OISS FORM 53 (12/80)

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD
PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 97TH CONGRESS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

BILL	DATE	PAGE(S)
S.1874	Nov. 29, 1982	E4741-42

REMARKS: by Mr. Sawyer

SENATE JUDICIARY CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION TO REVISE THE JUDICIAL SURVIVORS' ANNUITY PROGRAM

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 29, 1982

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the attention of the House of Representatives to an issue which seriously affects the Federal judiciary. In 1956, Congress established the judicial survivors' annuity program (JSAP) in order to provide for the payment of substantial annual benefits to the eligible surviving spouses and children of deceased Federal judges and justices.

Unfortunately, the original formula for funding the annuity program was not thoroughly analyzed in 1956 and it

Anyone in the open would receive at least 2nd degree burns. A reflex glance at the initial flash from as far away as 35 miles from the explosion would probably cause blindness. A fire storm would kill thousands more either directly or indirectly by suffocation, the fire having consumed all the oxygen.

Lethal radiation would be spread throughout the Wellesley area and beyond for a period of days to weeks, depending upon the weather conditions, nature of the bomb and other factors. Death from radiation would be either rapid or delayed several weeks, depending upon the radiation exposure.

WHAT PLANS HAVE BEEN DRAFTED FOR EVACUATING THE WELLESLEY POPULATION?

The town of Wellesley is part of the Greater Boston Risk Area Suburban West region. Relocation instructions have been prepared. Excerpts and summaries are included in this booklet so that you may determine for yourself whether the crisis relocation plan is an appropriate response to the threat of nuclear war.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) stated in its pamphlet Crisis Relocation Planning (October, 1980), "It seems likely that a crisis would not be abrupt . . . that people would have time to see, discuss, and understand the instructions for relocation." According to FEMA plans, it will take two and a half days to evacuate the Boston region.

The FEMA Relocation Instructions state that Wellesley and Weston (combined population 38,474) have been assigned to Milford, N.H. (population 8,685). This host community should be reached by using Route 128 to Route 3 to Everett Turnpike to 101A to 101 to Milford. The map on the next page indicates the host community assignments of some of our neighboring communities. Other communities nearby assigned to Route 128 north are Needham, Newton, Wayland, Waltham and Watertown. Because of the number of vehicles that would be heading away from Boston and the metropolitan risk area, car markers are being prepared for residents to clip out and attach to car windshields with tape or glue.

In the FEMA pamphlet, Relocation Instructions, there is a list of survival supplies. In addition to a two-week stockpile of food, families should have on hand and plan to take tools—especially shovels, picks, hammers—essential in improvising a fallout shelter. "Both the residents of the host areas and the city evacuees will have to work hard for a day or more to construct improvised shelters to protect against fallout. In this case, radiation protection would be cheap as 'dirt'."

Crisis Relocation Planning says that the food supply after a few days "would depend almost entirely on present commercial distributors—the people who feed 220 million Americans today." The effect of a nuclear attack upon the distribution system is not mentioned. Little or nothing is said about the destruction of medical facilities at a time when millions may be severely burned; nor of the unavailability of medicines, including morphine for people in great pain; nor of the contamination of water supplies and destruction of sewage facilities; nor of the likelihood of epidemics. Although the possibility of anti-social behavior by evacuees and hostility towards them by the host communities is not dismissed, the pamphlet assures that "in an emergency, people tend to be jolted out of their normal routines and patterns—and many people go out of their way to help others."

THE ONLY DEFENSE AGAINST A NUCLEAR ATTACK: PREVENTION

Civil defense programs, including massive evacuations and shelter buildings, would diminish the loss of life somewhat in the nuclear war. But the statement that "a reasonably effective crisis location program could result in total survival of 80-90 percent of the population" (Crisis Relocation Planning, p. 5) is groundless. And even this excessively optimistic estimate cannot hide the fact that the nuclear attack would cause unprecedented suffering and probably the complete disruption of the society. The painful truth is that there is no defense against nuclear attack, there is no place to hide.

The only sane defense is prevention of a nuclear war. Moreover, further increase of our nuclear armaments is not an effective means of prevention. As former CIA Deputy Director, Herbert Scoville, said, "The U.S. has always been ahead of the Soviet Union in nuclear weapons technology." There is rough parity between the superpowers, each having the capacity to inflict horrible losses on its opponent even if attacked first. This retaliatory capacity constitutes a deterrent to a first strike by either side. This is the main fact that now prevents a nuclear war. A further escalation of the nuclear arms race will make us less rather than more secure. It would increast tension, making each side fear that the enemy may strike first, thus motivating a first strike in the other direction. Deployment of more and faster weapons, with more reliance on radar and computer systems, would greatly increase the probability that war will begin by accident.

Religious groups, scientists, physicians, public officials, ordinary citizens—men and women from all walks of life—are raising their voices to prevent such a war from starting, either by design or accident, through human or mechanical error. At the 1981 National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Archbishop John R. Roach of Minneapolis said: "On a global scale, the most dangerous moral issue in the public order today is the nuclear arms race. The church in the United States has a special responsibility to address this question. . . . The church needs to say 'no' clearly and decisively to the use of nuclear arms."

Many eminent Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant clergymen have made statements asserting that the nuclear arms race threatens the peace of the world, the continuation of civilization, and the survival of the human race. As a first step to halting this plunge toward disaster, many have endorsed a bilateral, verifiable freeze by the United States and the Soviet Union on further deployment, testing, and production of nuclear weapons.