

Such services are essential to pregnant teenagers, 96 percent of whom choose to keep their babies and raise them themselves. The vocational training made possible by Perkins Act funds would throw a lifeline to these young women who face such extraordinary pressures, giving them the means to support themselves and their children.

I urge the Senate to move swiftly on this measure, so that any ambiguity on this point will be eliminated, and that funds set aside for this purpose under the Perkins Act may be fully implemented.●

H.R. 3258—TO ESTABLISH FEDERAL PENALTIES FOR THE VANDALISM OF RELIGIOUS PROPERTY

SPEECH OF

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1987

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3258, legislation I have cosponsored to impose Federal penalties for damaging religious property and for obstructing persons from the free exercise of their religious beliefs.

The men and women who founded our Nation, did so to escape government intrusion into their religious lives. They sought a land where they could freely worship the God of their choice, without fear of harassment from those whose beliefs differed from their own. So strong is this belief in freedom of religion, that it is embodied in the first clause of our Bill of Rights.

Sadly enough, despite these protections, the rights of some to worship freely are being infringed upon by criminals who vandalize certain houses of worship and terrorize a number of congregations with threats of violence. Florida officials in the last 12 months have documented more than seven specific instances of vandalism and threats of force against synagogues throughout the State.

It was just over 1 year ago that synagogues in the Tampa Bay area I represent were subjected to more than a dozen bomb threats. These calls frightened a number of families away from participating in Jewish holiday services. In other cases, swastikas and vulgar graffiti were sprayed on synagogue walls, and cemeteries were vandalized.

These attacks and threats seriously impinge upon the rights of these people to worship freely, without the threat of violence or harassment. H.R. 3258, which we consider today, would make it a Federal crime to obstruct the free exercise of religion with these types of threats. It would also impose strict Federal penalties upon anyone who defaces or destroys religious property.

This legislation, which I cosponsored previously in the 98th and 99th Congresses, would complement the efforts of many States, including Florida, that have enacted similar laws of their own. The Florida House of Worship Protection Act, enacted by the Florida State Legislature in 1984, makes it a felony, rather

than a misdemeanor, to desecrate churches and synagogues.

Mr. Speaker, while the Constitution protects the American people from government intrusion into their practice of religion, there are no Federal laws to punish individuals who harass and vandalize our houses of worship. This legislation is urgently needed to send a signal to these criminals that our Nation will not tolerate acts of violence against congregations of any faith.

NATO AND THE INF TREATY

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1987

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post ran a news article on the impact that the proposed INF treaty could have on NATO both politically and militarily.

As a member of the North Atlantic Assembly, and as chairman of that body's Civilian Affairs Committee, I have come to appreciate how important the alliance is to U.S. security interests. While the Post article emphasizes the military aspects of the treaty, it is also pointed out that there are political considerations to be aware of regarding the usefulness of this treaty.

We must proceed cautiously with our allies as we work to develop a NATO strategy devoid of the Pershing II missiles. The consequences of ignoring the political involved with the signing of this treaty could be harmful to the future of NATO.

It is in that light that I am submitting the Post article to the RECORD for my colleague's perusal.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 6, 1987]

NATO ADVANTAGES SEEN IN TREATY

(By Robert J. McCartney)

BRUSSELS.—NATO planners have concluded that the proposed U.S.-Soviet treaty to scrap intermediate range nuclear missiles would weaken the Soviets' over all military capability by at least as much as NATO's and may result in a small gain for the western alliance in the European nuclear balance.

The Soviets would give up more than three times as many nuclear warheads as NATO in the bargain, an advantage that one top-ranking NATO expert said was "not something to sneeze at."

The Soviets consequently would suffer a relative greater loss in the ability to strike enemy airfields, command and control centers and rear-echelon positions where troop reinforcements would gather in any war between the blocs.

"Clearly, we don't lose badly. In some ways, we think we have a gain. They give up more targets than we do," another expert at NATO headquarters here said.

While some NATO military commanders are unhappy about losing 108 U.S. Pershing II missiles under the treaty, the United States would still retain the ability to hit Soviet territory from Europe with submarine-launched missiles and bombs carried by F-111 based in Britain.

Eliminating the Pershing II missile force based in West Germany was widely considered Moscow's chief military goal in the negotiation on medium and shorter-range nuclear arms. The Pershing II, with a range of 1,100 miles, is regarded as the alliance's fast-

est and most accurate weapon capable of striking Soviet soil.

The Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty would eliminate only ground-based missiles with ranges of between 300 and 3,500 miles, which are estimated to represent less than 4 percent of superpowers' total nuclear arsenals.

"We will have a little less accuracy and flexibility," a NATO military expert said. But he added, "We still have weapons systems that cover those [INF] ranges."

The planned elimination of INF makes it more important than before to fulfill current plans to upgrade NATO's battlefield-range missiles and airborne nuclear weapons systems during the 1990's, according to civilian and military experts at NATO headquarters.

The major potential liabilities for the western alliance in the proposed treaty are political rather than military, according to officials here and at NATO's military headquarters in nearby Mons.

"In purely military terms, there is no question that we gain. In political terms, it's different," said Martin McCusker, director of the North Atlantic Assembly's military committee. The assembly is made up of 200 legislators from NATO member states.

One political question raised by the accord is whether it represents a downgrading of the U.S. commitment to defend Europe. The American INF missiles in Europe, which would be dismantled under the treaty, were deployed beginning in 1983 to counter the growing Soviet arsenal of SS20 missiles and to reassure European allies of U.S. determination to help defend them.

The other major concern is that the pact could create political momentum for additional nuclear disarmament accords that might eventually leave NATO vulnerable to the Warsaw Pact's perceived advantage in conventional forces.

Yet there is sharp debate within the alliance over whether Warsaw Pact conventional forces are really superior to those of the western alliance. The International Institute of Strategic Studies in London judges the conventional forces of both blocs to be in rough parity.

NATO experts expressed special satisfaction that the INF treaty would reduce the threat posed to NATO's 35 operational airfields and to ports such as Antwerp, Belgium, and Rotterdam where U.S. troop reinforcements would arrive in case of war. But the Soviets, like the Americans, would retain the ability to hit those targets with aircraft, submarine-based missiles, ICBMS and, in some cases, battlefield-range missiles.

"Both sides will have to make some adjustments. Both have a variety of options left," said Lawrence Freedman, head of the department of war studies at Kings College in London.

Under the planned INF deal, each side is to scrap all of its landbased missiles with ranges shorter than those of intercontinental ballistic missiles, or ICBMS, and longer than those of battlefield-range or tactical missiles. In terms of nuclear warheads, the western alliance will lose a total of about 480 currently deployed warheads. The Soviets, by contrast, would destroy more than 1,500 warheads.

Perhaps the biggest problem is that the treaty provides for scrapping the missiles considered ideal for making a "demonstration" shot early in a war to seek to persuade the Soviets to call off an invasion of Western Europe by Warsaw Pact conventional forces.

In this scenario, a single missile would be fired at a military target on Soviet territory