

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OFFERING MILITARY DEPENDENTS AND NONACTIVE DUTY MILITARY THE OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS PROGRAM

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Civil Service Subcommittee of the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee held hearings into the problems with the military health services system. Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs described the three biggest problems in military health care as "access, access, access." Those of us who have military installations in our congressional districts are all too familiar with these problems. It is not unusual for our caseworkers to be helping military spouses or dependents receive health care treatment because they could not get a doctor's appointment at the on-base military clinic.

In all fairness to the Defense Department, the Office of Health Affairs has been working to improve access. Last December, DOD announced it was expanding its health care program to provide military dependents and retirees with a triple option health care benefit. The cornerstone of the plan is the Tricare Prime option which affords beneficiaries the option to enroll in a managed care program. Beneficiaries will also be able to choose the current health care coverage provided under the CHAMPUS—now called Tricare Standard—fee-for-service program. The third option—Tricare Extra—will give beneficiaries access to a preferred provider plan.

The Tricare plan leaves many questions unanswered, and many military families are skeptical that Tricare will increase access to the health care.

Today, I am introducing legislation that would offer military beneficiaries the opportunity to participate in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program [FEHBP] on a demonstration basis in States where beneficiaries care covered under the Tricare Program. FEHBP has been held up as a model for containing health care costs and providing access to Federal employees. Certainly, the military families and retired military personnel deserve the same health care access and advantage of the FEHBP's wide range of choices. The current system of providing health care to military beneficiaries on a space-available basis, through a priority system, is no more than rationed health care. Military beneficiaries deserve better, and I am confident that they will obtain better health care benefits through FEHBP.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not perfect. It serves as a draft to be perfected. This bill will change as I receive comments from the Department of Defense, Office of Personnel Management, the military coalition, and other inter-

ested parties. It is my hope, however, that this vehicle will raise the issue to a level of debate that will enable us in Congress to seriously study merits of allowing military dependents and military retirees the opportunity to participate in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program.

ITALIAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

HON. WILLIAM J. MARTINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of October as Italian-American Heritage month and to acknowledge the accomplishments and contributions of Italian-Americans. As an American with Italian roots, I appreciate the significance of this month. My grandfather Michael came here from Italy to begin a new life, seeking opportunity for himself and his posterity. As many older Italian-Americans can attest, life in the States was not necessarily easy. Our people worked hard and labored long hours in some very difficult jobs, seeking only to earn an honest living. Michael Martini actually worked 16 hours a day making hats and selling them out of a little shop in what would become my hometown of Passaic, NJ.

Despite hard work, the road was not always easy. At times ethnic discrimination reared its ugly head to dampen the progress of Italian-Americans; they were often assigned the most menial tasks or passed up for promotions because of their names or their accents. Even as late as the 1970's, prejudice against Italian-Americans was not unknown.

One such example occurred during a 1970 City University of New York enrollment expansion in New York City. As the University enrollment experienced unprecedented expansion, faculty members born of Italian-American heritage were unjustly denied tenure. A small yet strong group of faculty began meeting on a regular basis to discuss the injustice unfolding all around them. After many years of cultivating support from outside agencies and State legislators, Italian-American descendants slowly but surely leveled the playing field. On March 17, 1975, Chancellor Kibbee of the City University of New York addressed the interests of the minority group developing academic, cultural and political programs aimed at the progress of the Italian-American society.

As they should, Italian-Americans have and will fight all forms of discrimination and prejudice head-on with pride and a fiery spirit. This is just one aspect of our culture we should remember as Italian-American Heritage month begins, and I want to urge my colleagues, especially those of Italian descent, to join me in the celebration.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE GEORGE C. STEEH III

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the March of Dimes is an organization with a noble mission: to fight birth defects and childhood diseases. We all share the March of Dimes dream which is that every child should have the opportunity to live a healthy life.

For the past 12 years, the southeast Michigan chapter of the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation has honored several Macomb County residents who are outstanding members of our community and have helped in the campaign for healthier babies. This evening, the chapter will be hosting the 12th annual Alexander Macomb Citizen of the Year award dinner. The award, instituted in 1984, is named after my home county's namesake, Gen. Alexander Macomb, a hero of the War of 1812.

This year, the March of Dimes has chosen my good friend, Judge George Steeh III, as a recipient of the award. Serving as a justice is not simply a job for Judge Steeh, it is an avocation. As he recently said, "I feel there's never a day that goes by where I don't have the opportunity to improve the human condition in my work." In his work and his private life, whether it be with at the Macomb County Circuit Court, the March of Dimes, Catholic Social Services, or the Comprehensive Youth Services, where he serves as an officer and member of the board of directors, George's involvement within the community exemplifies his commitment to improving the human condition.

Dr. Jonas Salk's polio vaccine is just one of the more famous breakthroughs that would not have been possible without March of Dimes research funding. And, without people like Judge Steeh the job of protecting babies would be that much more difficult.

I applaud the southeast Michigan chapter of the March of Dimes and Judges George Steeh for their leadership, advocacy, and community service. I know that Judge Steeh is honored by the recognition and I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting him as a 1995 recipient of the Alexander Macomb Citizen of the Year Award.

"GINGRICH AND THE COPPERHEADS"

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this important article by Mr. Stuart Sweet into the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to review it and heed its message.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

We must fight for a balanced budget at all costs, yet we must look ahead. The article clearly shows that even if we pass a reconciliation bill and lower cost appropriation bills which put us on a glide path for a balanced budget, we still have great challenges ahead. This country's unfunded liabilities are out of control:

[From the Investor's Business Daily]
GINGRICH AND THE COPPERHEADS
(By Stuart Sweet)

Newt Gingrich, a former history professor, risks being a footnote in history. Even if he leads Congress to victory over President Clinton in the coming battle of the budget, he will accomplish little relative to the size of the country's long-term fiscal problems.

Gingrich defines the political space in America. All the other major players position themselves a calibrated distance to his left. Sen. Phil Gramm is trying to occupy the same space. Sen. Bob Dole is slightly to their left. Clinton is some distance farther away, and congressional Democrats farther still.

Unfortunately, Gingrich has flinched from confronting the true crisis in Medicare and the government's other unfunded liabilities.

According to Medicare's actuaries—career civil servants—the hospital portion of Medicare has an unfunded liability of 3.37% of taxable payroll. That is, if every worker in the nation paid another 3.37% of his or her gross pay to the government for the next 75 years, America could honor its promises to pay hospitals what it will owe them for treating senior citizens.

On a net present value basis, this unfunded liability equals \$5.4 trillion in 1995 dollars.

Social Security is in somewhat better shape. It has an unfunded liability of 2.17% of payroll and a negative net worth of \$3.5 trillion in 1995 dollars.

The two add up to \$8.9 trillion. And the amount climbs higher every year we delay tackling the problem.

By my calculations, the GOP budget plan reduces Medicare's unfunded hospital bill liabilities by perhaps \$1.5 trillion. That's about one-sixth of what is needed to restore Medicare and Social Security to actuarial balance.

By comparison, the amount of federal debt held by the public is less than \$4 trillion. If Gingrich forces Clinton's surrender on the budget this fall, the debt held by the public will total just under \$5 trillion in 2002, when the budget is "balanced."

The GOP is silent about what would come next. But the numbers on Medicare and Social Security tell the story. The budget could stay balanced for another decade. Then, in 2012 and beyond, fiscal disaster strikes.

In other words, the GOP's plan to "save" Medicare only postpones fiscal Armageddon, giving Medicare's hospital trust fund five years of breathing room. It will go broke in 2007 instead of 2002.

Then, about 2012, the retirement of the baby boom will hit the government's finances with an impact equivalent to the moon smashing into the earth.

Our politics only rarely produce major chances for fiscal reform. The last time was 1983, when Social Security's unfunded liability, then 1.82% of taxable payroll, was "solved." Twelve years later, the stakes are more than three times higher.

To be sure, Gingrich is bolder than Clinton and Democrats in Congress. Clinton's 10-year balanced budget plan would trim Medicare's unfunded liability by a trivial amount. Congressional Democrats pounced on him for even that. And they've launched a million-dollar ad campaign to denounce the plan to "slash Medicare."

This is crass politics, not commitment to Medicare. Cabinet officers and nonpartisan actuaries agree that Medicare benefits would have to be more than cut in half for its hospital fund to balance.

You have to go back to 1864, when the Peace Democrats and the Democratic Copperheads undermined President Lincoln in the midst of the Civil War, to find equally irresponsible partisanship.

Lincoln didn't slow the war effort to appease the Copperheads. He did what he thought was right.

Today, only Gingrich can redefine the political geometry by putting forward a comprehensive plan to return Medicare to long-run financial health and to put Social Security back "on the table."

The right place for this move is the budget reconciliation process, which should conclude no later than this Christmas.

Nothing is stopping the GOP from attaching more reforms to the reconciliation bill, to control spending after 2002. These could include raising the eligibility age, increasing copayments and deductibles, or privatizing the Social Security System.

That would be radical and genuinely historic. It might draw support from unlikely sympathizers. The Washington Post, for example, has come out in favor of slowing Social Security spending by raising the retirement age and limiting COLA's.

If Gingrich is playing to the history books and not the next election, he cannot be too bold on entitlements. Lincoln saved the Union by defying the Copperheads. And Republicans dominated Washington for seven decades because of his resolve.

BEST WISHES FOR HEALTHY RECOVERY TO BOB BARRACLOUGH, A FIRE SERVICE FRIEND

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a very dear friend of the American fire service underwent bypass surgery this past week. On behalf of the Congressional Fire Services Caucus and the Congressional Fire Services Institute, I want to take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to Bob Barracough for a speedy recovery.

I have known Bob for many years. A native of Pennsylvania like myself, Bob got his start in the fire service as a youth spending time at the station house with his father who was a firefighter. For the past 15 years, Bob, himself, has served as a volunteer firefighter.

Presently, he divides his time between business, Class 1, public speaking, and involvement with a number of fire-related associations. A strong supporter of CFSI, Bob is a major contributor to the institute's internship program. The program gives future leaders of the fire service invaluable Washington experience that will serve them well in the years ahead.

I look forward to seeing Bob on his feet again soon. Until then, we in Washington send our best wishes to you, Bob, for a full recovery.

A TRIBUTE TO THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF FOOD FOR ALL

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the fine work and outstanding public service of a distinguished nonprofit organization, Food for All, founded in Redlands, CA in 1985 by Linda and Milan Hamilton. In recognition of its years of growth and success, the innovative Food for All Program is making its 10th anniversary this year and will celebrate the occasion at a dinner ceremony on October 12.

In cooperation with local retailers, Food for All offers consumers an easy and convenient way to support local efforts to combat hunger. Food for All's simple concept uses barcoded donor cards available at supermarket checkout stands which shoppers purchase along with their groceries. As the administrator of these funds, Food for All distributes 90 percent of these contributions in the form of grants to community-based organizations and international projects striving for long-term solutions to hunger. These grants are made through a network of volunteer committees and local grant advisory boards.

Since 1985, Food for All has distributed 3,352 grants totaling more than \$4.7 million. Of this amount, \$2.2 million has gone to emergency food suppliers such as food pantries, soup kitchens, and shelters; \$1.4 million has been awarded to multiservice agencies which help families and individuals develop the ability to support themselves and others; and \$1.1 million has been granted to projects overseas which develop self-sufficiency for families and communities.

The Food for All Program has grown and increased supermarket participation from two stores at inception to presently 1,713 stores in nine States. Supporting this worthy effort is a network of more than 800 volunteers who participate in solicitation, merchandising, funds distribution, community outreach, and a number of other Food for All activities. In addition, I particularly want to recognize Paul Gerrard of Gerrard's Markets and Jack Brown of Stater Brothers Markets for their leadership in making Food for All the phenomenal success that it is today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, and the many supporters of Food for All in recognizing this outstanding program for its community- and market-based approach to addressing hunger. As we recognize Food for All for its worthy contributions over the past 10 years, let us not forget its origins in the hearts and minds of Linda and Milan Hamilton. For everything they and so many others have done to make it a success, it is only fitting that the House of Representatives pay tribute to Food for All today.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY COUNCIL REPORT POSES QUESTIONS

HON. MARK E. SOUDER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, the DOD appropriations bill emerged from conference with significantly more money added for certain items above the House recommended level. One important addition is \$100 million more than the Nunn-Lugar program.

The Nunn-Lugar or Cooperative Threat Reduction Program has been accused of permitting the Russians to replace obsolete missile systems with more modern and more threatening ones, in fact, facilitating the upgrading of Russian strategic forces.

Yesterday in the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee, we passed out a budget reconciliation package which reduced spending by more than \$10 billion. Some of those savings were made by eliminating the out-of-school interest subsidy that students receive on their loans, during a so-called grace period. While we are reducing benefits to students in America, with the Nunn-Lugar program, the United States is actually encouraging Russian students to study nuclear physics because we will pay them salaries to work at the International Science and Technology Center in Moscow they graduate. The center receives \$21 million in Nunn-Lugar aid. Scientists involved in nuclear weapons testing and nerve agent research are said to have received Nunn-Lugar grants. When the General Accounting Office examined the Nunn-Lugar program, it was this center that "raised the most concerns among GAO investigators."

I am enclosing a series of reports from the American Foreign Policy Council which poses more questions about the legitimacy of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program:

RUSSIA TEST-LAUNCHED NEW ICBM

Yesterday morning, the Russian government test-launched a new-generation intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM). The launch is the most visible sign of Moscow's ongoing strategic ongoing strategic nuclear modernization program, as the House prepares to vote on the 1996 defense authorization and appropriations bills.

Reuters reported from Moscow that the ICBM was launched from the Plesetsk cosmodrome 600 miles north of the Russian capital.

Russian Military Space Forces spokesman Ivan Safronov says that the missile is a three-stage TOPOL-M, a variant of the SS-25. According to Safronov, the TOPOL-M will be based on mobile launchers and in silos.

He stated that 90 of the 154 SS-18 ICBM silos in Russia will be converted to house the TOPOL-M. The SS-18s are being dismantled with United States aid under the "Cooperative Threat Reduction" or Nunn-Lugar program. The TOPOL-M cannot be deployed, if Russia is to remain within START limits, until the SS-18s and other ICBMs are dismantled. Therefore, this aspect of Nunn-Lugar funding will help make deployment of the TOPOL-M possible.

To date, Congress has failed to conduct significant oversight of the Nunn-Lugar program, and how portions of it are being used to benefit Russian military modernization. The Cooperative Threat Reduction Act (PL 103-160), Section 1203(d)(2) contains a restric-

tion that Nunn-Lugar recipients "forego * * * the replacement of destroyed weapons of mass destruction."

The launch underscores the need to revisit Nunn-Lugar, and to deploy a national ballistic missile defense system by 2003.

According to Safronov, once the SS-18s and other aging systems are dismantled, they will be replaced with ultramodern missiles. He told Reuters: "Russia hopes to replace all its outdated missiles in the coming years."

AMENDMENT WOULD TIE NUNN-LUGAR TO MOSCOW'S BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS COMPLIANCE

Problem. The Russian military maintains a clandestine biological weapons program in violation of its international agreements. U.S. assistance to dismantle obsolete Russian weapons, build housing for officers, "convert" portions of military plants for civilian purposes, and other aid under the Cooperative Threat Reduction (Nunn-Lugar) program frees up Defense Ministry funds to finance the biological weapons program. To date, the U.S. has offered Moscow little incentive to account fully for—let alone abandon—its germ warfare research and development.

Solution. Congress can provide Moscow that incentive by conditioning all Nunn-Lugar funding for Russia on biological weapons research, development, and production.

An amendment to H.R. 1530 is being offered by Rep. Robert K. Dornan (R-CA) to offer that incentive. The amendment is a measured, constructive approach that maintains full Nunn-Lugar funding. The amendment reads:

"Sec. 1108. Limitation on Cooperative Threat Reduction Program Relating to Offensive Biological Weapons Program in Russia.

"None of the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization in section 301 for Cooperative Threat Reduction programs may be obligated or expended for programs or activities with Russia unless and until the President submits to Congress a certification in writing that Russia has terminated its offensive biological weapons program."

Congress's original intent for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program was to help former Soviet republics to dismantle weapons of mass destruction that could be used against the United States and its allies, or that could proliferate to rogue regimes.

The Clinton administration has acknowledged that Moscow continues a substantial covert biological weapons program, and that Russia is not in compliance with the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention. The Dornan amendment offers the most substantive step yet toward helping Russia abandon germ warfare and comply with its international commitments. Rep. Dornan is currently seeking cosponsors, according to legislative director Bill Fallon.

What will hearings reveal? There has been no effective oversight of the Nunn-Lugar program. A new GAO report states that Nunn-Lugar assistance already is being diverted to finance Russian development of new weapons of mass destruction. Rep. Curt Weldon (R-PA), Chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development of the National Security Committee, has called for hearings.

GAO: RUSSIA USES NUNN-LUGAR AID TO DEVELOP NEW WEAPONS

American aid to Russia is being used to pay scientists who continue to develop weapons of mass destruction and dual-use technologies, Moscow and Kiev have blocked U.S. audits of the aid, and the Clinton administration is four months late in making an accounting to Congress.

These fundamental problems with aid under the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act (P.L. 103-160), or "Nunn-Lugar" program) are revealed in a draft General Accounting Office (GAO) report made public by Bill Gertz in today's Washington Times. The report and article make the following points:

Nunn-Lugar has done little to reduce the proliferation threat or improve nuclear weapons controls in Russia.

Moscow is using Nunn-Lugar conversion funds to "reactivate dormant weapons facilities."

The International Science and Technology Center in Moscow, receiving \$21 million in Nunn-Lugar aid, "raised the most concerns among the GAO investigators."

U.S. officials monitored the Center "only intermittently," and not quarterly.

U.S. officials told the GAO that the Center "is intended to help prevent proliferation . . . rather than preclude scientists from working on Russian weapons of mass destruction," even though the Center bars funding for such work.

The Center is "creating dual-use items" that can be used in Russian military modernization.

Nunn-Lugar pays nuclear scientists to prevent them from emigrating, but they "may spend part of their time working on Russian weapons of mass destruction," according to the report.

Scientists involved in nuclear weapons testing and nerve agent research received Nunn-Lugar grants.

The U.S. has made no audits of Nunn-Lugar funding in Russia or Ukraine, because Moscow and Kiev have objected to such audits, the GAO said.

The Clinton administration is four months late in providing Congress with an accounting for Nunn-Lugar funds spent, which is required by law.

The State Department will assume funding of the Center from the Department of Defense next year, and hopes to spend another \$90 million over seven years.

RUSSIA FAILS TO MEET ALL SIX CONDITIONS TO RECEIVE NUNN-LUGAR FUNDING

The Russian government is violating all six congressional restrictions in the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act (PL 103-160) that authorizes U.S. aid for the "demilitarization of the former Soviet Union." PL 103-160 contains a loophole that allows aid without the recipient meeting the six commitments, if the president deems such aid to be in the "national interest." However, Congress has not yet assessed whether aid in these circumstances remains in the national interest. The six PL 103-160 commitments are:

Section 1203(d)(1): "Making substantial investment of its resources for dismantling or destroying its weapons of mass destruction. . . ." Russia is dismantling nuclear warheads on its own, but is replacing many with modern ones. The U.S. agreed to pay for Russia to design its own \$15 million fissile material storage facility, but DoD reported, "The project has been hampered by problems with the Russians not paying their designers to meet the Russian commitment to this effort." The GAO states, "Russia is likely to place a low priority on paying the high cost of [destroying its declared 40,000 metric ton chemical weapons stockpile]."

Section 1203(d)(2): "Foregoing any military modernization program that exceeds legitimate defense requirements and foregoing the replacement of destroyed weapons of mass destruction." The CIA expects Russia to "flight test and deploy there new ballistic missiles—a road-mobile ICBM, a silo-based ICBM, and an SLBM—during this decade . . . [and] a new ballistic missile submarine after

the turn of the century." The United States presents no offensive threat to the Russian Federation, and therefore the strategic modernization program is not within Russia's "legitimate defense requirements." Obsolete weapons being destroyed with the help of PL 103-160 will be replaced with modern systems. Russia maintains large covert programs to develop new generations of chemical and biological weapons.

Section 1203(d)(3): "Foregoing any use in new nuclear weapons of fissionable or other components of destroyed nuclear weapons." According to the GAO, the Administration has failed to get Russia to agree to "specific transparency measures that would help ensure that stored materials are derived from dismantled weapons, safe from unauthorized use, and not used in new weapons." Therefore, the U.S. must assume that Russia will recycle warhead components in its strategic modernization program.

Section 1203(d)(4): "Facilitating United States verification of any weapons destruction carried out under this title . . ." Russia has thrown up numerous obstacles to U.S. verification of weapons destruction, and the U.S. has no means to inspect or account for destruction of any Russian nuclear warheads. Moscow has not permitted substantial U.S. inspection of its chemical weapons program; likewise, Moscow has stonewalled on U.S. inspection of its biological weapons facilities, though Kremlin officials made a token "concession" at the May 10 summit that allows U.S. inspections of a "handful" of biological weapons facilities in three months.

Section 1203(d)(5): "Complying with all relevant arms control agreements." Russia is currently in violation of the Biological Weapons Convention, the Chemical Weapons Convention, STRT I, and the Vienna Confidence Building Measures Agreement, and may be in violation of the ABM Treaty (with S-500s).

Section 1203(d)(6): "Observing internationally recognized human rights, including the protection of minorities." The 35,000 dead in Chechnya, widespread persecution of various ethnic groups (particularly Chechens, Georgians and Azeris), renewed domestic political murders, legal and administrative mechanisms for dictatorial rule, sharp restrictions and intimidation of journalists and widespread police abuses indicate widespread human rights violations.

GAO AND U.S. EMBASSY SAY THAT MILITARY CONVERSION AID WILL HELP MODERNIZE RUSSIAN ARMED FORCES AND PROMOTE PROLIFERATION

Congress thinks American military conversion assistance to Russia is helping to put Soviet-built military plants out of the war business—thus reducing threats to the United States—and to bring them into the consumer production business, thus helping build a market economy.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) and a cable from the U.S. Embassy in Moscow report evidence to the contrary.

Rather than break up high-tech military design bureaus to make sure they will never again develop weapons, the Russian government's strategy is to channel Western aid "to a small number of key technology-rich research and design institutes," according to the July 8, 1994 cable. Most of these institutes will remain state-owned. Few are going out of the military business.

A 1995 GAO report states, "These parent companies [designated for U.S.-funded conversion aid] would still produce some defense equipment * * * raising the possibility that U.S. aid could benefit the parent defense companies if safeguards are not put in place." (GAO/NSIAD/95-7)

"Many of the companies selected for conversion will continue to produce weapons. Profits and technology from the newly privatized firms could be returned to the parent defense enterprises. Furthermore, many Russian officials remain interested in preserving a sizable defense industry to earn hard currency by exporting arms," the GAO report adds.

"Russia's * * * military leaders are anxious to learn about the management and manufacturing methods of the West," observes the embassy cable, adding, "The Russian military is attempting to regain military potency with dwindling financial resources."

To compensate for its huge personnel reductions, the Russian military is going high-tech, and needs Western aid. According to the embassy cable, "With this change, the Russian military is shifting strategies and doctrine. First, the military is deferring new production to focus on systems upgrade and research. Second, the military is shifting from military-only research to dual-use technology research that will benefit the Russian economy. Third, the Defense Ministry is seeking to guide the creation of 30 defense-industrial-financial conglomerates that would produce both military and civilian high-tech equipment. Finally, the military is broadening beyond an emphasis on weapons procurement to improve weapon maintenance, improved information processing, and better battle management."

This helps explain why hard-line Russian military leaders are so intent on expanding Nunn-Lugar funding to pay for "conversion," and why they are so supportive of the U.S. Commerce Department's efforts to promote American investment and technology transfer to such enterprises.

SIX REASONS TO RECONSIDER THE NUNN-LUGAR PROGRAM

Congress is on the verge of providing the Clinton administration with desperately needed political cover for its mishandling of the Nunn-Lugar program in the former Soviet Union. Lack of congressional oversight has permitted hard-line elements in Russia to manipulate the Clinton administration and abuse the program in ways that are not only wasteful, but harmful to American national security. Nunn-Lugar is being used mainly to destroy obsolete weapons that Moscow will replace with high-tech arms currently under development. Nunn-Lugar funds have been diverted to fund some of this development.

1. Russia is in violation of most if not all six conditions set by Congress in the original Nunn-Lugar (Cooperative Threat Reduction) legislation (PL 103-160). (For a discussion of each point, see Foreign Aid Advisory No. 5, "Russia Fails to Meet All Six Conditions to Receive Nunn-Lugar Funding," May 19, 1995.)

2. Moscow needs Nunn-Lugar funding to enable deployment of new generation ICBM. When Russia test-launched a new-generation TOPOL-M ICBM on September 5, 1995, military spokesman Ivan Safronov told Reuters that 90 of the existing 154 SS-18 ICBM silos in Russia will be converted to house the new TOPOL-Ms. In other words, the TOPOL-Ms cannot be deployed until Nunn-Lugar helps dismantle the obsolete SS-18s. Safronov added, "Russia hopes to replace all its outdated missiles in the coming years."

3. Russia continues clandestine production of chemical and biological weapons. Russia maintains large covert programs to develop new generations of chemical and biological weapons. Dissident chemical weapons scientist Vil Mirzayanov revealed an entire new class of binary chemical weapons under development, which Moscow refuses to ac-

knowledge. The Clinton administration acknowledges that Russia is continuing with its substantial clandestine germ warfare program.

4. Nunn-Lugar aid has been diverted to fund development of weapons of mass destruction. The GAO released a June report that found that the International Science and Technology Center in Moscow, receiving \$21 million in Nunn-Lugar aid, "raised the most concerns among the GAO investigators." The report says that the Center is "creating dual-use items" that can be used in Russian military modernization. The report adds that Nunn-Lugar pays nuclear scientists to prevent them from emigrating, but they "may spend part of their time working on Russian weapons of mass destruction." Scientists involved in ongoing nuclear weapons testing and nerve agent research received Nunn-Lugar grants, GAO said.

5. Nunn-Lugar aid may promote weapons proliferation. A 1994 GAO report raises the possibility that U.S. aid may unwittingly promote weapons proliferation: "Many of the [Russian] companies selected for conversion will continue to produce weapons. Profits and technology from the newly privatized firms could be returned to the parent defense enterprises. Furthermore, many Russian officials remain interested in preserving a sizable defense industry to earn hard currency by exporting arms."

6. Nunn-Lugar aid is helping Russian plants that continue to manufacture high-tech weapons. The 1994 GAO report states that Moscow is using Nunn-Lugar conversion funds to "reactivate dormant weapons facilities." It adds, "These [Russian] parent companies [designated for U.S.-funded conversion aid] would still produce some defense equipment . . . raising the possibility that U.S. aid could benefit the parent defense companies if safeguards are not put in place." Commerce Department publications acknowledge that related aid programs go directly to Russian military enterprises that continue to produce modern tanks, armor, military electronics, military aircraft, anti-ship weapons, cruise missiles, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and submarine-launched ballistic missiles, as well as anti-aircraft systems designed to shoot down American "stealth" aircraft.

WHY IS THE U.S. AIDING RUSSIA'S HIGH-TECH MILITARY INDUSTRY?

Russia's high-tech military industry is the backbone of a planned large-scale modernization program that Defense Minister Pavel Grachev says will compensate for troop reductions and compete with American firms on the international arms market.

Last week, a top Russian officer, Col. Gen. Yevgeny Maslin, lobbied senators to maintain funding for "conversion" of Russian military plants. At the same time, he defended Moscow's strategic nuclear modernization program. The CIA and DIA report that Russia is readying to test-launch a new generation silo-based ICBM, a mobile ICBM, and SLBM, and is developing a new ballistic-missile submarine to go on-line within the next decade.

The U.S. government, in trying to help Russian "reform," has been promoting and subsidizing the transfer of American technology and capable to many of Russia's most advanced military design bureaus and plants. Rather than abandoning military production for consumer products, these plants form the core of Russia's conventional and nuclear military modernization. To remain predominant in the military-industrial complex, they need Western technology and investment.

The Clinton Administration, with bipartisan congressional support, has been providing just that. The Bureau of Export Administration of the Department of Commerce, the Defense Enterprise Fund, the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, and other government programs and entities are promoting Russian firms that are not abandoning military production, but have merely opened civilian production lines to attract American support. The Commerce Department bulletin BSNIS Search for Partners (December 9, 1994) describes some of the firms.

"the principal designer and producer of Russian shipborne air defense missile systems"; "designs and produces sensor/guidance systems for airborne weapons"; a major producer of electronic components for space and military use"; "responsible for design and development of land-based, road-mobile solid-propellant missiles"; "global positioning system work with . . . MiG aircraft"; "developed guidance, navigation, and flight control systems for ballistic missiles"; "a leading developer of space satellite systems, sea and land-based cruise missile systems, and intercontinental ballistic missile systems"; "designs and develops tactical medium-range surface-to-air missile systems and weapons guidance systems for fighter aircraft"; "probably the world's leading producer of VHF air surveillance and surface-to-air missile target acquisition radars, which have counter-stealth features"; "a leading center for the design of launchers and ground support equipment for missiles and aircraft"; "a leader in the development and production of electronic control systems for missile complexes"; "a developer of submarine-launched ballistic missiles. . . ."

POINTS TO CONSIDER

Is Congress serving the nation by helping an increasingly hostile and unstable Russia to modernize its decaying war machine? Current policy is inadvertently exacerbating the following problems:

Strengthening the un-reformed military-industrial complex with the means to expand its political base in Russia; Proliferation of high-tech weapons to rogue regimes; Threats of a revitalized, high-tech military against Russia's neighbors; New threats to the United States, particularly through proliferation and strategic nuclear modernization.

LIST OF ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENTS RUSSIA IS CURRENTLY BREAKING

The debate about ballistic missile defense is mainly between those who place their faith in arms control agreements with Russia, and those who place their faith in U.S.-controlled defensive systems to knock out ballistic missiles fired at the United States or its allies.

The Russian parliament will demand that the U.S. comply "unconditionally" with the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty if Russia is to ratify START II—i.e., no ballistic missile defense. However, Moscow is systematically breaking current commitments and the U.S. is not demanding "unconditional" compliance. The following list drawn from open sources shows Russia's track record.

Biological Weapons Convention. Russia maintains a substantial covert biological weapons program in violation of the 1972 convention, according to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's (ACDA) recent annual report to Congress. Russian defectors and public officials, as well as the CIA, confirm the report.

Chemical weapons agreements. Russia is reported not to be complying with a 1989 bilateral chemical weapons accord with the U.S., and with the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention. Although the Convention has

not been ratified by the U.S. or Russia, both sides have come to an understanding that they will abide by it and allow mutual inspections. As of 1995, Russia continued to conceal chemical weapons facilities from U.S. inspectors.

Missile Technology Control Regime. Russia violated the 1990 Missile Technology Control Regime by seeking to sell SS-25 ICBM technology to Libya, and by successfully selling SS-25 technology to Brazil. The administration declined to impose sanctions because Russia "promised to stop."

START I. Moscow conducted a mock nuclear attack on the United States in 1993, failing to give the U.S. advance notification as required by the treaty. Russia conducted a mock SS-25 ICBM, air-launched cruise missile, and submarine-launched ballistic missile attack on the United States on June 22, 1994, but ACDA will neither confirm nor deny whether Russia gave the required advance notice. In 1995, Russia used SS-25s as space launchers without properly notifying the U.S. in advance. Questions remain about encryption of SS-19 ICBM flight tests, whose telemetry should be decipherable so the U.S. can determine the warhead load.

START II. The new ACDA annual report states that Moscow intentionally tried to conceal technical characteristics of the SS-N-20 SLBM in tests in 1991 and 1995. The administration failed to pursue the violation.

Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty. Moscow has broken the CFE treaty by waging the war in Chechnya, and has stated its intention to violate the CFE treaty further, not only by maintaining disallowed troop and armor concentrations in the northern Caucasus, but by creating a new 58th Army to be based in Chechnya.

Agreements on transparency of fissile material storage and weapons dismantling. The July 1995 ACDA report finds that Russia is not making good on its agreements with the U.S. to make all fissile material storage facilities and weapons dismantling processes transparent to U.S. inspectors.

IN RECOGNITION OF 150 YEARS OF THE ORSON STARR HOUSE

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, 1995 marks the 140th anniversary of what is believed to be the oldest standing home in Royal Oak, MI. On Sunday, October 8, the Woman's Historical Guild will celebrate this impressive anniversary. They will be joined by their friends from the Royal Oak History Society, the Royal Oak History Commission, and the Royal Oak Historical District Study Commission.

Orson Starr first moved to Royal Oak, MI, with his wife Rhoda Gibbs Starr, and their son, John Almon Starr, in 1831. As Mr. Starr's manufacturing business prospered, the family moved from the original log home to a house which Mr. Starr, built with such extraordinary craftsmanship, it is still standing today. The house was originally built in Greek Revival architectural style. The style is still apparent to the home today and is more commonly known as "Michigan Farmhouse" style.

Despite major changes in the 1900's, interested citizens have been successful in maintaining the home and preserving its history. The Woman's Historical Guild of Royal Oak is presently responsible for preservation of the

interior of the home. Through the contributions of the Historical Guild, the city of Royal Oak, and individuals, this historic site is now open for all to see and learn from.

My thanks to all those individuals and organizations involved in the preservation of Royal Oak history, and my congratulations and best wishes on this 150th year of the Orson Starr house.

A TRIBUTE TO AJEA 2000 FOR THEIR SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to AJEA 2000, an organization in my district that has contributed greatly to the educational enrichment of the minds of our youths. AJEA 2000 is a network of four innercity Catholic schools in Chicago who raise funds to support tuition and other educational costs for financial disadvantaged children. These schools have worked successfully for decades within Chicago's neighborhoods to produce well educated young people who have become leaders in our city and beyond.

The four participating schools, St. Ambrose, St. Elizabeth, St. James, and Holy Angels, have one of the best records of student retention, graduation, and academic achievement in the city. By providing scholarships and other award grants to students, many otherwise disadvantaged children have the opportunity that every American deserves—and that is the opportunity for the best education possible.

Mr. Speaker, please let the record show that I am proclaiming Saturday, October 7, 1995, "AJEA 2000 Day" in Chicago in honor of the more than 2,000 financially disadvantaged children they have helped. AJEA 2000's commitment to further the education and lives of young people is one that should be commended. It is an honor and a privilege to enter these words into the RECORD.

MEDICARE REFORM

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration's trustee's report warns the Medicare Trust Fund starts to go broke next year and the entire program will go bankrupt in 7 years.

America's elderly and future generations are at risk. If the fund goes bankrupt, the law says the government will make no hospital or other trust-paid health services available. We can save Medicare by using new approaches, new management, and new technologies.

Medicare and Medicaid are Government-run health care programs filled with fraud and waste—roughly \$44 billion each year. Currently, Medicare spends more than twice the amount of the private sector and in 1994 costs rose 11 percent. The plan we purpose will allow for increased Medicare spending, but at

a slower rate. If spending increases 6 percent instead of 10 percent as Clinton proposes, the trust fund will be solvent.

We need to create a system that offers the best care at the lowest costs. We can save Medicare and improve it, and give seniors the greatest control over their own health care.

If we don't act, our 32 million seniors, 4 million disabled, and our future generations will be the ones in jeopardy.

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF ST. MARY'S HOSPITAL

HON. WILLIAM J. MARTINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of the centennial celebration of St. Mary's Hospital in Passaic, NJ.

The celebration began Sunday, August 13, 1995, and events continued throughout the week. St. Mary's is dear to me not only because I was born there, but also because it is a beacon for the community. Advanced medical specialists and eternal charity have come to characterize this establishment. For 100 years St. Mary's has served the people of Passaic County; its longevity is a testament to its success. I have no doubt that generations to come will be the beneficiaries of St. Mary's loyal service.

In 1895, St. Mary's opened her doors to the public in the old St. Nicholas Young Men's Parish Center as a 20-bed emergency hospital. Sponsored and staffed by the Sisters of Charity of St. Elizabeth, St. Mary's Hospital continues, "the healing mission of Jesus by responding to the changing health care needs of the communities we serve." The mission statement and goal of the Sisters of Charity is embodied by the staff of St. Mary's and illustrated every day through their gentle care and kind hearts.

St. Mary's Hospital remains a leader in the development and implementation of innovative medical procedures. The hospital's vision and altruism does not end there; St. Mary's continues to help those members of the community burdened by poverty. Their humanism is further illustrated through the practice of giving each patient one-on-one personal attention, thereby ensuring a comfortable and thorough diagnosis of their ailment.

Through dedication and love St. Mary's Hospital has healed millions of lives both spiritually and medically. By opening their doors to those who cannot afford the medical attention they deserve, the hospital provides a service rarely seen in this day and age. This reiterates their loyalty to their mission which began 100 years ago.

The centennial of this outstanding hospital demonstrates the exceptional dedication of a staff devoted to serving others for the betterment of their community.

DEDICATION, ACCOMPLISHMENT, FRIENDSHIP

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, there are moments in life that are a mixture of joy and sadness, and many of us who care about Saginaw Valley State University, are about to experience such a time with the retirement of Charles B. Curtiss. For the past 32 years, this man has been a member of the university's governing board, and on Monday, October 2, he is being honored for his years of service following retirement from the SVSU Board of Control.

Charles Curtiss is certainly dedicated. He served as the chairman of a local committee that led to the establishment of Saginaw Valley State University. His 32 years of service is the longest length anyone has ever served at a public institution of higher learning in Michigan. His motivation on behalf of SVSU specifically and higher education generally, has been inspirational to many who have come after him and will continue to serve as a model for years to come.

He has had many accomplishments. Besides helping to create a university, he is most active with fund raising to help keep it strong. He has greatly contributed to the raising of millions of dollars during his tenure. He designed the management formula for the university to make sure that it kept its focus by effectively establishing one program before moving on to another.

Perhaps most importantly, Charles Curtiss is a good friend, and has made many. I was privileged to work with him during my days as a student at SVSU, as a student body president. Our friendship developed quickly and early, and has grown over the years. Charles' appointment and reappointments to the SVSU board by both Republican and Democratic Governors, including George Romney, William Milliken, and James Blanchard, clearly demonstrating his ability to make people of different persuasions understand his effectiveness at leadership.

At the coming event, Charles will be honored by having the Business and professional Development Building of the West Complex of Saginaw Valley State named as "Charles B. Curtiss Hall." This is a fitting tribute for a man who has given of himself over the years, and has left a mark that will be most difficult to match.

Mr. Speaker, we need dedicated leaders who make true accomplishments while conducting themselves in a friendly and respectable manner. We need people like Charles Curtiss. That is precisely why I said earlier that this moment is a mixture of joy and sadness. We have joy because we appreciate all that Charles has done, and we wish him well. We are sad because we will miss him, and we know that someone like him is so hard to find.

I urge you, Mr. Speaker, and all of our colleagues to join me in thanking Charles B. Curtiss for his years of dedication, accomplishment, and friendship, and wish him well for the new challenges he is certain to undertake.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN NICK SMITH AT A.B. LAFFER, V.A. CANTO AND ASSOCIATES 36TH WASHINGTON CONFERENCE

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD my speech I made this morning at the A.B. Laffer, V.A. Canto and Associates 36th Washington Conference.

There are two points I wish to make. First, that a failure to increase the debt ceiling, even for a prolonged period, will not result in a default. Second, the Federal debt has become a burden on everyone in our society and congressional fortitude in balancing our budget would result in lower interest rates.

Since the Second Liberty Bond Act was passed in 1917, Congress has set an overall dollar ceiling on the amount of debt the Treasury can issue. Prior to the act, Congress voted on each debt issuance. The limit applies to nearly all debt of the Federal Government, including nonmarketable securities issued to trust funds. Periodically the debt reaches the ceiling and Congress is faced with the question of whether to increase the limit. Since 1940 Congress has responded with an increase 77 times. In October of this year, the debt ceiling will again be reached and this will be the leverage that my colleagues and I will use to ensure the American people get a balanced Federal budget for the first time since 1969.

The Secretary of Treasury and the President have called for separating the increase in the debt ceiling from the budget. However, there exists substantial precedent for using the debt ceiling to affect legislation, particularly on budget issues. There were prolonged interruptions in the debt ceiling associated with the debate over the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act—Gramm-Rudman-Hollings—in 1985. The debt ceiling vote was withheld, and the Treasury began underinvesting trust funds in early September of 1985 and by November of 1985 actively disinvested trust funds in order to make payments. A permanent increase in the debt ceiling to \$2.0787 trillion was enacted on December 12, 1985.

The 1990 budget was resolved during six temporary increases in the debt ceiling between August 9 and a permanent increase on November 5. During this session the Treasury primarily used the postponement of auctions to manage the cash flow.

The Congressional Budget Office, as of yesterday, estimates the debt limit will be reached sometime at the end of October. Treasury's first potential cash management problem could occur November 3. At this point, Social Security payments must go out. During the first week of November, these payments, along with other retirement and disability payments, will reduce Treasury's cash by about \$37 billion. The next hurdle will be on November 15, when interest payments of approximately \$25 billion are due. Overcoming this hurdle will require clever cash management on Treasury's part.

Some have argued that failure to raise the debt ceiling will result in a "train wreck" which will cause Treasury to default and forever

harm the credit of the United States. This need not be true. Treasury Secretary Rubin has told me, both in a letter and in personal conversation, that in the case of reaching the debt ceiling Government obligations would be paid on a first-in-first-out basis. I have introduced H.R. 2098, which would alter this. H.R. 2098 provides that, in the case the Treasury is unable to borrow on a timely basis due to the debt ceiling being reached, the Secretary of the Treasury has authority to follow a priority of payment as established by the President. This will ensure that vital payments will be made as the cash flow is managed in order to preserve the soundness of the existing debt obligations.

In every month that Treasury is likely to be at the debt limit, there is sufficient cash to make all interest payments, Social Security payments, Medicare payments, and other essential payments. Nonessential payments might have to be delayed, but there is no question that interest and principal on Government obligations would be paid.

Moving to my second point, some have argued that it would be irresponsible to not increase the debt limit, even if we do not get a balanced budget agreement, because the financial markets will be so shaken by the possibility of a delay in payments that interest rates will skyrocket. However, it is high long-term real rates that are putting a drag on the economy. A firm commitment by the Congress to balance the budget, to the point of willingness to risk short-term rate increases, could easily flatten the yield curve and shift it down, in other words, lower long-term rates.

Government borrowing consumes massive amounts of America's financial capital. The outstanding debt subject to limit stands at \$4.86 trillion. To put this in perspective, \$4.86 trillion if stacked in \$1,000 bills would reach more than 300 miles into space. The effect of such a debt reaches beyond the obvious effect on interest rates, it places a burden on those who will follow us in shaping this great Nation of ours. Each child born in our country today, during their lifetime, will pay approximately \$187,000 in taxes just to pay their share of the interest on the national debt. That doesn't include paying off one penny of the principal. Boston University economist Laurence Kotlikoff forecasts that, if Federal spending continues at its current rate, a child born today could have up to 84 percent of his income consumed by taxes. In 17 years, if we continue on the current path, all tax revenue will be consumed by entitlements and interest payments on this enormous debt.

Balancing the budget will take several hundred billion dollars out of the demand for loanable funds. The reduction in Treasury demand is part of the reason Chairman Greenspan and others are predicting such a decline in rates. But rates could drop prior to the actual balancing if Congress takes a firm enough position on the issue. Thus, I predict failure to raise the debt ceiling in order to force a balanced budget by 2002 will cause a decline in long-term rates and possibly even short-term rates, given the term structure of U.S. debt.

Nobel Laureate Milton Friedman was espousing his crowding out hypothesis some 30 years ago. He was correct. Government spending will crowd out private investment. Another Nobel Laureate, James Buchanan, and his colleague, Richard Wagner, warned us almost 20 years ago that an unconstrained

Federal deficit would lead to high interest rates and eventually high inflation as the Fed is forced to monetize the debt. In addition, we have seen, over the last 15 years, a massive rise in our trade imbalance. The latter is in good part due to our huge Government borrowing, resulting in foreign countries lending us money instead of buying our goods. It is time that we put a stop to this. We cannot sustain a Leviathan government and retain economic growth and our personal freedom.

What Thomas Jefferson wrote in a letter to Samuel Kercheval in 1816 should be the motto for the debt limit coalition as pressure mounts to compromise: "And to preserve their independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude."

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOROUGH OF EAST NEWARK

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Borough of East Newark, which is celebrating its 100th anniversary this year. Although East Newark is small in size, the residents are known for their big hearts.

Once a part of Kearny, East Newark broke away in the spring of 1895 to become an independent borough. The vote was cast for incorporation on July 2, 1895, and the new borough, just 64 acres in area, became the smallest community in the State of New Jersey.

Two of the early industries in East Newark were the Clark Thread Co. and the Clark Mile End Spool Cotton Co., the largest thread mills in the United States at the time. The companies became Englehard Industries in the early 1930s. The area is now home to the East Newark Industrial Center, which houses over 80 corporations in the garment industry.

With its industries in place, East Newark began to build its community. The East Newark Volunteer Fire Department was organized in October 1895, and the East Newark Police Department was established a month later. Today, both are still in place, 100 years after they were first established to provide for the protection of life and property. East Newark's first public school was built in 1896, and still serves children from kindergarten to eighth grade.

The first church established in the borough was St. Anthony's Roman Catholic Church, the congregation originally founded in 1901 by Italians who moved from West Hoboken. While the original church was destroyed by fire in 1935, it was soon rebuilt and still serves the community today at the same site on Second Street.

In many ways, East Newark's history continues to influence the present. Current Mayor Joseph R. Smith is a descendant of John C. Smith, one of the original petitioners in the effort to establish the borough. I would like to salute Mayor Smith, Council President Walter Roman, Councilman Hans Peter Lucas, Councilman William Lupkovich, Councilman Frank Madalena, Councilman Robert Rowe, and Councilman Charles Tighe for continuing a tradition of excellence in community service.

While the past century has seen monumental changes in the face of the community, East Newark remains an example of smalltown pride and big-spirited determination. With a population of only 2,200, East Newark proves that you do not have to be big in size to make a big contribution. Please join me today in celebrating the 100th anniversary of this little metropolis, which continues to forge its own path on the road to a new century.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CLINTON TOWNSHIP DEPARTMENT OF FIRE/RESCUE

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to observe the 50th anniversary of the Clinton Township Department of Fire/Rescue. The event is being commemorated this evening, September 29, 1995, during a dinner and dance at the Fern Hill Country Club in Clinton Township, MI.

In July 1944, the Township Board of Trustees asked the citizens of the township if they would authorize \$10,000 to purchase equipment and staff a fire department. In November, a bid was accepted for the purchase of a fire truck and by May 1945, Mr. Andrew Rushford was hired as the head of the volunteer fire department.

Fifty years later, the department has grown to 79 highly trained and professional personnel. Since the single engine volunteer days of 1945, the Clinton Township firefighters have come a long way. Annually, members receive over 13,000 contact hours of training. They respond to over 4,000 calls a year. They have one of the best hazardous materials response teams in the State and the Fire Marshall Division investigates the cause of every fire in the township.

We are truly fortunate to have people committed to serving their communities as firefighters. They stand ready to assist people 24 hours a day, regardless of the conditions or how difficult the situation may be. These men and women often face tasks that must be done during the worst moments of other people's lives. Fires, accidents, medical emergencies—regardless of the circumstances, firefighters can be counted on to do their best. The job is one in which we hope that the skills possessed are never used. However, as we all know, when these skills are required, we are grateful for those who have them.

The members of the Clinton Township Department of Fire/Rescue have seen many changes in their community. Largely rural in 1945, Clinton Township has grown to become a populated suburban community. Major highways traverse the city, including Interstate I-94. Despite these changes, the department remains committed to serving the public, not only Clinton Township residents, but often travelers on these many roads who may be residents of other cities, States, and even countries. I believe that one of the most inspiring qualities of firefighters is that their mission is to save all lives, whether the person is young or old, rich or poor. When most are panicked and fleeing a crisis, they are going in and often risking their own lives in the process. The members of the Clinton Township

Department of Fire/Rescue are no exception and on behalf of everyone who has ever needed their services, I thank them for their devotion to duty.

I ask that my colleagues join me in offering heartfelt congratulations to the members of the Clinton Township Department of Fire/Rescue for 50 years of outstanding service. I know that they will continue to serve the public with pride, dedication, and professionalism.

WORLD WAR II COMMEMORATIVE COMMUNITY CEREMONY

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, on August 26 the citizens of Toledo held a ceremony in commemoration of World War II. I was privileged to participate in that ceremony to honor the 70 million strong allied nations who achieved that victory. We honored in particular the 405,000 Americans who gave their lives in that struggle, our 671,000 wounded, and the 16 million who served abroad and on the home front. It was a moving ceremony, Mr. Speaker, and I ask that the remarks of the participants be included here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WORLD WAR II COMMEMORATIVE COMMUNITY CEREMONY

We are here today as free citizens, as the heirs of true patriots. It is especially fitting to commemorate together this 50th anniversary of Allied victory in World War II, and that we publicly pay tribute to the 400,000 dead Americans, 671,000 wounded, the 16 million who served in that war, and the over 70 million Allies who united in a struggle for freedom.

I am pleased to tell you that the final site selection for our nation's World War II Memorial to be located in Washington, DC will be made by the first of October. Ground for the Memorial will be broken on November 4, 1995, a dedication which will kick off a week of celebrations and remembrance—of allied victory in Europe, in the Pacific, and in North Africa and the Mediterranean.

The soon-to-be-built World War II Memorial in our Nation's Capital, which took five years of hard work to gain passage through Congress, will serve as a permanent memorial to the veterans of that war which preserved liberty in this generation. The memorial will also stand in tribute to the home-front families and civilians who served this nation in myriad ways. It is a memorial to the men who captained neighborhood drilling in blackouts, to "Rosie the Riveter", to all of the men and women who kept our country running while so many others were overseas, to everyone who bought a War Bond, who planted a Victory Garden, who carefully utilized ration cards for gasoline and food. And it is a memorial to our nation's truest legacy: the children born after the war, and their children, and their children, and on into the 21st century.

In one way or another America will always be fighting against some form of tyranny, and for the rights of men and women to live in freedom and with dignity. We are reminded of the lofty words in America the Beautiful, "those heroes proved in liberating strife who more than self their country loved, and mercy and sacrifice more than life." We are reminded of how great our debt is to those who went before, and what a real

responsibility it is to measure up to them, to plan and work for our secure and free future, and that of our children.

During this second half of the twentieth century, our country led the world into the nuclear age and tamed its awesome power. Our nation built the Hoover Dam and harnessed the powers of the oceans and the waters. Ours is still the finest health care system in the world even with its shortcomings. Social Security gives our senior citizens dignity in retirement. In the last 50 years, American lifted half of the nation out of poverty and built a middle class.

The Statue of Liberty, Mother of Exiles, boldly remains a beacon of hope to the world's dreamers seeking sanctuary on our golden shores. She observes us today as the sons and daughters of those who faced a darkened world, with tyranny triumphant, and beat back the global forces of darkness to enshrine the rule of law. Our forbearers preserved the inalienable rights of each person and enlarged freedom for the majority. They forged an industrial and agricultural giant, prosperous and democratic, unknown in all the history of humankind. In things great and small, they affirmed again and again their fighting faith that tomorrow would be better than today, that they could make it so.

We, the children of freedom, must rededicate ourselves to bettering America and charting a new course for a new century.

We must infuse the spirit of America—our liberty and our nationhood—with a renewed optimism such as Carl Sandberg captured when he eloquently penned, "I see America, not in the setting sun of a black night . . . I see America in the crimson light of a rising sun, fresh from the burning, creative hand of God. I see great days ahead, great days possible to men and women of will and vision. . . ."

In remembrance of those years of World War II and in recognition of all that has passed in the 50 years that followed the peace of the Spring and Fall of 1945, I am honored to present to Lucas County Commission President Sandy Isenberg this award, conferred by the President of the United States and the U.S. Department of Defense, designating Lucas County, Ohio as a World War II Commemorative Community.

REMARKS BY REV. GEORGE M. RINKOWSKI AT WORLD WAR II COMMEMORATIVE COMMUNITY CEREMONY

To all assembled here, today, and to the whole Nation! A Benediction is a blessing. We, the United States of America, have been wonderfully blessed during the course of our history. But, we have been a blessings to the world at large and to many nations individually. As we commemorate the end of World War II, we must keep in mind our prisoners of war and our missing in action, are comrades. We must not forget the sacrifices these comrades are still making and the suffering they are still suffering for us and our way of life. They must remain alive in our minds and our hearts. Their families continue to suffer along with them.

We are "One Nation Under God" Indivisible, with Liberty and Justice for all. These ten words of our pledge of allegiance to the flag of our country summarize the Declaration of Independence made by fathers of our land. We are commemorating with thanksgiving the many sacrifices of our Army, Navy, AirForce, Marines and Coast Guard who brought liberty and justice to those many nations enslaved by the powers of darkness and the evils of aggression.

In the history of the world there has never been a nation that conquered and the rehabilitated both the freed nations and the ag-

gressor war-mongers. We did good to those who had done so much evil. And we bettered the lives of those who had been overcome by intruders.

Fifty years and in every year since then we have been a blessing to the world. The principles of government which we established a few centuries ago have become the force for good to many nations and a good example to many more.

As we remember with thanksgiving the great work of the sixteen million members of our Armed Forces who served as a bulwark against evil aggressors, we want to commemorate the millions of our fellow citizens who worked and supported our fighting forces. The agony and suspense of those at home cannot be calculated. We send prayers to God to reward them for their goodness.

Thanks be to God!! And God Bless America!

A CHINA-BURMA-INDIA THEATER AND PACIFIC THEATER VETERAN WORLD WAR II

(By Earl W. Hoffsis)

Over 53 years ago I served half way around the world from Toledo, the place of my birth.

After a lengthy, 94 day trip from Newport News, VA, I arrived India, the mysterious East. In the China-Burma-India Theater of war, a land area comprising the largest theater of the war, the majority of the 325,000 manpower were in support of the Army Air Force. My unit, XX Bomber command had the task of preparing and utilizing the newly manufactured Superfort the B-29 to shorten the war in the far east. The CBI theater was last in all supplies, men and equipment as the war was getting hot in the European theater with invasion at Normandy imminent.

In this land of the famous Flying Tigers and Merrill's Marauders and the Mars Task Force, a great deal of the making of the initial airfields was by hand labor with hundreds of Indian and Chinese pulling huge rollers to get the fields in shape for the biggest bomber of the war.

Since supplies were scarce as was the means of getting them to the forward bases, the ATC and Bomb Groups were also put into action to get the gas, bombs, food, clothing and food over the Hump into China. Due to the extreme altitude and many sudden breaking storms, many planes were lost between India and Kunming, China. The route became known as the "Aluminum Trail" due to the many C47's and crews sacrificed through storms, enemy action or accident.

The 4 engine bombers, B-24's and B-29's flew some of the longest missions of World War II, some in excess of 3200 miles, where mines were laid in harbors in the Singapore and Rangoon area.

The Burma, China terrain was some of the roughest of the war. At times, trails were only wide enough for men and their mules, such as those of the 612th and 613th Field Artillery. Few if any jeeps could make the grade or path width. Some of the diseases of the area accounted for many of the casualties of the CBI.

Shortly after seeing the Stars and Stripes at half mast in memory of our fallen leader, President Franklin Roosevelt, the XXth Bomber Command was shipped to Tinian Island, where along with the XXIst Bomber Command located on Tinian, Saipan and Guam were better able to complete their bombing missions in the Tokyo area. The round trip time was 12 to 14 hours.

The gallant Marines, Army and Navy had cleared the Marianas, Okinawa and Iwo Jima with a heavy toll of life. Many heavy bombers were saved by the islands of Okinawa and Iwo Jima being under American Control. In all it reported that over 8,000 airmen were saved from ditching in the Pacific, over enemy territory and with damaged planes

through their making emergency landings on Iwo Jima or Okinawa.

It was from Tinian, a short distance from our base that the Enola Gay made its flight into history. This date just 50 years ago this past August 14 will be known forever as V-J day to all veterans of the China-Burma-India and Asiatic theaters.

For us old veteran, historians cannot change the events as etched permanently in our memory.

LETTER TO MARCY KAPTUR

VETERANS MEMORIAL,
Toledo, Ohio, August 26, 1995.

As a Nation, and as a people, we are always available to celebrate war. Flesh against flesh—blood against blood—and—steel against steel. We mark with pride the winning of war, but without ego centered on victory. Equally we turn out collective back on war, if there is no winner.

Turn back to the end of the war in Korea. Remember . . . that February day when Vietnam released and returned prisoners. Was it victory when Gerry Denton stepped off the plane and held Jane in his arms for the first time in over seven years? It was for Denton, but not for America. We celebrate victory, perhaps, because we have never learned to celebrate peace.

When I came home to Tucson after my time in the service of my country, my road was—perhaps, different from yours, and yours, not because I am a woman, because no sooner was the ink on my separation papers dry—then I was, along with so many other women, lost in the bright light of victory in Asia and in Europe.

My return raised more eyebrows than salutes. The question of patriotism lost in the questions. A widow at 20, a reason, perhaps. A call to do what was needed to be done, a need to compete, anything you can do—I can do better. Or was it a legacy of generations of soldiers and sailors, a bloodline an Uncle in South Africa and winning the Victoria Cross, dead in the battle of the Marne in France. Cousins in the battle of Normandy and in the landings in the Pacific. A brother in the North Atlantic on the run to Murmansk (sp) in Russia. Are my genes less willing? Wiling to take the oath. Any less willing to work for victory? Parades? Celebrations! And perhaps—thanks for the peace.

But no parades, no thanks, only the challenge that comes from the feeling—as soon as I took off that uniform, put my wings in a drawer and visited my mother's grave, that I was overcome by the feelings, my service had stepped into the glare of challenge, and somehow, never cast a shadow.

Like many other women who answered the call, heard the challenge, we marched home to the sound of muffled drums, and vanished. Over the past few years the drums have picked up the beat, was it Desert Storm? Or was it the women, in gun ships, on bomb runs, or was it the shadow of the women in the 1940s who hit the flight lines running, who heard the call.

Was it my cousin who—as a nurse—lead the children into safe haven from the bombing in Liverpool, or was my cousin who commanded an ack ack battery near Dover and who met the ragged convoy coming from France and to find her badly burned brother in those wounded.

My challenge to myself, and to you, today, will be to pledge to volunteer for peace. To extend that hand that covers your heart and reach out to help. Help the fallen and the falling. To steady the step of those who have lost the way. Take the time to share—time—with those who have only the memory of other times. To wage a war for peace!

Hear again the call to volunteer, when you raise your right hand to pledge your life,

your energy, your compassion to win the peace.

As veterans we share a common thread of willingness to be counted. Our Nation is calling on you again to be counted. Get out of the back row and step up front. Into the front lines—get the facts. Get the ammo of involvement, and get off your fences and fight for the right to be an American. A nation that shows the way with people, not with the gold of treasury, the strength of industry, but a people who are celebrating peace; hearing and healing.

I am proud of my American birth, I must also thank the warriors my family gave me in my heritage. A heritage I pledged for war and continue to pledge—again—for peace.

My husband, of only four weeks, name is on this monument. I honor his name and will not forget his sacrifice.

LOIS M. NELSON,
Women Airforce Service Pilot, WWII.

DEDUCTIBILITY FOR THE COST OF PROVIDING MEALS TO EMPLOYEES OF SEAFOOD PROCESSORS OPERATING IN REMOTE LOCATIONS OF ALASKA

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill to restore 100 percent deductibility for meals which seafood processing companies are compelled to provide to their employees at processing operations located in remote areas of Alaska. This legislation is necessary because the limitations on the deductibility of business meals and entertainment enacted in 1986 and 1993 have inadvertently reduced the deductibility of these employer provided meals to only 50 percent. The consequence has been that these companies, most of which are small businesses, are forced to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars in additional taxes simply because they must provide meals to their employees at remote locales where there are no other meal options.

This legislation would conform the treatment of seafood processors under the Internal Revenue Code with the treatment of other employers—such as operators of commercial vessels and oil and gas rigs—who must provide meals to their employees because the employees do not have another practical alternative to obtaining their meals. Under current law, these employers, because they must provide meals to their employees, are permitted to deduct the full cost of such meals as an ordinary and necessary business expense. The bill I am introducing would provide the same treatment for seafood processors in Alaska.

The seafood processing industry in Alaska is primarily located in remote coastal areas of the State, almost all along the Aleutian chain of islands. Most of these facilities operate on a seasonal basis from spring through fall, and must fly their workers in for temporary periods. The processing plants are located near very small towns and native villages. In some cases the processing plant is the only human activity in the area. Because of this isolation and lack of infrastructure the firms which operate in the areas have no choice but to provide all meals consumed by their employees. In fact, these operations are so isolated that the

employers must also provide all housing, recreation, transportation and medical services.

There would be only about 40 firms which fall into the category covered by our legislation. Most employ under 100 people, although some are larger operations with hundreds of workers. But in all cases it must be emphasized that the employer is the only source of food and shelter for the employees and that the plants are located in very remote areas. In many cases there are no other settlements, and, indeed, no other human activity for many miles around. A final significant impact of the industry on our Nation comes from its role as a source of export revenue. Over 50 percent of the export earnings generated by the seafood industry nationwide originates in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. After years of suffering from huge trade deficits it is encouraging to see that our region of the country is making a positive contribution to our balance of payments.

The changes to the tax laws in 1986 and 1993 which reduced the deductibility of business meal and entertainment expenses from 100 percent to 80 percent and then to 50 percent were justified as an appropriate limitation on a discretionary business expense with a significant personal consumption element. The decision was made that good public policy required changing the tax code so that the public was no longer helping defray the cost for business organizations to entertain clients and other business associates.

However, Congress recognized that where the employer must as a practical or legal matter provide meals to employees—that is, where the employees do not really have the option of providing meals for themselves—that such a mandatory cost of business should continue to be fully deductible to the business. Under current law, employers of crew members on certain commercial vessels and employers of certain oil and gas workers, who provide meals to their employees when those employees have no real alternative means of obtaining food are permitted to deduct the full cost of providing the meals. The same precise situation applies to seafood processors in Alaska and they should be governed by the same rule. Their workers cannot go to a restaurant, they cannot go home and they cannot bring meals with them to work since they live in bunkhouses and do not have access to grocery stores.

The companies which are covered by this amendment have paid the Federal treasury millions of dollars in taxes since 1986. These tax payments are both unintended and unfair. In attempting to correct the abuse of the three martini lunch Congress certainly did not intend to burden legitimate businesses which are providing meals to their employees in cases where those employees have no other source of food.

ITALIAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE

HON. WILLIAM J. MARTINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Columbus Day and in celebration of Italian-American heritage.

In 1492, Christopher Columbus, a brave and noble explorer landed in a vast and foreign

land full of promise. His courage and desire for success made him a hero to his people and a leader among men.

Today, centuries later, we recognize this historic day to pay tribute to Christopher Columbus and all Americans who boldly strive for success in their communities. By making the most out of Columbus's discovery every day the American people have distinguished themselves as an exceptional Nation.

Columbus Day celebrates our proud and united people and recognizes in particular the unique Italian-American experience. With strong leadership and eternal pride, Italian-American communities distinguish themselves through a strong sense of family and dedication to their youth.

Through the work of such groups as UNICO National, an organization committed to support youth programs, community development and other charitable societies, children and adults in the Italian-American community view the achievements of past leaders and understand what actions epitomize role models. Without the unceasing efforts of an exceptional staff, UNICO National would not enjoy the success and prestige that have come to characterize the organization.

In honor of their dedication to the growth and development of their communities and the United States as a whole, one day a year is devoted to acknowledging the contributions and achievements of Italian-Americans. Happy Columbus Day to my fellow Italian-Americans as they celebrate our patriotic heritage.

OTA: DEFENSE AGAINST THE DUMB

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, today marks the last day of existence for the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment [OTA]. For 23 years OTA has served the American public by giving invaluable guidance and analysis on the dizzying array of technological advances we face in modern society. In its ignorance, Congress has voted to end this institution. It will be missed.

In recent months, I have seen a lot of mindless things being done in the American public's name. First we saw science-based regulatory decisionmaking being used as a slogan for the process of gutting Federal health and safety regulations. Then we have witnessed the slashing of research budgets designed to provide the science upon which these decisions were to be based. Across government, research and development budgets have been cut in order to pay for tax cuts that we don't need.

This mindless approach to government substitutes public relations gimmicks for policy, trying to palm off as reforms simplistic proposals to sell House office buildings, dissolve cabinet agencies, and end daily ice deliveries to House offices. The unfortunate irony of this process is that the victim of this irrationality has been an agency set up to make the legislative process more rational: OTA.

I was serving in Congress in the mid-1960's when we first discussed the need for OTA. In what seems like the dark ages, before e-mail,

genetic engineering, flip phones, and dozens of other technologies that have changed our lives, we were concerned that the rush of technological advance would overwhelm our ability to make rational political judgments. We looked over the various congressional support agencies and did not find the kind of scientific and technological expertise needed to address the challenge. So, we created OTA, an agency that has served Congress well in the intervening years.

In recent months we have heard many criticisms of OTA, as those intent upon issuing press releases on the downsizing of government focused upon that agency's elimination. Some said that OTA studies took too long. But the OTA was established to provide comprehensive, balanced analysis of complex questions. It looked at the technology, at its social and economic impacts, and then made a range of recommendations for congressional action. That process takes a long time. For those with short attention spans, those who fear factual information because their minds are already made up, and those who never get past the executive summary of "shake and bake" boiler-plate policy reviews, OTA probably takes too long. For those of us who take our elective responsibilities seriously, careful analysis is a necessity.

Some critics have maintained that other congressional support agencies could accomplish the same task. That was not the case in 1972 and is even less true today. None of the support agencies have the expertise that OTA had on science and technology issues. None of these agencies employ the use of a balanced panel of outside experts and stakeholders to review the issue under examination. None of these agencies have a bipartisan, bicameral governing body to insure neutrality and independence. None of these agencies have a science advisory panel composed of world-class science and technology leaders. Each of these agencies have expertise and produce competent studies, but none can produce the high-quality in-depth studies for which OTA has become internationally known.

And I disagree with those who say that the executive branch, or the National Academy of Sciences, or some department of science could provide this information. These are not congressional agencies. They cannot tailor information to the unique needs of the legislative branch. And, as we determined when we first looked at this issue in the 1960's, we did not want the legislative held captive to information produced by the executive branch, without regard to which party is in the White House.

Mr. Speaker, as someone who was around at the birth of this agency, it saddens me to be present at its death. It saddens me to see dedicated public servants turned out of jobs that they performed with outstanding competence, even up until the final hours today. Each of us owes a debt of gratitude to those people and each of us has a responsibility to help them make the transition to another position. For those of my colleagues who are unaware, these people cannot use the Ramspeck provisions to move into civil service jobs. In fact they do not even have active civil service status. We have treated these people poorly and they deserve much better.

Let me conclude with an observation made by a former OTA employee who stated OTA's task as being to create for Congress a "de-

fense against the dumb." It is shameful that in the end, OTA was defenseless against a very dumb decision by Congress.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE LIFE OF CLEVELAND L. ROBINSON

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Cleveland L. Robinson, distinguished leader of the trade union movement and fighter for economic and civil rights. Indeed, he spent his life working for the poor and for those who have the least. Mr. Robinson's life is a great example of leadership for the new generation. Mr. Robinson passed away on August 23, 1995, and was buried in New York. In honor of Mr. Robinson and for the edification of my colleagues, I introduce the following statement:

CLEVELAND L. ROBINSON

Cleveland Lowellyn Robinson was born December 12, 1914, in Swaby Hope, a rural parish of Manchester, in Jamaica. He worked as an assistant teacher and then as a police officer until he emigrated to the United States in 1914.

Cleve, as he was known to all, began his union career in the United States in 1946, when he successfully led an effort to unionize the Manhattan dry goods company, where he worked. He joined the staff of District 65 as an organizer in 1947, was elected vice-president of the union in 1950 and secretary-treasury in 1952, a post he held until his retirement in 1992. During the 1950s and 1960s, Cleve led the Negro Affairs Committee, supervised the union's work in the south, and led its adult literacy and vocational education programs.

During the fifties, he worked with A. Philip Randolph to found the Negro American Labor Council and become the council's president upon Randolph's retirement in 1966. Cleve was a charter member of the organization's successor, the National Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, and served as CBTU's executive vice-president until his death.

Cleve was a close friend and advisor to the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. in 1963, Cleve served as the administrative chair for the great March on Washington. Cleve's work epitomized the union's philosophical and organizational commitment to civil rights that led King to describe District 65 as "the conscience of the labor movement." Cleve also served as a commissioner of the New York City Commission on Human Rights under Mayors Wagner and Lindsay. He was a life member of the NAACP since 1953, and a member of the boards of directors of the southern Christian Leadership Conference and the Martin Luther King, Jr., Center for Non-Violent Social Change. He was a founding member of the New York State Martin Luther King, Jr. Commission, appointed by Governor Mario Cuomo as the commission's vice-chairman in 1985 and the chairman in 1993.

Cleve was also a staunch supporter of the African National Congress since the early 1960s and a close friend of the Congress of South Africa Trade Unions [COSATU]. He was a founder of the Labor Committee Against Apartheid Coordinating Council, and co-chair of the official visit of Nelson Mandela to New York in 1990.

Cleve continually maintained close ties to his native Jamaica, organizing relief efforts

for hurricane victims and other support projects. The government of Jamaica bestowed upon him numerous honors, including the coveted Independence Day Award in 1992.

In 1993, Cleve was made an Honorary doctor of Humane Letters by Brooklyn College of the City University of New York.

Cleveland Robinson was an indefatigable organizer and champion of workers' economic and civil rights for over forty years. He dedicated his life's work to the realization of Dr. King's "beloved community." His work was not deterred by the loss of his eyesight to glaucoma during the 1960s. It was often said that Cleve may have lost his sight, but that he was a man of great vision.

He is survived by his beloved family, his wife of 18 years, the former Doreen McPherson; his sister, Myra Sinclair; his sons, Winston and Noel, and daughter-in-law, Lucille; his daughter, Barbara Stuart; and six grandchildren. His first wife, Susan Jenkins Robinson, passed away in 1970.

DEFEND LIFE AND OUR NATION

HON. RICHARD "DOC" HASTINGS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, let me clearly say to my fellow colleagues in the House that I strongly believe in the sanctity of life, and it is with great reluctance that I vote today for the Defense appropriations conference report. I remain concerned that the language of this conference report—which would prohibit the use of abortions at military medical facilities—will only go into affect if the Defense authorization report contains similar language. I have made it clear that the Defense authorization conference must not alter this important language.

As a member of the National Security Committee, however, I am also aware of the fact that our party has committed to revitalizing our defense, and this legislation is the key element of fulfilling that promise. Defense spending has been cut by nearly 30 percent over the past 5 years. Spending on procurement of military hardware has fallen by almost 75 percent over that same period of time. President Clinton's defense budget would slash another \$7 billion out of our national security. This bill freezes spending at last year's level, giving our Armed Forces much needed resources in these uncertain times.

I understand the concerns expressed by some of my colleagues. But there is no reason to expect that sending the bill back to conference would result in strengthening the anti-abortion language already in the bill. There is, however, a very good chance that doing so could deny our young men and women in uniform funds which are essential to their safety, their training, and to the equipment which they must have to do their job.

This is a difficult vote. But I have decided that I must vote in favor of a strong national defense today, and continue to work to protect our unborn in the days, weeks, and months ahead.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I urge those members who serve on the Department of Defense authorization conference committee—which is meeting this week—to retain language which will defend innocent life and provide for the vital functions of our Nation's defense at home and abroad.

INTRODUCTION OF FARMS FOR THE FUTURE ACT OF 1995

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Farms for the Future Act of 1995. I have joined my friend Mr. GILCHREST in drafting this bill to help fix a problem that threatens the very essence of Thomas Jefferson's vision of our Republic: the family farm.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture Resource Inventory shows that the Nation is losing over 1 million acres of productive farmland each year to urban development. This represents a loss of topsoil roughly equivalent to that being saved by Federal erosion control efforts, including the Conservation Reserve Program.

The land being lost is disproportionately prime farmland with the highest productivity. In many cases, it is irreplaceable as a source of domestic fruit and vegetable production, 85 percent of which comes from counties near expanding cities.

The loss of this land threatens our Nation's long-term ability to produce abundant inexpensive food supply and compete in the global agricultural market. Moreover, keeping this land in agricultural production has additional benefits, ranging from watershed and wildlife habitat enhancement, to reducing the tax burden on communities from wasteful urban sprawl.

Since the late 1970's, States and localities have invested an estimated \$650 million to protect this resource—funds that went directly into farmers' pockets in exchange for voluntarily agreeing not to develop their property. This has protected 400,000 acres of high-quality farmland, but a study by the American Farmland Trust shows that for every farmer the States can help, another six willing farmers are disappointed. Meanwhile, the Federal Government has contributed almost nothing.

This is wrong. A national problem of this magnitude deserves national attention. The State and local leaders in this effort deserve a Federal partner. And the farmers who have been turned away from State and local programs because of a lack of resources deserve Federal support to help them meet their goals.

This Federal response should be governed by two basic principles. First, Federal efforts to conserve productive farmland must protect the private property rights of farmers. Second, the Federal Government should build upon existing and future State and local farmland preservation efforts.

My bill does that by simply helping the existing State farmland conservation programs more effectively serve the farmers and other agricultural landowners who want to get the equity out of their land without contributing to urban sprawl. It would establish a matching grant program to add Federal resources to this State driven effort.

I urge my colleagues support of this legislation.

1996 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Defense appropriations conference report for fiscal year 1996. With the severe cuts the Republican majority is making in education, environmental protection, housing programs, and in other vital needs, increasing defense spending by nearly \$7 billion dollars more than the Pentagon requested is not justified.

The security of the United States cannot be provided for by simply increasing the number of planes, bombers, and submarines. Economic security, safety at work, and access to quality health care are real elements of national security. How can we say the United States is more secure with these appropriations, while Medicare is being cut; while funds are reduced for occupational safety for American workers; while educational programs are gutted?

The conference report provides for more B-2 stealth bombers, B-2's that are not part of the Pentagon's request. That's \$493 million for unnecessary planes while programs to assist senior citizens are slashed. The report continues in this vein, with funding for the *Seawolf* submarine, an increase in spending on Star Wars missile defense, and billions more for other weapons and programs.

At the same time as funding spirals upward for uncalled for defense programs, the Republican majority is sacrificing funds for the United States share of U.N. peacekeeping operations and cutting United States assistance for the demilitarization of the former Soviet Union. The environment also takes a hit in this conference report. Programs to clean-up environmental contamination from past military activities and to improve current and future Defense Department environmental awareness also receive less funding. This is short-sighted and misses the aspects of security that comprise our quality of life, a quality that is linked to the environment in which we live.

Mr. Speaker, the security of the United States is not served by this conference report. We need smart people not just smart bombs! Increasing spending on weapons and programs the Pentagon did not ask for does not provide security for workers, students, children, or senior citizens. I strongly urge a "No" vote on the Defense conference report.

TRIBUTE TO SANFORD RUBENSTEIN

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank Mr. Sanford Rubenstein for his work as a delegate to the 1995 White House Conference on Small Business. His contributions at the conference were helpful in formulating a small business policy agenda for the 21st Century. Mr. Rubenstein participated in vital discussions that are critical

to small businesses, such as the need to access capital, regulatory reform, and pro-growth tax policies.

The recommendations of Mr. Rubenstein and his fellow delegates at the conference will serve as the basis for important new legislation which will be considered by the Congress and the President. Sandy Rubenstein's selfless work in making the 1995 White House Conference on Small Business should be recognized and commended.

COMMEMORATING 50 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate J.P. Griffin, Inc. and Griffin Service Corp. on the occasion of their 50th anniversary in business.

Their story is a vivid illustration of the promise of opportunity which is inherent to freedom. It began with a handshake. That's when Lester Olson became a one-third partner in J.P. Griffin, Inc., an appliance repair company he had joined a year earlier when the firm was launched. Leaving a secure position with a shipyard where he made \$840 per month, he began his new job making the grand sum of \$30 per week. But Lester and his wife Yelive knew how to combine opportunity with hard work and sacrifice.

As the company took on more and more jobs involving the installation of commercial refrigerated display cases and walk-in coolers, it became a natural transition to move into work with refrigerated shipping vessels, and finally, air conditioning.

By the early 1950's, Floridians were turning off their fans, closing their windows, and installing central air conditioning in their homes and businesses. J.P. Griffin, Inc. was one of the leaders during this breakthrough period.

In the early 1960's, the service department was separated from the construction department, and Griffin Service Corp. was set up under the management of Ted Wade. Today, Bryan Lingerfelt manages Griffin, Inc., just as his father did for over 20 years.

No history of the development of modern Tampa would be complete without mentioning the impact of companies like J.P. Griffin, Inc. and the Griffin Service Corp. Equally as important, their community contributions have been significant throughout the years.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate Griffin Inc. and Griffin Service for 50 years of excellence.

SUPPORT HUMANE TREATMENT OF HORSES

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the "Safe Commercial Transportation of Horses for Slaughter Act of 1995." This legislation would improve the handling care and equipment requirement for the safe

transportation of horses for slaughter. Similar legislation has been introduced in the Senate.

Last year, I was stunned by an article in *Equidae*, the National Horseman's Inc., publication, that exposed the inhumane treatment of horses transported for slaughter. Imagine injured, pregnant, and ill horses crammed into cattle cars with combative stallions and other horses to be shipped on long journeys to slaughterhouses with no dividers separating them. For those of you who are not horse enthusiasts, it's like putting a fox in a hen house. As a thoroughbred owner, I find this appalling. Many including myself, consider horses to be a part of their families like a dog or cat. Can you imagine this treatment to Fido or Fluffy? I think not.

I recently met with Kelly Young and Nancy Waite from my district and Trina Bellak of the Humane Society of the United States about this matter. On a recent trip to a horse auction in New Holland, PA, they described the horrible conditions to which these horses are subjected. One mare was found so ill, she lay trembling on the floor of a trailer. An attendant attempted to rescue it, but, unfortunately, was too late. The mare had to be put down. The tragedy is that had she not found this horse, it would have been thrown into a trailer with dozens of other horses, and most likely would have died from overcrowding.

However, what is even more repugnant is that an individual from New York, an attendant at the auction, has been convicted of violating 150 counts of New York's State law regulating horse transport. He has accumulated fines amounting to \$11,000 and has yet to pay them. Meanwhile, horses continue to be transported in vehicles with ceilings too low for their height. Pregnant mares, new born foals, rambunctious stallions, and injured horses continue to be packed together, often without food or water for days.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation would give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to ensure that protections are in place to prevent these horrendous practices that occur during the transport of horses for slaughter. This legislation makes no attempt to outlaw the slaughter industry, but rather protect horses from unnecessary pain and suffering.

This bill would require horses to be rested and provided food and water after traveling no longer than 24 hours; vehicles would be required to be in sanitary condition and provide at least 6 feet, 6 inches of headroom; provide adequate ventilation and shelter from extreme heat and cold; be of appropriate size for the number of horses transported; allow for position of horses by size, and separation of stallions; provide for veterinarians to determine if horses are able to withstand stress of transportation.

Several States have passed legislation similar to this bill. However, because this is an interstate industry, it is necessary to have a uniform Federal law. My bill has the full support of the American Horse Council, the American Horse Protection Association, and the Humane Society of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to co-sponsor this legislation which is specifically geared toward providing horses adequate protection during transportation for slaughter. I plead with all animal enthusiasts to support this bill.

TIP OF THE HAT TO A 31ST DISTRICT VOLUNTEER

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, every so often, a member of our society goes far beyond the normal call of duty, and deserves special recognition. One of my constituents, John Van Wicklin, is such a person.

In November of 1994, John shared with me his vision of holding a weeklong summer camping program for abused and neglected children in rural Allegany County—one of the poorest counties in New York State, if not the Nation. He set up a chapter of the Royal Family Kids' Camp [RFKC], a nonprofit organization founded by Wayne Tesch of Costa Mesa, CA.

The main objectives of RFKC are to provide abused and neglected children (ages 6–12) with a safe haven from the horrors of abuse, a fun-filled week, a host of positive memories and role models, and a context of basic Christian values. His goal was to raise \$11,000 to cover the costs of running the camp. Whatever he couldn't raise, he was prepared to pay out of his own pocket.

John worked directly with Commissioner Joan Sinclair, Ben Fanton and others in the Allegany County Department of Social Services to identify the 28 hardest cases in the county's system. As they identified these children, the hard work of raising the necessary dollars and recruiting volunteers of all different backgrounds and interests began.

Scores of people answered the call by volunteering their time, energy and resources to make John's vision a reality. People from all walks of life pitched in—many community members donated materials; a local medical doctor, Doug Mayhle, took time out of his busy schedule to be a camp counselor; a player from the Buffalo Bills signed autographs and sent a message to each kid; and the faculty, staff, administration and students of Houghton College were a huge help. Also, thanks to many gracious donors, his financial goal was comfortably surpassed.

In the end, everyone's hard work paid off, and the camp was a tremendous success. John sent me a letter in July of 1995, to relay a story from the camp. There are many stories. Each one starts with a young child who was in some way denied part of his or her childhood. Each story ends with a child who was given the chance to be a kid again, in an environment without the terror of being physically, sexually, or mentally abused. Children with dreadful worries—much greater than any child should ever have—were seen laughing and smiling with other children of similar backgrounds, and a group of dedicated adults whom they learned to trust.

John plans to hold another camp in 1996, and increase his budget to accommodate more children. From what I understand, people are already lining up at John's doorstep to get involved.

Mr. Speaker, my hat's off to John Van Wicklin. I hop you and all of my colleagues here in Congress will join me in saluting him and the many friends and volunteers of the Royal Family Kids' Camps around the Nation. Their spirit and dedication are much appreciated.

ANNIVERSARY OF KHALISTAN'S
INDEPENDENCE

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, on October 7, 1987, the Sikh Nation took its destiny into its own hands by declaring the independence of Khalistan. I am very pleased to salute the Sikhs of Khalistan on this anniversary.

The Sikh Nation ruled Punjab in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and was supposed to receive its own country when the British freed India in 1947. Though promised by India that their freedom would be protected, those promises collapsed like a house of cards. As a result, no Sikh has ever signed the Indian constitution and the Sikh Nation has struggled ever since then to regain its sovereignty.

I find it appropriate that as the anniversary of Khalistan's independence approaches, the government of Canada is re-opening its investigation into the 1985 explosion of an Air India jetliner which killed 329 people to determine if there was any involvement by the Indian government.

In this light, American support for Khalistan's independence is crucial. I commend the Council of Khalistan for the work it is doing to free the Sikh Nation and I join my colleagues in congratulating the Sikh Nation on the anniversary of Khalistan's declaration of independence.

I am placing into the record a review of *Soft Target*, the book that describes the Air India case, by David Kilgour, a Canadian Member of Parliament, and an article from *Awaze Quam* by Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan.

SHOULD THE U.S. BE TRADING WITH INDIA?

WASHINGTON.—Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan, today condemned India's downing of its own airliner ten years ago. June 23 marks the tenth anniversary of the attack, which killed 329 people. "This was a tragic event," said Dr. Aulakh. The Sikh Nation extends its deepest sympathies to the families of the victims. This act was brutal terrorism in its most naked form.

Agents of the Indian regime openly blamed the Sikhs for the attack even before it was known to the public that it had happened. But in *Soft Target*, journalist Brian McAndrew of the Toronto Star and Zuhair Kashmeri of the Toronto Globe and Mail, show conclusively that the Indian regime blew up its own airliner.

In the book, an agent of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) is quoted as saying "If you really want to clear the incidents quickly, take vans down to the Indian High Commission and the consulates in Toronto and Vancouver, load everybody up and take them down for questioning. We know it and they know it that they are involved." According to the book, the Indian consul general in Toronto, Surinder Malik, identified and "L. Singh" whom Malik said was a Sikh activist in Canada, as the culprit. This occurred when the police had just found the passenger register. But according to Kashmeri and McAndrew, Malik took his wife and daughter off that flight shortly before it departed. An auto dealer who was a friend of Malik's also cancelled his reservation at the last minute.

The book also reports that less than a year before the Air India bombing, 29 people were

killed and 32 injured in an airplane bombing Madras which also appears to have been planned by Indian Intelligence. According to *Soft Target* "CSIS found the similarities between the Madras plot and the bombing—aboard Air India remarkable." Additionally, according to Kashmeri and McAndrew, "CSIS was astounded that such similar plans could be hatched in opposite parts of the world. It would not be so astounding though, if the plans emanated from the same source—namely, from within the Indian intelligence service."

"Brutal terrorist acts like the Air India bombing should prevent any country from receiving American aid or trade," said Dr. Aulakh. "Events like this only remind us that India is a brutal tyrant which will stop at nothing to achieve its aims. If America is a moral country, it must cut off all aid to India." Dr. Aulakh said.

Recently, India has emerged as a new U.S. business partner despite evidence that it is collapsing. Several Swiss drug companies pulled out last year due to the unstable market and the Washington Post reported last fall that it takes the average Indian three days pay just to buy a box of Corn Flakes. Yet the U.S. and India have exchanged visits from high-level officials in pursuit of increased trade between India and the United States.

The Indian regime has murdered over 120,000 Sikhs since 1984. It has also killed over 43,000 Kashmiri Muslims since 1988, over 150,000 Christians in Nagaland since 1947, and tens of thousands of Assamese, Marupuris, and others. According to the U.S. State Department, over 41,000 cash bounties were paid to police officers between 1991 and 1993 for killing Sikhs.

Many people are beginning to see the breakup of India as inevitable. Dr. Jack Wheeler of Freedom Research Foundation, who foresaw the Soviet breakup, predicted last year in the newsletter *Strategic Investment* that within ten years, Indian "will cease to exist as we know (it)."

On October 7, 1987, the Sikh nation declared the independent country of Khalistan. No Sikh has ever signed the Indian constitution. Sikh ruled Punjab from 1710 to 1716 and from 1765 to 1849. In the February 1992 state elections in Punjab, only 4 percent of the Sikhs there voted, according to Indian Abroad. On December 26, former Member of Parliament Simranjit Singh Mann spoke to a crowd of 50,000 Sikhs calling for a peaceful, democratic, nonviolent movement to liberate Khalistan. He asked those attending to raise their hands if they supported freedom for Khalistan. All 50,000 did so. For that speech he was arrested on January 5 under the new-expired Terrorist and Disruptive Activities Act (TADA), despite the fact that the Punjab and Haryana High Court has ruled that speaking out for Khalistan is not a crime. Mr. Mann remains in illegal detention in a windowless cell after more than five months.

"The continuing detention of Sardar Mann shows how frightened India is of an idea," said Dr. Aulakh. "Just talking about freedom for Khalistan terrifies the brutal tyrants of New Delhi. But freedom for Khalistan and all the nations living under brutal Indian occupation is inevitable," said Dr. Aulakh.

"India is not one nation," he said, "It is a conglomeration of many nations thrown together for administrative purposes by the British. It is last vestige of colonialism. With 18 official language, India is doomed to disintegrate just as the former Soviet Union did." Dr. Aulakh said, "The Sikh Nation's demand for an independent Khalistan is irrevocable, irreversible, and non-negotiable. But we are willing to sit down with the In-

dian regime anytime to demarcate the boundaries of Khalistan. A peaceful resolution to this issue is in India's interest. It is time for India to recognize the inevitable and withdraw from Khalistan and all the nations it brutally occupies."

WHAT LAY BEHIND THE AIR-INDIA DISASTER

(By David Kilgour)

This book will be received with hostility by External Affairs Minister Joe Clark and his departmental advisers on India, the Indian High Commission in Ottawa and segments of the RCMP and CSIS. Canadians who cling to the romantic but fast-fading notion that the present government in New Delhi is a beacon of hope for a non-violent and democratic world will also be skeptical.

Basing their conclusions partly on information leaked by RCMP, CSIS and Metro Toronto Police investigators, journalists Zuhair Kashmeri and Brian McAndrew contend in *Soft Target* that during most of the eighties senior Canadian Cabinet ministers and their officials—who were obsessed with winning the favor of the two Gandhi governments for trade, Commonwealth and North-South reasons—were easily duped by Indian agents operating within Canada. This manipulation, begun partly because India's Congress I Party needed the Sikhs as scapegoats to win votes on a law-and-order platform, resulted in a large community of hard-working and enterprising Canadians becoming estranged from both Ottawa and a good deal of Canadian society.

A particularly refreshing feature of *Soft Target* is its treatment of Sikhism, a 500-year-old faith few Canadians know much about. The founder, Guru Nanak, believed in one God, a classless democracy and equality of the sexes. A later guru built the Golden Temple in Punjab, probably more spiritually important to Sikhs worldwide than the Vatican to Catholics or Mecca to Moslems. The last and most influential guru, Gobind Singh, first persuaded many Sikhs to wear the turban and four other faith symbols largely so that they could not deny their religion when persecuted for it. The Sikh homeland, which at its peak stretched from Tibet to Afghanistan, was lost in 1839 when its ruler converted to Christianity and came under the control of England's ubiquitous Queen Victoria.

The first Sikhs who in 1904 managed to settle on Canada's West Coast, despite MacKenzie King's effort, as deputy labor minister, to bar all Indian immigrants until 1947, experienced much hardship. By the eighties, however, 200,000 to 250,000 Sikhs were prospering across Western and Central Canada, when Indira Gandhi ordered the attack on the Golden temple. She had first detained hundreds of suspected Sikh separatists and, in 1981, unleashed a surveillance operation against expatriate Khalistani supporters in Canada and elsewhere.

Two cases examined here are the shooting of Toronto policeman Chris Fernandes and the Air-India disaster. About the Fernandes killing, the authors conclude that *agents provocateurs* from the Toronto Indian consulate, seeking to discredit Sikhs generally among Canadians, in effect engineered the violence at the demonstration where Fernandes was shot. The vice-consul had inflamed some of the participants, had predicted in advance that violence might break out and even hired a friend's son to photograph the event. Canadian public opinion predictably sided with the Indian and Canadian governments against the Sikhs.

The worst mass murder in Canadian history occurred near Ireland for years ago, killing 329 Air-India passengers, many of them Canadian citizens, and crew. Many people concluded that Canadian Sikhs had

placed a bomb on board, but a nation-wide investigation, costing an estimated \$60-million, has left the crime still unsolved.

According to Soft Target, some senior CSIS officials and one RCMP officer eventually concluded that an Indian intelligence service was probably the real culprit. After all, a number of persons associated with the Indian government had cancelled their reservations on the doomed flight. And why did the Indian consul-general in Toronto have a near-perfect account of what happened so soon after the event?

Moreover, a similar bombing had occurred at the Madras airport in southern India about a year earlier, most probably caused by the Third agency, an Indian intelligence group created in the early eighties to win support for Indira Gandhi's government by encouraging Sikh extremists in Punjab. One group at CSIS concluded from the exclusively circumstantial evidence available that most likely the Third agency ordered the bombing, knowing that suspicion would fall on Sikhs generally and Canadian ones in particular. Another CSIS group inferred that the planting of a bomb was not authorized in New Delhi, but originated solely with local security agents.

Some Canadians became convinced that Talwinder Singh Parmar, head of a tiny extremist Sikh group based in Vancouver, the Babbar Khalsa, was the Air-India murderer. The RCMP, say Kashmeri and McAndrew, eventually decided that Parmar was an agent of the government of India. They query why, among numerous contradictions, a major financial backer of Parmar in Vancouver received a \$2 million loan from the State Bank of India (Canada). By early 1989, Parmar had disappeared, and Joe Clark finally ordered several Indian diplomats to leave. Until then, as detailed carefully in Soft Target, Clark and his officials had accommodated the Indian government repeatedly in ways that seemed to have the effect of poisoning the minds of Canadians against Sikhs.

This controversial book examines some important issues and is largely convincing. All who want Ottawa to do the correct thing for correct reasons in both domestic and foreign policy should read it.

IS AMERICORPS WORTH KEEPING?

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I think you will find Susan Molinari's article on AmeriCorps informative:

IS AMERICORPS WORTH KEEPING?

(By Susan Molinari)

Volunteerism is a tremendously American tradition. Few of us, however, would characterize a volunteer as someone who is paid (more than minimum wage) receives medical benefits and child care allowances, and gets a \$5,000 education stipend.

Welcome to the AmeriCorps world of volunteerism.

The Clinton administration's year-old AmeriCorps program is riddled with problems, not the least of which is that it's too expensive to administer. That's why the Senate followed the House's lead and voted on Tuesday to completely de-fund AmeriCorps. The government simply must stop making financial commitments it can't keep, especially when we have to rob other needed programs to do so.

OTHER PROGRAMS SUFFER

Despite that fact that we were able to fund the 20,000 AmeriCorps "volunteers," we could not, for instance, fully fund either the Pell Grant or the Stafford Loan program, both of which help thousands more.

For every AmeriCorps participant who got education dollars, five students could get Pell Grants. Factor in other, noneducation costs for one volunteer to participate in AmeriCorps, and the number of Pell Grants that could be funded jumps to 18.

Some of AmeriCorps' high costs are directly attributable to the way this "volunteer" program is administered. The non-partisan, independent General Accounting Office estimates that it costs \$27,000 per participant to run the program, and this figure jumps to \$33,000 when the dropout rate is factored in.

AmeriCorps' overhead, including \$2 million in payments to a public relations firm, accounts for some of the more than \$10,000-per-participant cost overruns from the \$17,000 originally estimated. More than half the cost of the program goes to pay for the bureaucrats who administer it.

According to the GAO, the price tag to the federal government for one AmeriCorps volunteer is \$15.30 per hour, including salary, health and child care benefits. This doesn't include the education stipend, training or administrative overhead. When you plug in the money cities, states and private sources kick in, the cost per hour for one volunteer's time jumps to \$19.60, again minus education stipend, training and overhead. Originally, this number was supposed to be \$6.43 per hour.

While government costs soar way over initial projections, private contributions have been much lower than expected. Rather than picking up half the costs, as was promised at the outset, private funds make up only 7% of the cost for each volunteer, the GAO now estimates.

Rather than costly new government bureaucracies, we have a better way to encourage charity and foster community spirit. For decades we have used the tax code to create just such an atmosphere, through deductions for charitable contributions. And we have a better way to fund the education of middle and lower-income students—by fully funding existing programs such as Pell Grants, to the extent resources will allow.

I admire the 20,000 young men and women who have joined AmeriCorps, as I admire the 89.2 million Americans who volunteer—without pay—their 19 billion hours worth of time each year. Trying to encourage volunteerism through a big-government approach, however, does more to encourage bureaucrats than community service.

AmeriCorps participants do worthy work, but the real substance of American-style volunteerism is proven every day by those who are willing to give their time to make others' lives better.

MEDICARE REFORM

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today about the subject of Medicare. It is a topic that has been in the headlines and on the news every day now for weeks. It is on the minds of almost every constituent I see. It is among the foremost issues we are addressing here in this body, and definitely, I think it

would be safe to say, is the current major concern of seniors across America.

The GOP has put out a plan to cut Medicare. Based on what is known or perhaps I should say not known in terms of legislative language being unavailable, this plan is one which it seems will have a devastating impact on the most vulnerable of Americans—senior citizens.

In a letter I received from the Families USA Foundation it spoke about how seniors will lose guaranteed health protections that they have today. It spoke about how these individuals will lose out-of-pocket health cost protections at the same time that pending proposals would double Medicare premiums. We're talking about out-of-pocket health costs which already consume more than one-fourth of seniors' incomes.

What this says to me is that something is drastically wrong—that this is not the path to pursue.

Allow me quote from a letter I received this week from a Texas senior:

As a Senior Citizen and drawing Social Security, which I earned, I would like to input my viewpoint on Medicare. I am more fortunate than some of my widow friends in the amount that I get each month, but with the price of living today it is not very much. Out of this Social Security deducts \$46.00 per month and believe me this covers very little, so in order to pay for health care I am forced to take a supplemental policy that costs me \$65.00 per month. If Congress cuts any part of this Medicare care it will force all of us to go on the county medical care for the indigent. Can you imagine what that would do to the whole country if all the people on Medicare had to go that way. Most of us have worked hard all our lives and paid our bills, but what the government has done . . . is unforgivable . . . and NOW they want to put us all on WELFARE.

This is typical of what I am hearing. People are frightened. People are scared. And rightly so.

My party is closely identified with Medicare. Democrats first conceived of Medicare and led the effort to enact the program into law. We have been its champions ever since. This program has been a success, helping to provide health care to millions of Americans who otherwise could not afford it. That is not bad as so many today would have us believe. It is good. If changes need to be made then our goal must be to work together to determine what it is we need to do that is positive and will continue to protect our Nation's seniors. That is what I am wholeheartedly committed to doing.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO INCREASE DEDUCTION FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS OF SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will restore equity and fairness in the tax treatment of the nation's small business entrepreneurs. The Self-Employed Health Fairness Act amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals to 100% of such costs.

Mr. Speaker, our tax code is fundamentally unfair to the self-employed in its treatment of the deductibility of health insurance. Large corporations enjoy a permanent, 100% deduction for health insurance premiums, while the self-employed business person has previously received only a 25% deduction. Congress enacted legislation this year to make the deduction permanent, and to raise it from 25% to 30% in 1995.

I supported this legislation and was encouraged by its passage. For the sake of fairness, however, we should take the next logical step and raise the deductibility for the self-employed to 100%. We must ask ourselves a very basic and fundamental question: Why should we treat the self-employed small business person differently from a large corporation?

The fact is, small business is, by far, the country's most important motivator for innovation, job creation and economic growth. Creating a successful small business takes guts, determination, and hard work, but it represents the very best of the American dream. I know this firsthand, Mr. Speaker. Both myself and my husband are small business owners. We both have experienced the satisfaction of creating successful small businesses, creating new jobs, and contributing to our community.

However, we have also felt the onerous tax and regulatory burdens that stand in the way of successful small businesses today. Self-employed small business owners face a number of very unique problems, and the disparity in the tax treatment of health insurance cost represents one of the more troublesome of these.

Let's send a message to America's self-employed businessmen and women that they are just as important as big business. Let's restore fairness and equity to the tax code's treatment of the health care expenses of self-employed individuals. I urge my colleagues to join me in enacting this important legislation.

EIGHT ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIKH STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM AND HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. DAN BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the urgent human rights situation in Punjab. As I have said many times on this floor, The Indian government and Indian armed forces have repeatedly trampled on the human rights of the Sikh majority in this northern province.

The State Department has reported that between 1991 and 1993, the Indian government paid 41,000 cash bounties to policemen for extra judicial killings of Sikh suspects. Human Rights Watch issued a report in 1994 quoting a Punjab police officer as saying that 4,000 to 5,000 Sikhs were tortured at his police station alone. Asia Watch said in one of its many reports on the appalling situation in Punjab that virtually every Sikh being held in prison is tortured.

The Indian government's current reign of terror dates back to the attack on the Golden Temple in Amritsar in 1984. That summer, Indian security forces launched a blistering assault on this holiest of Sikh shrines, along with

38 other Sikh temples, killing an estimated 20,000 Sikhs.

The brutal atrocities committed against the Sikh people led to a strong independence movement throughout Punjab. On October 7, 1987, the five-member Panthic Committee, appointed by all of the major SIKH resistance groups, declared their intention to create an independent Sikh homeland by the name of Khalistan, and created a governing body known as the Council of Khalistan. This October marks the eight anniversary of that declaration.

The President of the Council of Khalistan, Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, resides in Washington DC, and has been a tireless advocate of human rights and self-determination for the Sikhs. Dr. Aulakh has worked with great determination over the last eight years to inform Members of Congress and other government officials of the terrible atrocities being committed against the Sikh people.

The human rights situation has not improved over the last eight years, if anything, it has gotten worse. Earlier this month, an esteemed human rights activist, Jaswant Singh Khalra, was abducted from his home after having publicized the murder and cremation of thousands of Sikhs by Indian security forces. Mr. Khalra is reportedly being tortured in prison. Just this week, over 150 of the most distinguished Sikh leaders held a peaceful protest in front of the Governor's mansion to protest Mr. Khalra's detention. All were arrested and harassed.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the Indian government in Punjab to begin to respect the basic and fundamental human rights that all human beings deserve—life, liberty, justice and self-determination. It is time for the reign of terror to end. I congratulate Dr. Aulakh and him many colleagues on their dedication and persistence over the last eight years. On this eight anniversary of the declaration of Khalistan, I congratulate all of the Sikh people who have peacefully and quietly stood up for their rights under an oppressive system. My thoughts and prayers are with the families whose sons and daughters have disappeared or been tortured or murdered.

LEGITIMATE BUSINESS EXPENSE DEDUCTIONS

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, along with my colleague Mr. CARDIN, that would once again allow businesses to deduct the expenses they incur while responding to legislative proposals that can affect their businesses, their communities, and their livelihood. The bill would simply allow businesses to deduct legitimate business expenses incurred in contacting or working with their State representatives.

In 1993, Congress approved the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 which contained a provision that disallowed the deduction of certain business expenses against Federal corporate income taxes. The denial of deductibility of lobbying expenses was proposed as a means of curtailing the activities of special interests here in Washington. Those who advo-

cated this provision made no claim that it was necessary to address any problem at the State level.

Instead of solving a problem, the enactment of this provision has created a major problem at the State level. Most businesses, and especially small business owners, can't afford the time to visit personally with their State legislators to discuss the impact of legislation on their businesses. To make sure their voice is heard in the legislative process, they count on trade associations, to which they pay dues. Of course, the dues are generally deductible as an ordinary and customary expense of doing business.

The problem under the 1993 change is that the portion of trade association dues attributable to lobbying activities by the trade association is no longer deductible. This creates a major record-keeping headache for the association and the small business owner.

The original proposal before the Congress 2 years ago would have applied to local governments as well as State and Federal government. Fortunately, before it was adopted, it was amended to exclude local government from its coverage. That was a significant improvement. The bill Congressman CARDIN and I introduced today will further mitigate the adverse impact of the proposal by exempting State legislatures as well.

As a former State legislator, I know well the value of the input of businesses in the deliberations of State legislatures. With small staffs and limited resources, State legislatures make important use of information provided by local economic interests in considering policy proposals. Additionally, State Governors frequently appoint "Blue Ribbon Commissions" and other advisory groups to recommend legislative solutions to problems. These advisory bodies depend on input from members of the business, professional, and agricultural communities who are knowledgeable about circumstances within the State. The record-keeping requirements and tax penalties associated with the lobbying tax discourages this important participation.

Mr. Speaker, we ought not to be making it harder for Americans to participate in the decision-making process in their State capitols. The denial of a deduction of a legitimate business expense incurred to lobby at the State level is an unwarranted intrusion of the Federal Government on the activity of State governments. At a time when we are attempting to return many responsibilities to the State level, it makes no sense for us to impose obstacles on the ability of State legislatures to gather the information they will need to do their jobs. I would ask our colleagues to join us in restoring this deduction at the State level.

IN HONOR OF ROY L. WINES, JR.

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a loving husband and father, a civic leader, and a hero, a man whom I revere and am proud to call my dear friend. His name is Roy Wines.

Roy was born and raised in Southampton, NY. His ancestors were of Welsh background

and they settled in Southold in the 1640's. At the young age of 18 he enlisted in the Army Air Corps and received his wings in 1943, becoming one of the youngest pilots in the Air Corps. After serving as a flight instructor until the end of WWII, he attended the Long Island Agricultural and Technical Institute where he achieved the highest academic average in his class. In 1947 he married his childhood sweetheart, Violet Albright and they now have two sons and six grandchildren.

Over the years Roy has been dedicated to serving the community in both church and civic activities. As a member of the United Methodist Church of Southampton he has served as lay leader, as a member of the board of trustees, as chairman of the administrative council, and as chairman of the building committee. In the community Roy has served as vice commander of the American Legion in Southampton, member of the board of trustees of the Rogers Memorial Library in Southampton, member of the board of trustees of Southampton Hospital, treasurer of Southampton Historical Society, disaster chairman for the local Red Cross, chairman of Troop 58, Boy Scouts of America, and as a member of the Southampton Fire Department for over 43 years.

It was while he was serving in the Southampton Fire Department that we truly learned of Roy's dedication to his job, fellow citizens, and Nation. On March 30, 1974, the Southampton Fire Department was called to the home of Mr. and Mrs. Ruggieri whose house was on fire. The Ruggieri's home was engulfed in flames and they were trapped in their upstairs bedroom. Mrs. Ruggieri was 4 months pregnant at the time with their daughter, Kate. Ignoring the raging inferno that was the Ruggieri's home, Roy, alone, climbed up a ladder and led Mr. and Mrs. Ruggieri to safety. While descending the ladder, the heat of the fire caused the bay window from the living room below to explode. Mrs. Ruggieri said, "I will always be grateful to Roy Wines for saving three lives." I am enclosing her letter to the Southampton Fire Department for the RECORD.

Unfortunately, Roy has been dealing with some serious health problems and I wanted to take this opportunity to share the love and affection of our whole community for Roy with this House. Even with that added burden, Roy is still very much involved in many church and civic related activities. With so few heroes in today's world, I am honored to know Roy and I join Roy's family, friends, and the Nation in expressing our deep-felt gratitude for his honorable and heroic efforts.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1995.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE SOUTHAMPTON FIRE DEPARTMENT: I am delighted to finally have the opportunity to acknowledge and thank Mr. Roy Wines for his selfless act of courage in the rescue he participated in as a fireman to save my husband and myself from a house fire in March 1974.

The fire occurred at a house we were renting on Meadow Lane in Southampton. The owner was planning a renovation of the kitchen and we agreed to go out and prepare for the contractors. Due to a severe snow storm, it took us almost eight hours to reach Southampton, and we did not arrive until almost midnight.

I remember being awakened around one a.m. to the sounds of crashing in the living room below. Because I was then four months pregnant with my daughter, Kate, I did not sleep well and so fortunately awoke to hear

the noise. I woke my husband and he called the police, for we both thought the house was being burglarized. We barricaded the bedroom door and waited for the police to arrive. Within minutes, smoke started to come under the door, and when we tried to escape, we were forced back by a huge wall of fire that was racing up the staircase from the first floor.

We called the fire department and waited, not knowing what to expect next and not even sure we could or would be rescued. We tried several times to break out windows, but to no avail. The worst moment came when all the power in the house went out and we were in complete darkness, without flashlights or matches.

I will never forget the incredible sense of relief upon hearing and seeing the Southampton Fire Department trucks pull into our driveway.

The details of our rescue have faded with time, but I think you should know that it was Roy Wines, who alone, came up a ladder and led us both to safety. It took great courage at a time when the fire had reached such a stage that the bay window from the living room below exploded as we descended the ladder.

I know that many volunteer firemen and police officers helped in the rescue efforts that night, but I will always be grateful to Roy Wines for saving three lives on March 30, 1974.

Thank you and God bless.

A PRAYER FOR RICHARD ANDREW BAUTISTA

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my heartfelt sympathy to the Bautista family. Friday, September 22, 1995, 12-year-old Richard Andrew Bautista was shot once in the head as he was returning on the freeway from a Los Angeles Dodgers' game.

The young Bautista, a soccer player, an altar boy and a friend to many at Whittier St. Gregory the Great School, was, without provocation, the victim of more senseless violence. Only 5 days earlier in Los Angeles, gang members fatally shot 3-year-old Stephanie Kuhen.

While the greater Los Angeles community quickly responded to help the Kuhen and Bautista families, nothing can bring little Stephanie back to life and nothing can restore the peace that Richard knew when he was at the baseball game. I am torn inside—the father of 5 children and grandfather of 10—for I cannot sufficiently express my grief and convey to the families my sorrow.

I was touched by Richard's fellow students who are raising money to buy a soccer ball and present it with all their signatures. In our small way, as a community, they are saying and we should say we are here for you.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues assembled to pray with me for Richard's speedy recovery. Our collective spirit of love is with the Bautista and Kuhen family.

NII COPYRIGHT PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce, along with Representative PATRICIA SCHROEDER, the ranking Democratic member on the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, and Representative HOWARD COBLE, one of our most senior and valued Members, the NII Copyright Protection Act of 1995.

This bill is the product of recommendations made by the Working Group on Intellectual Property Rights, led by the Honorable BRUCE A. LEHMAN, the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, of the administration's information infrastructure task force. After intense study and several hearings, this bill reflects the collective input of the administration, the Congress and the private sector on protecting intellectual property on the Internet.

It is a new age in the world of copyright. Digitization now allows us to send and retrieve perfect copies of copyrighted information over the National and Global Information Infrastructures [NII] and [GII]. With these evolutions in technology, the copyright law must change as well to protect one of our Nation's most valuable resources and exports, the products of our authors. Whether it be movie, video, compact discs, software programs or books, the NII and GII will change the landscape as to how these products are delivered to the marketplace. In order for the Internet to be a success, it must carry desired content. Copyright owners will not make their works available in the digital environment, however, until such material can be effectively protected, since computerized networks now make unauthorized reproduction, adaptation, distribution, and other uses of works so easy.

This bill is a starting point. While it does not address all of the issues that need to be considered on protecting intellectual property on the NII and GII, including provisions regarding special uses by libraries, it represents generally the steps which we must undertake in protecting access to creative works.

I look forward to working with our subcommittee and the entire Congress in carefully examining the state of copyright law, and to making necessary changes so that the benefits of the electronic age can truly materialize.

SPEECH OF DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE STROBE TALBOT TO THE DELEGATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE U.S. CONGRESS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, last evening a delegation of the Members of the U.S. Congress hosted a dinner in honor of our colleagues of the European Parliament who are here in Washington for the semi-annual meetings between delegations of our two legislative bodies. The current meeting between our two

delegations is the 44th meeting since this parliamentary exchange began not long after the European Parliament was established.

Last night our two delegations had the honor and pleasure of hearing from our distinguished Deputy Secretary of State, Strobe Talbot. His remarks were not sugar-coated, and they were not the light fare of an after dinner speech.

Deputy Secretary Talbot gave us a very sober, thoughtful, and insightful analysis of the impact and consequences of the various appropriations and authorization bills that have been adopted by the House and Senate thus far this year. Fortunately, none of these bills have yet been approved by both Houses, and none have been enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we fully understand the effect of these pieces of legislation before the members of this body uncritically vote again for the unfortunate legislation that has been approved already by one of the Houses of Congress.

I ask that Deputy Secretary Talbot's remarks of last night be placed in the RECORD. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely urge my colleagues in the Congress to give serious, thoughtful, and careful consideration to these views.

PREPARED REMARKS BY DEPUTY SECRETARY STROBE TALBOT, CONGRESSIONAL DINNER IN HONOR OF EUROPEAN PARLIAMENTARIANS

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Representatives of the European parliament and of the diplomatic corps, members of the House and Senate, friends and colleagues, ladies and gentlemen: it's an honor to be here with you tonight.

I want to join the rest of you in offering my thanks to Ben Gilman for his hospitality. Mr. Chairman, I bring greetings from Secretary Christopher, who is now at an event honoring the Israeli and Palestinian statesmen who, a few hours ago, took another bold step toward a comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East. Today's landmark agreement—like those in September 1993 and August 1994 that preceded it—is in no small measure the result of hard work by Europeans, as well as American, diplomats.

Today's good news also reflects bipartisan cooperation here in the United States going back over two decades and several Administrations, Republican and Democratic. Leaders from both sides of the aisle on Capitol Hill have played an essential role in securing the funding for the Middle East peace process. I can only hope that in the future the same kind of cooperation—between the two branches of our government, and between our two parties—will be possible on other issues of abiding concern.

As everyone here knows, the Clinton Administration and the 104th Congress have some serious differences, notably over the amount of money that Congress is prepared to allocate to the conduct of American foreign policy.

There is a lot at stake in how this issue is resolved. If the cuts suggested by Senate appropriators are put into law, the State Department would be forced to close as many as a quarter of our posts worldwide—some 50 embassies and consulates, including in Europe and the Middle East. Other proposed cuts would force the United States to fall even further behind in its payments to international organizations. That would result in clear violations of our international obligations, including our Treaty obligations under the UN charter. These cuts would make all but impossible the kind of initiatives that have supported the Middle East peace process.

The case for continuing American engagement in the world may be self-evident to ev-

eryone here this evening, but I'm not sure that it is obvious to all of your constituents, who include the citizens of Galway, Ireland, and Genoa, Italy, and Regensburg, Germany as well as those of Tampa, Florida, and Midletown, New York, and Bakersfield, California.

Let me offer an explanation for why some in the United States are flirting with ideas and proposals that are isolationist in their potential consequence if not in their motivation.

During the Cold War, many Americans defined what we were for—and what we were willing to pay for, and even fight and die for—largely in terms of what we were against. There was a world-class dragon out there for us—if not to slay, then at least to contain in its lair. For most Americans, the principal objective of American foreign policy—and the principal purpose of our diplomatic activity and military presence in Europe—could, quite literally, be reduced to a two- or three-word slogan: "Contain Communism," or "Deter Soviet aggression." There was, on the home front of American foreign policy, little doubt or dispute that we had a vital national interest in supporting institutions, and participating in ventures, that enabled us to protect ourselves and our Allies from the Red Menace.

Today, the rationale for vigorous American international engagement—and for the resources to support it—will no longer fit on a bumper sticker. But it can fit easily enough into a single paragraph, which might go something like this:

At the heart of President Clinton's foreign policy—and underlying much of his domestic policy as well—is a recognition that the world is increasingly integrated and a determination to make integration work in our favor. Integration means that, for good or for ill, one nation, region, or continent is susceptible to influences from others. Distances are shorter, borders more permeable. Commerce and culture ride the jet stream, the air waves, the fiber-optic cables, to the betterment of all of us. But so do crime and terror, to our common peril. Those scourges, along with nuclear proliferation, infectious disease and environmental degradation, are truly international problems that demand international solutions.

That means we must not only revitalize and enlarge existing institutions and arrangements and habits of cooperation, but we must also put in place new ones. The purpose of such enlargement, revitalization and innovation should be to make sure that the ties that bind us together are positive—that they benefit and strengthen us, individually and collectively; and that they enable us better to deal with common threats and enemies.

Therefore, it is no less important today than it was during the nearly fifty years of the Cold War that the United States remain engaged in the world—and especially, I stress: especially in Europe.

I emphasize the transatlantic dimension of America's international role not just because I am speaking to visitors from across that particular ocean. And not just because the ties between the United States and Europe date back to our colonial origins. I do so because what happens in Europe is key to what happens everywhere else.

The Cold War was a global struggle. But it began in Europe, and it ended there. It is in Europe that, together, we are establishing the guiding principles of the post-Cold War era. It is also there that we are facing the most daunting tests of our ability to concert our energies and our wisdom—and thus to defeat the most serious threats to our common interests and our shared goals.

As Secretary Christopher said last June in Madrid, "every generation must renew the

[Transatlantic] partnership by adapting it to meet the challenge of its time." The challenge for our generation is in large part economic and commercial. As leading economic powers, the United States and the nations of Europe share an interest in a vibrant open trading system. That means that we must apply to the elimination of trade barriers the same far-sightedness and sense of common purpose that we applied to tearing down the Berlin Wall and the Iron Curtain. And there still are such barriers, both between Western and Central Europe, and between the European Union and the United States. The need to eliminate these barriers takes on added importance in light of the worrisome long-term economic trends that the transatlantic community faces—stagnant income growth in North America, and stubborn unemployment in Europe. We can certainly do better—and that means better by our own people—if we further open our markets to one another.

Let me, if I may, now speak about integration and cooperation in the realm of our common political values and our common security interests. The goal of peace, stability and cooperation among nations is as near fulfillment in Europe as it is anywhere on earth; but it is also in Europe that this goal faces one of its greatest dangers. That may sound paradoxical, but it is actually quite natural, since Europe has been the site of both the best and the worst in human history, especially in this century. Europe is, after all, both the birthplace and the graveyard of fascism and communism. The political culture that nurtured, if that's the word, the monstrosities perpetrated in the name of Kark Marx and in the careers of Hitler and Mussolini also made possible the realization of the dream of Jean Monnet.

So it is understandable that Europe today, as this century comes to an end, should provide the most promising and advanced example of integration—dramatized by the very existence of a European Parliament—while, simultaneously, it confronts us, in the former Yugoslavia, with the most vexing and dangerous example of disintegration.

Over the past four years, the tragedy and horror in the Balkans has occasioned a good deal of finger pointing back and forth across the Atlantic. That is as understandable as it is regrettable. After all, when it seems too hard to fix a problem of this magnitude, it is all too easy to fix the blame on someone else.

But in recent months, and particularly in recent weeks and days, the situation, while still perilous, has become more hopeful. A turning point came, I believe, at the London Conference in late July. That gathering of seventeen nations crystallized the resolve of the international community to back diplomacy with force, and it streamlined the mechanism for doing so.

The day before yesterday, Secretary Christopher, Assistant Secretary of State Holbrooke, and EU special envoy Carl Bildt announced another breakthrough in the negotiations over the constitutional underpinnings of a Bosnian peace settlement. As we speak, Ambassador Holbrooke is flying back to the region for more negotiations.

When future historians write the history of this episode—the worst conflict in Europe since the end of World War II and the first major threat to peace on the Continent in the post-Cold War era—they may give us credit for getting it right, although they will unquestionably regret that we took so long to do so. I, for one, will settle for that verdict.

But I also hope that future historians will note that we drew the right lessons. And first among these is the need for the United States to work with individual European

governments as well as with collective European institutions to prevent such conflicts in the future, and to increase our capacity to resolve them if they do occur.

There are many organizations that have vital roles to play in this regard, notably the OSCE. But as we are now seeing in the Balkans, the two most important institutions are, and will continue to be, the EU and NATO. The EU is the foundation for future economic growth and prosperity across the continent, while NATO is the bulwark of transatlantic security and the linchpin of American engagement in Europe. Let me say a word about why both should take in new members.

Over the past six years, virtually all of the peoples of Central Europe and the former Soviet Union have undertaken dramatic reforms. They have toppled communist dictatorships, liberalized command economies, and begun the hard work of building stable, secure, independent, democratic, market-oriented and prosperous states, at peace with their own populations and at peace with their neighbors. But those reforms are not guaranteed to continue or succeed. All of these countries, whether they have gained their freedom for the first time or recovered the sovereignty that they lost earlier in the century, are embarked on a difficult transition that will take years, if not decades, if not a generation or more. It is in our interest as well as their own that they succeed.

That is why the United States is counting on the European Union to expand. Only the EU can offer the newly liberalized economies of these newly liberated nations the markets they need to continue and complete their evolutions. Only EU membership can lock in the essential political, economic and social reforms that these emerging democracies are now implementing.

We understand the political difficulties involved in expansion. We know that the candidate members will have to work hard to meet the conditions of membership. But we also hope that current EU members will approach the question of expansion with an open mind, understanding the benefits to all.

Now, a few words about NATO—an organization that includes twelve members of the EU but that also serves as an anchor of American and Canadian commitment to the Continent's security. Earlier today, NATO Secretary General Willy Claes held a briefing in Brussels for representatives from twenty-six nations in Central Europe and the former Soviet Union on the rationale and process of NATO enlargement. This morning, as part of President Clinton's commitment to full consultations with Congress, we provided staff members with that same briefing.

As today's briefings make clear, the enlargement of NATO will bolster democratization and regional stability in the region that used to be the domain of the Warsaw Pact. But this process is going to require skill and steadiness in many respects. We must—pursue the goal of NATO enlargement in a way that genuinely and comprehensively advances the larger one of integration; that does not, in other words, create a new division in Europe.

With that imperative in mind, the Alliance is well on its way to developing new ways to promote cooperation with the armed forces of the non-NATO European states. Under the banner of the Partnership for Peace, nations that have been enemies in the past are now conducting joint peacekeeping exercises: Albanians and Greeks, Bulgarians and Turks, Hungarians and Romanians. In August, soldiers from three Allied and fourteen Partnership countries trained together at Fort Polk in Louisiana; another set of exercises will begin in Vyskov in the Czech Republic this weekend; and starting on Monday there will

be a maritime training maneuver in the Skagerrak Channel off the north coast of Denmark.

In order to ensure that NATO enlargement does indeed serve the larger cause of post-Cold War integration, the Alliance is prepared, in parallel with the process of bringing in new members, to conduct a dialogue, and eventually to develop a more formal relationship, with the Russian Federation. That way, all parties will be assured that the emergence of the new security order in Europe respects, and enhances, their legitimate interests.

This goal may sound rather abstract, but we have, in the work that our governments are doing with the Russian Federation today, an opportunity to make cooperation between NATO and Russia concrete, practical, productive and promising, both for the immediate cause of peace in the Balkans and for the long-range one of European security and integration.

Earlier today, President Clinton and Foreign Minister Kozyrev met in the White House and agreed that Russia and the members of NATO have a shared interest in cooperating closely in implementing the settlement that will, we all hope, emerge from the current negotiations. Of course, any U.S. participation in a peace implementation plan will be under NATO command and control, and we are committed to full consultations with the Congress as the planning unfolds.

So the paradox of the former Yugoslavia can, I believe, still be turned to a net advantage for the future of Europe: the most immediate and dangerous challenge we face offers a historic opportunity for pan-European and Transatlantic cooperation. In the relatively near future, peacekeepers from NATO and former Warsaw Pact countries could be working side-by-side to implement a peace settlement.

Let me close with reference to a European city that is not represented by any of you here tonight: Sarajevo. In 1914, its citizens heard the first shot of what became known as the Great War, the conflagration that plunged Europe into darkness. Seventy years later, another generation of Sarajevans were the hosts of the 1984 Olympic Games. They distinguished themselves, however briefly, in the eyes of the world as a model multi-ethnic, multi-faith community. Serbs and Croats—Orthodox, Catholics, Jews and Muslims—lived together in harmony.

For most of the past four years, this same city has been besieged; its citizens struck down by snipers and torn limb from limb by mortars; its outskirts the site of mass graves for the victims of genocide.

But there is now some hope that this same city could, before this year is out, be universally recognized, including by Serbia and Croatia, as the capital of a unitary state of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In which case it would be, once again, as it was during the Olympics eleven years ago, a symbol of Europe's—and the world's—noblest aspirations.

We might dare to imagine that a politician from Sarajevo may, in the not-too-distant future, take a seat in the European Parliament. In that capacity he or she might even have the honor, as I have tonight, of addressing a meeting of this biannual interparliamentary gathering.

Of course, that will happen only if the current negotiations stay on track, and that's a very big if indeed. So it's appropriate, Mr. Chairman, that at the end of the evening tonight, you'll be serving us coffee and not champagne. It's too early to celebrate a victory or congratulate ourselves on success. There's plenty of hard work ahead. But it's not too early to see where we want to go and to reaffirm our determination to get there together.

RUSSIA AND NATO EXPANSION

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the ink had hardly dried on Russian President Boris Yeltsin's secret decrees authorizing military intervention in Chechnya last December when he arrived in Budapest for a summit meeting of the Conference, now Organization, on Security and Cooperation in Europe [OSCE]. Ironically, the summit agenda included adoption of a so-called Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security aimed at, among other things, promoting the peaceful settlement of disputes. The Code also reiterated the sovereign right of participating States to join alliances, a contentious point which has had a chilling effect on United States-Russian relations as a growing number of European states seek to join NATO. At a Budapest news conference, Yeltsin decried eastward expansion, warning of the growing prospects for what he termed a "cold peace" and cautioning against creation of new lines of demarcation in Europe which would "sow the seeds of mistrust."

Mr. Speaker, Moscow's preoccupation with NATO expansion diverts attention away from the real threat to Russian security and stability—the Kremlin's failure to resolve crises, such as the conflict in Chechnya, through peaceful means. President Yeltsin has, himself, sown the seeds of mistrust in the fertile killing fields of Chechnya. Veteran Russian human rights activist Sergei Kovalev, who appeared before the Helsinki Commission earlier this year, recently warned of an increasing militarization in Russia, resulting from the Chechen conflict, which could undermine moves toward democracy in his country. Last December, Yeltsin suggested it premature "to bury democracy in Russia." Time will tell if Russian democracy can weather the turbulent storm brewing on the horizon as the country prepares for a new round of parliamentary elections later this year.

"If history teaches anything," President Reagan once observed, "it teaches self-delusion in the face of unpleasant facts is folly." Mr. Speaker, it appears that, at long last, the Clinton administration may be beginning to come to terms with present realities in Russia. Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott stated last week that "there is great uncertainty about the future in the East * * * and we have to be prepared for the worst even as we do everything we can to bring about the best." An expanded NATO, Talbott acknowledged, could protect Europe from possible turmoil in Russia. His remarks came after an official visit to Moscow. Meanwhile, Secretary of Defense Perry, on a tour of capitals of several leading candidates for NATO membership, signaled a growing determination to proceed, albeit gradually, with NATO expansion.

In a related development, NATO ambassadors in Brussels last week gave preliminary approval to criteria which could govern expansion of the Alliance beyond its current 16 members. To date, 25 countries, including Russia, have joined the Partnership For Peace Program. The expansion study, to be presented to interested countries on Thursday, will, I hope, provide much-needed impetus to

the process of enlarging NATO. A number of countries, including Romania, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, and Ukraine have already asked NATO to dispatch missions to their capitals in order to receive further details on the process.

Russian reaction to these developments has been predictably sharp. Moscow's vocal opposition to NATO expansion could, ironically, further solidify support for membership in former Warsaw Pact countries and, perhaps, in some of the New Independent States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Administration to resist firmly any attempt by Russia to veto NATO expansion, in general, or the admission of any state or states, in particular. President Clinton should clearly communicate this point to President Yeltsin when the two meet next month in New York. It is my view that every state should be given the same chance to pursue NATO membership, including the Baltic States and Ukraine.

It is up to Russia to determine what, if any, relationship it is interested in pursuing with the Alliance. Mr. Speaker, the process of NATO expansion should not be further delayed as the Russians attempt to sort out their own affairs. Mr. Speaker, a democratic Russia has nothing to fear from the expansion of a voluntary defensive alliance founded upon democratic principles and norms of behavior. Russia has sown the seeds of mistrust through its brutal military campaign in Chechnya and it is up to the Russians to demonstrate that they can indeed be a reliable partner with the West.

STATE INFRASTRUCTURE BANKS— INNOVATIVE FINANCING FOR OUR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the State Infrastructure Banks Act of 1995. This bill will provide new opportunities for State and local governments to finance vital transportation infrastructure needs.

This act gives States the option of creating State Infrastructure Banks [SIBs]. SIBs are infrastructure investment funds designed to provide States with a variety of financing options for infrastructure projects.

Traditionally, Federal transportation funding programs offer only one form of financial support—reimbursement grants. SIBs offer a new financial concept for funding transportation programs which cannot be accommodated within the structure of traditional Federal reimbursement programs. With traditional grant programs the Federal share of a project's costs is set, usually at 80 percent, and there are not alternative ways to finance the transportation projects. This act would allow States to transfer up to 15 percent of their federally apportioned transportation funds into SIBs. States would then utilize the SIBs to tailor the role of Federal funds to a project's needs. This is especially important when over time the project needs change.

In addition, SIBs would encourage innovative financing partnerships between the public and private sectors. Private financing sources are very interested in investing in public infrastructure. Unfortunately, the traditional Federal

funding requirements do not provide these potential investors with any opportunity. SIBs provide States with a range of loan and credit options for each infrastructure project. Such options may include low interest loans for all or part of a project, loans with interest-only periods in early years, construction period financing and more. Other potential investors may include the bond market, commercial banks, construction consortia, mutual funds, insurance funds and retirement funds.

Current funding approaches do not allow infrastructure development to keep pace with the private economy it is designed to serve. Historically, Federal transportation programs require that States obligate Federal-aid funds on a so-called pay-as-you-go basis. In effect, this requires that project sponsors have all the cash required to build a project available well before beginning construction. In private sector terms, this structure effectively dictates that States fully fund a project's costs with 100 percent government equity before construction begins. The sectors of the economy that depend on transportation do not wait until 100 percent equity financing is available before they begin development. As long as infrastructure financing practices are tied to the current rules, infrastructure investment can be expected to perpetually lag behind the economy's needs and demands.

By requiring the accumulation of all capital as equity in advance, traditional funding rules actually result in deferred reconstruction projects. This serves to drive up construction costs much more rapidly than inflation rates due to the increased rate of deterioration of the infrastructure. As a result, projects cost more than anticipated. Therefore, fewer projects can be undertaken.

Additionally, SIBs allow the States to leverage decreasing Federal funds. Historically, the Federal Government substantially underwrote the costs of new transportation projects often with reimbursement grants of up to 90 percent. Today, the Federal Government's share of investment in transportation infrastructure is estimated to be only 30–40 percent of total investment.

Leveraging is accomplished in the State Infrastructure Bank Act of 1995 by giving SIBs the option of using Federal funds as a capital reserve. The SIB may then borrow money in the bond market and establish a significantly larger loan fund. Another way of leveraging is to use the funds as a credit reserve for enhancement and support of privately financed projects by using reserve ratio accounting methods. This maximizes Federal dollars.

SIBs also maximize taxpayer dollars used for transportation in other ways. With SIBs, this same money can be recycled numerous times for making several different loans for infrastructure needs. Second, the initial Federal investment is expanded with each new loan when they are repaid with interest.

A modern transportation infrastructure is a critical element for creating economic development and job growth. Additionally, these improvements in our transportation networks generally enhance the quality of life for everybody. I believe the State Infrastructure Banks Act of 1995 offers solutions to the inherent problems of the current funding mechanism and better accommodates the needs of our Nation's infrastructure.

RENE ANSELMO TRIBUTE

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my colleagues to join me in paying special tribute to a remarkable individual whose long and distinguished career can forever be a symbol of determination, perseverance and audacity. Mr. Rene Anselmo, who died earlier this month from heart disease, was not only the millionaire chairman of Alpha Lyracom Space Communications, operating under the name Pan American Satellite, but also made a lasting contribution to the Hispanic community by helping to create television's Spanish International Network [SIN], now Univision.

Reynold Vincent Anselmo was an energetic and restless young man who joined the Marines in 1942 at the age of 16, spend 3½ years as a World War II tail-gunner, and completed 37 missions in the South Pacific. After the war, he enrolled in the University of Chicago's Great Books programs and after earning a theater and literature degree in 1951, he moved to Mexico where he discovered an affinity for Hispanic culture.

In Mexico, Mr. Anselmo directed and produced television and theater shows, and in 1954 he started working for Mexico's largest media company, Televisa, selling its TV programs to other Latin American companies. His hard work and dedication attracted the attention of Mr. Emiliano Azcarraga Vidaurreta, the founder and head of Televisa, who in 1961 hired him to start up television's SIN, now Univision Two years later, Mr. Anselmo moved to New York to manage SIN and oversee the TV stations.

At that time, Hispanics comprised less than 5 percent of the U.S. population, and the only Spanish-language stations were on the UHF channels that most TV sets were not then equipped to receive. Mr. Anselmo, however, used his Mexican connections and experience to build the business. By 1984, SIN had 400 TV stations and cable affiliates and served the more than 15 million Hispanic people in the United States who represented the fastest-growing segment of the population. SIN provided an alternative to the U.S. media, which did not pay too much attention to the Spanish community or when it did, cast it in a less than favorable stereotype.

In 1986 SIN was under siege by the Federal Communications Commission, which claimed that SIN's ownership violated rules against ownership of United States networks by aliens. As a result, Mr. Anselmo abdicated his position in 1986 and separated from his old friend and partner Mr. Azcarraga. Instead of retiring, Mr. Anselmo founded Pan American Satellite Corp. [PanAmSat], the world's only private global satellite services company. To do this, Mr. Anselmo had to fight against steep odds to break the monopoly on satellite transmission of video images held by the International Telecommunications Satellite Organization, or Intelsat owned by 120 governments, including the United States.

Before Mr. Anselmo launched his satellite company, no one had challenged Intelsat's international monopoly. Today, PanAmSat handles a significant share of transatlantic news, transmissions by ABC, CBS, CNN and

the BBC; and channels financial data for Volvo, Citibank Corp. Latino, and others.

In addition to Mr. Anselmo's devotion to his companies, he was a loving husband, father and grandfather, and a great neighbor. In fact, he was probably best known in his hometown of Greenwich, CT not for his business success, but for his beautification of the town. Mr. Anselmo personally paid for the planting of tens of thousands of bulbs each spring.

Not only will Greenwich, CT be a less pretty place with his passing, but all of America loses a great businessman, family man and war veteran. For a better understanding of this great man, my colleagues may be interested in reading a profile of him which was published in *Continental Profiles* in August 1991.

[From *Continental Profile*, Aug. 1991]

HIGH FLIER

(By Frank Lovece)

Look! Up in the sky! It's a bird! It's a plane! It's . . . well, it's a bird, as artificial satellites are affectionately called. And this particular bird is a rare duck indeed: The first privately owned, international telecommunications satellite in orbit. Not surprisingly, the guy who sent it flying is a bit of a strange bird himself.

This is Rene Anselmo, chairperson of Alpha Lyracom Space Communications, operating under the name Pan American Satellite—no relation to the airline. Prior to this particular first, he's distributed American TV shows in Mexico, founded a theater company that evolved into Second City, and helped create television's Spanish International Network (SIN), now Univision. And despite having cleared a cool \$100 million when he sold his SIN shares five years ago, he is far less Michael Douglas as Gordon Gekko than James Whitmore as Harry Truman.

In his plush office on the second floor of a modern, red-brick low-rise in Greenwich, Connecticut, the crusty, 65-year-old Anselmo is dressed comfortably in an open-collared shirt and a pull-over sweater. Except for the halo of cigarette smoke from the Winstons he chain-smokes, he looks more ready for his grandkids than for multimillion dollar business deals.

"I don't consider myself a businessman," Anselmo says. "I guess I'm just your classic, basic promoter entrepreneur."

That he is, with a high-tech twist. Until Anselmo came along, U.S. TV networks, news organizations, and banks needing to transmit voice, data, or video internationally had virtually no other avenue but Intelsat, a 15-satellite, 120-nation co-operative. Each member-nation has a signatory organization, generally the government PTT (post/telephone/telegraph) monopoly. In the United States, it's the Communications Satellite Corp., a publicly traded company created by an act of Congress in 1962 just for this. Known as Comsat, it enjoys a legal monopoly. And just like nature feels about vacuums, Rene Anselmo abhors monopolies.

Spurred by the deregulatory climate of the 1980's, and flush from the sale of SIN, Anselmo put up most of the \$85 million needed to buy and launch his RCA-made satellite, dubbed PAS-1. It lifted off June 15, 1988 from Kourou, French Guiana, via Arianespace, the European private-rocket company—with Anselmo having no assured customers, and only about \$40 million in insurance if the darned thing blew up.

Yet his pie in the sky paid off: Among other things, Pan American Satellite beamed this year's Academy Awards ceremony overseas, live; handles a significant share of transatlantic news transmissions by ABC, CBS, CNN, and BBC; and channels fi-

nancial data for Volvo, Citibank Corp. Latino, and others. Financial observers say Anselmo's privately held firm should surpass its projected 1991 revenue of \$25 million. The company is now well positioned in a telecommunications equipment-and-services market that the U.S. Department of Commerce predicts will be worth \$1 trillion next year.

Yet even with that big a market, why start such a risky, untested venture at age 61, after having cashed in on a fortune? "Well, I gotta do something," Anselmo protests. "Satellites and broadcasting are so integrally related, and with SIN I was an early user of satellites, so it was just a natural adjunct," he says, shrugging. "And the reason nobody ever did it before is nobody was ever allowed to do it."

This is so. It wasn't until 1984 that a Rockville, Maryland firm called Orion Network Systems began nudging the government for permission to launch a private, international telecommunications satellite (private domestic satellites are a separate and fairly common thing). Thusly nudged, President Ronald Reagan signed a 1984 document called Presidential Determination Act #85-2, allowing private satellites to compete in the Intelsat market.

"I immediately jumped in," Anselmo recalls, "because I knew all the satellite service we weren't getting—and the costs for what was available were exorbitant because it was a monopoly market. The whole system had to be changed," he says, "and it was a nice, personally challenging thing to do."

Reynold Vincent Anselmo has had a lifetime of nice, personally challenging things to do. Born in Medford, Massachusetts, he joined the Marine Corps at 16 and spent three-and-a-half years as a World War II tail-gunner, completing 37 combat missions in the South Pacific. He came home to earn a theater and literature degree from the University of Chicago in 1951, and to found a campus theater group called Tonight at 8:30—some of the core members later went on to create the famous troupe, Second City.

"Rene and I lived side by side in basement apartments," recalls acting teacher Paul Sills, who co-founded Second City and the two predecessor groups. "He was an interesting man, full of details. Always wore white shoes and carried an umbrella; had some of the Harvard Yard about him. What I learned from Rene was that you could actually start a theater—that you didn't need anybody's permission."

By now it was the beat 1950s, the era of Jack Kerouac's *On the Road*. Anselmo drifted to Mexico. He liked it enough that after a brief return to the States—where he was a guest director at the Pasadena Playhouse, and met Mary Morton, his future wife—he returned to Mexico to live.

After a \$25-a-week stint dramatizing Time magazine stories for the U.S. government's Voice of America radio broadcasts, Anselmo hooked up with a radio-show distributor named Paul Talbot, and began a small syndication company. When a television developed, Talbot began buying syndication rights to Americans shows and had them dubbed in Spanish; Anselmo would lease them to Mexico TV stations. Some years later, Emilio Azcarraga, founder of the Mexican TV network Televisa, S.A., hired Anselmo to start up a division to export their programs to other Spanish-speaking countries.

In 1961, Anselmo—still a Televisa employee—and other investors began buying UHF TV stations in the United States, and pioneered Spanish broadcasting here. Over the course of 25 years, that core of stations grew into SIN/Univision, with 400 TV stations and cable affiliates. Yet since it was 20 percent owned by Azcarraga, Anselmo—a

U.S. native who ran it out of New York City—had to divest himself because of a complicated federal issue over whether the network was foreign-owned—which was strictly forbidden.

The incident, to Anselmo, is an example of bureaucracy and authority gone awry. Scrappy as ever, he sees the same red-tape morass in Intelsat and Comsat. "It's like Communism and Socialism in Eastern Europe," he grumbles. "You wonder how the people over there put up with that for 75 years."

He's probably overstating the case—Intelsat has done much demonstrable good, making telecommunication available to countries that otherwise couldn't afford it. Yet Anselmo's correct that as in any monopoly situation, you can't go across the street if you don't like the price or service.

Comsat charges a reported flat rate of \$2,637 an hour; Pan American Satellite, between \$1,000 and \$2,400 an hour, depending on usage based on volume per year, with most customers paying, says Anselmo, about \$1,300. Even with a few hundred added at each end for earthstation fees (included in the comsat rate), Pan American Satellite is a bargain. And to the joy of news organizations with breaking reports, Anselmo always has a satellite transponder or two set aside for last-minute spot bookings.

He's also fighting like a bulldog for access to the international telephone systems. Known as "public switched networks" (PSNs), these phone lines are used to transmit almost everything, from voice to data. The right to compete with Intelsat in this market would be a boon to Anselmo. However, such access was specifically excluded from the Presidential Determination Act that allowed the formation of Pan American Satellite in the first place. Not one to lie down in the face of a monopoly, Anselmo has embarked on an ambitious, yet seemingly quixotic campaign to remedy the situation. Tired of writing lengthy missives to politicians and bureaucrats, which he feared were not being read, Anselmo took out a paid advertisement in *The New York Times*, to address the situation. But this was no staid political ad. In the form of a 17-frame comic strip, it featured Anselmo and his dog taking on well-heeled lobbyists (in football regalia) and in one panel depicts Anselmo as a Kurdish refugee. The cartoon culminates with Anselmo making a plea for President Bush to "strike a blow for global telecommunications liberalization. Lift the PSN restriction now."

Most of the U.S. telecommunications industry wants Anselmo and others to have the access to PSNs: Literally dozens of telecommunications users, satellite makers, and others filed comments on his behalf with the Federal Communications Commission last February.

That prompted Intelsat to recommend Anselmo be given 100 PSN circuits to use—an amount Anselmo says is "like having a billion dollars in your pockets and saying, 'Here's a penny.'" He exaggerates, yet according to spokespersons at both Intelsat and the F.C.C., 100 circuits is, indeed, a pittance.

But the game seems destined to change. Orion Network Systems Inc. is close to launching its two satellites, and Anselmo is negotiating to order three. And chances are, every bird will be booked: The last few years have seen explosive growth in satellite news services, fax transmissions, video teleconferencing, private telephone networks, and bank/credit data communication—the latter of which increased over 40-fold from 1970 to 1985, and could soon account for 40 percent of all telecommunications traffic.

At present, however, it's still a poker game with an enormous ante. Anselmo's first satellite cost a cut-rate \$47 million; slightly more advanced ones are double that now. "And launch costs have quadrupled," Anselmo says. "You have an \$80 million satellite, an \$80 million launch, another \$32 million for insurance—and then it's \$10 million a year [operating and maintenance costs] for 13 years," the average life of a communications satellite. Now add in the cost of a satellite earthstation teleport in Homestead, Florida, and 40 or so employees.

Each bird Anselmo puts up will top out, he figures, at \$40 million in revenue a year. "You're making money there," Anselmo says. "But owning satellites is not a good business in itself. You have to develop services. Let's say you're an airline. You want to put in VSATs, these dishes for data, and hook up travel agencies all over the place, so they can get into the computer via satellite. Now the airline doesn't want to operate that. So you provide that service: You install the stations, take care of them, provide the satellite transmission—there's money *there*."

"You don't do these things to make money," Anselmo claims. "You do and you don't. I'm doing it to give me something to do, and I just love breaking up this whole monopolistic system—all these state-owned telecommunications systems that don't provide good service in their countries and don't let anyone else provide it. I'd just *love* to break up that system," he says, tilting his lance.

SALUTE TO THE SIKH NATION OF KHALISTAN

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 29, 1995

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to salute the Sikh nation of Khalistan on the eighth anniversary of its declaration of independence. The Sikh leadership declared Khalistan independent on October 7, 1987.

Many of us have been long-time supporters of Khalistan's struggle to achieve its rightful place among the independent countries of the world. Frankly, it is in America's best interest to support the independence of Khalistan. Upon achieving its independence, Khalistan has promised to sign a friendship treaty with the United States, as opposed to occupying Indian regime which votes against the American position in the United Nations 84 percent of the time. I am inserting an article from India Abroad of May 5, 1995, on this issue. As India deploys the Prithvi nuclear missile and continues development of the Trishul, in violation of international standards, it would help promote America's interests in the region if we had a reliable, democratic ally which could serve as a buffer between India and Pakistan.

But while strategic concerns are important, they are not the best reason to support freedom for Khalistan. We should support freedom for Khalistan because it is the right thing to do. Currently, the Sikhs of Khalistan live under the boot of brutal Indian oppression. This oppression has caused the deaths of more than 120,000 Sikhs since India's brutal attack on the Sikh Nation's holiest shrine, the Golden Temple at Amritsar, in June 1984. Thousands of Sikhs have been arrested, tortured and killed by the brutal Indian regime. Thousands of others have simply disappeared, never to

be heard from again. In some cases, their families have been waiting for several years for word of their whereabouts. Our own State Department reported in 1994 that between 1991 and 1993, over 41,000 cash bounties were handed out to police officers as a reward for killing Sikhs. In November, the Indian newspaper Hitavada reported that the late governor of Punjab, Surendra Nath, had been paid the equivalent of \$1.5 billion to organize and support covert terrorist activities in Punjab, Khalistan, and in neighboring Kashmir. I am again entering this report into the RECORD so that my colleagues can see clearly the true nature of Indian democracy.

One definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results. Despite years of evidence that their repression has only strengthened the Sikh Nation's determination to liberate Khalistan, the Indian regime continues to increase the brutality and tyranny in a futile effort to scare the Sikh Nation into submitting to India's brutal rule. So great is the Indian regime's fear of the Sikh Nation that when Sikh leader Simranjit Singh Mann called for a peaceful movement to liberate Khalistan, he was arrested and held in illegal detention for 6 months. So great is their fear that when Jaswant Singh Khalra, general secretary of the Human Rights Wing, Shiromani Akali Dal issued a report showing that the regime had arrested, tortured, and killed 25,000 young Sikh men, then declared their bodies unidentified and cremated them, the police kidnapped Mr. Khalra and made him disappear like so many before him. These are merely two of the most recent examples of India tyranny in occupied Khalistan. There are so many other examples, large and small, that it would take me the rest of the session to list them.

There is only one way to secure freedom for the Sikh Nation; a sovereign and independent Khalistan. Only by supporting independence for Khalistan can the United States, the bastion of freedom for the world, help to insure freedom in the Indian subcontinent. It is time for our government to speak out in support of freedom for Khalistan and the other nations living under Indian misrule. Until then, I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the Sikh Nation on Khalistani independence day.

[From Heritage Foundation Study: India Abroad, May 5, 1995]

THINK TANK LISTS INDIA'S U.N. VOTES AND RECEIPT OF AID

A study by the Heritage Foundation, an influential conservative think tank in Washington, has found that India is high on the list of the top 10 countries receiving American aid though it voted against the U.S. at the United Nations, Aziz Haniffa writes. The study noted that India, which is slated to receive over \$155 million in U.S. aid this year, voted against the U.S. last year at the U.N. Meanwhile, the World Bank is seeking to convince industrial nations, specially the U.S., that aid can be profitable, Ela Dutt reports.

TOP 10 COUNTRIES VOTING AGAINST THE UNITED STATES AT THE U.N. AND TOTAL UNITED STATES FOREIGN AID FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

	U.N. votes against United States in 1994 [Percent]	Fiscal year 1995 aid
India	84	\$155,479,000
Laos	80	2,000,000
China	77	771,000
Lebanon	71	9,195,000
Burundi	70	15,772,000
Sri Lanka	70	35,872,000
Zimbabwe	70	31,729,000
Algeria	69	75,000
Angola	69	5,000,000
Ghana	69	58,587,000

STUDY LINKS U.N. VOTING WITH AID

(By Aziz Haniffa)

WASHINGTON.—A study by the Heritage Foundation, an influential conservative think tank here, particularly in Republican circles, has found that India headed the list of the top 10 countries receiving U.S. aid, while voting against the United States in the United Nations.

The study, written by Bryan T. Johnson, a policy analyst, with the foundation, noted that India, which is slated to receive over \$155 million in U.S. assistance in the fiscal year 1995, cast its ballot in opposition to America 84 percent of the time last year at the U.N. "That is as often as Cuba," the report said.

TOP 10 LARGEST RECIPIENTS OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN AID AND THEIR VOTING RECORD

	Fiscal year 1995 aid	U.N. votes against United States in 1994 [Per- cent]
Israel	\$3,003,800,000	5
Egypt	2,121,729,000	85
India	155,479,000	54
Peru	150,516,000	55
Bolivia	134,178,000	58
Bangladesh	112,679,000	64
Ethiopia	92,148,000	51
Haiti	85,813,000	57
South Africa	82,463,000	58
Philippines	74,004,000	61

According to the document, India was followed closely by Laos (80 percent anti-U.S. voting record, while receiving \$2 million in U.S. aid); China (77 percent, \$771,000); Lebanon (71 percent, \$9.1 million); Burundi (70 percent, \$15.7 million); Sri Lanka (70 percent, \$35.8 million); Zimbabwe (70 percent, \$31.7 million); Algeria (69 percent, \$75,000); Angola (69 percent, \$5 million), and Ghana (69 percent, \$56 million). By contrast, Russia, which as part of the Soviet Union confronted the U.S. on nearly every issue during the Cold War, was found by the Heritage study to have voted against the U.S. only 33 percent of the time last year. It also said that of the 10 countries that voted with the U.S. the most, nine are former Soviet-bloc countries. The study noted that some 74 percent of U.S. foreign aid recipients voting in the 1994 U.S. session did so against the U.S. a majority of the time. It said that of the 113 countries that are foreign aid recipients and also members of the U.N., 95 of them voted against the U.S. more often than Russia.

It reported that the top 10 countries, headed by India, that voted against the U.S. the most would receive nearly \$313 million in foreign aid in the fiscal year 1995.

All but one of America's top 10 largest recipients, which the report identified as Israel, voted against the U.S. a majority of the time in the 1994 U.N. session.

While acknowledging that while there are many reasons why a country may vote with

or against the U.S. at the U.N., Johnson contended that "clearly the amount of aid they receive from the U.S. is not one of them."

Thus, he asserted in his report, "If the voting record of an aid recipient at the U.N. is any record of whether countries are serving U.S. interests—and champions of foreign aid must conclude that it is—then the U.S. is not getting its money's worth."

TOP 10 COUNTRIES VOTING WITH THE UNITED STATES AT THE UNITED NATIONS

	Percent of votes against United States in 1994	Fiscal year 1995 aid
1. Israel	5	\$3,003,000,000
2. Georgia	10	75,000
3. Slovak Republic	20	1,580,000
4. Hungary	20	3,420,000
5. Czech Republic	21	1,954,000
6. Poland	22	4,068,000
7. Bulgaria	22	1,682,000
8. Albania	22	1,249,000
9. Moldova	23	1,011,000
10. Slovenia	24	125,000

He wrote that these voting records demonstrate that an overwhelming majority of the recipients of U.S. foreign aid fail to support U.S. interests abroad, adding, "In fact, the data show that some of these countries actually undermine U.S. policies abroad."

The study said that this information begs the question: Why is the U.S. spending so much money on countries who care little about America's interests abroad? Consequently, the report urged that when foreign aid is scrutinized as a target for cutting the federal budget, "Congress would do well to look further into these numbers."

It said, "Not only has foreign aid failed at its primary mission of promoting economic development, it often has failed, too, at supporting America's national interests abroad."

The U.S. Agency for International Development, which has come under heavy criticism since Republicans took control of Congress in November, with Sen. Jesse Helms, North Carolina Republican and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, calling for its abolition, dismissed the findings of the Heritage report.

USAID said in a statement that "to use recorded votes in the United Nations as an indication of support for American interests is a red herring."

It said the figures released by Johnson's report "do not reflect the overall voting picture" of U.S. aid recipients, and noted that 77.4 percent of U.N. votes are determined by consensus, leaving less than one-quarter of its votes to be resolved by recorded votes. Consequently, the statement argued, the fact that countries often side with the United States during consensus votes are ignored by the Heritage report.

The statement also said a country's U.N. voting record "is only one dimension of its

relations with the United States," emphasizing, "Bilateral economic, strategic and political issues are often more directly important to U.S. interests."

However, Johnson in an interview with India Abroad argued that it is the recorded votes that matter and not the consensus votes that simply deal "with minor issues related to procedural, administrative things."

He asserted that the recorded votes are what "deal with the big issues like extending the embargo on Cuba, Bosnia, things like that, and even in the U.S. Congress it is the recorded votes that analysts and pollsters always look at."

Johnson ridiculed the agency's contention as a "poor way of arguing," saying that the recorded votes on particular issues "is where the distinction can be made very clearly, unlike consensus votes." He denied that he was being judgmental or specifically identifying individual countries, declaring, "One of the last things I would want to do is to say that foreign aid should be used to try to affect the voting records of various countries in the U.N." He said the rationale for the study was essentially to rebut the Clinton administration's contention that there was a connection "between our foreign aid dollars spent and America's national interest being supported by the foreign aid recipients."

Congressional sources, however, acknowledged that the Heritage study was "bad news for India," and that when Congress reconvenes, India critics on Capitol Hill like Rep. Dan Burton, Indiana Republican, would use the report as fodder to justify their attacks on India and to call for cuts in U.S. development aid to that country.

[From the Hitavada, Nov. 6, 1994]

SURENDRA NATH PAID TO FAN MILITANCY?

(By Sukhbir Osan)

CHANDIGARH, November 5.—Was the late Punjab Governor, Mr. Surendra Nath, who died in a plane crash with nine family members, behind the thousands of killings in Punjab and Kashmir through a third agency?

According to highly placed sources, the Union Government had made available a huge amount of Rs. 4500 crore to Mr. Surendra Nath, IPS, who held many a prestigious post from time to time, to "prop up" terrorism in Punjab and Kashmir in a bid to defame the Punjab and Kashmir militants. Both the Union Home Minister Mr. S.B. Chavan and the Internal Security Minister Mr. Rajesh Pilot were well aware of the fact that Mr. Nath had very successfully infiltrated "officials" of the Punjab and Kashmir Government into various terrorist groups.

What is further intriguing the minds of the people of Punjab is the ignorance being feigned by the Government of India, especially its Home Ministry regarding the "seizures" made from "Punjab Raj Bhawan" after the demise of Mr. Nath. The total "col-

lection" amounts to Rupees 800 crore inclusive of cash, jewelry, and other immovable property. In fact, according to sources, this "body" seems to be a part of the amount of Rs. 4500 crore which was placed at the disposal of Mr. Surendra Nath to root out terrorism.

Mr. Surendra Nath played an all important role to give strength to the hitherto lesser known C.I.S.F. (Central Industrial Security Force) and it is being alleged that some of "its" men were used to kill innocent persons including the family members of the Punjab police personnel as well as teachers, doctors, engineers, media men and political personalities.

A "suspended" police official Bakhshish Singh remained very close to Mr. Surendra Nath. Mr. Singh was the security in charge of the all time high-profile top Akali leader and the former Punjab Finance Minister Mr. Balwant Singh who was gunned down by "terrorists" in a broad day light. Mr. Bakhshish Singh was immediately suspended after the ghastly murder of Mr. Balwant Singh. But with the advent of Mr. Surendra Nath as the Governor of Punjab, Mr. Bakhshish Singh, a Nath confidant, re-appeared on the scene and enjoyed a very easy access to Mr. Surendra Nath even at "odd" hours and was "well informed" of all the "secret missions" of the late Governor.

Though the Union Home Minister, Mr. S.B. Chavan has denied that currency has been seized from the Punjab Raj Bhawan, he has further complicated the issue by saying that only the Prime Minister Mr. Rao could say anything about the "seizures" made from the Raj Bhawan.

Though the veteran CPI leader and the former Punjab Minister, Mr. Satyapal Dang as well as the Khalistan protagonist Mr. Simranjit Singh Mann have asked for a CBI probe into the Punjab Raj Bhawan seizures, the Government of India is maintaining a studied silence. Meanwhile, a Human Rights protagonist and an advocate of the Punjab and Haryana High Court has filed a written petition in the Supreme Court for a CBI probe into the matter.

According to sources, the list of seizures prepared by intelligence agencies is very long and is consisting of Rupees 110 crore in cash, jewelry worth Rupees 40 crore, immovable property worth Rupees 650 crore, various political bungalows and farm houses and above all his attempt to grab land near Kullu at a throw away price of Rupees 8 crore.

The Prime Minister, these sources maintain, is annoyed with both Mr. Chavan and Mr. Pilot since he feels that their infighting is behind all this "leakage" to media persons and may have a "damaging influence" on the Congress I performance in the ensuing election being held in the Southern States.