

July 2, 1980

Northern Ireland. This failure to understand the gravity of the situation in Northern Ireland is due in no small measure to the apparent reluctance of some influential American newspapers to report completely or accurately on the tragic events taking place in that unhappy land.

A recent example of this distortion of the real situation in Northern Ireland has been pinpointed with great accuracy by the Irish Echo, an American newspaper which does give us full details on the situation in Northern Ireland.

As many of my colleagues are aware, there is a move afoot in the United States to persuade the U.S. Department of State to lift its ban on the sale of American arms to the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC)—the Northern Ireland police force. Recently, the New York Times supported this move in an editorial favoring this dangerous change in U.S. policy. I had earlier joined Representative MARIO BIAGGI, Democrat of New York, and 16 other members of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs in urging the State Department to hold to its ban on arms sales to the RUC.

The Irish Echo details the distortions of fact in the New York Times demand for arms shipments to the RUC. In a most perceptive examination of the matter, the Irish Echo notes that the British Government's own commission has condemned the RUC treatment of its prisoners, yet the British Government now lobbies for lifting the State Department ban.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of a clearer understanding of the true situation in Northern Ireland, I insert the full text of the Irish Echo editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

[From the Irish Echo]

#### DISORTING THE FACTS

It is difficult to comprehend that a newspaper of stature which The New York Times is could stoop to disparage the Irish American community the way it did in an editorial last week.

It was callous, petty and most of all, unjust. It also showed once again the evil influence of the British lobby in America.

Righteously quoting the British Foreign Minister, Lord Carrington, as if his opinion was automatically correct on matters Irish, the Times called on the U.S. State Department to lift its ban on the sale of arms to the Royal Ulster Constabulary—the Northern Ireland police.

To The New York Times, the RUC, apparently, is a responsible police organization. In reality—and how sad it is that The New York Times could totally ignore reality in its editorial defending the RUC—the RUC has been generally condemned by the most responsible of organizations for using torture to coerce "confessions" from prisoners and for degrading men and women because of their race.

A British Government commission issued a report—the Bennett Report—condemning the RUC's use of force on prisoners.

The European Court at Strasbourg condemned the way prisoners in British jails in

Northern Ireland were treated. The court called interrogation methods used by the RUC excessive and indecent.

Amnesty International corroborated the charges against the British military and the RUC in Northern Ireland. This organization has been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for its work in defense of tortured political prisoners throughout the world.

For the U.S. State Department to reconsider its very proper ban on the sale of weapons to this discredited police force would be outrageous. The New York Times demeans itself by calling for weapons for such an organization.

We applaud the members of Congress who have spoken out against the lifting of the ban. Any member of Congress who would support such a lifting of that ban would deserve immediate retirement.

It is really very simple, the British controlled police force in Northern Ireland—the RUC—is a discredited police force. It should in no way be considered for arms from this nation.

#### HONORING MISS MARTHA L. KROGMANN

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1980

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, during my tenure in the House of Representatives I have had an opportunity to meet a great many distinguished individuals in my district. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and thank one of those individuals, Miss Martha L. Krogmann, for the dedicated service and charm she has provided to so many people in the Greater Los Angeles area.

Martha recently received the Honorary Service for Children Award from the South Bay Council of the Parent Teacher Association and was honored as a recipient of the South Bay Young Womens Christian Association Award for 1980. I offer my colleagues a copy of the Honorary Service Award commentary as a reminder of the tremendous impact one woman can have in our society:

Our recipient today was born quite a few years ago in the United States. However, she traveled extensively in Europe and speaks French, Spanish, German and some other languages fluently.

She taught in the Los Angeles School District for 25 years where she received acclaim for her exciting and innovative programs in the Dance, her specialty. It was during this time that she was honored by the Los Angeles City Council as their teacher of the year, winning the coveted "Golden Apple Award." And so you see, our honoree has spent many years brightening the lives of children.

More recently, after she retired, she joined the ranks of volunteers. Since 1967 our recipient has been a member of the Neptunian Club. It was through this organization that she became acquainted with a Senior Citizen volunteer organization known as RSVP. Here she spent one year teaching German at Torrance High. She calls on lonely people through their Telecare program and really brightens many spirits with her delightful personality.

Her representation at the Manhattan Beach Coordinating Council is a delightful and inspirational experience.

For three years our recipient has been directing the multi-cultural program at La Marina School. She provides her own experiences and speakers of foreign backgrounds who enrich the backgrounds of the children there.

Our honoree is a true eccentric in the most delightful sense of the word and she's a real "Spring Chicken," especially in her outlook.

#### QUOTING FROM FRIENDS

"She's a beautiful person, a true friend, and all her peers love her."

"Her programs are a great favorite with the children, and they look forward to her friends from abroad indeed."

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to present to you someone who makes a real difference in the lives of all of us children.

Please join me in honoring—Miss Martha Krogmann.

#### RAISE THE CIGARETTE TAX

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1980

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the Federal excise tax on cigarettes has not been increased since 1958. Then, the tax of 8 cents a pack represented 37 percent of the average retail price of a pack of cigarettes. Today it is 14 percent. During the same period, the social costs attributable to smoking have soared, reaching an estimated \$5 to \$8 billion in direct health care costs and over \$12 billion in lost wages, reduced productivity, and absenteeism.

This is why I joined our colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) in sponsoring his bill—H.R. 7019—amending the Internal Revenue Code to increase the excise tax on cigarettes.

This is one more issue on which BOB DRINAN has provided leadership. He will be missed.

The June 26, 1980, editions of the Town Crier Newspapers of Wayland, Weston, and Sudbury, Mass. carried a guest column authored by Father DRINAN. In this column, he outlines the case for an increase in the cigarette tax. I insert this article reprinted in the RECORD at this point. It is an effective argument for our legislation.

[From the Town Crier Newspapers of Wayland, Weston, and Sudbury (Massachusetts), June 26, 1980]

#### RAISE CIGARETTE TAX—AND STOP SMOKING

(By Congressman ROBERT F. DRINAN)

In 1964 the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health concluded: "Cigarette smoking is a health hazard of sufficient importance in the United States to warrant appropriate remedial action."

Over the past 15 years thousands of additional studies conducted throughout the world have conclusively reinforced the findings of that first Report. We now know far beyond any reasonable doubt that cigarette smoking contributes to disease and premature death. Heart disease, emphysema,

bronchitis, lung cancer, and other disorders have been definitively linked to cigarette smoking.

Confronted with this knowledge, the government has an obligation at least to inform its citizens of the dangers of cigarette smoking.

#### REAL COSTS OF SMOKING

But over the past 35 years we have learned other things about cigarette smoking. We have learned that women who smoke during pregnancy increase the likelihood of birth defects in their children. We have learned that cigarette smoke has an adverse health effect on exposed non-smokers. We have learned that smoking now accounts for \$5 to \$8 billion in direct health care expenses for the federal government and for over \$12 billion in lost wages, reduced productivity, and absenteeism for employers and the economy.

Cigarette smoking harms not only the smokers but children, non-smokers, and the economy as well. Confronted with this additional knowledge, the government has a duty to discourage cigarette smoking.

#### EDUCATING TO STOP

In a free society, outright government prohibition is traditionally and rightly viewed with apprehension. In our efforts to discourage smoking, therefore, we have relied on education and exhortation. Congress has required that warning labels be placed on all cigarette packages and advertisements and has removed all cigarette ads from television and radio, the public domain. Federal agencies and local governments have restricted smoking in elevators, airplanes, trains, buses and some eating establishments and other public places. Schools and private institutions have attempted to educate the public with regard to the dangers inherent in cigarette smoking.

These efforts must continue, but we do have another weapon at our disposal, one that is especially appealing in view of the current effort to balance the federal budget.

#### CIGARETTE TAX SAME FOR 29 YEARS

Despite the tremendous financial burden placed on the federal treasury and the economy by cigarette smokers, the federal cigarette excise tax has not been increased since 1951, when it was set at 8 cents per package. As we struggle to reduce unnecessary government spending, the government can no longer afford to subsidize the multi-billion dollar public health cost of cigarette smoking. While we all have incurred billions of dollars of direct and indirect costs attributable to smoking, costs increasing each year, the cigarette excise tax has not been raised for 29 years. How many other federal taxes can claim the same distinction?

This year I have introduced legislation in the House of Representatives that would increase by ten cents a pack the federal excise tax on cigarettes. The measure would increase the tax per pack from 14 percent of the average retail price to 24 percent—still well below the 37 percent level established in 1951 when retail prices were much lower.

Assuming that consumption will not be affected, the tax increase would bring in an additional \$3 billion per year, raising the total revenue from the sale of cigarettes to \$5.4 billion—an amount barely equivalent to the direct health care cost to the government of cigarette smoking.

#### SIX MILLION WOULD QUIT

Studies cited in the Surgeon General's latest report, however, indicate that enactment of this legislation will cause about six million Americans to quit smoking. If so, we will all benefit and will still receive twice as

much revenue as from the present tax. Importantly, teenage smoking in particular would be discouraged since young people have been found to be more sensitive to the price of cigarettes—and there are six million smokers under age 20 in the United States.

There can be no doubt that it is altogether appropriate to place the economic burden of smoking on the 54 million Americans who this year will choose to smoke a total of 615 billion cigarettes at our expense. We must also redouble our efforts to protect the non-smoker from the noxious fumes of the smoker. And we must strengthen our warnings and exhortations, especially to the youth, and continue our research into the deleterious effects of smoking.

In 1975 I introduced legislation to reduce the health hazards of smoking the first legislation to protect the rights of non-smokers. In the last few months of the 96th Congress, I intend to do all I can to fulfill our moral and financial obligation to discourage cigarette smoking and to improve the well-being of all Americans.

#### LA PALMA RUNNING CELEBRATION

### HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1980

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, since its passage, proposition 13 has been felt in Orange County cities in numerous ways. A budget cut exercised by the city of La Palma was the decision to discontinue their Fourth of July parade and fireworks display. To honor the birth of this country and to provide their residents with the traditional celebration they have come to anticipate, the city will hold the second annual running celebration.

This event, a 5 kilometer and 10 kilometer running celebration, will be co-hosted by the La Palma Police Association, the city of La Palma, and Automatic Data Processing, Inc. Beginning runners and families are being encouraged to enter into the events, which will also include wheelchair athletes.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this event has captured the spirit of the Fourth of July. Civic organizations, local business, industry, and city staff have all worked together to create this event for La Palma and they have contributed to the development of a permanent facility for the better health and enjoyment of their residents.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in honoring the city of La Palma and the planners of this event for their innovative program, and the effective way in which they have maintained the Spirit of '76 in their Fourth of July celebration.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS IN SOUTH KOREA

### HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 2, 1980

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, because of my sincere concern about the situation in South Korea, I would like to commend to my colleagues the following article which appeared recently in the Nation. In it, Mr. Don Ranard outlines our own Government's failure to adequately address the difficult questions of democratic participation and social change in South Korea.

The article follows:

[From the Nation, June 23, 1980]

#### DARKNESS IN SOUTHERN PARK'S CLONE IN SOUTH KOREA

(By Donald L. Ranard)

The best that can be said of the current turbulence in South Korea is that it was predictable. Iness Ranard, "Seoul Brothers," *The Nation*, January 19. The worst is that if Washington continues its present diplomacy toward Seoul, it will inevitably be confronted with another foreign policy debacle.

For the past three decades, U.S. policy toward Korea has had a dual objective: prevention of war on the Korean Peninsula and the development of a viable South Korea. Yet today, and in the land where once the United States was determined to build a "showcase of democracy," there is greater tension and more instability than at any time since 1950.

President Carter now faces in Korea a foreign policy disaster that, unless reversed, could be greater in significance than Iran. The ugly photos in the American press of Korean paratroopers carrying M-16 rifles co-produced by Colt Industries in Pusan and of American M-45 tanks killing college students in Kwangju can only make the American public, on whose support the independence of South Korea ultimately rests, wonder who is the real enemy, where lies the major threat. No clearer illustration of the failure of American policy has been seen since the Korean War ended.

The portents of impending tragedy were discernible as early as last fall. At the time of the expulsion from the National Assembly of the leader of the opposition party, public restiveness with President Park Chung Hee's Government was mounting. In seven cities, students were stepping up their opposition and paying a heavy price in beatings and deaths.

Although censored by the Korean press, inadequately reported by American newsmen and downplayed by the State Department, these developments were assessed as so dangerous to internal stability that Korean Central Intelligence Agency chief Kim Jae Kyu assassinated his patron President Park in order to "restore democracy and minimize to the extent possible the sacrifice of the people."

Provided with the first real chance in years to help turn Korea around, the Carter Administration waffled. A deeply concerned but, with regard to Korea, misguided Secretary of State Cyrus Vance made equivocal public statements in response to Seoul's foot-dragging on constitutional reform and national elections. It was little wonder that the Korean military concluded that American policy under Carter, as it had under Nixon and Ford, still placed greater empha-