FEDERAL WHITE-COLLAR EMPLOYEES

The Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970 is a major factor in setting Federal salaries; it established the procedure for annual, more or less automatic, implementation of comparability. In effect, it ruled that Federal white-collar pay should roughly equal private sector pay for similar jobs.

May Federal employees are concerned that the basic soundness of the Comparability Act might be undermined by increased criticism of the Federal pay scales and by recommendations for alternative proposals that are impractical, untested, or expensive. The current administration's attitude toward Federal pay is demoralizing and is raising a sense of insecurity and unrest among Federal employees.

VI. COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS

Since 1967, the majority of employees and retirees in both the public and private sector have had their wages and annuities aligned with the Consumer Price Index [CPI]. For the retired, whose primary source of income is an annuity or pension, cost-of-living adjustments [COLA's] are essential in order to remain solvent. I support regular and equitable COLA's for Federal retirees.

VII. CONTRACTING OUT FEDERAL WORK AND POSITIONS

Over the past several years there has been an increased emphasis on moving workload and positions from the Federal Government to the private sector. This thrust has come from the executive branch of the Government, primarily the Office of Management and Budget [OMB]. The pressure to contract out appears to be politically motivated and intended solely for the purpose of reducing the size of Government and expanding the private sector.

Federal employees are not opposed to contracting out certain jobs or functions if it makes sense from a practical and economic point of view. I suggest requiring each agency to provide a rationale for contracting or not contracting out specific functions.

The Federal Government relies on certain principles in order to function in an open, democratic manner. Among these principles is the theory of service and dedication to a common cause. Our public officials and civil servants fulfill this noble cause when they choose to give up the larger benefits available in the private sector. Without them, our Government would cease to function. It is only fair and wise that we bestow upon them the benefits that they have rightfully earned. Let us not forget this when we meet again to decide the future of the Civil Service Retirement System. Thank you.●

SOVIET JEWRY

HON. THOMAS J. TAUKE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 2, 1984

● Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, as I and my colleagues have done previously as participants in the Congressional Vigil for Soviet Jewry, I would like to speak again on behalf of the many Jewish citizens suffering persecution in the Soviet Union. While the Soviet Government continues to disregard the human rights and religious freedom of their Jewish countrymen, I will continue to bring their sad story before my colleagues and all Americans who, thankfully, know no such persecutions in this country.

It is clear that the mistreatment of Soviet Jews is a very real part of Soviet society. One does not have to look very far or very hard to uncover new incidents where the Soviet Government has succeeded in ruining the lives of Jewish citizens through harassment.

There are many convenient ways that the Soviet Government has mastered to deny this select group the human rights all people should enjoy. We hear stories of Soviet Jews being exiled to labor camps. We hear stories of Soviet Jews being denied admission to universities. And we hear stories of Soviet Jews being forced to stay in a land where anti-Semitism is promoted by the media and in literature.

Consider, for example, the plight of Abe Stolar and his family, who have suffered greatly at the hands of the Soviet Government. Abe and his sister Eva were born in Chicago, where their parents had settled after fleeing tsarist Russia. In 1936, after returning to Moscow, Abe's father was arrested during one of Stalin's purges and has never been heard from since. Abe's grandmother and aunt were also arrested and sent to Siberia, where they both died in concentration camps.

Abe himself was expelled from the Moscow School of Arts and made to work as a hard laborer. In 1941, he joined the Russian army, serving on the front line until the end of the war. Abe survived the war, and Eva survived the Holocaust; she managed to emigrate to Israel some years later.

In 1974, Abe, his wife Gitta, and their son Mikhail were granted visas to join Eva in Israel. In order to leave, they were required to sell their apartment, relinquish Soviet citizenship and pack all of their belongings off to Israel. One year later, with only a few small suitcases, they were prevented from boarding a plane. On June 19, 1975, they were told that Gitta's visa was not in order; the family was prohibited from leaving because of a fabricated claim that she had had access to secret information at the time of her retirement 2 years before. Twelve

days later, they were informed that they could not leave the Soviet Union for 2 years on grounds of "security." Even though their pensions were reinstated by the Soviet Government, Abe and Gitta refused to take up their Soviet citizenship again.

Without a place to live, Abe and his family were put into an apartment belonging to someone else. They have been living in that empty apartment on the meager allowance the government pays them to remain in the Soviet Union.

Mikhail, Abe's son, was unable to get into an institute of higher education because of the circumstances in which they are living. Threats have been made that Mikhail will be called for 2 years of military service. If he is called to serve, the family's visas would be delayed again at least another 6 or 7 years, or refused entirely on the same convenient grounds of "security." Mikhail applied to emigrate to Israel alone and wait for his parents, but he was told that he could not leave the U.S.S.R. because of his mother's supposed knowledge of secret information.

In 1978, Abe wrote three letters to Mr. Brezhnev, asking that his war service be counted favorably toward the family's emigration application. These letters were never even acknowledged. The Stolar family is subject to constant petty harassment from Soviet authorities. They are now being sued for the price of their cooperative apartment. This is the apartment the authorities put them in when the family was first kept from leaving the Soviet Union. The rightful owners want to get Abe's family evicted, which would leave them on the streets.

Meanwhile, Eva had been soliciting the help of friends in California in the hope that her brother's family would someday be able to join her there. She campaigned vigorously in Israel and America, and as she was about to leave for a meeting on her brother's behalf, she collapsed and within a few minutes, died.

I would like to believe that the fight against the mistreatment of Soviet Jews will not die with Eva. In February 1981, Abe and Gitta celebrated their silver wedding anniversary, and in December Abe reached his 73d birthday. He remains cheerful, resolute and undaunted, still hoping to escape the grip of the Soviet Government that continues to deny his family their visas.

The case of the Abe Stolar family is but one of many cases. I urge the Soviet Union to stop persecuting the Stolar's, and other Soviet Jews. We in the United States must continue to call attention to these blatant denials of human rights. I urge my colleagues and the American people to join me in protesting the abuses of the Soviet Government.●