

April 11, 1984

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 2755

have served well as seed money to generate further funding from State governments and private sources. We must continue to support these valuable programs.

In Connecticut, libraries have done a superb job of managing with their limited resources. In fiscal year 1984, Connecticut received about \$1.5 million in Federal funds for statewide library services; this was then matched by the State with an additional \$3.25 million. This is a dramatic demonstration of the wide impact of this Federal program. These funds helped to add new books to library collections, to provide services to handicapped readers, and to promote resource sharing among libraries.

It is appropriate to recognize America's libraries both with our words and with our appropriations. It is impossible to imagine a world in which libraries were allowed to disappear, where one did not have access to their collections. I join with my colleagues in saluting America's libraries. ●

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?  
There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. WALKER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. GINGRICH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WEBER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. WEBER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. FEIGHAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McEWEN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. McEWEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

## THE MINING OF NICARAGUAN HARBORS—A GREAT POLITICAL MANIPULATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SILJANDER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. SILJANDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House on what I consider one of the greatest political manipulations I have seen on the floor with the Committee on Foreign Affairs in a long time in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I must be very candid in talking about Nicaragua and the crisis in Central America. Some people have exhibited what they call an outrage, an outrage at the fact that the United States has somehow participated in mining the ports of Nicaragua.

I think it is important that we bring some of these facts to light regarding this particular situation.

No. 1. Mining of a harbor in Nicaragua has been done for one express purpose—by the Contras, not the United States, by the Contra-revolutionaries, to help in the constant effort to interdict arms flowing into Nicaragua from the Soviet Union, from Cuba, from Libya, and even from the Palestinian Liberation Organization back in the Middle East, funneling arms into Nicaragua and then those arms are transferred from Nicaragua elsewhere in Central America to promote what they call the visionary Marxist revolution without frontiers.

I really see little difference in terms of the goal of interdiction or stopping the arms flow into Nicaragua and out of Nicaragua throughout the Central American region, little difference in using mines or using grenades, guns, artillery, that this Congress has voted in support to the counterrevolutionaries in Nicaragua. Those grenades and those guns have killed people. If the Congress has still, at least in the past, been considering, has considered successfully and is still considering more aid to the Contras in Nicaragua, I think that is certainly reasonable considering the crisis in Central America and considering that we are facing 9,000 Cubans, we are facing 2,000 Soviet-bloc advisers, many PLO and Libyans that are in Central America.

Incidentally, regarding the PLO in Central America, I rather doubt that the PLO is looking for a homeland in Central America. They are there with the Cubans, the Soviets and the Libyans for one express purpose, to help promote that Marxist revolution throughout the region.

But back to the parallel. I see very little difference in allowing the Contras to place mines in the harbor

where it has been proven beyond any reasonable doubt that major shipments of arms have come in through that harbor into Nicaragua for revolutionary spreading purposes. I see very little difference in placing those mines, which are not meant to sink ships or to kill or destroy ships, but simply to damage ships as a deterrent for ships coming into the harbor. They are concussion made, handmade concussion mines, which again, I repeat, are not used to totally destroy ships, but only used in terms of disabling and damaging ships.

Now, if we compare that to the fact that the Congress—and I repeat once again, that the Congress has voted for more other types and more seriously deadly weapons, yet here we have a tremendous outcry by the liberals in Congress about this action.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SILJANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

□ 1920

Mr. HYDE. I want to commend the gentleman for his insight and for his courage in taking the floor this evening to speak out on an issue that disturbs a great number of us, because the train is rolling down the track. The administration is being condemned out of hand because it dares, it dares to seek to protect the suffering 5 million people of El Salvador from the importation of ammunition and weapons from communities in Nicaragua and this, of course, is something that is just improper. It is just something not to be done.

I want to ask the gentleman a question. You were present and you were very active in the consideration of the ill-fated Boland-Zablocki bill which you will recall we debated last year, which sought to cut off any funds whatsoever for the insurgents fighting to recapture their own revolution within Nicaragua, the forces that are called Contras that were seeking to democratize their country, that were seeking to have pluralism, to have a free press, a free practice of religion. And we were assisting in an undercover fashion, which uniquely becomes exposed because of the outrage of the gentlemen of the left who dominate the majority party and who seem to think that resistance to Marxist-Leninist hegemony is somehow wrong.

But the alternative that was offered by the Boland-Zablocki bill was to literally build a fence around Nicaragua, that it was somehow ungentlemanly and indecent to support undercover operations, covert operations, so we will build a fence overtly, we will interdict this exporting of weapons and ammunition to El Salvador by halting them overtly; \$80 million was the amount of money that was authorized in that legislation.

I want to ask the gentleman: Do you remember what their suggestion was

Executive Registry

36,044

on interdicting shipments of arms to El Salvador by sea? I can see building a barbed wire fence, maybe electrified. I guess you could not put land mines around Nicaragua because that is improper and ungentlemanly and forbidden. But how are they going to interdict shipments by sea if mines, ocean mines are somehow wrong and contrary to international law, and brutal? How were they going to interdict shipments at sea; do you remember? Were we going to bomb those ships? Were we going to put a naval blockade? What was their plan?

Mr. SILJANDER. I do not think they had a plan.

I thank the gentleman for his comments and points. I really do not think they had a plan.

It is pretty obvious there is a two-track philosophy and approach by the liberals. One, let us support interdiction of funds for arms on land and not do anything on sea, thereby leaving an obvious gaping loophole in the whole philosophy in the entire legislation, and a more practical inlet of arms through the waterways of Nicaragua. So I do not think they really had a plan for that.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SILJANDER. I am happy to yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. A number of Members of Congress had an opportunity not long ago to meet with the Ambassadors from Honduras and Costa Rica and to talk to them about the problems their countries are facing because of the Communist menace in Nicaragua. The leaders with whom I talked, we had a long discussion, indicated to be that the Communist Party in Costa Rica, for instance, has been requested by the Nicaraguan Government to send their Communist participants to Managua to be taught guerrilla tactics and military tactics so that they can come back and undermine the Government of Costa Rica. The same thing in Honduras.

As a matter of fact, recently they found 600 Communists that had been trained in guerrilla tactics and military tactics in Nicaragua coming back across the border to try to stir up trouble in Honduras. And they have been training these people in Managua to undermine these governments.

In addition to that, they have had labor leaders who are Communist sympathizers in Costa Rica and Honduras in Managua trying to work with them in starting strikes in both those countries to undermine those governments. There they are working day and night trying to undermine those governments to such a degree that they will fall of their own weight.

In addition to that, I would like to quote some facts and statistics which have not been discussed much by those who favor pulling in our horns throughout Central America.

First of all, the fact, No. 1, which we talked about earlier today. Since the Sandinistas took over in Nicaragua, 36 new military bases have been built. Nicaragua now has the largest army in Central America. They have 44,000 active duty army personnel and 58,000 militiamen, a total of 102,000. And they are building dally toward a goal of 250,000.

Mr. SILJANDER. If I could just reclaim my time for a minute, are you telling me then that there are approximately 105,000 trained Nicaraguans under arms today, as of this moment?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. There is no question about it.

Mr. SILJANDER. I was told by many of the news reports and by those on the left in the committee and in the Congress on the floor that the reason for the buildup of arms in Nicaragua and for the training of the troops in Nicaragua was for a simple reason, to off-balance the guerrilla activities.

Would you say 105,000 is sufficient to off-balance activities of 15,000 guerrillas?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I think that is an absolutely ridiculous argument that they are making. The fact of the matter is they have twice the army, twice the size of the entire armed forces of all of Central America combined. All of their neighbors, if you add up all of their armed forces together, they are only about half of what Nicaragua has, and Nicaragua is continuing to build their armed forces toward a 250,000 man army.

Mr. SILJANDER. I think the gentleman is making a very good point. So the argument they are using that this buildup of arms, buildup of training, buildup of manpower, is not really for strictly defensive purposes, or to stop the insurgency movement in Nicaragua, but it looks rather evident, at least based on the statistics that we are hearing, it looks rather evident that the real goal is in fact consistent with the export of arms, the export of training and revolution throughout Central America. Their interests are not just merely defensive, and to cease and desist the insurgency, but, rather, to quote the Sandinistas themselves, to bring this revolution much further than their own borders.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I may, if the gentleman would yield further, I would like to point out that Alberto Ortega, Daniel Ortega's brother, who is the Defense Minister there, has said on numerous occasions that he wants this revolution from Costa Rica all the way to Guatemala, and assuming his attitude is not going to change, into Mexico as well, and that endangers the very security of the United States of America.

Mr. HYDE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SILJANDER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am most interested and fascinated by the statistics of the gentleman from Indiana, because what we see is a country, Nicaragua, a poor country, geared for conflicts rather than economic growth. They take all of their assets and resources and pour it into the Defense Establishment, by far more than they need to defend their country—from the post office of Costa Rica? Is that what they are afraid of?

It is utter nonsense. But it is geared for conflicts just like Cuba, a beautiful country, with beautiful people, with natural resources that should flourish. But all of their assets go into military expenditures so that they can have an expeditionary force in Angola, in Ethiopia. Their army can go all over the world at the bidding of the Soviet Union, gearing their economy for conflicts instead of economic growth.

Is this taking care of the poor people that the trendy vicars and the liberation theologians are so enthused about, taking all of the money and all of the assets and pouring it into the military instead of helping the poor people?

I guess the only job you can get is if you work for the army.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SILJANDER. I yield back to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman very much.

I would just like to point out that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Hyde) has stimulated my thought processes a little bit. I would like to point out that instead of taking care of their citizens from an economic standpoint and trying to build a sound economic base, they are putting a lot of people in fear down there. As a matter of fact, they are modeling their entire society after the Cuban society. They are putting a Communist agent or sympathizer in every block so that they can inform upon their neighbors if they have any concern about what the Government is doing in Nicaragua. So there is a spy network that it taking over in Nicaragua which is undermining the very society down there.

Mr. SILJANDER. Are you saying, I want to understand this more clearly, the gentleman from Indiana is suggesting that in Nicaragua they are placing in every precinct of sorts or every block Communist sympathizers or Marxists sympathizers to the Government that will observe and watch their neighbors, and if they observe any activity which they consider anti-government and they report this to the Government, then the Government can thereby take some form of action against those civilians?

□ 1930

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That is right.

April 11, 1984

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 2757

Mr. SILJANDER. That does not sound like a very open and free society. I might remind the gentleman that in 1979, after the takeover of tyrant Somoza the Sandinistas went before the OAS looking for recognition, saying that all of you should recognize us because we will initiate in our new government, Sandinista government, freedom of religion, freedom of press, freedom of labor unions to participate, freedom of speech and freedom of travel and life and society and elections.

And what I am hearing is that a society gearing up for not a defensive mechanism to defend themselves, but a mechanism really for promoting war and revolution. It sound like we are hearing a system and a society that is repressing the civilians by the Big Brotherism, rather than having TV cameras in every home, we have a block watcher in each block or each precinct.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That is exactly right.

Mr. SILJANDER. Is this what you are alluding to?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes, it is. If the gentleman would yield further, I will state a few more facts which I think the American people and this Congress ought to be aware of. There are now about 8,000 Cuban advisers in Nicaragua, including at least 2,000 military advisers.

In 1983, an estimated 15,000 tons of Soviet bloc arms and equipment reached the Sandinista army; that is about a 60-percent increase over 1982. So they are building this military machine at a very rapid rate. Nicaragua is equipped with the most modern weapons, dozens of Soviet-made tanks.

Recently, they received from Bulgaria, another Communist bloc country, amphibious tanks so they could go into the swamp areas there and make sure they wipe out the Contras, who are trying to regain their country.

There are 800 Soviet-bloc tanks, Soviet M-152 howitzers, 100 anti-aircraft guns, helicopters, planes.

They are expanding four of their airports down there so they will accommodate Mig-23 jet airplanes flown in from the Soviet Union. The Government has T-54 and T-55 tanks; they recently sent approximately 70 Nicaraguans to Bulgaria for training as pilots and mechanics. I can go on and on and on.

There is no doubt in my mind or anybody who is studying the problems in Central America, that the Sandinista government in Nicaragua is building a war machine that has but one purpose and that is to take away the freedoms of the people throughout Central America, make that a Communist launching pad from Mexico to put the United States in an untenable situation on our southern border.

If this Congress does not pay attention to that problem to day and if we

do not give the proper military aid and assistance to Nicaragua, the Contras in Nicaragua and El Salvador, we are going to have real severe problems in the not-too-distant future.

My biggest concern is that American boys at some point in the future will be involved in a land war somewhere between here and Central America, probably Mexico, trying to defend the freedoms that we enjoy today, unnecessarily.

Mr. SILJANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. I think that is an excellent point, because some of the critics of the policy in Central America have said that we are leading up to the commitment of U.S. troops.

Now listen to this reasoning: The reason we are leading up to the commitment with U.S. troops is because the Nicaraguans really, the Nicaraguan Freedom Fighters, the Nicaraguans who want the Sandinistas to live up to their promises, they are out there fighting. There could be more of them fighting if there was the support for them.

That is going to lead to the commitment of U.S. troops. In other words, because the Salvadoran Government and its army is fighting against the Cuban-Soviet-Nicaraguan insurgents, death squads, that is going to lead to the commitment of U.S. troops.

The fact is that when people in these countries, nationals of these countries fight for their own freedom and are willing to risk their lives for their countries and their freedom so that they are not subverted by a Marxist Axis of Nicaragua, Cuba, and the Soviet Union, that is when U.S. troops will not be used.

Now we have a condition where these people with a little bit of support are willing to put their lives on the line and fight the emissaries of the Soviet Union. If we withdraw our assistance, that is when these emissaries of the Soviet Union become extraordinarily powerful, can move up the Central America isthmus toward Mexico and the Rio Grande River and it is precisely then when these countries have fallen that U.S. troops may well be put into play.

What we are trying to do, what I understand the gentleman from Indiana is saying, is that we do not want United States troops committed. We are willing to assist those who are willing to put their lives on the line and fight for freedom and at a cost—you talk about \$20 million for the Contras in Nicaragua, you talk about \$60 million for El Salvador; that is the cost of a couple of sophisticated fighter planes. A Trident submarine costs \$1 billion, an MX costs hundreds of millions of dollars; B-1 costs \$1 billion; and we may have to do this in order to be able to negotiate with the Soviets who already have these things.

But to say somehow we are spending money ineffectively when people are willing to fight and die, is really

strange; to say that that is going to cost American lives when the nationals of these countries are putting their lives on the line in order to stem the tide toward the United States.

Mr. SILJANDER. Regaining my time, I think this is precisely the point that stirs my heart and stirs my emotions, because while I sit in Congress and all day today in the Foreign Affairs Committee, listening to testimony by Kenneth Dam, who is Assistant Secretary, regarding the mining incident, when I see the mining incident, it is an out, a scapegoat for the liberals now to suggest, "Let us cut off all covert assistance, any assistance, overt or covert, to the Contras, the counter-revolutionaries, the freedom fighters in Nicaragua."

I see this as their opportunity for now to say, "It is time now Congress should cut it off completely." And if we do so, if we in Congress decide to turn our backs on the freedom fighters in Nicaragua, if we do that, then they will be those responsible for, inevitably, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania is alluding to, then they will be responsible for sending American troops from their own borders into Mexico to stabilize a very unstable situation.

What do you think the Russians are doing there to the tune of thousands of Russian advisers, also Bulgarians, training in secret 9,000 Cubans? They are not there for a picnic.

Mr. RITTER. I thought they were there because they enjoy the climate of the Caribbean.

Mr. SILJANDER. I appreciate the humor of the gentleman, because it does illustrate in a sarcastic framework just the very issue we are all talking about. They are there for a precise purpose; a clear purpose, to destabilize the domestic economy, to draw attention to, the PLO anyway, draw attention away from the Middle East to the United States, our own borders, because they see this revolution without frontiers, they see a Mexico that is economically distraught; they see a debt crisis in Central America, looming on the horizon. They see a great opportunity considering two-thirds of all American trade going through the Caribbean Basin.

Mr. RITTER. Is the gentleman saying that if this Congress withdraws support for the Contras those fighting, so that the Sandinistas will live up to their promises that if America withdraws the \$21 million that that will make the situation far more dangerous for the United States in that region.

Mr. SILJANDER. Absolutely. Who is off balance? The hundreds of millions of dollars of Soviet, Cuban, Libyan, PLO, oil money and oil money flowing into Nicaragua.

As the gentleman from Indiana outlined, tanks, 105,000, an army bigger than all Central American combined.

And the goal stated by them of 250,000.

Executive Register

36,045

H 2758

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

April 11, 1984

□ 1940

Now listen, it is pretty clear.

Mr. RITTER. That is one-tenth of the population of Nicaragua. That would be equivalent, would it not, to an army, a U.S. Army of 22 million people?

Mr. SILJANDER. That is correct.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SILJANDER. What I am trying to say, it is clear the intention is not a defensible one or one of pure defense on the part of the Sandinistas or Nicaraguans. It is not one the Soviets are there for a picnic. They are there to destabilize the entire region which thereby destabilizes the United States. And after all, from the Soviet standpoint, they have China on one border, who is not a clear friend, they have Turkey on another border. Why should the United States be free of enemies on our borders?

And since economically—I will repeat what I said before—two-thirds of our trade goes through the Caribbean Basin and Central America. Sixty-six percent of our imported oil. And I ask people listening, go back to the time we paid double for the price of oil within a month's time because of a slight interruption of imported oil. And those lines overlapping one another, two and three deep around the gasoline and the fueling stations of America. Beyond that, what about the refugee crisis? What about the fact that it is estimated now that 50,000 are flooding across the borders per month. Who is going to feed and clothe them?

Are refugees bad people? No.

Mr. RITTER. Is the gentleman saying that the nationals who have to live under Marxist totalitarian rule do not necessarily want to stay there and they attempt to live; is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. SILJANDER. I am saying that refugees are fleeing tyranny. They are fleeing Communist interruptions of economies in Honduras and more specifically, El Salvador. They are fleeing tyranny in Nicaragua. They are fleeing this Marxist revolution.

It happened in Vietnam. Ten percent of the population left by boat.

And here, as Ronald Reagan said, all one needs to do is go by foot to leave. And at 50,000 a month now, what if Honduras, Guatemala, Costa Rica, with no army to speak of, and Mexico with its economic destabilizing condition today, what if they were all to fall? Some estimates go as high as 500,000 a month flooding across the border.

Mr. RITTER. If the gentleman will yield further, Jack Anderson, who receives great renown for his analysis was in the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania. He gave a speech to a group of people. He said that the Soviet Union was interested not in the destabilization of El Salvador or in the arming of the Nicaraguans, those were only stepping stones.

Jack Anderson said, when he came to the district, that their goal was the destabilization of the United States of America.

Where the gentleman is correct, once Mexico becomes a situation of great turmoil, at that point there will be a massive influx north across the Rio Grande River, an influx that even today we have difficulty handling. Can one imagine what it would be like if a tyrannical regime or widespread revolution comes to the country of Mexico, what that would mean to the southwest United States and really the entire United States of America. Anderson said the goal of the Soviet Union was the destabilization of the United States using Central America and the Caribbean as the stepping stones.

Mr. SILJANDER. Khrushchev said that, "We will bury you," to the United States. I do not think he meant in ashes of nuclear holocaust. I think he meant in a very practical way we will bury us internally. He will bury us through our own hemisphere, through the Central American crisis that looms over us.

I just repeat: Who is going to pay the price for the hundreds of thousands of fleeing civilians, fleeing tyranny, who will pay the price of housing, clothing, feeding, language training? And what about the jobs that will be taken from Americans? Again, let me repeat, refugees are not bad people. They are just honest citizens fleeing tyranny, but can the United States afford 10 times the illegal immigration we are now experiencing today? That is the question. Can the American taxpayers afford it? And are we willing to afford it?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield to me, I would just like to make two quick points.

First of all, we must, if we are going to avoid these terrible things we are talking about tonight, if we are going to avoid those, we must interdict the massive amounts of military supplies coming into Nicaragua.

Now, there has been a lot of criticism of mining those ports down there and I will not go into all the arguments that are going to be made today or have been made or will be made tomorrow, but the fact of the matter is we are going to have to stop those military supplies from getting in there because the minute they get in there they are being used within that country and they are being exported into El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Costa Rica, every place they possibly can in Central America to undermine those Governments. And the only way you are going to stop them from getting into those other countries and in the hands of Communists and Communist terrorists in those countries is to stop them from getting in there in the first place.

So whether or not we mine the harbors or try something else, something

must be done to interdict those supplies from getting in and getting out.

The second point I would like to make is that three of the gentlemen standing here in this colloquy went to Granada. And you will recall we saw the Soviet documents, agreements between the Soviets and the Grenadian Communist government and the North Koreans and the Cubans. Those agreements pledged millions of dollars, \$10 million from the North Koreans, 15 million rubles from the Soviets to Grenada, an island 8 miles by 18 miles. They were going to use that for a military base to expand the revolution throughout the eastern Caribbean into Central America and South America. They had given us a complete roadmap. The leaders of Nicaragua have said the same things that Castro has said and Bishop said in Grenada before he was disposed. There is no doubt that their goal is revolution throughout Central America and to take over that part of the world.

I think it would be a dereliction of our responsibility in the Congress of the United States if we did nothing about it. I think it would be terrible for us to stand idly by and watch our southern neighbors succumb to the Communists.

If we do this, in my opinion, we are going to rue this day. Freedom will cry aloud from every person in every country we allow to be crushed under the boot of communism. I think that the three of us tonight have experienced a little bit of it by going to Grenada. It is incumbent upon us, as well as the gentlemen from California and Illinois to get this message across to our colleagues in the Congress.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SILJANDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank all of the gentlemen who have participated tonight for putting this very important message out. The way I feel after several days of watching the Foreign Minister of Nicaragua come in and make his PR play in front of America's televisions and talk shows and newspapers, that in fact his visit, to change the subject if you will, has been very successful. And essentially that is exactly what he is involved in is changing the subject instead of focusing America's attention on the promises that the Sandinistas made to hold elections, which they have never held, to have a humane government in accord with the letter that they sent to the OAS in July of 1979, and to allow a free press, and a number of other things. They have, instead of focusing America's attention on their failures in those regards, they are now talking about the World Court and trying to focus America's attention on whether or not we should submit ourselves to the jurisdiction of this forum.

April 11, 1984

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 2759

I would contend that as long as they are in the business of destabilizing the Americas, it is perfectly appropriate for the United States to stop their inventory from coming in.

Again I remember the Nicaraguan Minister, Mr. D'Escoto, said, after he had been asked a question four or five times on one program, "Are you in fact sending arms to El Salvador?" First he said, "We are not sending arms in violation of any laws." And when he was really pinned down, he finally said, "No; we are not."

I think that Democrats and Republicans have watched the classified briefings. I do not think there is any doubt that arms and ammunition are going from Nicaragua to El Salvador. I do not think any Member in this Chamber would dispute that. They might have a dispute over whether or not in fact our assistance to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua is substantially interdicting the flow of arms, but nobody doubts that there is a flow of arms from Nicaragua into El Salvador.

Mr. SILJANDER. Let me ask the gentleman a question then. Does the gentleman not find it in the context of what we have talked about tonight rather incredible that Members of the U.S. Congress, here in the land of the free and the brave, the greatest model of democracy in the world, is it not rather amazing that because of this mining incident that that should be reason enough to cut off all covert assistance, in any form or any kind, overt or covert for that matter, to the counterrevolutionaries or freedom fighters in Nicaragua? I find it rather amazing.

Why and what, in the gentleman's opinion, would motivate Members of this body to advocate that as a result of this mining incident, we should thereby cut off all assistance and allow the revolution to continue, allow the destabilization of that region to continue, which will be, as we have talked about very often tonight, an erosion of our own security and economy at our borders.

□ 1950

Mr. HUNTER. I think to answer the gentleman's question that if they are successful, if the Sandinista propaganda effort is successful in sending the Foreign Minister out here to hit the American media and to appear on the talk shows and do the interviews with the print media, if that effort is in fact followed by this Congress cutting off aid to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua he is going to be able to go home and say, "Mission Accomplished. We pulled off one of the greatest propaganda efforts in the history of this conflict."

"Here we have been able to divert American attention away from the security matters that they were operating under before the security concerns for Central America, we have been

able to divert attention away from the fact that we have abused human rights in our country, we have diverted attention away from the fact that we have never held elections."

And I understand now the rules are if they hold the elections they are going to give a whole 15 minutes a week to all of the opposition parties combined. I think their time is going to be something like midnight to 18 after midnight. They are not going to allow popular people in the country, like Eden Pastora, to appear on the ballot because they would otherwise win. And the only political assemblies that will be allowed will be political assemblies that the government sanctions, that is, the assemblies that are focused on government candidates.

So they have made a mockery of the representations that they have made to the OAS. This talk about a representative democratic government that they talked about is so much baloney, and yet they have turned America's attention. More importantly, they have turned the attention of the leadership, the leadership in this House—and every person here represents a constituency of about half a million people—away from the real issues. And that is going to be a tragedy.

I cannot feel mad at my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, even those on this side of the aisle, who feel that the issue now is to decide whether or not we should succumb to the jurisdiction of the World Court and try to go through these legal equations. If in fact this House turns its attention away from the tremendous danger that is manifest in the regime in Nicaragua to the United States of America and our allies in this hemisphere, it will be a tremendous tragedy.

Mr. SILJANDER. I thank the gentleman very much for his comments.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SILJANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. I want to say to my friend from California that I looked up the World Court today. They have 15 judges. One is from the Soviet Union, one is from Poland, one is from Syria, there is one from India.

Now, I suggest that I would be very chary about submitting anybody's human rights to judges from the Soviet Union and Poland and Syria. And India worries me a little bit because they have not been all that sympathetic with the consent between the Marxist-Leninists and the United States.

But I would hesitate to bring some of the world's toughest controversies to that World Court. Maybe the West Bank settlements, maybe the Golan Heights. I just do not think we would trust an evenhanded verdict from that court. And why should the national security of this hemisphere be brought over to a forum that far away that has on its judicial bench people whose whole philosophy, not to say theology,

is antithetical to the struggle against Marxist-Leninism in this hemisphere.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SILJANDER. If I might make one point about the World Court, I think an overriding concern certainly in the World Court is: How can the United States logically and tragically bring before a World Court system exposed to international press issues and facts that Kenneth Dam, Assistant Secretary, could not bring before an open committee of the U.S. Congress? He said, "I am sorry, I cannot answer any of those questions regarding the mining because it is classified evidence or classified information. I will be happy to respond in a closed, classified briefing."

So we are expected to go before the World Court and expose our classified information and discuss the guerrilla activities. It seems rather illogical, No. 1, that we discuss and argue an irregular war activity, which is very difficult to pinpoint anyway, and, No. 2, that we discuss information which we cannot openly discuss in the United States of America and before the Foreign Affairs Committee of this Congress.

So I think that, really, comes right down to the point why we are crazy. Certainly it would be foolish to go before a court under those circumstances, beyond the fact that the Sandinistas have tried the United Nations to divert attention away from human rights violations and social injustices. Now they are going to the World Court. It is all a propaganda ploy. Why do they not go before the Contadora Four? That is where we place confidence, in their own people. Why should they go beyond, to outside international realms, to those who are not as close to persecutions?

Mr. RITTER. I will tell the gentleman why, if the gentleman will yield. There is a very good reason why.

Mr. SILJANDER. I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to tell me why.

Mr. RITTER. Because the Sandinistas are experts in theater. The Sandinistas are putting on a show before the world in order to hide the inequities and to hide the vast Soviet military buildup that is going on in their country, in order to hide behind this veil of theater at the World Court what they are doing as command and control over the insurgents in El Salvador.

Now, I find this feeling of hurt that the Sandinistas have expressed interesting, to say the least.

Think of the hypocrisy. The Sandinistas, the Marxist-Leninist Soviet-Cuban dominated Sandinistas, they are up in arms about mining of their harbors, while at the same time they are in charge of directing what the next bridge is to be blown up in El Salvador, what the next road is to be blown up, what the next power station and telephone line is to be blown up.

Executive Registry

H 2760

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

April 11, 1984

And it is there in the House Intelligence Committee report, and the liberals and the conservatives and the Republicans and the Democrats all know the command and control function of the Nicaraguan Government over the insurgency in El Salvador.

Mr. SILJANDER. Where is the outcry? Reclaiming my time, where is the outcry, then, of these freedom lovers on the left who think it is so horrible? To quote one of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he said because we are allowing the freedom fighters to use concussion bombs, concussion mines, which do not sink any vessels, they have not killed a single soul yet.

"I used to think," he said, "there was a difference between the Soviet Union and the United States going to such radical, fanatical extremes to compare our allowance of freedom fighters interdict arms," suggesting therefore in a syllogistic way that we are equal to the Soviet Union because of their persecutions.

Mr. RITTER. If the gentleman will yield, these are the same people who said that our rescue operation in Grenada was equivalent to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

This is the convoluted thinking, this mirror image thinking, that somehow Stalin's heirs, Hitler's moral twins, are the same as the world's greatest democracy. This entails a substantial loss of self-confidence and self-assurance in the goodness of the American democratic experiment. This entails a blindfold over reality, whereby when repressed people the world over wish to escape somewhere, where do they come? They spend years trying to get in here. And to somehow equate the United States with the Soviet Union because we are helping freedom fighters regain their just due, as promised by the Sandinistas, with Nicaraguan totalitarian leaders is really stretching the point. And I think the American people will see through this theater that the Sandinistas Marxist-Leninists have been promoting at the World Court.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SILJANDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We do not have to make veiled allusions to the secret briefings or Intelligence Committee reports that are not made available to the public. All we have to do is to read the Intelligence Committee report itself when they reported to this House, an official document, an open document. They said in several places in that document that beyond any doubt the Sandinistas were providing arms, ammunition, direction and control, communication direction, and all of that, to the guerrillas in El Salvador.

I suggest that what is happening here, regardless of what one might feel about the mining issue itself—as

the gentleman has pointed out, not one ship has been sunk, no one has been killed, I do not think anyone has even been injured, while there have been injuries and deaths, and so on, in the land war that is going on between the Contras and the Sandinista armed forces. But I think what has happened is, as has been pointed out already here, certain people in this body and in the other body and in the public itself are using this issue as an excuse to shut off all covert aid to the Contras in Nicaragua.

□ 2000

I suggest what is happening here regardless of what one might feel about the mining issue itself, and as the gentleman pointed out, not one ship has been sunk, no one has been killed, I do not think anybody even has been injured. While there have been injuries and death and so on in the land war that is going on between the Contras and the Sandinista armed forces.

I think what has happened is, as has been pointed out already here, certain people in this body and in the other body and in the public itself, are using this issue as an excuse to shut off all covert aid to the Contras in Nicaragua. I suggest the reason that is happening is because the Contras are starting to have some success.

They have recently been able to get together: Ardes in the North, or Ardes in the South, Pastora's organization and that of Robelo. With FDN in the North and with the Miskito Indian groups, two of those. They are starting to do some real damage. I do not think there is any danger on the part of or any fear of danger that they are going to overthrow the government, but they certainly are giving them a bad time, and they are making them think about whether or not they do want to continue to not keep their promises. They have even made some noises in the direction of changing their society. I do not think they are sincere, but at least they are making those noises.

I do not think that anybody believes, truly believes that if all that were to stop, if all the Contras were to disappear from Nicaragua, that the Sandinista government would go ahead with those things it has said it will do.

Mr. SILJANDER. Let me ask the gentleman a question: Who are the counterrevolutionaries? We have talked about the Contras, who are they?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. There are three groups as I understand it. One is a group of persons known as the FDN. There is a seven-member board of directors, consisting of people who were Somoza opponents for the most part. I think there is one National Guard colonel who spent all of the civil war here in Washington because he did not apparently enjoy the confidence of Mr. Somoza so he had him out of the country. The rest are all civilians who were mostly in opposition to Mr. Somoza.

One of them, Adolpho Calero, is a conservative businessman who supported the Sandinistas when they first came into office.

Mr. RITTER. Who was indeed imprisoned by Somoza at one time.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I was going to point that out. I went to Nicaragua in November of 1979 right after the revolution took place in July. Mr. Calero was one of the businessmen who asked me and the other members of that delegation to give economic assistance to the new government so they could survive.

So, he was not against them until they started imposing their Cuban-style revolution on what had happened. They stole the revolution is what happened. The people in the South have an even more interesting history: The military leader of that group is Eden Pastora, known popularly in Nicaragua as Captain Zero. He is the one who captured the National Assembly and held scores of very prominent people hostage for a long time, and who really put the revolution across. He was one of the top commanders in that revolution. A real gun soldier, not a desk soldier at all.

He became disillusioned. He is not what we would call a conservative. But he became very disillusioned with the Cubanization of that society, and he is now in opposition to it. One of his compadres is Alphonso Robelo, who is a member of the original junta; not the nine-member directorate, not the military arm, but the civilian arm that was right underneath that; the five people.

He became disillusioned. Then there are two groups of Indians who are really fighting for their survival. Anyone who would suggest, as some did when we had a debate on this before, that they are doing it for the money, I think are really trivializing.

Mr. SILJANDER. That is why I find it difficult to understand why the same people who are on the left are saying that we should cut all aid to the counterrevolutionaries over to covertly are the same ones that are suggesting that all the freedom fighters are former members of the National Guard under Somoza.

Now that is obviously, blatantly, clearly untrue. So at every angle we turn, any issue we seem to assess more than superficially, we find that the rhetoric lacks substance.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. The gentleman pointed out one very good example of that. There were what, some 7,000 or 8,000 members of the National Guard under Somoza? There are 10,000 Contras right now. So, even if they all survive and they all did that, there are more. So obviously they are not all Somocistas.

Mr. SILJANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RITTER).

Mr. RITTER. There are probably more former Somocistas serving in the

April 11, 1984

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 2761

Sandinista Army than there are serving with the Contras.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. As a matter of fact, recently an entire unit, 250 Sandinista regular soldiers defected to the Eden Pastora's group Ardes, in the South of Nicaragua.

Mr. SILJANDER. The gentleman mentioned the Miskito Indians in the Eastern and Northern section of Nicaragua. It seems incredible to me also of the human rights and religious violations of those peoples alone. If I were a Miskito Indian, and the government that promised freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of travel, placed 90 percent of my people in sugar cane work camps, Cucra Hill, for example, has 12,000 Miskito Indians, it is built for approximately 800. I think there is one doctor that comes by once a week. There is very little food, very little medical attention and there are other work camps elsewhere in Nicaragua of Miskito Indians.

If they burned 127 of my churches down, I would think that the freedom of religion rhetoric certainly did not go too far in terms of reality.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RITTER).

Mr. RITTER. It is truly amazing that after what the Sandinistas did to the Miskito Indian people, the ethnic peoples of the east coast of Nicaragua, that there was not an incredible outcry all over the United States and the rest of the West. But this silence, amounts to a deafening roar. The fact is, that the leader, one of the key leaders of the Miskito Indian, Misura Group, his name is Stedman Fagoth. Stedman was told, in a Nicaraguan jail by Thomas Borge who happens to be the Interior Minister that if he had to, if Borge had to, if the Sandinistas had to, to bring Sandinism to the east coast of Nicaragua, they would kill the last Miskito.

Now, these are the criminals that we here on this House floor are saying is the duly constituted Government of Nicaragua. No wonder there is a substantial, and this is a real revolution, the revolution of the Contras and Ardes, and the Miskitos against the Sandinistas, no wonder, because they have adopted the kind of policies which, regarding the Miskitos, amount to genocide.

Mr. SILJANDER. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. The gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned religion and I think it is interesting to note that when some of us were in El Salvador, I will be speaking about this later, for the election down there, we had the occasion to meet with archbishop Rivera y Damas. Archbishop Rivera y Damas is certainly not one who could be characterized as being, well how should I put it, he certainly enjoys the reputation of being quite liberal, of being very studious about what he says, being very careful about what he says, and he has not been

known for criticizing the left any more than he has criticized the right.

We asked him about the religious situation in Nicaragua and he said there are two views of that. He said one view is that the Nicaraguans have really terribly violated the religious rights of the people of that country; they have prohibited the bishop there from saying his mass on television as he had done before; they have interfered with religious education, and they have set up a really competitive church, a popular church, as they call it, which has been criticized by Pope John Paul II.

He said there is another view that the revolution there is going along pretty well and that there are a few problems but that they do not amount to much. He said, I subscribe to the first view. That is about as strong a statement as he makes about anything. We all know what the Sandinistas did to the Pope when he was there: Orchestrated a very demeaning experience for him with people yelling and holding up signs and so on. So I think, as the gentleman said earlier, the Sandinistas certainly have not kept their promise, and one of the reasons that the Contras are engaged in the activity they are, which was pointed out earlier, is not because they are getting money, but because they are laying their life on the line each and every day that they are engaged in that activity.

□ 2010

One of the reasons that they are doing that is to hold the Government's feet there to the fire to make them keep those promises, to have free elections, to have free labor unions, and all the rest of it.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SILJANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding and, incidentally, I thank him very much for organizing this special order because I think there is so much mythology surrounding the subjects that it is absolutely essential that some of the facts get through.

Going back to the mining incident, I think it should be stated that not only are these mines not capable of sinking a ship, not capable really of injuring people, but also that when these mines were set, the countries and the shipping firms that were shipping into these ports were notified. Not only were they notified, but as I understand it, Lloyds of London was even contacted to check on the possibilities of insurance in the case of damage.

I think what we are really talking about here is the difference between a mine at sea and a mine on the land. As a matter of fact, a mine on the land can do far more human damage. So this great outcry needs to be put in some perspective.

What our policy in Nicaragua basically amounts to is, one, we seek the Sandinista rulers to begin to bring an end to their military relationship with the Soviet Union and Cuba that makes them into another armed camp, that makes them into another base for exporting revolution, their term "revolution" in this Hemisphere.

We seek a cessation of their exporting violence to their neighbors. We seek a reduction of the size and extent of their military forces as endangering the rest of the Isthmus, as endangering perhaps even the United States itself. We seek an opening up of the political system for pluralism so that a promise made today cannot be turned upon tomorrow; that the system is pluralistic, democratic, and allows the people to make the decisions, the Nicaraguan people to make the decisions, not the Politburo and the KGB and the Soviet international fighting force of Soviets and Czechs and Bulgarians and North Koreans and what have you.

What is wrong with that? Those are honorable goals. Those are goals that certainly the people of Nicaragua, if they had a chance to vote on those goals, would support them themselves. They do not want to be Cubanized, Russified, and turned into an armed camp. They are now drafting 14-year-olds. They are having an enormous problem with their population, trying to bring in vast new quantities of recruits, but this is their way of militarizing the society further.

What we are talking about is the bottom line, some return, some form of the Monroe Doctrine, which says that large aggressive, foreign, hostile powers shall not make severe footholds contrary to the security interests of the United States in this Hemisphere. And this is what we see.

Mr. SILJANDER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania very much for his comments and all the other gentlemen who have participated in this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to end by saying we should not allow the issue, the real issue at hand, a Soviet-PLO-Libyan-Cuban backed revolution throughout Central America to be detracted by an obscure issue, and the bottom line is an obscure issue of mines in the harbors in Nicaragua, as a scapegoat to evade our responsibility and to avoid our responsibility to back freedom fighters in Nicaragua, which is no different than backing freedom fighters in Afghanistan fighting Soviet oppression there, and as we should have done back in World War II with the Jews in the ghettos, the Warsaw ghetto in Poland fighting against Fascist radicalism there.

I see a consistency of all three and I hope we can stand up as Americans and really see the need for us to join in unity and harmony and not allow ourselves to be detracted by hypes and by media attention on an obscure issue

Executive Register

H 2762

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

April 11, 1984

that is obscuring the reality of the tragedy of the situation in Central America and the need for all Americans to unify behind a common goal to assist the freedom fighters in stabilizing a very precarious situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nevada (Mrs. VUCANOVICH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mrs. VUCANOVICH addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### THE FACTS ABOUT CENTRAL AMERICA TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I was in El Salvador at the end of March to serve as an official observer of the presidential elections. All 31 of us—18 Members of Congress, Labor and religious leaders, professors and private businessmen—who made up the official delegation named by President Reagan, came away with the impression that democracy is truly alive and functioning in El Salvador. When we returned, our bipartisan group gave to President Reagan our assessment of the importance of continued support for the efforts of the Government of El Salvador to further the creation of a vital, representative, functioning democracy.

Sometimes it is difficult to measure the degree of progress being made toward a subjective goal like representative government. But I can tell you watching thousands on thousands of Salvadorans wait patiently in line for hours just to vote impressed me that they truly believed that their participation would make a difference for the future of their country. Many of these Salvadorans trekked miles to cast their votes. One lady carrying a baby told me she had walked 6 miles and had already been in line for three hours, waiting to vote for peace, she said. The Salvadorans had to brave bullets and bunions, they were not deterred from registering their preference for the next President of El Salvador. As it turns out, no single candidate got a majority of the votes and there will have to be a runoff election in early May to determine the final winner. Most experts seem to think that Napoleon Duarte, the candidate who won the largest percentage of the voting in March, will emerge the winner in the runoff.

It is true not everyone who wanted to was able to vote. Bureaucratic snafus and redtape complicated a process that was already made difficult by the guerrilla war being waged in parts of the country. The Marxist guerrillas tried to disrupt the election process by confiscating identification cards, burning ballot boxes and attacking polling places. At the start of the

day, some 20 small municipalities on the northern border were prevented from participating because of guerrilla activities, and by the end of the day another 22 precincts had their voting activities disrupted. But, approximately 78 percent of the Salvadorans voted, and that is a significant number in any country.

There was some criticism that people had to vote—that it is required by law. That is true in many Latin American countries, Western European countries and Australia. I am advised the law has never been enforced in El Salvador. In any case, let me ask you this. Would you rather risk a few colones fine—which has never been imposed—or being stopped at a guerrilla checkpoint and have them see you voted after their warnings not to?

The final argument—and a good one—is a variation of leading a horse to water. For the purpose of argument, let us say—against everything I and all of my colleagues saw and heard with our own eyes and ears—that Salvadorans could be made to vote against their will. Even so they could not be made to vote any certain way, or for any particular person or party. In El Salvador the traditional way of protesting the choice is by casting a blank ballot. In the last Presidential election—a rigged one in 1976—50 percent of the ballots were blank. By contrast, in the 1982 election, less than 10 percent were blank and less than that this March, 3 percent.

By voting in the elections in El Salvador, the people were making a political statement about the future of their country. The Salvadorans want an end to war, they want to be able to live their lives in peace with the hope of making a decent living, and they have chosen the ballot box, not guns, as the way to express their desire for change. They were showing by action what El Salvador's Archbishop Rivera Y Damas told us, "The guerrillas do not have the support of the people."

It is ironic to me that people who are fighting so hard to achieve democracy in their country, who are sacrificing so much, who reflect the desire for freedom and a better life for their children are the victims of a bitter and frustrating debate in the Congress about whether or not the United States should help. The National Bipartisan Commission on Central America worked exhaustively for 6 months, speaking to more than 200 experts in the United States and 300 in Central America. They concluded—and this was a group of Democrats, Republicans and Independents—that Central America is both vital and vulnerable, and that whatever other crisis may arise to claim the Nation's attention, the United States cannot afford to turn away from that threatened region.

Those of us who observed the elections in El Salvador returned to the United States fully understanding the conclusions of the Commission. The

United States must support the countries of Central America with a level of funding that will insure that those nations, like El Salvador, will have the means—politically, economically, and militarily—to develop and strengthen their Democratic system.

□ 2020

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

(Mr. ZSCHAU asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

STAT

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend my colleague and friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) for arranging this special order.

I think it is very important that the people of this country, as well as those in this Congress, understand what really took place on March 25, 1984, the date of the Salvadoran presidential elections. Before I went to El Salvador as part of the Presidential group to observe the elections, I was given brochures that had been preprinted, that indicated that the elections would be a sham, that this was just a charade, that it was a public relations gimmick in order to get support for an ill-fated and ill-conceived policy of this administration, that the people would be forced to vote, that the elections would be rigged; so as you might suspect, I was a little skeptical, having read the propaganda about whether or not these elections would take place in a good fashion.

When I went to the towns of Cojutepeque, San Martine, San Salvador, Ilobasco, and San Vicente, I saw in the early morning long lines of people, people had walked for miles to get a chance to cast their ballots. They were standing there in the hot Sun. Some had arrived at 5 o'clock in the morning, even though the polls did not open until 7. Some probably stood in line waiting to vote for a long as 6 hours, maybe even longer.

There were frustrations associated with it, as the gentleman from California mentioned. Some of the polling places had been overrun by guerrillas. The power had been knocked out the night before, which added to the confusion on an already complicated election day.

In addition, there were the snafus that arose as a result of an overzealous attempt, in my opinion, to make sure that there could be no legitimate charges that the elections were rigged. Every member in Salvador, every citizen in Salvador, had to have an identification card and also a name on a list and many people because they did not know exactly where they were to vote just stood in lines for hours only to find that they were at the wrong polling place.