As the Foreign Operation Subcommittee prepares to enter into a conference with the other body, I hope that my fellow conferees will take a moment to read the following editorial, which appeared in today's Washington Times.

This editorial illustrates the danger of basing our foreign policy on ethnic head counts in our districts, instead of the national security concerns of the United States. I sincerely hope that we can pursue a policy of friendship and cooperation with the Government of Turkey, and thereby ensure a long-lasting and mutually beneficial relationship between our two nations.

FORSAKING A VALUED BULWARK TO EXTREMISM

(By Amos Perlmutter)

It's generally acknowledged that Turkey is one of the key, critical strategic states in the Middle East, yet that acknowledgement seems to have escaped the United States in recent times.

Challenged by both internal and external forces, Turkish Prime Minister Tansu Ciller resigned after losing a vote of confidence on Sunday. The future of her Government—Turkey's friendliest to the U.S. in a long time—poses serious challenges to American foreign policy in the Middle East.

As far back as 1954, the United States and Great Britain helped engineer the Northern Tier, a North Asian political bulwark and fortress against the Soviet Union in the depths of the Cold War. The leading elements of the tier then were Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and Iraq, seen as partners to the West in the Cold War against the Soviet Union.

Turkey, which stands between Europe and Asia and controls the Black Sea passage to the Mediterranean did more than its part. It made a real and still vivid contribution to the Korean Way by delivering its legendary tough soldiers, who displayed conspicuous heroism. Turkey today remains a critical member of NATO and stands in key contrast to Iran, Iraq, Syria and the Muslim states of the former Soviet Union.

Given its critical importance and its basically steadfast history, it seems more than passing strange that the United States has never fully acknowledged or rewarded the contributions and importance of Turkey, including its key participation in the Gulf war, by allowing the use of its air space.

Why this casual treatment of Turkey? Some of the explanations for the American failure to recognize the importance of Turkey's strategic role in the Middle East have their roots in the workings of Congress, where the domestic lobbies of Armenia and Greece hold sway in a ferocious battle against Turkish influence. In fact, the specter of Sen. Robert Dole's candidacy bodes no good for Turkey. Mr. Dole, who was horribly wounded in World War II, was saved by the heroic medical efforts of an Armenian physician, a personal fact that appears to have influenced Mr. Dole's policy toward Turkey. Even without Mr. Dole, the Armenian lobby has been very effective in preventing Turkey from gaining the full economic fruits and benefits of the European Economic Community.

The even more powerful Greek lobby has managed to help relegate Turkey's image in the public eye to that of a non-European Muslim and Ottoman state that bears little resemblance to the reality of modern Turkey. In fact, Turkey's civic culture since the Kemalist revolution after World War I is that of a secular state, even if it is, like so many other countries in the region, burdened by the threat of an emerging radical, Islamic and Kurdish opposition.

The problem for Turkey is that it has so far displayed no gift for the kind of lobbying and public proselytizing that is characteristic of the Greek and Armenian efforts. Turkish-Americans are spread throughout the United States and form no cohesive voting or social bloc. The absence of a natural and organized lobby and the challenge presented by the organized Greek and Armenian lobbies have combined to result in a hesitant U.S. support for Turkey, despite its history and its strategic importance, which is greater than Greece.

The persistent complaint is that Turkey is not a real democracy, an argument that can be applied more correctly to the corrupt regime of Prime Minister Andreas Papandreau of Greece, a former sympathizer of the Soviet Union and of anti-American Third World radicals and terrorists. It's true that neither Greece nor Turkey are complete democracies on the order of the United States or Britain, but a good case can be made for Turkey on its substantive political and social culture, which is characterized by a history of civility, an absence of racism and anti-Semitism and a certain steadfastness to allies ever since the collapse of the Ottoman Empire.

It's true that the Ottoman Empire, once called ''the Sick Man of Europe'' was an abusive and corrupt empire. Yet even then, its system of vilayat rule allowed considerable autonomy and achieved more tolerance for religious groups than other empires of its time.

Today, Turkey is marked for its civility, and is important as a strategic partner. Most of the vestiges of the Ottoman Empire have long since vanished in the wake of the work of the model military reformist Kamal Ataturk, who is the father of modern, secular Turkey. Turkey, in fact, is the only secular Muslim state in the world today, a not unremarkable feat and status.

Turkey ought to be rewarded instead of ignored for its secularization efforts. True, Turkey must find a better way to deal with its Kurdish problem, although its current approach is relatively moderate, compared to the way Iraq treats its Kurdish minority. The Turkish government should probably do its utmost to recognize the Kurds, although not the PKP revolutionary Marxist group, as equal citizens.

Still, the reasons for American disinterest have more to do with domestic American lobbying activities than any real or perceived Turkish failings. It's high time the United States woke up to the strategic and critical importance of Turkey. The easiest way to do that is to imagine Turkey in the hands of fundamentalist Islamic forces. The opposite is true today—Turkey stands as a real and honest bulwark to the forces of radical and fundamentalist Islam.

EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1995

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from the First District of California, Representative RIGGS, in supporting an extension of State jurisdiction into the exclusive economic zone [EEZ] for the States of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and California. Certain fisheries, such as Dungeness crab, scallops, and thresher shark are not covered by a Federal fishery management plan [FMP]. States lack the authority to manage these fisheries while the Pacific Fishery Management Council and NMFS lack the resources to manage them. In the absence of management and conservation authority, these fisheries can easily be exploited by fishermen fishing exclusively in the EEZ and then landing the product in State or foreign nation without landing laws addressing that species of fish. The bill as it is currently written grants authority to manage in the EEZ to Alaska. I am hopeful that similar authority will be granted to Washington, Oregon, and California. I applaud the commitment by Representative YOUNG to work toward resolution of this issue.

WHO WILL NOTICE?

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, lately there has been a great deal of rhetoric about train wrecks and other analogies to cataclysmic events to describe the impending doom to the Nation's financial markets should the Government shut down if Congress and President Clinton disagree on a Federal budget. I believe that most of the gloom and doom forecasts come from bureaucrats and Democrats who generally overstate the importance of Washington to the rest of the Nation.

As far as I am concerned, the shutdown of non-essential Federal agencies would constitute the fulfillment of my mission as a Member of Congress. However, in the past, the Government has, in fact, shut down temporarily as Congress and the President fought over the details of the funding for the Federal agencies. I suspect that, outside the Capital Beltway, no one noticed when it was shut down.

In a recent Wall Street Journal article, Jim Miller, the former director of the Office of Management and Budget, also argues that no one, even those on Wall Street, will notice if the Federal Government temporarily shuts down during budget negotiations.

As we in Congress continue to convince President Clinton of the necessity to balance the Federal budget, I commend Mr. Miller's article, ''Government Shutdown? 'See If Anybody Notices' '' to my colleagues for reassurance.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN? 'SEE IF ANYBODY NOTICES'

(By James C. Miller III)

Washington is reaching the end game on the budget. The White House wants Congress to compromise on—read, back off—a budget that simultaneously cuts taxes by $245 billion, pays dollar for dollar for those tax cuts with spending cuts, and balances the books by the year 2002. In a fit of rhetorical overkill, the Clinton administration has warned of a ''train wreck'' that will shut the government down and shake the financial markets if no agreement is reached by Nov. 15.

In fact, the so-called train wreck would be more of a fender bender. The law is quite clear: There would be no shutdown—only ''non-essential services'' would be curtailed. The armed forces would stand ready as ever; social security checks would be mailed on time (and the post office would deliver them along with all other mail); air traffic controllers and meat inspectors would stay on the job. The fact is, the government has

''shut down'' four times in the last 15 years without anyone much noticing. After one such shutdown in 1990, the General Accounting Office asked various government agencies what their number one concern regarding a shut down was, most answered ''reduced morale.'' The IRS mentioned that it was worried about a ''loss of public confidence in the agency''!

As for payments to U.S. debt holders, a potential default will be no more than a bump along the road to a balanced budget. In 1987 and 1990, the government hit against the debt ceiling, and we heard the same apocalyptic rhetoric we hear today. In 1985, as Congress and the Reagan administration were busy erecting the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings guillotine, the debt ceiling was reached, and default loomed. Relying on a number of technical fixes, the Treasury Department was able to forestall actual default, but the uncertainty lasted more than a month. Did the market implode? Far from it: Stocks actually staged a rally—taking the S&P index to its then-all-time high. There's a lesson in that earlier experience that holds true today: The value of the debt investors buy depends on the dynamism of the U.S. economy—not the fate of the U.S. government.

As always, in its preference for fear over fact, the Clinton administration is playing fast and loose with the numbers. Take the allegedly increased cost of interest rates if the government does hit the debt ceiling. According to President Clinton's chief economic adviser, Joseph Stiglitz, a rise of one hundredth of one percent—a single basis point—would cost $3.5 billion over seven years. Three things are wrong with that number.

First, it ignores the fact that over $1 trillion of government debt is ''owned'' by another government agency or entity—money, in effect, that Uncle Sam's right pocket owes his left. Second, Mr. Stiglitz apparently assumes the impossible—namely, that all government debt would re-price immediately—and, third, that it would then carry the new and higher rate for the next seven years. That kind of statistical sleight-of-hand may pass for analysis in the White House, but not on Wall Street.

How can I be sure? I was serving as director of Office of Management and Budget under Ronald Reagan when one of these noncrises happened in 1986. At that time, of course, the roles were reversed. A Democratic Congress was trying to force increased spending and higher taxes on a reluctant Republican president. The Democrats thought Mr. Reagan would ''blink first,'' approve their extravagant spending bills, and be forced to raise taxes to pay for their largess.

Unable to convince them that wasn't going to happen, I found myself in the Oval Office apologizing to the president and saying that I feared the government would be forced to close down.

''Jim, Jim,'' he said, with that famous smile and a twinkle in his eye, ''just settle down. Let's close the place down and see if anybody notices.''

Then he went on the radio and said the same thing: If Congress doesn't act responsibly, ''I won't have any choice but to shut it down. If they want to put a real budget together by candlelight, it's OK by me.'' In the end, Congress agreed to take the most offensive measures out of their appropriations bills, and the government engines started back up after a brief pause.

The moral of the story: No one did notice.

Perhaps President Clinton is heartened by Mr. Reagan's example, but there is a profound difference in their positions: President Reagan stood with the American people in their desire to cut wasteful government spending. President Clinton stands against their wishes and for a continuation of the spending status quo.

Congress has the moral high road here, and they shouldn't be afraid of sticking to it. Theoretically, the president could engage in a reckless ''firemen first'' shutdown strategy. After all, the president has full power to define which services are essential and which are not. If he chose, he could define air traffic controllers as ''non-essential'' and hope the American people blame Congress for the closure of the nation's airports. Or, when the debt ceiling is reached Nov. 15, he could stop sending out Social Security checks to senior citizens, at least temporarily.

But the public will know that none of these actions is necessary. The law is clear: After debt holders, Social Security and other entitlements get first priority, and there is no good reason why those payments should ever be disrupted. If the president chooses to play politics with entitlements, he and only he will be responsible. If there is a ''train wreck,'' he will be the engineer failing to put the brakes on a runaway spending locomotive. And like one of President Clinton's favorite musicians, the late Jerry Garcia, used to sing, ''Casey Jones, you better watch your speed.''

MARZIEH

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1995

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Marzieh, legendary singer of Iran. The news media has reported the smashing success of Marzieh, grande dame of Iranian music, at her concert in California on September 30. You will recall that Marzieh began her tour of the United States with a brief stop in Washington, where many members, including myself, had the great pleasure of meeting her at a reception and dinner here on the hill. The sellout crowd of over 3,000 at Hollywood's Pantages Theatre gave her a tremendous welcome and one after another of her songs prompted standing ovations.

Marzieh is, of course, renowned among her people not only for her tremendous talent and career, spanning half a century, but for her commitment to democracy and human rights in her troubled homeland, Iran. The civil rights movement in this country was sustained with freedom songs and songs of praise. Marzieh has brought a new voice for Iran, a voice which has helped to preserve Persian musical traditions, and a voice which now lends itself to the battle for freedom and justice in Iran.

Just as the freedom songs of the 1960's carried the message of the civil rights movement, Marzieh's melodic tones will carry the message of the resistance against the repressive regime in Iran. At 71, Marzieh is already a musical icon, but with her courageous decision last year to leave her oppressed homeland after 15 years of silence and meet with the Iranian Resistance's President-elect, Mrs. Maryam Rajavi, in Paris, she has become much more: A true champion of her people. As Mrs. Rajavi's advisor on the arts and culture, I am sure that Marzieh will play a significant role in reviving the world renowned legacy of Persian art and music.

I send Marzieh my congratulations on her great success on the west coast, and my best wishes on her continuing work on behalf of the National Council of Resistance of Iran.

HONORING THE MONTEBELLO WOMEN'S CLUB

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1995

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Montebello Women's Clubhouse in Montebello, CA, which has recently been given the honor of being listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

The Montebello Women's Club originated in 1885. At that time, the club was primarily an intellectual and cultural organization that served the Montebello community. Not content to meet in their homes, the women's club began to raise funds for the construction of a clubhouse. By 1923 club members had raised enough funds and purchased two lots at the corner of Park Avenue and Los Angeles Street, where the clubhouse stands today.

The Montebello Women's Clubhouse, built in 1925, serves as a social gathering place for resident of the city of Montebello. During the city's formative years, the clubhouse was the only suitable facility for large meetings, banquets, dinners, and dances. As a result, the clubhouse rapidly established itself as the community's primary social and civic gathering place.

The Montebello Women's Clubhouse is a product of the Spanish revival architectural philosophy and an excellent example of this influence which was prevalent during the early 1920's. For the past 70 years, this beautiful Spanish colonial revival social hall has served the Montebello community and been host to Montebello's memorable historic social, community, and civic events.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I rise to recognize the Montebello Women's Clubhouse on the occasion of being listed in the National Register of Historic Places. I also ask my colleagues to join me in extending our best wishes and congratulations to members of the Montebello Women's Club.

LEGISLATION TO APPOINT A COMMISSION ON MEAT PACKING INDUSTRY

HON. TIM JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 18, 1995

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce legislation that will direct the President to appoint a special commission on the concentration and potentially reduced competition in the meat packing industry. This legislation is necessary to ensure the existence of open and fair competition in the livestock and meat packing industry.

Over the last year, livestock producers have faced devastatingly low prices that make it very difficult, if not impossible, to break even, let alone receive a reasonable return on their investment. Last spring, cattle and hog prices