

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO BOONE MAJORS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to Boone Majors, a longtime friend of mine who died on October 14, 1985, at the age of 89 years.

Oliver Boone Majors, Sr., was a lifelong resident of Wingo, KY, a small rural community in Graves County and the extreme southwestern corner of Kentucky. The son of Will and Nora Majors of Wingo, he was born on September 16, 1896. Like his father, Boone farmed until the mid 1930's. However, he took time out to serve his country in the U.S. Army, a veteran of World War I.

From 1937 to 1960, he owned and operated the Boone Majors General Store in Wingo. In 1960, Boone, in partnership with his son James, formed Majors Insurance Agency in Wingo. Boone was an active partner in that business until the early 1970's, at which time he retired and began devoting his time to oversight of his farming interests.

Throughout his 89 years in Wingo, KY, Boone Majors was always very successful in all that he chose to do. In addition to his farming and business endeavors, he was also a man of civic duty and achievement. He served as president of the Wingo Lions Club in 1947-48 and was the club's secretary for many years following. He was also active in the local political process, and, for example, was always anxious to help out in the precinct polling place during elections.

Boone Majors was a religious man and a longtime active member of the Wingo Church of Christ. He is survived by two sons, James Majors of Wingo, KY, and Oliver Boone Majors, Jr., of Wytheville, VA, and a sister, Ruth Goodgion of Pryorsburg, KY. His late wife Bessie predeceased him in 1968.

Boone Majors was a great asset to Wingo, Graves County, and western Kentucky, and I have always considered it an honor to call him my friend.

I join with the many friends of this outstanding Kentuckian in extending my sympathy to the family of Boone Majors.

ANNUAL SUMMIT MEETINGS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES PRESIDENT AND THE LEADER OF THE SOVIET UNION

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, we in the

Congress followed with great interest the recent Geneva summit between President Ronald Reagan and Soviet Leader Mikhail Gorbachev. Although there is hope that the summit will set the stage for future concrete progress in the relations between our two countries, it is clear that little was accomplished in either arms control or human rights—the two most critical issues that divide us.

Mr. Speaker, the one solid accomplishment of the Geneva summit was the agreement of the two leaders to meet again in 1986 and 1987. I welcome this decision to hold annual summit meetings between the leaders of our two countries.

Annual meetings make all of us breathe a little bit easier. Such meetings by themselves will not, of course, guarantee progress in the vital area of arms control or on any of the other issues that divide us. But the ability of our two countries to destroy each other many times over makes it mandatory that we pursue all avenues that might reduce tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Recently I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 242 expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should exert every effort to schedule annual summit meetings between the President of the United States and the leader of the Soviet Union. The resolution commends the President for the agreement of the two world leaders to meet again in 1986 and 1987 and urges them to institutionalize the practice of annual summits.

Last year, I introduced legislation urging the President to arrange a summit meeting with his Soviet counterpart. At that time the President was reluctant to make any commitment to hold such a meeting. In the spirit of bipartisanship in foreign policy I joined the Republican leader of the Senate, Senator Howard Baker and the Republican Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Charles Percy, in calling upon the President to hold a summit meeting with the leader of the Soviet Union.

My legislation in the last Congress—which is very similar to House Concurrent Resolution 242 this year—was linked to the 40th anniversary of the convergence of American and Soviet troops on the Elbe River in Germany—an unforgettable moment of victory over the bloody tyranny of Hitler and his Nazi regime. The Elbe Resolution, which I introduced, called upon the President to initiate a serious, well-prepared summit on the 40th anniversary of the Elbe River linkup and to inaugurate annual summit meetings with the leaders of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, annual summits are surely no panacea, but they are a prudent first step toward a more sane and less dangerous world in this nuclear age. The lack of significant progress at the recent Geneva

summit is a reminder both of the deep-seated differences between the Soviets and ourselves and of the need to increase our resolve to assure regular, on-going, high-level contacts. I invite my colleagues in the Congress to join me in cosponsoring this legislation urging our President to meet annually with the leader of the Soviet Union.

HOW INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS DAY IS COMMEMORATED IN THE SOVIET UNION

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 37th anniversary of the signing of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and many commemoration activities took place across the globe. Celebrated as "International Human Rights Day," many of our colleagues participated in a special order on the House floor on Monday. On Tuesday, President Reagan spoke before a large group commemorating this important event, and by so doing maintained the prominence of fundamental human freedoms as a major feature of our foreign policy.

Attempts to celebrate International Human Rights Day in the Soviet Union, however, were received in an entirely different manner by Soviet officials. Quiet activities were repelled, and a number of participants arrested.

Celestine Bohlen, of the Washington Post foreign service reported the details most clearly, a narration which I believe will be of great assistance to our colleagues in gauging Soviet human rights policy during this post-summit period. I therefore request that the Post article be reprinted in full at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for review and consideration by my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 11, 1985]

A GATHERING AT PUSHKIN'S STATUE—PROTESTERS, POLICE PLAY OUT SILENT RITUAL ON HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

(By Celestine Bohlen)

Moscow, Dec. 10.—A light snow was drifting across Pushkin Square early this evening when a curious crowd gathered at the foot of a statue to Russia's beloved poet to watch a demonstration.

The demonstration, however, did not take place.

In the space of an hour, a gang of burly men, operating under the eyes of uniformed police, had whisked away, one after another, at least eight Soviet citizens, kicked a lens off a CBS television camera, pounced on a cluster of leaflets dropped in the snow and thrown the weight of a human wall against anyone who tried to get close enough to watch.

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

Boldface type indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

All the while, about a hundred people stood around the base of the statue, watching passively, their faces showing neither approval nor disgust. Even the man who appeared to act as coordinator of the police action asked an onlooker at one point: "What are you watching? This isn't a film."

The demonstrators were at the Pushkin monument to protest human rights violations in their country.

The occasion was U.N. Human Rights Day, which a group of Soviet dissidents first chose to mark five years ago by simply standing by the Moscow landmark and silently taking off their hats.

It was a token gesture, publicly inoffensive, but one that hinted at the determination of those who want to speak out somehow against the policies of the Soviet government.

As soon as the tradition started, the police, in and out of uniform, moved in to stop it.

By 6 p.m. this evening, the small park around the Pushkin statue in the heart of Moscow—and a traditional meeting place—had all the signs of a stakeout. Militiamen, or Soviet police, stood in groups of threes. A sense of expectancy was almost palpable.

On Gorki Street, in front of the statue and near the subway stop, groups of men and women lingered, chatting, smoking, looking very much like other people standing around waiting to meet friends, but with one difference: no one came to meet these people, and so over time the snow gradually piled up on their hats and shoulders, setting them apart.

In another corner of the park, a group of western reporters, mostly European and American, huddled together also waiting, shifting from foot to foot to battle the cold.

The first scuffle came shortly before 7 p.m. Someone had scattered what appeared to be handwritten pages at the foot of the statue. In seconds, the burly men dove to the ground, snatching up the pieces of paper and demanding that others hand over their copies.

One man found half of a ripped page on the ground; another leapt to grab him when the two recognized each other and laughed. They apparently were there on the same mission.

Outnumbered on all sides, by the press and the police, the people who apparently came to protest drifted into the crowd singly, talking to no one. As one couple was nabbed and walked off, a young woman said firmly, but quietly: "There—that's human rights." Then she was led off.

After hanging around the edges of the crowd for half an hour, another man walked up the steps of the statue, took off his hat and said he wanted to recite poetry. He also was grabbed and escorted away.

The people were driven off in cars and buses. According to those picked up in previous years, they are taken to local police stations and questioned for three hours before being let go.

Back at the statue, the ritualistic game of cat and mouse played itself out, and the crowd began to drift away. The uniformed police moved in, establishing order, urging onlookers to back away from the monument steps.

"Please step back," said one officer to an old lady, who had come early and stayed in the cold to watch. "This is our monument and we should respect it."

GRIDIRON VICTORY TO DAYTON HIGH SCHOOL

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, as the late football coach Vince Lombardi would say, "Winning isn't the most important thing, it's the only thing."

Coach Lombardi was a little tough. But a group of high school footballers in my Oregon district are probably thinking the same thing right now.

Dayton High School has captured the Oregon State class A high school football championship. The last time the Pirates took home the State champ cup was 21 seasons ago.

I recently met several of these rising football stars. And I believe they represent a new breed of high school athlete. Their performance on the gridiron and in the classroom is proof that athletics and academics really do mix.

Last week, Dayton played its best in what could only be described as an Oregon "ice bowl." Neither snow, subfreezing temperatures, nor the rock-hard, frozen turf prevented the Pirates from sliding to victory. Vince Lombardi would have been proud.

Neah-Kah-Nie High School put up a valiant fight—but Dayton persevered, and rolled, 38-20, to victory. Lead by Butch Jumalson and the best offensive line in Oregon class A ball—Dayton chalked up a win that will be remembered in Yamhill County, and around the State, for years to come.

I grew up in a small town, and attended a small town high school. I know how hard it is to make the grade in statewide competition, let alone come out on top. And I know how important this victory is to the coaching staff, the parents, and especially the Dayton students who worked so hard to achieve their goal.

Coach Dewey Sullivan and his team went 13-0 this season—that's an enviable record, whether you live in Dayton, OR, or Washington, DC. Those of us who spend a lot of time in the Nation's Capital can only wish the Redskins could post such outstanding statistics.

NEW YORK TIMES SUPPORTS SEAT BELTS ON SCHOOL BUSES

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of H.R. 3305, the National Schoolbus Safety Act of 1985, that provides mandatory seat belts on all new school buses, I would like to bring the following December 11, 1985, New York Times editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

WHY NO BELTS ON SCHOOL BUSES?

Seat belts have been standard equipment in automobiles for so long that most children can't remember when cars came without them. Not so with school buses, in which many children spend more travel time than in the family car. The inconsistency demands correction.

Neither state nor Federal regulations require seat belts in school buses. The rare locality that requires them can thank an independent school board.

School buses already offer the safest surface travel, owing to special traffic regulations and to the Federal design standards to which they have been built since 1977. Of the 21 million children who ride school buses every day nationwide, fewer than a dozen died in crashes last year. The average number killed between 1981 and 1983 was 11. Mile for mile, only scheduled airlines are comparably safe.

Even so, there are unnecessary bus deaths, like that of Paul Goodrow, an 11-year-old from Mahopac, N.Y., last month. He was tossed into the air when his school bus went out of control and hit a boulder, and fatally injured when he landed on his abdomen on the seat back of the row ahead. A seat belt probably would have saved his life.

The current argument against school bus seat belts relies on a recent Canadian Government crash test study that showed belted passengers suffering more severe head injuries than unbelted passenger. But the study dealt only with head-on collisions and also showed belted passengers suffering less-severe chest injuries. The U.S. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration recently reported that half of all school bus fatalities occur in rollover accidents and 15 percent in side-impact accidents. It said safety belts "might be most likely to provide additional safety" in such accidents.

But what happens, opponents ask, if a group of belted kindergarten pupils had to flee a burning bus? The record suggests that fire is not a leading danger. Besides, learning how to unbuckle a seat belt and evacuate a bus ought to be as routine as a fire drill in school.

The main argument concerns cost—\$2,000 more for a new bus with belts. Federal officials appear set against requiring them because they lack clear proof that safety would be enhanced. But it is hard to maintain that safety would be reduced. State legislators could serve both safety and education for adult driving by ordering school districts to insist on seat belts in all new school buses.

SERVICE STATION OPERATORS BURDENED BY SALE OF ARCO

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to underscore for my colleagues the ramifications of the sale of ARCO's east coast operation to Shell Oil Co., earlier this summer and the effects that this sale has subsequently had on the individual service station operator. The following article appeared in the November 17 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer highlighting the dif-

facilities one ARCO service station operator has had throughout this process and stressing that this situation is representative of a number of other dealers in similar circumstances.

Walter Emond had been leasing Walt's ARCO in Pitman, N.J. for the past 20 years when, this summer, he learned, through a customer, that ARCO had sold their east coast operation and that Shell would be the new owner of his station. In September, he was dismayed to learn that one of the stipulations made by Shell in agreeing to a new 3-year lease with Emond would be that he remain open on a 24-hour basis. Despite the fact that there would be little demand for services between the hours of midnight and 7 a.m. and Mr. Emond would spend \$1,500 a week just to keep open during those hours, and despite the increased threat of crime, Shell seemed to have given Walter Emond and other service station dealers very little choice in the matter.

As a sponsor of legislation, H.R. 3338, to amend the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act and improve the position service station operators or franchisees have in such situations, I am concerned about the undue burden placed on Walter Emond and others like him all in the name of higher profits for the parent company. I commend this article to my colleagues' attention:

NEW SHELL 24-HOUR LEASES DISMAY EX-ARCO DEALERS

(By Virginia M. Resnik)

Walter Emond first learned that the Shell Oil Co. had bought all of the ARCO gas stations on the East Coast when a customer stopped into his Pitman station this summer and asked him if he would be going out of business now that his station was sold.

"I said, 'What are you talking about?'" Emond recalled last week. "My customer said, 'Didn't you know you were sold? ARCO sold its whole East Coast operation.'"

For Emond, who had leased Walt's ARCO on Woodbury-Glassboro Road in Pitman for 20 years, a bigger shock came in September when he went to a hotel in Cherry Hill to sign his new three-year lease with Shell.

"When I went to the meeting to sign the lease, they told me I had to be open 24 hours," Emond said. "I almost fell off the chair."

Emond, who did not have an attorney with him, said he had no choice. "It was either sign the lease or go out of business in December." He had previously set his own daily hours.

Last week Emond stood by his pumps and watched the huge ARCO sign come down and a red Shell sign go up in its place on the corner of his station.

ARCO gas station operators up and down the East Coast who lease their stations have faced the same decision in the last few months. Locally, service station tenants in Woodbury, Voorhees, Pitman, Somerdale, Stratford and Mullica Hill are in the same situation.

In Voorhees, the township committee unanimously passed an ordinance Tuesday that prohibits gas stations from being open between midnight and 6 a.m. No one spoke during the public hearing on the ordinance.

In Pitman, the borough council heard Emond's concerns about the 24-hour mandate and took no action. Emond said representatives of a 7-Eleven store in Pitman op-

posed limitations on business hours, and the borough council agreed with them.

Pitman Mayor Michael Hannum said that while he "sympathized" with Emond's situation, the borough council was advised by its solicitor "that it would be discriminatory to pick out only gas stations" and pass a law limiting their hours.

Hannum pointed out that Pitman has the 7-Eleven and two laundromats open around the clock.

"Southland [the parent company of 7-Eleven] expressed concern that their stores might be restricted. They argued very convincingly that they perform a service to the community by being open between midnight and 7 a.m.," Hannum said. He said Southland's representatives told the council that 7-Elevens do 20 percent of their business during those hours.

One operator, who asked not to be identified, said he refused to sign the 24-hour lease and told Shell officials that his station is in a residential area and that they would have to seek a zoning variance to operate after midnight. He said the lease was then changed.

Several service station operators covered under the open-all-night edict expressed concern for the safety of their employees because the stations would be more likely targets for robbers.

"Am I going to have to worry about coming in here one morning and finding the night man in a puddle of blood?" Emond asked. His station has been robbed twice in 20 years.

Ron Seig, the operator of a Shell station on North Broad Street in Woodbury, said he told his employees "just give them the money and don't argue. They [employees] don't carry much money anyway."

Seig finds humor in the 24-hour plan, which was supposed to take effect as soon as station operators signed new leases. "If you know Woodbury, you know that after 11 you could play tennis in the middle of Broad Street on most nights and not get hit by a car."

Emond said, "They roll up the sidewalks around here at 9 o'clock. This is going to cost me money. I have to pay two men, plus the insurance and electric. I'm not going to make it [at night] on the gas, so I'll end up working three hours [repairing cars] in the morning to catch up on what it costs me to be open at night."

Two station owners estimated it would cost them about \$1,500 a week to remain open from midnight to 7 a.m.

One Camden County Shell operator, who said he didn't want to be identified because he feared retaliation from Shell officials, said he knew of several Shell stations that had not begun to operate 24 hours, even though their leases required them to do so.

"You can't make money in those hours [midnight to 7 a.m.]," he said. "I talk to truck drivers coming from North Jersey and New York. They say Shell stations up there aren't open, either, and they have the same leases. If it's enforced many places, [Shell stations] will go under."

John Macguire, the Shell Oil Co. territory manager in Wilmington, Del., who handles the South Jersey area, declined to discuss the issue.

Norman Altstedter, a Shell spokesman in New York, denied that any operators were forced to sign the contracts stipulating stations remain open 24 hours. "Certainly our contracts are negotiable," he said. "The reason we try to have stations stay open for 24 hours is it's good for business for the dealer and for us."

"We have the most extensive [24-hour] program among the oil companies. We certainly encourage dealers to remain open 24 hours. We're doing it all over the country," Altstedter said.

He also said Shell has a security and safety program that includes sales for service stations, rewards for information that leads to arrests and bullet-proof booths for attendants at some stations.

Altstedter said he did not know why dealers are claiming they had no choice but to sign the leases or go out of business.

"Our experience has shown that a dealer [open 24 hours] makes more money over a period of time if they stick with it. It does work out," he said.

FATHER HORACE B. McKENNA,
S.J., PRIEST OF THE POOR

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the Society of Jesus is world renowned for its rich tradition of theological and academic scholarship and of teaching excellence in the classroom.

Less renowned but just as rich is the Jesuit tradition of service to the least among us.

One of the priests who most, in his life, reflected the highest Jesuit tradition of service to the needy and the unfortunate was Father Horace B. McKenna, S.J.

While Father McKenna died 3 years ago, his memory still surrounds and infuses St. Aloysius Parish, the site of his mission to Washington's street people, and Gonzaga College High School which is located on the same grounds. Father Horace's spirit of caring concern has inspired a generation of Gonzaga students to live out their school's motto and to become: Men for Others.

One of the keepers of Father Horace McKenna's special flame—and fame—is our former colleague, John S. Monagan, who served his congressional district, Connecticut and the Nation with distinction during his seven terms here in this House.

John has written a book about Father McKenna called—simply and appropriately enough—"Horace, Priest of the Poor." John's book is published by the Georgetown University Press.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to place in the RECORD, at this point, an article by Congressman Monagan entitled "Saint Horace," which appeared in the fall 1985 issue of the Georgetown magazine describing an uncommonly virtuous, sometimes cantankerous, but always loving and holy man, Father Horace B. McKenna, S.J.

SAINT HORACE

(By John S. Monagan)

When Father Horace B. McKenna, S.J., died three years ago at the age of 83, the highest officials of church and state joined spontaneously in praising his life-long efforts on behalf of the destitute and the oppressed. A New Yorker by birth, he had chosen to work with the rural poor and had spent over two decades in a black parish in

Southern Maryland. When this assignment was completed, he passed the remainder of his life in the inner city providing material and spiritual aid to people at the bottom of the social ladder. It was then that many from the Hilltop came to know and love him.

Throughout his career, Horace, as he was affectionately known, cherished his close links with Georgetown. In his wide-ranging social activities, he regarded the University as a reservoir of service and her undergraduates and alumni responded generously to his calls for help. Members of the faculty frequently visited his church, St. Peter Claver, at St. Inigoes in southern Maryland, to preach or perform other priestly functions. With the help of Eugene L. Stewart (C'48, L'51) and the support of the University, he created "Sursum Corda," Washington's inner-city housing project. He pressed Washington restaurateur Richard J. McCooney (C'52) into service to create SOME (So Others Might Eat), the highly successful cafeteria for the needy, where scores of socially-minded undergraduates have made their way to perform voluntary services and be educated in the needs of the disadvantaged.

It was at the recommendation of the Rev. Richard McSorley, S.J., that sociology professor Veronica Maz first brought some of her students to Horace's St. Vincent De Paul Society facility on Eye Street to learn the facts of life in the central city. She was so impressed with Horace's dedication that she lent her considerable powers to galvanize his projects, in particular one known as Martha's Table (named by Horace), dedicated to assisting the hungry of Washington, and in sponsoring McKenna's Wagon, a mobile dispenser of soup and sandwiches to the poor.

At least in part due to Horace's urging, the Georgetown Dental School now provides regular, free dental services to the clients of SOME.

Some think Horace McKenna canonizable. Georgetown has recently paid him honor in two particulars. A McKenna section has been established in the Special Collections Division of the Lauinger Library, where all of his papers have been deposited. In complements, the Georgetown University Press has published a McKenna biography, *Horace—Priest of the Poor* (written by the author of this piece).

Although he loved the literary classics and constantly read the Scriptures in Greek and Latin, Horace was not an academic. His mission was that of a parish priest living in close contact with his parishioners and serving their needs. In particular, it was to the indigent and the blacks that he directed his interest, raising his performance to a unique level with his remarkable persistence and humor.

He dedicated himself to this service at a time when his religious brethren spurned this area of work. He battled to improve the lot of his charges in the worst days of the Depression by obtaining federal, state, archdiocesan, and private aid and, when his efforts to bring equality of opportunity to blacks aroused the violent opposition of reactionary whites and caused him to be removed from the rural scene, he took up the cause of the urban underprivileged. As he said, he became an "alley-whacker" instead of a "bushwhacker" and began his life-long patrol of the downtown streets. Here he created a ministry of his own. "The work is the same—chasing sheep," he said, "—but the ground is harder."

At 19 Eye Street, his daily "line" provided emergency relief for crowds of petitioners, and from this vantage point he sparked a variety of programs calculated to give assistance to the homeless, the incompetents, and the luckless. It is a tribute to his foresight that several of these programs continue with conspicuous success today.

Although he operated in the midst of squalor, poverty, and human depravity that would have floored a weaker man, Horace was blessed with a marvelous sense of humor that helped to lighten his burden and also gave color to his preaching and his conversation. He could reduce complicated concepts to a vivid phrase. Explaining priestly vows, he once said that dedication to chastity meant "you could take a lady to lunch, but not to dinner."

Animating every activity was a devoutness that caused Horace to begin each new undertaking with a prayer, and a sanctity that impelled him to cling to essentials and to eschew the creature comforts sought by his less motivated contemporaries.

Horace was an independent thinker. To the very end of his life, his mind was a penetrating, searching machine. He submitted governmental policies and those of the Church to unrelenting examination. It was this devotion to the dictates of conscience that brought him difficult days in 1968 when he differed publicly with Cardinal O'Boyle on the morality of the encyclical "Humanae Vitae." When he joined forty other priests in opposition to the cardinal's position against birth control, he was disciplined by being deprived of his faculty to hear confession for a period of two-and-a-half years. The issue became a *cause célèbre* when nineteen of the priests, known as the "Washington Nineteen," succeeded in establishing a precedent for processing an appeal in such cases. The result was the creation of a papal commission which produced a formula for agreement by the contending parties.

With this agreement, Horace ended his period of penalty. With a wryness that belied the anguish he had suffered and the soul-searching he had gone through, he observed, "That's what you get for arguing sex with an Irishman."

The final judgment of the Church, through its prelates and most prominent institutions, was to bestow upon Horace its accolade for his heroic life and his works of mercy. His great contribution was to be a precursor, a stimulator, and an example. He was ahead of his time in favoring greater attention to the poor when his projects were considered "off-beat" and the interest of the average person was directed into other channels. "The poor are all about us," he said. "We will see them if we only look." If there is a greater concern for the destitute today and a greater willingness to help them, much of the reason for this shift in public attitude can be ascribed to the teaching and example of Horace, who is buried in the cemetery below the Ryan Administration Building.

When as an infant he was brought to the parish church to be baptized and the officiating priest asked what his name was to be, Dr. Charles McKenna, his father, said "Horace." The priest demurred. "There is no Saint Horace," he said. "He'll be the first," replied Dr. McKenna.

BANNING THE MEDIA IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to comment upon the apparent ignorance of the South African Government about what the root cause is of the continuing unrest in that country.

Pretoria's rulers seem to believe that outside forces are behind the continuing violence. They blame Communists, neighboring countries, and the international anti-apartheid movement for inciting discord. Most recently, Pretoria made the astounding claim that the media is to blame for encouraging militant nonwhites to flout authority.

No one in the white hierarchy has considered the possibility that apartheid is to blame. The media has had very little to do with the alienation of an entire generation among blacks. Nor has the media been the catalyst behind the rise of prominent leaders such as Steven Biko, Nelson Mandela, Desmond Tutu, or Allen Boesak. Blaming the media for the prerevolutionary situation in South Africa is at best a dangerous mistake. More likely, it is a calculated attempt to legitimize further repression by the Government.

I would urge my colleagues to protest this latest escalation in the war against freedom in southern Africa. In this vein, I submit the following articles for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the New York Daily News, Nov. 20, 1985]

IN SOUTH AFRICA, THE PRESS IS LOOKING THE WRONG WAY

(By Earl Caldwell)

The newspapers have gone back to reporting pieces of the story, a bit here and a bit there. On television there is almost nothing.

In South Africa, they're calling the news media's bluff. Reporters always say: You get the story, you get it by any means necessary, you do what you have to do. South Africa is saying: Not here, not any more.

Yesterday, in one of the pieces to come back from South Africa, the report was that over the weekend at least 13 more people were killed. The report was that the police, armed with shotguns opened fire on crowds of blacks. The explanation was that some in the crowd had thrown stones and gasoline bombs. This, we're told, happened near East London in a place called Queenstown. There were no other details. The bits and pieces are all we get.

Just a few weeks ago, the story from South Africa was one of the biggest in the world. It was hard to pick up a newspaper or magazines that didn't have a report. And on television, night after night, there was film that told the story in a compelling way.

Then the government in South Africa called the media's bluff. The government told reporters to get the information they needed from the police. They told television to keep its cameras out of Soweto, where 2 million blacks live altogether. And they told them not to take their cameras to any of

the other places where the story they were after was developing.

Nobody tells reporters what to do. Nobody tells television that it can't cover a story it really wants to cover. But the South Africans did. They told the media all that—and then threatened fines (up to \$8,000) and prison sentences (up to 10 years) for the ones that didn't obey. So in the papers now, there are only snatches of the story. And on television, almost nothing.

The South Africans are gambling. There is no way in the world they can fill their jails with reporters and photographers and camera crews from around the world. They can't do it; it's as simple as that. But the gamble they're taking is that can call the media's bluff. They believe they can threaten reporters and that just doing it will scare them off. The South Africans don't believe the media is ready to go all out to cover the story.

The tradition of reporters doing what has to be done to get the story goes back a long way. Some news people have been jailed, and others have lost their lives. But the tradition says, You report the story.

The South African government can throw every foreign journalist out of the country. That's easy to do. But the South Africans cannot imprison the media of the world. They know that, and they are not even prepared to try to lock up journalists in a wholesale way.

But they are, as the saying goes, selling wolf tickets. They're playing poker. And while they may not be getting over, they are getting by. For now, that counts. It counts big.

Reporters are not free to report. They are not even free to move about and observe, to just see what is going on. So no matter what happens in South Africa, there is just one version of the story, and that's the one police tell.

Recently, the chiefs of various foreign news bureaus in South Africa were asked how they intended to respond to the restrictions imposed by the government. Most said they would obey the law. But most also said that if something really big were to happen, they would cover the story no matter what.

It was another piece of the evidence that the media has accepted the bluff. Something big is already going down in South Africa. In less than a year, close to 1,000 lives have been lost, and the killing is on the rise. Just the past weekend, another 13 died.

But still, in the newspapers there are only bits and pieces of the story, and on television, almost nothing. For now, the South Africans are calling the news media's bluff.

[From the Washington Post, Thursday,
Dec. 5, 1985]

SOUTH AFRICA TRIES TO KEEP IT HIDDEN— BUT THE BRUTALITY, NOT THE REPORTING OF IT, IS THE THREAT

(By William Raspberry)

JOHANNESBURG.—It's easy to get so caught up in the unexpected fights, the political turmoil, the sense that change is finally about to come to this troubled land, that you sometimes need to be reminded of what the turmoil is all about.

My reminder came the other night at the Market Theater, where I saw a portrayal of the (Steve) Biko Inquest.

The makeup of the audience was one of the surprises that one so quickly comes to take for granted: mixed couples and racially integrated parties of theatergoers sipping pre-theater cocktails and exchanging pleasantries in this land of apartheid, without obvious self-consciousness.

But then begins the performance: a powerful, condensed, reputedly quite accurate portrayal of the inquest into Biko's death after 26 days in incommunicado detention. You hear no word from Biko himself—the play is set after his death. What you get, while listening to the official explanations and buck passing, is a reminder of the corruption and the physical and mental brutality required to maintain this awful system.

You know it already, of course. You know it from visits to Soweto, where a significant portion of the huge population lives in utter squalor, where children now on strike from school wander aimlessly about, where the armored personnel carriers called Casspirs are a common, thoroughly detested part of the landscape.

You know it from hearing, at a recent press conference, eyewitnesses to police violence that left 13 people, mostly elderly women, dead after a protest march in the Pretoria township of Mamelodi.

But this knowledge fades surprisingly fast when you return to the somewhat unreal world of the cities, and you begin to understand why the authorities have put such heavy restrictions on journalist forays into the townships. A few print reporters manage to get around the restrictions, but no one takes any outlandish chances for fear of having his newspaper shut down. More telling by far, though, is the absence of television pictures. (Reporters, photographers and TV cameramen, when they are lucky enough to obtain permits to enter the townships, are understanding orders to put their notepads and cameras aside when an emergency situation—meaning anything worth recording—arises.)

As in America, there is the sense here that it didn't happen if it's not on television. Even when you know it happened, because you read about it, the absence of pictures keeps it from registering as deeply as it otherwise might. People outside the townships—which is to say white people—got precious little on their state-run TV channels of what was happening in the townships even before the recent press restrictions. Now they get virtually nothing except "talking heads" reports. The violence that they don't see doesn't become a part of their dinner table or cocktail time conversation. It doesn't intrude unbidden into their thoughts. It doesn't quite exist.

In short, from the viewpoint of the authorities, the press restrictions are working. Not perfectly, but well enough for now. They sometimes pay a price when, as in the Mamelodi slaughter, the reporters (and by extension, their audience) are forced to choose between the statements of self-proclaimed eyewitnesses with an interest in making things sound as gruesome as possible and the statements of the authorities, which regularly turn out to have understated the facts by a wide margin. Professional reporters, had they been allowed at the scene, might have provided a fairly realistic picture of what took place.

But even as it works, the government's keep-it-hidden policy contains the seeds of disaster. By masking both the level of official violence and the growing resistance to it, the government may be misleading the ruling white minority into a false sense that there is still plenty of time to work things out.

For if the police and military violence—indeed the violence of apartheid itself—isn't quite real for whites, who don't see it on television, it is terribly real for its victims, who increasingly are demanding relief on pain of

rendering the country a bloody and ungovernable mess.

The disparities a visitor sees as he moves about the cities look not much more appalling than ordinary class differences.

And then the Biko play restores context. The deaths in detention neither began nor ended with Biko. The most recent (only a fool would say the last) was recorded in 1985.

Nor have the detentions, more often than not without charges being brought, abated. The 290 detentions of last week brought to more than 6,200 the number of people detained since the emergency regulations went into effect on July 21. The authorities—perhaps again to keep whites from understanding the seriousness of the situation—don't even bother anymore to release the names of the detainees, though it is believed that 1,200 are still being held.

Maybe one day the government will learn that it is not the press reporting of facts but the awful facts themselves that constitute the threat to peace in South Africa.

The program notes include a 1971 Biko speech that ends with this passage: "The tripartite system of fear—that of whites fearing the blacks, blacks fearing whites, and the government fearing blacks and wishing to allay the fear among whites—makes it difficult to establish rapport between the two segments of the community. The fact of living apart adds a different dimension and perhaps a more serious one: it makes the aspirations of the two groups diametrically opposed."

"The white strategy so far has been to systematically break down the resistance of blacks to the point where the latter would accept crumbs from the white table. This we have shown we reject unequivocally. And now the stage is therefore set for a very interesting turn of events."

AN AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times recently ran an article on a friend of mine, a municipal bond officer with Goldman, Sachs & Co., Mr. Robert N. Downey.

The article discusses Bob's contributions to his firm and how his hard work turned the firm's fortunes around. I must admit, however, that I'm not at all surprised. Bob Downey is a remarkably hard working and creative individual. He deserves the praise that the Time article affords him. Bob Downey is a credit not only to his firm but to New York City as well. I commend the article to my colleague's attention.

MUNICIPAL BOND OFFICER LEADS GOLDMAN TO TOP

When Robert N. Downey came to Goldman, Sachs & Company in 1969, the firm was not much of a force in the municipal bond business.

"When I came here there were a dozen people in the municipal bond department," Mr. Downey said in a recent interview.

"The first year I was here we did two little issues for colleges and ranked 50th among municipal bond underwriters. We didn't do much business that year, but we generated a lot of ideas."

Times have changed, and those ideas have borne fruit.

This week Mr. Downey's department, which now consists of 132 professionals, acted as lead manager on \$1.6 billion worth of municipal bond issues.

The weekly total, a record for any firm on Wall Street, swelled the volume of financings in which Goldman, Sachs has acted as lead manager so far this year to more than \$12.8 billion. This week's deals helped to widen the firm's lead over Merrill Lynch as the nation's leading underwriter of municipal bonds.

Mr. Downey, 49, was named a partner at Goldman, Sachs in 1977 and took over management of the municipal bond department three years later.

When he talks about the department's success, the subject he dwells on most are its people.

"That's the No. 1 thing," he said. "We certainly have the people with the brains and the motivation to do deals."

The introduction of new financing twists like growth and income securities has helped attract clients to Goldman, Sachs. But the firm's surge this year has also occurred during a period when the entire municipal bond market is booming.

Issuers, wary of tax legislation being debated in Congress and attracted by a steady decline in interest rates this year, have floated a record \$107 billion worth of debt so far in 1985. For all of last year, \$101 billion worth of new municipal debt issues went to market.

Some observers predict that an additional \$50 billion to \$58 billion worth of public debt may be offered in the last two months of the year.

"I don't see that much more coming, but the market is certainly absorbing all that is being issued," Mr. Downey said.

Along with other participants, Mr. Downey seems convinced that the pace of activity will not spill into 1986.

"There will be a big fall off after the first of the year," he said, "if only when it is compared to the last few months of 1985."

Mr. Downey, a graduate of Dartmouth College, began his career in municipal finance with R. W. Pressprich & Company in 1962.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. HAROLD L. SHIRE OF LOS ANGELES

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you and our distinguished colleagues to join me in saluting a remarkable man and an outstanding Los Angeles leader, Dr. Harold L. Shire.

On Friday, November 29, on the occasion of his 75th birthday, Dr. Shire was honored by his family and many friends at the Congregation Shaarei Tefila in Los Angeles. Dr. Shire is prominent as a lawyer, industrialist, educator, and philanthropist. As an attorney, he has held positions as assistant U.S. attorney and assistant district attorney in Los Angeles County, as well as practicing privately in Los Angeles and Beverly Hills.

But Dr. Shire's talents and achievements go way beyond the law. He holds degrees of

MLA, MBA, and Ph.D. as well as his J.D. His invention of flexible connectors on jet aircraft made a historic contribution to aviation. He founded the General Connectors Corp., and served as president and chairman of the board of that company. He has been a professor and assistant vice president at Pepperdine University in southern California, and has taught at the United States International University in San Diego.

Dr. Shire has also been a tireless and enormously resourceful benefactor of the Los Angeles Jewish community. This commitment extends beyond the Jewish community of today to that of decades from now, as he has devoted himself to such projects as the Yeshiva University of Los Angeles, which will enrich the community long into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this extraordinary American richly deserves the recognition given to him on November 29. I ask that the leadership and the Members of the House of Representatives join me in wishing Dr. Shire, his wife Cecilia Shire, and all of his family good health and many more years of continued contribution to our community and to our Nation.

CARGO PREFERENCE COMPROMISE

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant issues currently being debated in the House-Senate conference on the farm bill is cargo preference.

As my colleagues know, cargo preference is an essential element in maintaining our U.S. merchant fleet. Since 1981, we have lost over 18,000 seafaring jobs, a decline of nearly 40 percent in that industry. We have seen a sharp drop in orders of private ship construction, resulting in fewer jobs for cities like Baltimore, MD, and Boston, MA.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, representatives from all sectors of the U.S. maritime industry came together with groups from the agricultural community to work toward a compromise on cargo preference. Those of us who support a strong merchant marine would have preferred no compromise on cargo preference.

But after much thought and consideration, we have recognized that the substantial benefits of export promotion programs were being withheld from American farmers because of USDA's shutdown of the Blended Credit Program. They bargained in good faith, despite the fact that the Federal courts had reaffirmed their original position on cargo preference. They recognized, as I do, that two suffering industries like agriculture and the merchant marine should be working together to strengthen, and not weaken, their respective interests.

Last week, the House Merchant Marine Subcommittee, on which I serve, held an oversight hearing on the "Cargo preference

compromise." The maritime coalition supporting the compromise appeared before the subcommittee, indicating why they believe the solution they have proposed, and which is before the House-Senate conference, is a good idea for those who serve in the merchant marine and for farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the coalition's statement to my colleagues, and urge them to indicate their support for this compromise to the House Members of the conference committee.

STATEMENT OF THE MARITIME COALITION ON "THE CARGO PREFERENCE COMPROMISE" BEFORE THE HOUSE MERCHANT MARINE SUBCOMMITTEE DECEMBER 5, 1985

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, we welcome the opportunity to present our views on the cargo preference compromise between the maritime and agriculture industries. The panel appearing this morning was selected to represent the broad spectrum of the American maritime industry which worked to craft the compromise. All of the organizations in our coalition are listed on the covering page of the written statement. Our panel consists of: Bruce J. Carlton, Deputy Executive Director of the Joint Maritime Congress; C. James Patti, President of the Maritime Institute for Research and Industrial Development; Frank Pecquex, Legislative Director of the Seafarers International Union and Maritime Trades Department, AFL-CIO; Albert E. May, Executive Vice President of the Council of American-Flag Ship Operators; and Emanuel Rouvelas of Preston, Thorgrimson, Ellis and Holman, appearing on behalf of the Transportation Institute. Before discussing the cargo preference controversy and eventual compromise, the coalition would like to express its deepest appreciation for the leadership, thoughtfulness and strong support demonstrated by the members and staff of the subcommittee and the full Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee during the debate and vote on cargo preference provisions in the House farm bill. Indeed, without your leadership and the wide margin of support you developed on this matter, we undoubtedly would not be here today to discuss a compromise.

The compromise on cargo preference drafted by the maritime and agriculture industries was the culmination of a long chain of events associated with the so-called "Blended Credit" controversy. We do not need to describe in detail all of its components but nevertheless, it is useful to recall two key aspects of that episode which in large part helped established the foundation upon which this compromise was built.

In her decision in *Transportation Institute v. Dole*, U.S. District Court Judge June Green found unequivocally that the Cargo Preference Act of 1954 applied to the Blended Credit program administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Judge Green further observed that although the court had not been asked to rule on cargo preference applicability in the GSM-102 (loan guarantee) program, she would have concluded that cargo preference applied in that case too. Immediately after her decision, USDA suspended the Blended Credit program to avoid complying with Judge Green's order, thereby abandoning more than one-half billion dollars in export sales of agricultural commodities.

Thus, despite the fact that the federal court had reaffirmed the position of the maritime industry on cargo preference—and

originally that of DOT—the substantial benefits of export promotion programs were being withheld from American farmers by USDA's shutdown of the Blended Credit program.

The maritime community was galvanized by these events and joined ranks to defend the principle of cargo preference and to ensure its equitable and judicious application. Representatives of every affected segment of the industry met together for the first time on March 13 of this year to discuss what was then viewed to be a total impasse on the Blended Credit controversy. It was also perceived that a broad and deep attack on the principle of cargo preference was brewing, and that all cargo preference programs might be jeopardized. That meeting formed the basis of what would become today's unique coalition of labor, management, ship operators, shipbuilders and related groups. I would add at this point that our differences on other important maritime issues are well known and understood by members of this subcommittee. This is not the case with cargo preference. Without reservation, we are bound and determined to see that cargo preference is carried out to the full letter of the law.

Between March 13 and June 4, the maritime cargo preference coalition met frequently to devise and refine a strategy to overcome the obstacles we faced. Our initial efforts were directed to restoring the Blended Credit program and defeating legislation designed to reverse Judge Green's decision. Our attempts began with letters to USDA from the House and Senate—in large measure from this subcommittee—urging Secretary Block to reconsider the decision to terminate the program. We also focused on S. 721, a bill which went far beyond a mere reversal of the District Court decision in that it would have vested total discretionary authority in USDA to determine when cargo preference was to be applied. Our industry quickly determined that enactment of S. 721, or the several similar bills introduced in the House, could foreshadow the total demise of cargo preference, and with it the destruction of our industry.

We were heartened by the strong show of support from members in both houses. Nevertheless, there was no movement to renew the Blended Credit program, thereby shutting off cargoes for the merchant marine and penalizing the farm community. Likewise, anti-cargo preference/anti-maritime language was incorporated into the early drafts of both the Senate and House bills authorizing the farm programs undertaken by USDA. Simultaneously, the government appealed the Blended Credit decision, and we were forced to continue our legal battles. But there was an unexpected benefit arising from the struggle. The hard work of the coalition on cargo preference cemented the maritime industry to a degree which surprised even our most vocal critics.

We should stress, however, that the goals of the coalition at this point did not include a compromise with any other group or industry. Our work was aimed solely at the preservation of the very existence of the U.S.-flag fleet. On June 4, representatives of the maritime coalition met for the first time with those of the agriculture industry to discuss our differences on cargo preference. In our view, this meeting was just another step in the process of preserving cargo preference. Over the course of nearly two months, these same representatives continued to meet in intense, straightforward and vigorous negotiations. We quickly found

some common ground: both industries were in deep economic trouble; both were victims of longterm worldwide recession; both suffered precisely the same consequences of an over-valued dollar; both faced stiff foreign competition, which was often heavily subsidized by foreign governments; and both needed immediate relief if their continuing economic difficulties were to be reversed.

Maritime and agriculture recognized that some degree of "give-and-take" would have to take place. Since there was no controversy whatsoever on cargo preference as it applied to the P.L. 480 Food for Peace program, that matter was not examined. Rather, we focused on those various government-assisted export promotion programs that had separated our two industries for many years, culminating in the Blended Credit controversy.

At the outset, both sides laid down guiding principles which were seen as forming the basis of any agreement which we might be able to devise. The maritime industry articulated two such principles: one, we needed additional cargoes on U.S.-flag vessels to promote our economic well-being; and two, the principle of cargo preference was non-negotiable. The representatives from agriculture explained their basic requirements just as succinctly: one, they needed flexibility in designing export promotion programs in order to increase sales abroad and stem the tide of declining exports; and two, they needed to know precisely when cargo preferences was to be applied to government funded programs.

The stage was thus set for the difficult process of negotiation, accommodation, and cooperation. We began with several proposals and counter-proposals from both sides of the table, each structured around our respective interpretations of the other side's "guiding" or "baseline" positions. But in spite of two weeks of serious and good faith efforts, we still were unable to conclude a workable mechanism.

At that point, maritime offered the outline of a proposal which went directly to each side's essential demands and provided the framework of the compromise before you today. Cargo preference would not apply to the commercial-type export programs of the USDA or CCC, such as Blended Credit and Export PIK. Cargo preference requirements on concessional-type programs, such as P.L. 480, administered by USDA, CCC and AID would increase by 25 percentage points, phased-in over 3 years. The principle of cargo preference would be preserved, and agriculture would know precisely when it was to be applied. A further consideration, that cargo preference be administered by DOT in a flexible and efficient manner led to the proposal that a broadly representative national commission be created to examine ways in which the current practices could be improved upon. A key element in the national commission was the direct participation of the Congress, including the Merchant Marine & Fisheries Committee.

The two sides were able to reach an agreement based on this core concept, primarily because there was a recognition that each side's basic demands were preserved, and that such a solution, if enacted into law, could be administered with relative ease when compared with other proposals we had explored.

Before we conclude our statement this morning, we would like to stress again that the entire maritime industry stands united behind this compromise, and we are joined

as well by a broad-based coalition of agriculture interests.

This subcommittee and its parent committee took the lead in in fending off the most concerted attack on cargo preference and the U.S.-flag fleet to come before the House of Representatives in many years. The maritime industry is grateful for your solid defense. We would ask this subcommittee to lead the way again in supporting this compromise when the issue is raised during the conference with the Senate on the 1985 farm bill.

This concludes our remarks. We would be pleased to answer your questions.

A SALUTE TO THOMAS B. SHROPSHIRE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, thank you for providing me with this opportunity to salute my good friend, Mr. Thomas B. Shropshire. Recently, Mr. Shropshire retired after 33 years of distinguished service with the Philip Morris Corp. and the Miller Brewing Co. With his retirement, Philip Morris and Miller Brewing have lost an exceptional corporate executive.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas B. Shropshire has been a trailblazer. He was one of the first black Americans to become an officer with a major corporation. He, in turn, has helped other black Americans get started in the corporate sector. For these individuals, Thomas B. Shropshire has been a mentor, motivator and confidant.

Thomas Shropshire began his association with Philip Morris in 1952 as a sales representative. He progressed through the ranks as the export representative to the international division of the Philip Morris Corp. By the mid-1960s, he had held a number of positions with Philip Morris in Africa.

His achievements in Africa were so impressive that in 1972, Thomas Shropshire was appointed by Philip Morris executives to the new management team for the Miller Brewing Co. Largely because of his work and expertise, today, the Miller Brewing Co. has been elevated from the number seven slot to the number two brewer in terms of sales in the United States.

In 1978, Tom was elected vice president of Philip Morris, Inc. and senior vice president of the Miller Brewing Co. He also is a member of the board of the Miller Foundation and the Seven-Up Co.

In addition to his achievements within the corporate sector, Thomas Shropshire has been active with numerous civic, community and charitable organizations. Because of his efforts, the Miller Brewing Co. and Philip Morris have expanded its corporate contributions to include such organizations as the National Urban League, the United Negro College Fund and the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation.

As a result of his tireless efforts with these and other organizations, Thomas Shropshire is the recipient of numerous

awards and honors. He is revered by individuals from all walks of life.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that stands out most in my mind about Thomas Shropshire is that he is an exceptional human being. He has dedicated his life to not only succeeding in the corporate sector, but also helping others to succeed. He is an unselfish individual who has used all of the resources at his disposal to help others.

Although he is retiring from his position with Philip Morris and the Miller Brewing Co. I know that we will continue to hear about his work with various civic organizations. At this time, I ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting Thomas B. Shropshire on his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Cleveland Call and Post on my good friend, Thomas B. Shropshire.

(From the Call and Post, Nov. 7, 1985)

MILLER EXECUTIVE THOMAS SHROPSHIRE CHOOSES EARLY RETIREMENT

MILWAUKEE—Thomas B. Shropshire has elected to take early retirement after 33 years with Philip Morris and the Miller Brewing Company. His retirement became effective November 1.

However, the 60-year-old senior vice president and treasurer will continue his association with the firms by serving as a consultant to the Philip Morris companies.

When he's not consulting, Shropshire will pursue his favorite hobby, golf, "stay involved with my photography and spend a lot more time with my son and daughter." He and his family now live in Mission Viejo, Calif.

Shropshire, whose career spans four decades, is one of a small cadre of Black men and women who helped open the doors for other Blacks by venturing into the corporate world at a time when few companies hired Black professionals. He is also one of very few Blacks who reached the upper echelons of that world.

The foundation for Shropshire's success was laid in Little Rock, Ark., where his widowed mother, a school teacher, worked hard to instill in her three sons the importance of education, a commitment to excellence, full use of their God-given talents and a commitment to helping others. Her efforts were successful. In addition to her son Tom, Mrs. Shropshire's son William (called Bruce by his family) is an oral surgeon in Atlanta, and her son Jackie is a lawyer in Gary, Ind.

After completing his education in Little Rock, Tom Shropshire enrolled in Lincoln University in Jefferson City, Mo., where he majored in business administration. He then attended the graduate school of business at New York University, and served in the U.S. Navy.

With the help of the New York Urban League, Shropshire obtained a job with Philip Morris Incorporated in 1952 as a sales representative in Brooklyn, N.Y. The following year he was named college supervisor, a position he held for seven years.

Shropshire's effectiveness on the domestic front led to his appointment in 1961 as export representative to Philip Morris' international division. He spent the next decade of his life working in Africa. As export representative, Shropshire was responsible for organizing and supervising distribution and sales of Philip Morris products in 20 different countries.

From 1963-1966, Shropshire served as sales manager for tropical Africa; and, in 1967, he was appointed coordinator for Africa.

His rise up the corporate ladder continued in 1968 when he was named chairman and managing director of Philip Morris Nigeria—responsible for not only marketing, but manufacturing operations as well.

While much of his time in Africa was spent handling company business and advancing his career, Shropshire did not forget an all important tenet of his mother's teaching—a commitment to helping others.

Shropshire served on the Court of Governors of the University of Lagos Medical School, the Nigerian-American Chamber of Commerce, and the Nigerian National Swimming Association. In addition, he served on the All-African Games Committee.

Shropshire's management of Philip Morris operations during his tenure in Africa helped the company's Marlboro brand become the number one selling tobacco product worldwide; and helped firmly establish the viability of product segmentation in the consumer marketplace.

In recognition of his contributions to the company, Philip Morris chose, in 1972, to make Shropshire a member of the new management team sent to Milwaukee to turn the Miller Brewing company into a top beer industry contender.

Shropshire, who was elected to the board of directors of the company, initially served as vice president of market planning for Miller. His leadership helped guide Miller from a modest seventh position in the industry to the number two brewer in the United States.

In 1978, Shropshire was elected a vice president of Philip Morris Incorporated, and senior vice president and treasurer of Miller. He also serves on the board of the Miller Foundation, the Seven-Up Company, Key Banks Incorporated, Athletes for Youth and the Milwaukee Bucks Professional Basketball team.

As he did in Africa, Shropshire has given his time to organizations that benefit others. He formerly served on the advisory council of the W. Paul Stillman School of Business at Seton Hall University in South Orange, N.J., the Business Advisory Council of Milwaukee's Cardinal Stritch College, and as a trustee of Talladega College in Talladega, Ala.

He has been active in the Milwaukee Urban League, the Wisconsin Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and the National Industrial Advisory Council of Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America (OIC).

He is currently a member of the board of trustees of the National Urban League and Howard University.

Shropshire said he "will probably get involved with community activities in California."

In addition to his person participation in civic, educational and community activities, Shropshire was instrumental in getting Miller involved in fund-raising efforts for such organizations as the United Negro College Fund and the National Urban League.

He has encouraged hiring and promotion of Blacks within the company. One of the most satisfying aspects of his career has been "seeing so many Blacks come into all facets of the corporate world," he said.

He has also encouraged development of programs at Miller that support Black economic development of activities that benefit local Black communities and organizations.

In addition, he has encouraged Miller sponsorship through banking relationships and direct purchases from Black businesses.

Over the years, Shropshire has been a much sought after speaker who carried his no-nonsense message about the need for Black economic development and self-determination to college students and other Black audiences around the country.

His efforts and achievements in the business, education and civic arenas have not gone unnoticed. In 1974, Lincoln University gave him its Distinguished Alumni Award, and in 1980, he was awarded an honorary doctorate of laws degree by his alma mater.

Huston-Tillotson College in Austin, Texas conferred an honorary doctorate of humane letters on Shropshire in 1982, and Miles College in Birmingham, Ala. conferred the same degree on him in 1984.

In 1985, Philander Smith College also conferred an honorary doctorate of humane letters on Shropshire.

The Chicago Conference of Brotherhood named Shropshire Man of the Year in 1975, and he received the same award from Hucksters International in 1976. The following year, Shropshire received the Philadelphia Tribune Charities Humanitarian award.

The string of honors continued in 1979, when Shropshire received the B'rith Human Rights Award, and the Omega Psi Phi Community Award. The same year, Shropshire was given Ebony magazine's American Black Achievement Award in business. The award recipients were selected by men and women on Ebony's 10 most influential Black Americans list. Another honor, the Roberto Clemente Award, was presented to Shropshire in 1981 by the National Association for Puerto Rican Civil Rights.

The Miller distributors in Arkansas established a graduate business scholarship in his name in 1982; and NUABA, an organization of Black beverage retailers he help form, established the Thomas B. Shropshire Business Person's Achievement Award that same year to honor those who demonstrate "the desire and the ability to lead in the world of business."

In recognition of his support of their organization, the Wisconsin Chapter of the United Negro College Fund (UNCF) established the Thomas B. Shropshire Scholarship Fund in 1985. Scholarships will be awarded to Wisconsin students attending UNCF schools.

Miller is an operating company of Philip Morris Incorporated, the wholly owned subsidiary of Philip Morris Companies Inc. Principal beer brands include Miller High Life, Lite, Lowenbrau, Magnum, Meister Brau and Milwaukee's Best.

THE CULTURE AND ANIMALS FOUNDATION

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Congress is besieged with lobbyists pursuing their own self-serving legislative agendas, it is refreshing and reassuring to find another kind of organization that is pursuing noble and idealistic goals.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the Culture and Animals Foundation [CAF]. This group is a non-

profit, cultural organization committed to fostering the growth of intellectual and artistic endeavors in those individuals who are united by their positive concern for animals.

Unlike so many other animal groups, this organization is not a political or activist group; it employs no lobbyists and has no political agenda. Its purpose is to promote, through education, an understanding and appreciating of our kinship with animals.

The CAF fosters three related programs to foster these goals. First, through its research program, CAF funds scholarly research into the lives and works of intellectuals and artists who have expressed a positive concern for animals.

Second, through its creativity program, the CAF funds original work of artistic, scholars, and creative thinkers who express their concern for animals in an original manner.

Third, through its performance program, CAF funds the performance and presentation of intellectual and artistic work that furthers the aims of the organizations, including the products of its research and creativity programs.

The scope of CAF's three programs is as diverse as artistic and intellectual endeavor will allow. Work ranging from history, legal theory, philosophy, and poetry, to dance, painting, sculpture and music is supported. Grant recipients are chosen by a selection committee comprised of experts appointed by CAF's board of directors. The number and amount of the grants is determined by the availability of supporting funds.

Mr. Speaker, I warmly applaud the aims of the Culture and Animals Foundation to increase our awareness of the delightful animals that share our planet. I urge my colleagues to encourage and support this distinguished group.

BETTER HEARING AND SPEECH MONTH

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation which will promote public awareness of the millions of Americans who are communicatively handicapped. My colleague, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, is joining me in this effort. With the support of our colleagues in the Senate and the House, we were able to pass a resolution like this one last year. By designating the month of May 1986 as "Better Hearing and Speech Month," we can encourage further attention to the needs of almost 10 percent of our population who fall into this largest of all categories of disability.

Across our Nation, there are approximately 15 million Americans who suffer some form of hearing impairment, ranging from mild hearing loss to profound deafness. More than a quarter of the senior citi-

zen over 65 experience some degree of hearing loss.

Over 10 million people experience speech or language impairments stemming from neuromotor diseases, congenital malformations, orthodontic conditions, vocal cord cancer, strokes and language-based learning disabilities. Every year over 84,000 people lose their ability to grasp word meanings and communicate through verbal speech as a result of strokes or head injuries.

Despite their handicap, people with communication disorders have made significant contributions in virtually every occupational category and profession. Thomas Edison, Beethoven, and Samuel Morse overcame their hearing impairments to do work that benefits us still today. President Reagan, Florence Henderson, Nanette Fabray, Patricia Neal, and Lou Ferrigno—the Incredible Hulk—are only a few of the prominent personalities whose professional achievements have continued in spite of hearing or speech difficulties. Nevertheless, many people with communication disorders continue to encounter obstacles which inhibit them from achieving their full potential.

Communicatively impaired citizens face special difficulties in achieving educational parity with their nonimpaired classmates. Young children with hearing imperfections and communication difficulties are often unable to develop language fluency with the ease of others their age. While the academic lag may be small during the primary grades, it often has a cumulative impact.

Unequal opportunity in one area frequently results in a denial of options in other areas. For the vast majority of handicapped Americans, a deficient education severely restricts their employment opportunities. As a result, people with hearing and speech impairments are often undereducated, and later underemployed. While attitudes and laws have changed over the years to provide more job opportunities, this group of disabled Americans still has less access to job advancement than the population as a whole.

Over the past two decades, Congress has passed legislation in response to historic patterns of discrimination against the handicapped. Paralleling these legislative advancements have been technological developments which have augmented the limited abilities of many speech and hearing impaired people. Recent developments such as closed captioned television, telecommunication devices for the deaf [TDD] and speech synthesizers help to eliminate barriers which prevent those with hearing, speech, or language difficulties from fulfilling their potential. An example of this advanced technology is in use in Congress' TDD phone lines, which allow communicatively impaired citizens to voice their concerns to their elected officials.

Among the most dramatic breakthroughs in modern science is the creation of the cochlear implant. Through the surgical implantation of a minute device, people who are profoundly deaf are now able to hear sounds of varying length and intensity. Further developments may make it possible

for the pitch and frequency of sounds to be distinguished also. With such refinements, the cochlear implant promises to provide thousands of previously deaf people with the ability to hear human speech for the first time in their lives.

Looking back, we can say that American researchers, scientists and inventors have opened many doors for the communicatively impaired, facilitating their entry into the mainstream of American life. Yet the technological advances I mentioned can be fully utilized only in a society which enforces the basic equal opportunity laws and civil rights protections every citizen deserves.

Across the country, plans are underway to promote awareness of the needs of the communicatively handicapped and to acknowledge their many achievements during Better Hearing and Speech Month. The effort is actively supported by 21 national organizations: A.G. Bell Association for the Deaf, American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, American Hearing Research Foundation, American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, Better Hearing Institute, Boys Town Institute for Communication Disorders in Children, Delta Zeta Sorority and Foundation, Disabled American Veterans, Gallaudet College, Hearing Industries Association, House Ear Institute, National Captioning Institute, National Hearing Aid Society, National Hearing Association, National Technical Institute for the Deaf at Rochester Institute of Technology, New York League for the Hard of Hearing, Psi Iota Xi Sorority, Quota International, Sertoma Foundation, Speech Foundation of America, and the Voice Foundation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this important and humanitarian endeavor. Together we can diminish the barriers facing these Americans and enhance their opportunities for a brighter and more fulfilling future.

SUPERFUND

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues in the House for supporting and passing the amendment offered on the floor by Congressman DOWNEY during consideration of Superfund reauthorization. We had to work hard to eliminate from the committee bill, the provision which would have imposed a broad-based, value added (sales) tax on manufacturers who contribute little, if any, to the waste problem we face. Federal environmental law is grounded on the premise that those responsible for pollution pay for its cleanup. A defeat for this amendment would have violated this premise. I believe we can now move forward in cleaning up these hazardous sites on a timely basis without further unnecessary delays.

RAYMOND F. THOMPSON—A
LIFETIME OF SERVICE AND AC-
COMPLISHMENT

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to one of the more outstanding members of my constituency. Mr. Raymond F. Thompson, who has distinguished himself and other members of the Eighth Congressional District of California by a lifetime of service and accomplishment, in pursuit of social justice and fair and equitable treatment for people of all races.

Although a native son of San Francisco, Mr. Thompson has been a long-term resident of Berkeley. He was one of the first black men to work in the San Francisco shipyards and he was a powerful leader in the early endeavors to bring about racial equality in the trade unions. He integrated the Boilermaker's Union working on ships in the San Francisco Bay yards. He was a major organizer of the 1934 general strike that established power for organized labor in the San Francisco Bay Area.

His history in Berkeley is equally active and effective; he worked diligently to bring about equitable treatment for ethnic minorities in exercising their rights to fair housing and rights to vote. He was an early leader in racially integrating Berkeley neighborhoods with a long history of segregationist practices.

He has provided leadership to people of all colors by years of service on the board of directors of the Consumers Cooperative of Berkeley which operates supermarkets, and provides goods and services to its over 130,000 member-families. The Berkeley Cooperative has extensive collaborative activities with the national and international cooperative movement, therefore, Mr. Thompson, who served three terms as a member of the Co-op board and two terms as vice president of the Co-op, was responsible for developing and strengthening the overall cooperative spirit of that time.

Mr. Thompson has been a working man all of his life; he had spent his labor in bettering the lot of all the people in the Eighth Congressional District. As befits a Berkeley resident, he has an extraordinary capacity to quote Shakespeare extensively. Now that he has passed his 80th year of life, I feel that his accomplishments should be noted and honored. Thank you for joining me in this commemoration to a useful and wonderful person.

DON'T JEOPARDIZE IRA AND
OTHER RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the following letter I re-

ceived from my constituent, James W. Marvin, Jr., of my hometown of Mayfield, KY.

Indeed, Mr. Marvin's excellent comments to me about his opposition to changing the tax rules for individual retirement accounts (IRA's) and other employer-sponsored retirement programs are timely, especially in light of the fact that the U.S. House of Representatives is today considering and debating tax reform legislation.

I urge my colleagues to read the following letter from James W. Marvin, Jr.:

MAYFIELD, KY, October 14, 1985.

Mr. CARROLL HUBBARD,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HUBBARD: Three years ago, with the passage of the Economic Recovery Tax Act, Congress gave the American worker effective ways to take charge of his or her financial destiny by using individual retirement accounts. The beauty of an IRA is, and has always been, its simplicity. However, there now appears to be a cloud of red tape hovering over the IRA Program.

I am writing to ask that you please not impose contribution restrictions on IRA's by linking them to other types of retirement plans. Please allow those covered by employer-sponsored plans to continue to have a choice in how they invest for their future financial security.

I believe most American workers would agree that IRA's are among the most universally beneficial programs to come out of the Legislature in years. Congress has a major success to its credit. Please do not put it in jeopardy.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

JAMES W. MARVIN, JR.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on December 10 I was privileged to deliver the commencement address before the students and faculty of the University of Tennessee graduating class of 1985.

I am pleased to insert my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the benefit of my fellow colleagues.

The remarks are as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE COMMENCEMENT
ADDRESS

Chancellor Reese, deans and administrators, faculty, members of today's graduating class, and your families:

I appreciate the opportunity and the great honor to participate in your commencement exercises.

I was here at the University of Tennessee and in Athens, Tennessee on last September 24 with President Reagan and Congressman John Duncan for this area.

At that time, we were stumping hard for the President's tax proposals and tax reform generally. Recently, the Ways and Means Committee, on which both Mr. Duncan and I serve as senior members, reported a bill from our committee.

The President, who has been the prime mover of tax reform in the country, is still

the key factor in whether any tax reform takes place. I believe we will pass a bill for the House, but the President must get behind any bill if it is to pass in the Senate.

It was no accident that the President came to Knoxville. He probably knew that you would beat Vanderbilt and win the Southeast Conference. The President merely wanted to insure his ticket to the Sugar Bowl.

There are several groups of you represented here today to whom I hope to impart a message before I complete my remarks.

First, to you the graduates, particularly the undergraduate class of 1985.

For many of you, one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of your life is finished.

You have earned good grades and awards, and the life ahead of you holds new opportunities at which you will assuredly excel.

For you, either graduate school or the job market is awaiting your enthusiasm, effort, and energy.

You have accomplished a significant milestone in your lives and you should applaud yourselves.

To the graduate students who have earned masters or doctoral degrees in any range of subjects, the worlds of research and education need your advanced training, new ideas and discipline.

This most challenging world in which we live is revitalized every time one of you steps forward, untainted by the cold realities of life, fresh from the intellectual challenges of the classroom.

Hold on to your ideals. Be bold, and don't be afraid to challenge.

You are the dreamers, the lone voice in the crowded room who dares to ask why. We are all here today to say to you "a job well done."

There is another group among you who didn't challenge your minds and who were satisfied with barely passing grades and few expectations—those of you who were simply along for the ride.

To you I have one simple message: welcome to the real world.

If you are wondering whether I am referring to you, here is a simple test in order to determine to whom I am referring:

Has anyone ever said to you, you are not working up to your potential, or this work is mediocre at best, or if you put as much time into your work as you put into your social life.

If the answer is yes, then I've got news for you—your days of week-night parties, last minute cramming for major projects, and asking for extensions are over or will be short lived. The real world won't wait for you.

Make a commitment to yourself today. Commit that your next effort, be it a job or graduate school, will be your best effort.

"Today is the first day of the rest of your life." This statement has never been more true for anyone as it is for you today.

No one can fault you if you try and don't succeed. But if you barely succeed, with little or no effort, then you have wasted a blessing, a God given opportunity, that in future years, you may realize was not your right to waste.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Assistance and Unemployment Compensation, I see many people who weren't blessed with your opportunities.

They will never have the chance to attend a university like Tennessee.

With the cutbacks in educational programs over the last few years such as finan-

cial aid, student loans, and research grants to colleges and universities, it is my fear that those who have not been able to take advantage of a quality higher education to date, may never have the opportunity to participate in future commencement ceremonies at great institutions such as UT.

Legislators, like myself, recognize these facts and are fighting daily to preserve and expand our educational system.

Currently before us in the Congress is a proposal commonly called Gramm-Rudman. The Gramm-Rudman amendment is an attempt to balance the Federal budget by 1991 and to overcome one of the major problems facing our economy today, the Federal deficit.

Gramm-Rudman would force the President and the Congress to work together to identify more than 50 billion dollars in additional cuts for the coming fiscal year.

If Congress and the President cannot agree as to where the cuts should come, then the President would make the cuts.

You should note that this procedure is radically different from the constitutional authority granted the Congress for authority over the budget of the Federal Government.

As a supporter of a balanced budget, I am pleased that the leadership and the conferees have agreed to exempt programs designed to combat poverty.

I am equally pleased that the Pentagon will be forced to tighten its reins on defense contractors who abuse their relationships with the Federal Government.

I am concerned, however, that given the Federal Government's recent policies and trends toward education the very structural foundation of our educational system is being attacked.

Educational programs have been cut from 10.8 billion dollars in 1981 to 7.9 billion dollars in 1984, a decline in current dollars of more than 25 percent.

Many programs directed at student financial aid such as guaranteed student loans, college work study, and Pell grants upon which many of you relied in order to go to college have already been some of the hardest hit in the last four years.

Education is not one of the protected areas under Gramm-Rudman and will probably be cut again.

If you couple these cuts with the rising costs of private education, the role of State colleges and universities will increase in drastic proportions.

Given the harsh realities of budget cuts and high costs, we cannot allow our public universities to be perceived as a school of last resort for students who cannot afford to attend private schools.

Public universities must be on the cutting edge of research and innovative teaching techniques in order to attract the very best faculty and student body.

The University of Tennessee is making great strides in educational excellence.

I was proud to read that Professor Bill Bass of your anthropology and forensic science department was named "Professor of the Year" by the Council for the Advancement and support of Education.

We need more professors like Dr. Bass, individuals who are committed to their work, and dedicated to the inspiration of their fellow man.

We commend and appreciate you, for we know that your commitment is a result of love and hard work.

But Dr. Bass' commitment must be present not only at this level of education,

but at the elementary and secondary school levels as well.

The future educators out there among you, must do more to improve our educational system.

You must help to restore a vigorous curriculum in our secondary schools with an emphasis on English, math and science.

If Tennessee is to compete, you the educators at this level, must provide the leadership and guidance to our lower level schools.

My friends, the State of Tennessee is about to become the beneficiary of the largest single, private capital investment in the history of the industrial world.

I am, of course, referring to General Motors' Saturn Plant.

The benefits, as a result of this plant to the State of Tennessee are tremendous.

However, GM is demanding that the schools and universities in this area provide them with qualified individuals—people who can think logically, intellectually, and analytically.

These abilities can only occur if fundamental skills in English, math, and science are emphasized.

A battle for the future is constantly being waged in the classrooms of the world.

There is an old saying which goes as follows: "If you want one year's prosperity, grow grain. If you want ten year's prosperity, grow men and women."

Our country has succeeded over the years because we have recognized throughout our history the importance of learning. . . the dignity of hard work, the need to take the initiative, and the good that comes from helping others.

Our country has placed a high value on education and to allow the erosion of our educational system by indiscriminate Federal cutbacks would undermine the tremendous progress we have fought so long to achieve.

Only through quality education can we fortify our national resolve, renew the confidence in our national purpose, and enrich the spirit of our times.

In closing, let me leave you with this simple yet most powerful message that I discovered in a past edition of the Wall Street Journal.

The text reads: "The greatest waste of our natural resources is the number of people who never achieve their potential. Get out of that slow lane. Shift into that fast lane. If you think you can't, you won't. If you think you can, there's a good chance you will. Even making the effort will make you feel like a new person. Reputations are made by searching for things that can't be done and doing them. Aim low: Boring. Aim high: Soaring."

OFFSHORE OIL NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND INTERIOR SECRETARY HODEL

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address my colleagues about the provision that sets out negotiation guidelines for Interior Secretary Hodel which we have included in the continuing resolution. The negotiations in which we expect to engage Mr. Hodel pertain to the matter of drilling

for oil reserves off the California coast. Two very different opinions have evolved on this matter, and our negotiating agenda must be to see if we can bring the two sides close enough together that a sensible plan can be drafted.

Congress originally authorized the Secretary of the Interior in the mid-1950's to lease Outer Continental Shelf [OCS] tracts to oil companies. Three-mile square sites were auctioned off up through the 1960's, as the oil interests sought to develop domestic commercial resources. But these activities took place in the placid days before Americans had heard of Arab oil cartels or OPEC embargoes. Oil was cheap, and no economic incentive existed to prompt mass development of OCS lands.

State waters, within 3 miles of the coast, were part of a different historical process. Certain stretches of the coastline were dotted with scores of offshore rigs where oil was near the ocean floor surface in shallow waters. Sites off of Santa Barbara, Santa Monica and Long Beach emerged as major oil-producing fields in State waters. Until 1969, no significant accidents occurred to raise concerns about the environmental effects of offshore oil drilling.

The massive spill from a rig off of Santa Barbara in the summer of 1969 signalled the end of the oil companies' financial honeymoon. Fifteen thousand square miles of ocean surface were polluted. The cleanup effort consumed \$100 million. Californians inland and on the coast wanted more than just verbal assurances that drilling would be done with environmental and aesthetic protection in mind. State and Federal legislators were called upon to enact protective legislation that shielded sensitive marine habitats from potentially damaging development.

Marine sanctuary protection now prevents drilling along major stretches of the coast. While existing wells continue to produce marketable oil, no new wells have been drilled since former secretary James Watt announced that oil companies could bid for any tract they wanted. The California congressional delegation had been successful in imposing moratoria on drilling since 1980. Our success ran out this fall.

Secretary Hodel, who is charged with presiding over our Nation's resources, disagrees with the blanket moratorium strategy we have used. He believes Californians are only one group affected by the development of OCS oil resources. Other Americans who rely on domestic oil, he said, must be consulted before a final agreement is made.

The Secretary could not accept the terms of the preliminary agreement announced last July, and no subsequent talks have taken place.

We in Congress still wish to negotiate. I believe there are areas off the coast that can be developed where commercially valuable oil exists without endangering either water or air quality, without having a negative effect on marine life and without affecting the world-famous California coastal tourist attractions. This is a very sensitive

matter, though, and progress cannot occur without the participation of Californians who will feel the consequences whether or not drilling takes place.

I sought a position on the negotiating team that was authorized in the continuing resolution. Due to the limited number of positions on the team, I was not chosen. This technically will not prevent me from working with my colleagues who share my concern for our beautiful coastline.

My hope for the discussions that will follow enactment of the continuing resolution are many. First, these talks should lead to a concrete settlement to which both sides will agree. Some communities, like Eureka, look forward to the business new oil will bring to them. Others, Oceanside, Carlsbad, San Clemente, and those where tourism is a primary industry, have clearly stated their preferences against OCS drilling. Meeting the differing needs of the various cities and towns along the coast must also occur in talks with the Secretary. The oil companies must identify their best guesses as to where the most recoverable oil is. Environmentalists will have to locate the areas most sensitive to development as well as those parts of the coastline where marine life and water conditions will tolerate exploration.

Only when individuals and groups with opposing views meet can progress be made. The lack of motion in these talks is frustrating. When the moratorium expires tomorrow, the ban on future lease sales will be lifted. I will work with my colleagues who sit on the panel that meets with Mr. Hodel and seek continued protection for the entire coast until an agreement is signed by the participants.

HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN: THE U.N. CALLS SPADE A SPADE FOR A CHANGE

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the frankness of a recent U.N. report concerning widespread human rights violations in Afghanistan. The U.N. is now willing to speak the truth about the terrible Soviet atrocities being directed against the Afghani people. This new U.N. frankness in dealing with the Soviets is encouraging. I hope it continues.

The United Nations Commission on Human Rights recently reported that Soviet activities in Afghanistan included mass bombings, killings of civilians, mutilations, routine torture, the forced evacuation of rural areas, the imprisonment without trial of tens of thousands of political prisoners, and religious intolerance.

While the Afghani Government refused to allow the author of the report to enter Afghanistan, he was able to interview Afghani refugees who had fled to Pakistan. Soviet brutality is so extensive in Afghani-

stan that over 3 million people have escaped to Pakistan. Earlier this year, the U.N. Commission on Human Rights in Geneva voted to urge a halt to the massive human rights abuses in Afghanistan by over 120,000 Soviet soldiers who have occupied that once peaceful country since 1979.

The great irony of this continuing Soviet occupation and brutalization of the poor people of that country is that the Soviets claim that they were invited into Afghanistan to protect that country and its people.

I commend the U.N.'s Human Rights Commission in Geneva for calling the attention of that international body to the ongoing shame of the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan.

I strongly recommend the following New York Times article on human rights violations in Afghanistan to my colleagues in the Congress.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 3, 1985]

REPORT FOR THE U.N. DENOUNCES AFGHANS ON RIGHTS

(By Elaine Sciolino)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., Dec. 2.—Violations of human rights have become widespread in Afghanistan since Soviet forces joined the fighting there nearly six years ago, according to a report presented today to the United Nations.

The report, prepared for the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, says that violations include indiscriminate mass bombings and killings of civilians; mutilations and routine torture; the forced evacuation of rural areas; the imprisonment without trial of tens of thousands of political prisoners, and religious intolerance.

The report says the actions appear intended not only to destroy opposition to the Afghan Government, but to break the spirit of an independent people and destroy the traditional family and tribal structures.

"Every hour lost is detrimental to the population and to the human rights situation in the country," wrote Felix Ermacora, an Austrian law professor who prepared the report.

WAR CALLED 'INCREASINGLY CRUEL'

It says that the Soviet-backed Afghan Government, "with heavy support from foreign troops, acts with great severity against opponents or suspected opponents of the regime without any respect for human rights violations." It says that the increasingly cruel nature of the war has been endangering entire peoples and tribes.

Mr. Ermacora, who was not allowed by the Afghan Government to visit the Government side in the war, based his report largely on evidence collected from two visits to Pakistan, where he interviewed Afghan refugees and visited hospitals.

The Afghan delegate, Mohammed Farid Zarif, condemned the commission's investigation today as interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs. He called the report a "wild and worthless piece of trash" and labeled its charges "shallow and superfluous hallucinations."

Mr. Zarif accused Professor Ermacora of pro-Nazi activities and tendencies.

The United Nations committee currently debating Mr. Ermacora's report is expected to vote later this week on a resolution introduced by a number of Western countries commending him for his report and expressing "great concern" for the violations of rights in Afghanistan.

COMMISSION APPROVED REPORT

Last February, when Mr. Ermacora presented an earlier version, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva voted 26 to 8 to urge a halt to "grave and massive human rights abuses."

Citing Afghan witnesses, the report lists purported abuses committed against civilians since the Soviet intervention, including hostage-taking, the rape of women, the plundering of houses, the wholesale destruction of crops and forced conscription of children.

"Mosques have been desecrated, religious books destroyed and in some cases even used as toilet paper, while members of the Islamic faith have been obliged to eat pork and to drink alcohol," Mr. Ermacora wrote. He added that rural populations suffered from starvation and disease because the Government withholds food and medicine.

The report says that toy bombs shaped like pens, birds, harmonicas, radios or matchboxes were being dropped from helicopters to maim children. Mr. Ermacora calls these actions "totally out of proportion to any military requirement."

Although the report does not specifically mention the estimated 115,000 Soviet troops stationed in Afghanistan, Western diplomats consider it the first major instance in which the United Nations has documented human rights violations committed by the Soviet Union.

The report concludes that international organizations have "an urgent responsibility to find ways and means to insure respect and guarantees of human rights" in Afghanistan, including the right of four million refugees to return home.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES ADOPTS RESOLUTION REGARDING SALVADORANS

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, 170 Members of this body are cosponsors of H.R. 822, a bill which would temporarily suspend the detention and deportation of Salvadorans now in the United States.

Americans in communities throughout the United States have expressed concern about the safety and well-being of Salvadorans who have fled their war-torn homeland. Many Americans have extended a helping hand to Salvadorans in this country, undertaking at great personal risk to offer sanctuary to the Salvadorans when in fact it is our Government that should offer the refugees a haven by granting them extended voluntary departure.

I would like to share with my colleagues the resolution recently adopted by the council of the city of Los Angeles, declaring that Los Angeles is a sanctuary city. I particularly call to the attention of my colleagues the provision reaffirming the support of the city of Los Angeles for H.R. 822/S. 377, the legislation introduced by Representative MOAKLEY and Senator DECONCINI to temporarily suspend detention and deportation of Salvadorans in the United States. I urge prompt action by this

Congress to adopt this urgently needed legislation.

The text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the United States of America has provided an enduring symbol of freedom for generations of people from other countries who fear persecution in their native land on this basis of their political belief; and,

Whereas, the United States Congress reaffirmed this tradition in the provision of the Refugee Act of 1980 which recognized the right to asylum of the refugee, defined as "any person who is unable or unwilling to return to his/her country because of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, or membership in a particular social group or political opinion"; and,

Whereas, in the definition of refugee employed by the Federal Refugee Act of 1980, Congress specifically intended to include political refugees and exclude economic refugees with respect to the issue of asylum; and,

Whereas, refugee policy is primarily a responsibility of the Federal Government, but local communities and local governments sustain the fiscal and social impact of large numbers of immigrants seeking asylum from persecution, and

Whereas, the climate of fear prevalent among Central American refugees presently living in Los Angeles may potentially impair the efficiency of City government agencies, disturb the efforts of law enforcement agencies to resolve pending cases, and generally contradict the ideals of diversity and tolerance to which the City of Los Angeles subscribes;

Now therefore be it resolved, that the City of Los Angeles reaffirms the traditional American ideal of providing refuge here in the United States for people from other countries who fear persecution in their native land on the basis of their political beliefs; and be it further

Resolved, that the City of Los Angeles, without endorsing any of the contending forces in any country, goes on record in opposition to the deportation of known law-abiding Central American refugees who have fled their homelands for fear of losing their lives; and be it further

Resolved, that the City of Los Angeles reaffirms its support of H.R. 822 (Moakley) and S. 377 (DeConcini), which would establish as official policy the suspension of deportation of certain Salvadoran nationals, provided such is consistent with the Refugee Act of 1980; a position consistent with a previously approved City Council action including such in the City of Los Angeles' 1984-85 Federal Legislative Program; and be it further

Resolved, that the City of Los Angeles appreciates the humanitarian work of private social service and religious institutions such as United University Church, First Unitarian Church of Los Angeles, Sepulveda Unitarian Church, Emerson Unitarian Church, Temple Shir Shalom, and Shir Chadash New Reform Congregation, which have provided assistance to Central American refugees in the Los Angeles area; and be it further

Resolved, that the City Council finds that immigration and refugee policy is a matter of Federal jurisdiction; that Federal employees, not City employees, should be considered responsible for implementation of immigration and refugee policy; and further that the City Council directs City employees to exclude refugee status as a consider-

ation in their daily activities and routine dealings with the public, with the proviso that this directive should not be construed as sanctioning the violation of any law or encouraging interference in law enforcement efforts; and be it further

Resolved, that the City Council commends the Chief of Police and the Los Angeles Police Department for adopting a policy of excluding consideration of the refugee status of crime victims and witnesses who are law-abiding from the Department's routine law enforcement activities; that the City Council urges wider public dissemination of this policy, in English and Spanish; and that the City Council further reaffirms the Department's policy of detaining and arresting suspected criminals, regardless of their citizenship status, and reporting to the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, only those undocumented aliens booked for multiple misdemeanor offenses, high grade misdemeanors, or felony offenses; and be it further

Resolved, that the City of Los Angeles supports, in concept, legislation which would clarify the responsibility of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service to approve asylum for applicants on the basis of the definition of "refugee" in the Refugee Act of 1980 relating to a legitimate fear of persecution in his or her native country, without regard to the political direction of the current government in his or her native country, and without consideration of the relationship between the current Administration in this country and the current government in the refugee's country of origin; and furthermore that this concept be included in next year's Federal Legislative Program; and be it further

Resolved, that the City Council recognizes the many demands placed upon the City's limited fiscal resources by current citizens residing in Los Angeles, and therefore urges the President and Congress to give greater consideration in their deliberations to the fiscal needs of large urban areas such as Los Angeles which have borne a disproportionate share of the cost burden resulting from Federal refugee policies; and be it further

Resolved, that the City Council directs the Human Relations Commission to submit an annual report, commencing in November 1986, on the status and unmet needs of immigrants and refugees residing in the City of Los Angeles; and be it further

Resolved, that the City Council in adopting the policies in this resolution, calls upon the people of the City of Los Angeles to reaffirm the American tradition of providing refuge to law-abiding persons who have fled their native country for fear of persecution on the basis of their political beliefs, and hereby declares that Los Angeles, as part of a national policy of providing refuge to persons seeking asylum from political and not economic persecution, is a City of Sanctuary for such persons.

THE HISTORY OF THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF HANOVER, NEW JERSEY

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my fellow Members, the history of the First Presbyterian

Church of Hanover, NJ. This congregation, which is located in my district, was founded some 277 years ago.

In the ensuing years, this church witnessed the birth of our Nation, its development, and its evolution into the world's greatest democracy.

Like the history of so many other long-standing institutions, the history of the First Presbyterian Church of Hanover is one that we can all learn from.

For this reason, I would like to ask that the history of the church as presented to me by Pastor Fred Depenbrock be included in today's RECORD.

The history follows:

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF HANOVER

About the year 1710, several families from Newark and Elizabeth, N.J. and some from East Hampton, L.I. settled at Whippany. This entire region was then a wilderness, but these settlers knew of the abundance of iron ore available and doubtless settled there for the purpose of manufacture.

These early settlers were not mere reckless adventurers, but were persons of substantial character, intelligent, industrious and some of them pious. For the first few years after their settlement, there is no account of religious services among them, but in the year 1718, a building for divine worship was erected on the present site of the cemetery in Whippany. This plot of 3½ acres was given for the purpose of erecting a house of worship by a schoolmaster, John Richards.

The first pastor, Rev. Nathaniel Hubbel, was a Yale graduate and served the church in Westfield as well as Whippany. He lived at first in Whippany, but moved to Westfield when his house in Whippany burned down. He continued to serve the church in Whippany until about 1730. It was during his pastorate that the village of Whippany received the name of Hanover.

Following Rev. Hubbel's ministry, the Rev. John Nutman was ordained pastor of the church at Hanover. He also was a Yale graduate and was a fine scholar. His congregation extended over a wide range of country, embracing the territory now covered by Hanover, Whippany, Chatham, Madison, Parsippany, Morristown, and even beyond these areas. Not long after Rev. Nutman settled in the area, because the meetinghouse was small and dilapidated, the feeling arose among the congregation that a new meetinghouse should be erected, but where it would be built was a matter of grave contention. The people from the Madison area were desirous of having it located nearer them, while those from Morristown were determined that, if the site were changed, it should be in their favor. Strange as it may seem, it was at length determined to decide the matter by "casting a lot"—all parties agreeing to abide by such a decision. When the lot was taken it was in favor of continuing on the old site. However, notwithstanding their previous agreement to stand by the decision, the people from the Morristown area withdrew and formed the First Presbyterian Church of Morristown, at that time known as West Hanover. This separation left the congregation in Whippany with not enough people to be able to pay the pastor's salary. An attempt was made to get the Morristown church and the Whippany church reunited, but it never succeeded. Mr.

Nutman served the church until 1745 having been its minister about fifteen years.

The following year, in 1746 Mr. Jacob Green was installed as pastor. Early in Mr. Green's ministry the question was again agitated whether or not a new meetinghouse should be built. The site proposed for the new building was where our present church now is located. The South Hanover (or Madison) people left the congregation and in 1747 erected a new meetinghouse in Madison.

No action was taken however on relocating the church building until 1755 when it was at last decided that the old church building should be abandoned. At that time two houses of worship were erected; one of these at Hanover Neck, now part of East Hanover (the building was situated a little east of the present building), and the other was built at Parsippany. Mr. Green preached at both places until 1760 when the Parsippany congregation obtained a minister of its own. Mr. Green continued as pastor at the new meetinghouse in Hanover Neck. Only a small part of the congregation that assembled in the church at Whippany went to Parsippany. All the elders and deacons at that time lived within the boundary of Hanover, and so attended the new building in Hanover Neck.

In 1757 a new parsonage was built which is still standing today, across the street from the present parsonage on Hanover Road.

Completion of the new church building was slow, and as late as 1770 the galleries (or balconies, as we know them) still had no floors. In that year a determined effort was made to raise funds to complete the building.

Between the years 1774 and 1777, there were no parish meetings due to the Revolutionary War. During that period the church building was used as a hospital by the Continental Army!

In 1779 an application was made to the State of New Jersey for a charter to incorporate the First Presbyterian Congregation in Hanover. The following year, before entering upon their office, the trustees were qualified by oath, a practice that is still followed to this day.

Mr. Green died on July 4, 1790, having been pastor of the church for 44 years.

After Mr. Green's passing the church was served by four different pastors until 1834 when Rev. Mandeville was installed as pastor. The important event of Mr. Mandeville's ministry was the erection of the present church edifice. On February 12, 1835, it was decided to tear down the old meetinghouse and build a new one. On the 14th of April that same year, the carpenters began to dismantle the old building that had served for eighty years; and during that period, eight hundred and eighty persons had professed Christ within its walls and one hundred and twenty had been received by letter. Within it some of the most impressive scenes had been witnessed. Wayward members had often stood up with tears of penitence to confess their sins in public and to re-dedicate themselves to God. At one time, nearly an entire aisle was filled with converts, who came to profess faith in Christ.

Some of the timbers of the old building were used in the new one (Mr. Stoll, the Sexton, could show you some of the timbers in the basement).

The first celebration of the Lord's Supper in the new church took place December 13, 1835, which was the first Sabbath the congregation assembled in this building. Mr.

Mandeville continued to serve the church until 1838 when he preached his farewell sermon and moved from Hanover to Freedom Plains in New York State.

The church continued through a long period of active evangelism, serving God and the people through the leadership of some very able and devout ministers for the next 74 years.

In January of 1912, the congregation authorized approval of plans to change the lighting in the church from kerosene to electricity, remodeling the front end of the church building so that the choir and organ could be placed behind an enlarged and more attractive pulpit. It also authorized the procurement of a new electrically motivated Moellor organ. Prior to this the choir and a handpumped organ had occupied the gallery over the rear of the church. By the 1st of June the building and organ were ready for service.

Today we should be proud to be worshipping in a congregation that has been in existence for more than two-hundred and sixty years. The church building has been declared a National Historical Site and is entered in the records of the National Historical Society in Washington, DC.

The First Presbyterian Church of Hanover is among the oldest religious organizations of the State, as the village of Hanover is perhaps the oldest inland settlement of the State. Hanover Church is the mother of all the Presbyterian churches in Morris County, including the large congregations of Morristown and Madison.

(This "Brief History" has been condensed from "A History of the First Presbyterian Church of Hanover, 1718-1968," compiled by the Reverend Oliver W. Chapin for the church's 250th anniversary.)

A SALUTE TO ANDREW STOFAN

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, President Reagan will present the coveted Presidential Rank Award to several senior executive service employees. I am pleased to announce to my colleagues that Andrew Stofan, Director of the NASA Lewis Research Center in Cleveland, will be one of the recipients of the Distinguished Presidential Rank Award. On behalf of the residents of the 21st Congressional District of Ohio, I salute Director Stofan on this achievement.

The principal criteria for the award is exemplary service with the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, Andrew Stofan has a 27-year record of service with NASA. Because of his dedication and skills, Mr. Stofan has progressed through the ranks of this Federal agency. In 1958, he began his service with NASA at the Lewis Research Center in Cleveland as a research engineer. Currently, he serves as the Director of the Lewis Research Center.

In fact Mr. Speaker, with the exception of a 4-year stint with NASA here in Washington, Andrew Stofan has been employed at the Lewis Research Center during his entire career with NASA.

During that time, he has been at the forefront of the expansion and development of this NASA facility. Today, I and many Clevelanders point to the Lewis Research Center with pride. Andrew Stofan has been instrumental in making the Lewis Research Center a highly respected and noted scientific facility.

I have had the pleasure of working with Andrew Stofan through the years. I have found him to be particularly helpful to me as a member of the House HUD-Independent Appropriations Subcommittee. Because of this association, I have visited the facility on numerous occasions and have been impressed with the kind and quality of research underway at the Lewis Research Center.

In addition to his demanding schedule with NASA, Director Stofan is an active member of numerous civic and community organizations in the Cleveland metropolitan area. He is a member of the Greater Cleveland Growth Association and serves as a board member of several other groups.

A native of the Cleveland area, Andrew Stofan received degrees from both Hiram College in Ohio and Carnegie Mellon in Pittsburgh.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Andrew Stofan, Director of the NASA Lewis Research Center, on his selection for the Distinguished Presidential Rank Award.

THE UKRAINIAN FAMINE

HON. DAN MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the newly-created Congressional Commission on the Great Ukrainian Famine, I have been eager to receive any information or comments which might be of benefit to our Commission.

Recently, our fellow Commission member, the distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. GILMAN] participated in a forum on this topic in Chicago, IL.

I have found our colleague's remarks to be so appropriate and relevant to the purposes of our Commission that I would now like to share these remarks by inserting them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

Thank you for affording me this opportunity to participate in this luncheon forum with this distinguished panel—James Mace of Harvard University, and Mayorn Kuropas, former Special Assistant for Ethnic Affairs at the White House, to discuss the great Ukrainian famine, and more specifically, the relationship of that crime against humanity to today's world, and what significant contributions can the newly created U.S. Commission on the Ukrainian famine produce.

A distinguished authority on Ukrainian culture, Robert Conquest, the curator of the

Russian and East European collection at the Hoover Institution, soon after the shooting down of Korean Air Line Flight 007, noted that in order to match the numbers slaughtered in the Ukrainian Famine of 1933, the Soviets would have to shoot down a Flight 007 every day for seventy-five years.

The Ukrainian Famine of 1932-33 is one of the great tragedies of history, and until recently, little systematic research had been done on this genocide. It is estimated that some seven million people died during the Soviet-instigated famine of the 1930's. And yet, as Dana Dalrymple, a U.S.D.A. International Agricultural Research Specialist stated:

"The famine was virtually unknown at the time despite the vast mortality and despite the fact that a number of accounts were published. Curiously, general histories of the Soviet Union still make little mention of the famine. In retrospect, the famine certainly represents one of the most efficiently managed news stories in history. It is incredible that Stalin could have pulled off such a feat."

Why, we are often asked, is it so important to focus our attention on a famine over a half a century old? Why, some ask, are we dredging up ancient history? What is to be gained by rehashing an event even now fading in the collective memory of mankind?

The Wall Street Journal answered that question for us in an article published on July 7, 1983, by Adrian Karatnycky, a research director of the A. Philip Randolph Institute. In that article, Mr. Karatnycky wrote:

"There is, of course, our moral obligation to honor the memory of the nameless victims by depicting the truth. Moreover, it is important to understand the forced famine as a pivotal event in Soviet history, whose consequences remain to this day. For the famine created a disastrous situation in Soviet agriculture from which the U.S.S.R. still has not fully recovered. Today—at a time when some would recast Soviet communism in a friendlier mold, the better to negotiate arms reductions with—may once again be an inopportune time to bring up the terrible loss of life and the painful trauma of the brutally scarred Ukrainian nation. Yet 50 years seems too long to remain silent about one of the greatest crimes in mankind's history."

In addition to the reasons cited in that article, the Wall Street Journal printed an editorial several months later, paralleling the events in the Ukraine in the 1930's with the ongoing tragedy in Afghanistan today:

"The Soviet invaders (of Afghanistan) are working hard to centralize the food distribution system and they are now trying to destroy crops they can't buy up. Afghans report Russian bombing of the irrigation system in the rich Shomali plain and napping of storage bins to destroy the wheat harvest."

The parallel often cited is Stalin's man-made famine in the Ukraine in 1932-33, when communist confiscation of the harvest caused at least five million to seven million deaths and wiped out the entire nationalist strata of that society."

The Wall Street Journal editorial closed with the challenge:

"Will the west sit this one out too?"

The premise of this editorial underscored the adage: "History is destined to repeat itself."

To this adage, I believe, we can add the codicil: "Only if mankind ignores the lessons history has taught us."

This is an appropriate time to bring the Ukrainian famine back into focus. Just a few days ago, President Reagan returned from the first summit meeting with the Soviets in six years. Although we all applaud the necessity of the American and Soviet leaders meeting face to face to seek solutions to the problems facing today's world, such a meeting would indeed be fruitless if the questions of human rights was not addressed.

And, we can not begin to understand the Soviet attitude to human rights if we do not familiarize ourselves with the saga of the Ukrainian famine.

The Ukrainian famine stands out as a watershed event in the history of human rights because of the magnitude of the travesty. An event such as the shooting down of K.A.L. Flight 007 is easy to grasp, because the number of 269 dead is a number we can all comprehend. But the over 7 million who died in the famine is of such magnitude that most of us have difficulty grasping it.

The deliberate attempt to wipe out the identity and the culture of an entire independently minded people is an event which we must understand if our quest for peace in today's world is to have a prayer of success.

That is where the responsibility of our public officials and of our educators becomes clear.

If we allow the Ukrainian famine to be forgotten, to be swept under the rug, it will be repeated . . . in Afghanistan, and in a hundred other places. History has taught us the sad lesson . . . that a crime committed against one people is a crime committed against all. If the world is allowed to forget the Ukrainian famine, then inevitably there will be future atrocities committed against other peoples—and our Ukrainian martyrs will have died in vain.

I was pleased to have co-sponsored and supported the legislation creating a Congressional Commission to investigate the famine in the Ukraine. I believe that such a Ukrainian Famine Commission would go a long way towards focusing the attention of the free world on the human misery that took place over fifty years ago in the Ukraine. I was particularly pleased about my appointment by Speaker O'Neill as a Congressional Member of the Commission.

The Ukrainian Famine Commission is now awaiting an appropriation so that we can commence our work. Once Congress approves our appropriation—which I am assured will take place prior to our adjournment at the end of the year—we will be able to begin our two-year mission to fully investigate and publicize the causes and the effects of this, one of the greatest man-made tragic disasters in history.

Speaker O'Neill appointed, as our Chairman, Congressman Dan Mica of Florida—a concerned and dedicated legislator who I am certain will serve as an outstanding Chairman. The other House Members appointed are: Congressman Dennis Hertel of Michigan and Congressman William Broomfield of Michigan, the Ranking Minority Member of our House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Members of the U.S. Senate appointed to the Commission are: Senators Dennis DeConcini of Arizona and Bob Kasten of Wisconsin.

The President has also appointed Howard E. Douglas, Ambassador-at-Large at the State Department; Gary Dauer, the Undersecretary of Education; and C. Everett Koop, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Once our appropriation is approved by Congress, the Ukrainian community will be recommending six public service commissioners. A full-time staff director will also be named, thus rounding out the full complement of commission members.

I can assure you that we intend to be a hard-working, dedicated group.

It is certainly appropriate that the President has named the Undersecretary of Education as a Member of the Commission, for it is extremely important that our educational community be made fully aware of the magnitude of this historical event, and that our young people be made aware of the extensiveness of this disaster, and are taught that such violations of the basic rights of humans are violations of all our human rights.

Finally, at long last, a literature is arising regarding this tragic episode which for too long was "swept under the rug."

Earlier this year, a book was published by a Ukrainian famine survivor, Miron Dolot. Entitled "Execution by Hunger: The Hidden Holocaust," this fascinating book is one of several major treatments in English, by an eyewitness of the Ukrainian famine.

The author, Miron Dolot, is to be commended for his courage in documenting the horrors of his childhood in the Ukraine, for one of the major hurdles that our commission will have to overcome—quite apart from the fact that survivors are harder and harder to find as the years go by—is that many survivors fear reprisals against family members who are still behind the iron curtain.

Another educational tool, which along with my Congressional colleagues, I am looking forward to seeing is the film, "Harvest of Despair," produced by the Ukrainian famine research committee with assistance from the National Film Board of Canada. This film has received rave reviews through Canada.

The Ukrainian people are admired by free men and women everywhere for their perseverance and their courage in the face of outrages of a shocking nature, just as other ethnic groups behind the iron curtain are courageously fighting for freedom and justice. Just in the past few weeks, I have had the extreme pleasure of welcoming to freedom Dr. Mark Nashpitz, a Soviet prisoner of conscience, and Lydia Staskovitch and her family, a Pentecostal leader. Mark had waited 15 years for his exit visa and Lydia more than 10 years. In speaking with them recently, they both stressed the importance of our speaking out in a decisive, forceful manner, and how important it is to put a human face on our trade negotiations. They also stated that we must never lose sight of the ideals of liberty and justice upon which our country was founded.

The plight of the Ukrainians has to a good measure not captured the attention of very many well meaning people for a variety of reasons. Because those periods of independence of the Ukrainian people has been so brief, many westerners do not think of the Ukrainians as a viable nation, like Poland or Russia, and that has aided the enemies of the Ukrainians who for years have tried to suppress the language, culture, and independent spirit of the Ukrainians.

The obvious intent of the Ukrainian famine was to suppress and break the spirit of Ukrainian independence. Although we are all horrified at the thought of seven million brought to their death, we are even more stricken by the knowledge that the famine was accompanied by an extensive

purge in the cities of the Ukrainian cultural and political elite—the potential leaders of Ukrainian nationalism. The Ukrainian famine was not just a general attack on a people—it was part of a concerted attack on the cultural and spiritual leaders of a nation.

The spirit of Ukrainian nationalism has, however, persevered. Because that spirit of hope remains alive, we can still look forward to the day when Ukrainian culture and independence shall triumph.

Let us all hope with confidence that our House Famine Commission and its activities will contribute towards bringing about the long-awaited day.

In closing, permit me to reflect a moment on the Geneva Summit meetings which have now come and gone.

The Congress and our Nation welcomed back our President and our Secretary of State with a strong outpouring of elation and pride . . . proud that our chief executive has re-opened a line of communication with our principal antagonist.

While it is essential that we fully explore and seek to build on this new opportunity to talk with each other, we must not be lulled into any sense of complacency by the euphoria emanating from all the handshaking and all the good humor and toasting at Geneva.

As we explore a new relationship with the Soviets we must remind ourselves of the character of the policy makers with whom we are communicating—a nation that:

Is involved in regional conflicts throughout the world—in Africa, in Afghanistan, and in Central America;

A nation that has invaded and is conducting a brutal war in its neighboring country, Afghanistan;

A nation that ordered its air force to shoot down an unprotected civilian passenger plane—K.A.L. Flight 007—killing all 269 civilians on board;

A nation that has such a low regard for human rights that it persecutes all those who have the courage to speak up for living up to the Helsinki accords—i.e., Nobel Peace Prize recipient Andrei Sakharov; the Anatoly Shcharanskys; the Orlov; the Josef Beguns, and all of the other political and ethnic prisoners.

Any accomplishments of this Geneva summit will only be able to be duly assessed in the years to come—and only if it truly contributed to peace, to justice, and to freedom.

And, if Georgi Arbotov is any indicator of any Soviet policy change—then I must be cynical—having heard him respond just hours after the summit meeting when in response to our inquiry concerning any change in the Soviet's human rights policy, he replied in the usual stereotyped, hard-nosed manner . . . that the Soviet's definition of human rights differs from our perception of human rights and that the Soviets are not in violation of any human rights.

Let us hope and pray that Mr. Arbotov's response does not portray the end result of our summit efforts.

Thank you and God bless.

HAL CHRISTENSEN

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the really nice people I have come to know in

this business of politics is Hal M. Christensen. Hal has represented the American Dental Association in Washington for 28 years and has directed the office since 1963.

Before I was elected leader and was serving on the Appropriations Committee, I forged a very cordial relationship with Hal because of the community of interests of our work since I was serving on the old Labor, Health, Education and Welfare Subcommittee.

Hal is going to be retiring at the end of this year and I certainly did not want the occasion to slip by without saluting him for first being such a fine representative of his profession and also serving so creditably as a Washington rep for the ADA.

He is an attorney and directed the profession's legislative efforts in the Nation's Capital during the unprecedented expansion of Government health care programs in the 1960's and 1970's, and will continue as a consultant to the association during 1986.

As director of the Washington office and assistant executive director for legislative affairs, he has been responsible for maintaining liaison with the U.S. Congress and executive agencies of the Federal Government.

Under his direction, the ADA's Washington office was expanded from a 1 person operation to a staff of nearly 20 persons. He had a lead role in the association's acquisition last year of the new 12-story downtown office building in which the Washington staff and several related dental organizations are housed.

He was instrumental in the establishment and development of the American Dental Political Action Committee, which has affiliates in all States.

He joined the association in 1957 as assistant secretary of the council on legislation, was appointed secretary to the council in 1960, and in 1961 was named Washington counsel of the ADA.

Thomas J. Ginley, executive director of the 140,000-member association has this to say about Hal: "No professional association has any individual who has so long and successfully represented its members in Washington as has Hal Christensen."

"Hal's efforts are associated with development of the National Institute of Dental Research, Medicaid coverage of dental care for needy children and Medicare reimbursement for covered services provided by dentists, self-employed pension plans, opposition to taxes on health benefits, and so many other pieces of legislation important to the profession and the oral health of Americans which are too numerous to list. In short, he has been dentistry in Washington and this profession is the better for it."

Hal received an honorary Doctor of Science degree in 1983 from Georgetown University where he gave the commencement address to graduates of the dental school. During his tenure, he has spoken at meetings of almost every State dental association.

He is a fellow, American College of Dentists; honorary fellow, International College of Dentists; honorary member, Ameri-

can Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons, and an honorary member of several State and affiliated dental organizations.

Before joining the association, Mr. Christensen was associate counsel to a subcommittee of the U.S. House of Representatives and was engaged in the private practice of law. A native of Utah, he completed undergraduate training at the University of Utah and received his law degree from the Washington College of Law, American University in Washington, DC. He has been admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court and the courts of Illinois, Utah, and the District of Columbia.

FARM CREDIT SYSTEM ISSUE

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week we voted on strengthening the authorities and responsibilities of the Farm Credit System. Their immediate problems need to be addressed if the nearly 1 million borrowers of the system are to be able to continue farming in 1986. I am greatly concerned, however, regarding the ability of local stockholder-borrowers to control their own associations. Association leaders in my district want to retain local control. They know best if farmers in their association will be able to repay the loans they make.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I call my colleagues' attention to an excellent discussion on the credit issue and expression of concern by the successful directors of the Production Credit Association of Northern Ohio for continued local control.

FEDERAL LAND BANK ASSOCIATIONS,
PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATIONS,

Fostoria, OH.

PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATION OF
NORTHERN OHIO

DEAR SIR: We are the directors of Production Credit Association of Northern Ohio, which was chartered by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration on March 19, 1934. Our headquarters is in Fostoria, Ohio, but our lending business is conducted in Hancock, Wood, Lucas, Ottawa, Sandusky, and Seneca counties, Ohio. We have approximately 2,500 farmers in these counties who own stock in the PCA and are borrowers from it.

The counties in which PCA of Northern Ohio operates are among the state's most productive in a number of different commodities. For example, Wood county ranks first in wheat production, second in soybean production and third in corn production in Ohio. Hancock county is first in soybean and second in wheat production. Sandusky county is first in cucumbers, processing tomatoes, and sugar beets. Our lending territory also includes fruit, vegetables, and greenhouse operations as well as beef, dairy cattle, hogs, sheep and poultry.

In the thirty-five year period from 1950 to June 30, 1985, PCA of Northern Ohio loaned more than \$1,000,000,000. It has had less than \$1,000,000 in cumulative loan

losses from the date it was chartered in 1934 until June 30, 1985. The association has been and continues to be profitable despite what many regard as the most adverse agricultural conditions in fifty years. It has been and is the largest agricultural lender within the six county area. We attribute this to several factors. First, the farmers with which we do business have had a great deal of confidence in the strength of the PCA. When they borrow money they are required to invest an amount equal to eight percent (8%) of the loan and to maintain their investment at that ratio during the life of the loan. They have always been confident that this eight percent (8%) investment can and will be returned to them as the loan is paid. Second, the PCA has historically loaned money at very favorable rates, typically as low as any production credit association in the Fourth Farm Credit District, comprising Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky and Tennessee.

These two factors, confidence and low interest rates, have combined to give the association a very significant market advantage over competing lenders. As a result, the association has been able to attract the best of the agricultural credit risks and to enable these farmers to reduce their interest expenses, which results in a lower overall operating cost, further enhancing the ability of these farmers to operate successfully in a period of difficult economic times. In turn, this has enabled us to operate with minimal credit losses, which, of course, lowers our operating costs.

Each of the factors discussed above is essential in our efforts to provide funds to our farmer-borrowers at the lowest possible costs. Without confidence that they could receive their investment in PCA stock upon payment of their loans, our farmers would borrow elsewhere. Unless our interest rates are competitive, it makes no sense for a farmer to do business with our association. Unless we can continue to operate the association in accordance with our existing credit standards, we cannot maintain a successful loan loss experience.

As a result of fifty years of prudent and successful management, our association has a net worth of an excess of \$10,000,000. Computed in the way commercial banks calculate capital for purposes of complying with the banking agencies' six percent (6%) minimums, PCA of Northern Ohio has a capital/asset ratio exceeding fifteen percent (15%), more than two and one-half times that it would be required to maintain if it were a commercial bank. Even if our investment in the stock of the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Louisville were to become totally worthless, our resulting capital/asset ratio would be only slightly less than that required of a commercial bank.

THE FARM CREDIT CRISIS AND THE POOLING OF CAPITAL REGULATION

Recently, as agricultural conditions in the United States deteriorated, the quality of agricultural debt began to be called into question. Approximately fifty commercial banks with significant amounts of agricultural loans in their portfolios have now been closed. Also, the Farm Credit Administration revealed similar problems in agricultural debt held by Farm Credit System lenders. As a result, negative accounts in the news media began to include mention of Farm Credit System securities. The yield differential between U.S. Treasury securities and those of the Farm Credit System, which had been almost insignificant, rose to

approximately one-fifth of a percentage point.

A Farm Credit Administration regulation (12 C.F.R. § 611.1145) that was designed to calm the credit markets, has had an opposite effect. The regulation purports to give the Farm Credit Administration the authority to transfer assets and equities among Farm Credit System lenders. Immediately after it was adopted the interest rates on Farm Credit System securities increased from approximately one-fifth of a percentage point over the yield on comparable U.S. Treasury securities to approximately nine-tenths of a percentage point over Treasuries. According to accounts in the press, the market fears that the regulation will drive the better credit risks out of the Farm Credit System. Some provisions of H.R. 3792 pose the same threat to the ability of Production Credit Association of Northern Ohio to continue to operate.

H.R. 3792 AND THE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM CAPITAL CORPORATION

Section 4.28L of the Farm Credit Act: As added by section 103 of the bill, this section would grant the Farm Credit Administration unlimited authority to require Farm Credit System institutions such as ours to contribute capital to the Farm Credit System Capital Corporation. This poses a direct and immediate threat to the farmers who have invested in our association. A crisis in confidence could trigger abandonment of our PCA (and other System institutions) by the most creditworthy borrowers. More importantly, even if the initial capitalization of the Capital Corporation does not result in the diversion of capital from our association, another provision in the bill will likely have the same result.

Section 4.28H of the Farm Credit Act of 1971: As added by section 103 of the bill, this section would authorize the Capital Corporation to require System institutions to make funds available to the Capital Corporation. Our PCA, which is certainly the most solvent of any in the Fourth Farm Credit District, has already invested \$8,131,000 in the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Louisville, including \$609,000 invested in the first eight months of this year. Stock in PCA of Northern Ohio held by our borrowers amounted to \$6,146,000 as of August 31, 1985. In other words, Production Credit Association has already invested in the FICB more than the amount invested in the PCA by its farmers-borrowers. Our investment in FICB stock has increased from \$6,643,000 at year end 1983 to \$8,131,000 at the end of August. At the rate we are going, all of our net worth will be tied up in FICB stock by the end of 1986. As a result, it seems probable that the Capital Corporation would very quickly begin to take the stock held by our borrowers. Before that happens we would expect the borrowers to go elsewhere for their credit needs, the most creditworthy going first. Our PCA will then rapidly be left with no customer base. Those farmers who stay with us will find their net worths decreasing as the value of their investment in the PCA declines.

Even if the Capital Corporation were to be financed with debt instruments issued to PCAs rather than with stock, unless PCAs receive a market rate of return, the transfer of funds to the Capital Corporation would quickly bankrupt the association. Our association does not have access to interest free money, nor does it maintain idle balances. For every dollar diverted to the Capital Corporation, our PCA will pay interest. The as-

sociation already pays approximately \$350,000 per year under a loss sharing agreement, in addition to interest on its note to the FICB. Any additional expense not offset by revenue will severely reduce our profitability, requiring that interest rates be increased above those of competing lenders, driving away our better credit risks.

We believe that the Farm Credit System as a whole cannot long survive by bleeding healthy PCAs in an attempt to save those already beyond salvation. The recent action of the Farm Credit Administration in administratively authorizing pooling of capital did not calm the fears of the credit market, but seemed instead to aggravate those fears. We believe that there can be no confidence in Farm Credit System Securities unless the credit markets can be sure that the Farm Credit System retains the confidence of the farmers. Because sections 4.28H and 4.28L would place the farmers' investment in PCA stock at risk, it will not solve the crisis of confidence.

Sincerely,

CARL H. BENSCH,
Chairman of the Board.
DEAN BIERY,
KENNETH HOOT,
RAY MURRAY,
ROBERT BOROUGH,
Directors of Production Credit
Association of Northern Ohio.

VOTE AGAINST SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 238

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present for the vote on Senate Joint Resolution 238 approving the Nuclear Cooperation Agreement between the United States and the People's Republic of China. Had I been able to, I would have voted against the resolution.

I am deeply concerned about nuclear proliferation. As nuclear technology becomes available to more and more nations, the possibility of nuclear materials, and the know-how to make weapons, falling into the hands of those who might use them and set off a nuclear war increases. The possibilities in highly volatile parts of the world such as the Middle East, are enough to give one pause.

At the time that the nuclear agreement was negotiated with China, the Chinese refused to add the written condition that they would not contribute to the spread of nuclear weapons. A verbal pledge on this key issue was accepted by the administration. Now, the Congress seeks to cure this defect by requiring that the same administration see to it that sufficient safeguards are in place to ensure that nuclear materials, facilities or components are used solely for peaceful purposes. If the original agreement was so important that the lack of safeguards could be accepted, how can one accept that they will now be rigorously enforced? Furthermore, how can we expect that the Chinese Government will be sensitive to a congressional resolution when

they have the agreement that they sought without agreeing in writing to the safeguards?

Today, we have been asked to take a leap of faith which can land the whole world in the abyss of a nuclear winter. I cannot, in good conscience, take that leap of faith and I join with my colleagues who refused to risk the security of our Nation and the continued existence of this world which we must all share.

WILLIAMS HELPS NEW JERSEY CITIZENS

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, on September 6, 1985, it was my pleasure to pay tribute to my special assistant, Jack Williams, for 10 years of voluntary service in my Stratford district office.

Before entering the Air Force in May 1942, Mr. Williams apprenticed with Dunlap Printing Company in Philadelphia. During World War II he served in the China-Burma-India theater as a photolithographer with the 20th Bomber Command.

Upon receiving an honorable discharge in December 1945, he returned to Dunlap Printing to resume his apprenticeship. In May 1948 he received his diploma in advertising from the Charles Morris Price School of Advertising and Journalism. From 1950 to 1956 he worked as a compositor at the Government Printing Office in Washington, DC, and subsequently accepted a position as Printing Publication Assistant with the Navy Department.

In 1961 he was transferred to the U.S. Naval Base in Philadelphia working as a printing publication specialist for 6 years at which time he was promoted to the position of Director of the Printing Procurement Department of the Navy Publication Printing Service at the Navy Supply Depot. Mr. Williams held the post until his retirement in July 1974. Recognized for his outstanding administrative capability, Mr. Williams received a recommendation by bodies representing 63 major printing companies for the position of Public Printer of the Government Printing Office in 1970.

Mr. Williams is a life member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 2218 and the Disabled American Veterans (Tampa, Florida). He is a former member of the Washington, DC, Club of Lithographers, the Philadelphia Club of Printing House Craftsmen, and Toastmasters International.

In 1975, Mr. Williams volunteered his services in my Camden County district office specializing in casework related to military matters.

My constituents have recognized the calibre of professional assistance which Mr. Williams provides and have readily expressed their thanks. The following are examples of their appreciation:

"You have cause to be proud of Jack Williams of your staff. He was quick in in-

quiring about my case and helpful in every way."

"I was very impressed with the service I received from your assistant, Jack Williams. I appreciated his sensitivity to my Veterans' Administration problem."

Without question, Mr. Williams is an outstanding member of that group of retired citizens who continue to unselfishly serve their community and the Nation.

I thank Mr. Williams for his generous contribution of time and expertise. On behalf of my constituency I extend deep appreciation to Mr. Williams for a decade of distinguished service. It is indeed an honor to have Mr. Williams as a volunteer staff member.

FEDERAL REGULATION OF DIRECT INVESTMENTS BY SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

HON. TOM DELAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, let me preface my comments by complimenting the members of the Government Operations Committee on the fine job they have done in preparing a report on direct investments by the savings and loan industry. The committee has made a commendable attempt to bring forth both sense and perspective to areas of regulation where even the experts disagree. Aside from the minor suggestions that I am about to make, I believe that this report presents a succinct and cogent summary of the field and makes several sensible proposals for future regulatory action.

A significant portion of the report consists of critiques of the various studies that have been conducted into benefits of direct investments by savings and loan associations. In general, I agree with the committee's assessment of these studies; however, I also believe that the committee has been overly critical of an empirical analysis of direct investments made by Prof. George Benston of the University of Rochester. Since completing the study discussed, Professor Benston has updated his analysis, and his revised study addresses several of the concerns raised by the committee.

I have obtained a copy of Professor Benston's updated study, and suggest that committee members review these materials to see if amendments to the report are in order. In short, the revised study takes into account many of the committee's concerns, and still concludes that direct investments are not a significant cause of savings and loan insolvencies. Second, while I agree with the analysis of the direct investment problem, I cannot wholeheartedly endorse all the conclusions drawn from the analysis. Specifically, the report points out that a general limitation of all the Bank Board staff papers is that they did not examine how direct investments would impact the risk of insolvency, which is the element of risk that is most relevant from a regulatory

point of view. Likewise, in examining individual case studies, the report gives detailed explanations of why it is impossible to claim that direct investments caused the collapse of a few troubled thrifts. Yet, despite the fact that the report demonstrates that there is no evidence to justify the Bank Board's interim regulation of direct investments, the report's conclusion does not emphatically state that the rule should be allowed to expire.

While the report intimates that the regulation should be allowed to expire if the FSLIC system is totally revamped, I would prefer that the report explicitly state that the regulation would expire on January 1, 1987, unless the Board can prove that direct investments are harmful to the industry. It is unacceptable for the expiration of this rule to be tied to the recapitalization of the FSLIC insurance fund, which may take many years to complete and is beyond the control of individual institutions.

Furthermore, if, as the report suggests, the largest problem facing the saving and loan industry is lack of recapitalization, it seems absurd to prohibit the industry from using one of the most valuable tools at its disposal, direct investments, to achieve this goal. Recapitalization must come from a combination of retained profits and new investments from outside investors, both of which can be achieved by the use of direct investment.

Third, the report pays lip service to the fact that there is a substantial States' rights issue involved here. While the ultimate insurer of deposits is the FSLIC, we are talking about savings and loan institutions which are chartered and regulated by the various States. I have yet to see a case where regulation can be better achieved by Washington bureaucrats than by local officials who are more aware of the problems faced by their own institutions. When a Federal agency comes out with one rule to apply to 50 States, they run the very real risk of throwing out the baby with the bath water.

Finally, I cannot accept the report's unalloyed enthusiasm for the regulatory structure erected by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for direct investment. The Bank Board now limits direct investments by requiring associations to obtain approval from the Federal Government before investing more than 10 percent of their assets in direct investments. From reading the final pages of the report, one would think that the Federal bureaucracy should solve all of its problems by inserting Government approval procedures between private enterprise and all controversial business decisions.

I, for one am not so enthusiastic about giving the Federal Government veto power over every important decision made by this country's businessmen and women. I, therefore, disagree with the report's endorsement of the prior approval procedures built into the direct investment regulation.

Similarly, I cannot support a report which commends a regulatory scheme that

proposes changing after 2 years the rules that govern the way an institution does business and suggests that this should be a model for other Federal agencies facing rapid change in the industries they regulate. While flexibility is indeed a commendable goal, regulations which are constantly changing create a great degree of uncertainty in the market place and make it extremely difficult for thrifts to conduct business in an orderly fashion.

In conclusion, I again commend the committee on their work and thorough presentation of a very serious and complex problem. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me the opportunity to express my views on this subject.

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO LINDA M. BILLINGS

HON. SALA BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, by now, many of you have heard of the tragic slaying of Ms. Linda M. Billings who was an employee of the Environmental Protection Agency. She was brutally attacked and killed by a young man in a robbery attempt as she worked late in her office on the day after Thanksgiving.

It was typical of Linda's dedication to public service that she was in her office at this time. Her memory, for me, will be one of energy, intelligence and compassion—attributes she shared wherever she went.

My strongest memories of Linda are from the period when she worked with the Sierra Club, as one of their staff members, in the 1970's. For many years, Linda worked in the Washington office of the Sierra Club, serving part of that time as their chief lobbyist on efforts to expand Redwood National Park in northern California. She spent many hours on this project with my husband, Phillip, who was then chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks.

Redwood National Park was eventually protected by an expansion of 58,000 acres and this accomplishment was due, in no small measure, to the efforts of Linda and of others who wanted to preserve these ancient giants for future generations to enjoy.

Following her Sierra Club tenure, Linda joined the Environmental Protection Agency in 1978 in the office of Pesticide Programs. She was selected to be the first Farm Safety Coordinator in 1980, where she was responsible for coordinating all EPA activities to protect farmworkers from pesticide hazards.

At the time of her death, she was preparing a revision of the EPA's Farm/Farmworker Protection Regulations, this was a major rulemaking effort to upgrade current EPA standards to protect farmworkers.

Linda's commitment to the present, her concern for the future and her care for others are what made her special. Her de-

termination and ability to get things done make her loss especially hard for all of us.

One of her colleagues at the EPA said this about her, "She was compassionate, yet tough and aggressive when working to protect farmworkers. Her energy, knowledge and commitment will be sorely missed at the EPA." Indeed, even though Linda's life was short, she left a marvelous legacy for us all in the way she lived.

GOUVERNEUR HOSPITAL, A CENTURY OF CARING: 1885-1985

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, Gouverneur Hospital, located in the Lower East Side of Manhattan, celebrated its 100th anniversary on October 10, 1985.

The hospital opened in 1885, when Grover Cleveland was serving his first term as President, David B. Hall was Governor of New York, and William R. Grace was serving his second term as mayor of New York City. Named after one of the streets that it was first built on, Gouverneur Slip, the hospital has grown from a 50-bed unit to its current 196-bed facility, exclusively for geriatric care.

Gouverneur is also known as the "Hospital of Firsts." Emily Barringer, a physician at Gouverneur, was the first woman to ride on an ambulance while serving the Bowery. Gouverneur was the first municipal hospital to open a TB clinic. Charles W. Stokes, Gouverneur's first house surgeon, later became the first Surgeon General of the U.S. Navy. The hospital established the first day camp on a ferry, the Westfield, for undernourished adults and children. Gouverneur Hospital is also first in the minds and hearts of people in the community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in commending Gouverneur Hospital for 100 years of dedicated, community service.

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE STATE SENATOR JOSEPH HIRKALA OF NEW JERSEY, ESTEEMED CITY CLERK, COMMUNITY LEADER AND GREAT AMERICAN

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 17, 1986, the residents of the city of Passaic, my congressional district, and State of New Jersey will join together in testimony to a distinguished State senator, outstanding community leader, and good friend, the Honorable Joseph Hirkala of Passaic, NJ, who has announced his retirement from his high office of public trust with the city of Passaic where he has served the citizens of Passaic since 1948 as

assistant tax assessor, registrar of vital statistics, supervisor of local public records, and assistant city clerk prior to his appointment as city clerk on January 1, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, we applaud Senator Hirkala's standards of excellence throughout his lifetime and over these past three decades plus 7 years in outstanding public service to the people of the city of Passaic. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in deep appreciation of all of his good works and share great pride in the success of his achievements with his good wife Josephine, son Robert, and daughter Karen as they celebrate this milestone of achievement in their family endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, there is much that can be said of Senator Hirkala and his lifetime of accomplishments in service to people. We are proud to boast that he was born and raised in the city of Passaic, NJ. He attended Passaic High School and Drake Business School. At the young age of 17 he enlisted in the U.S. Navy and served with distinction until his honorable discharge on December 1, 1945. He finished first in his class and was designated as "honor man" in signalman school. He saw duty on the gunboat *Action*, the destroyer *Dorch* and the cruiser *Philadelphia*. Our Nation's military service awards of merit that he received included: Good Conduct, American Defense, Asiatic-Pacific Theatre Campaign, European-African-Middle Eastern Theatre Campaign, Philippine Liberation Medal from the Philippine Government and the World War II Victory Medal.

Mr. Speaker, the quality of leadership and sincerity of purpose that Joe Hirkala has imparted to our people are mirrored in his many accomplishments and the warmth of his friendship that have won him the confidence and strong support of all of us who have the good fortune to know him. He has been a member of our New Jersey State Legislature for over 16 years. After serving in the general assembly from 1968 to 1972, Mr. Hirkala took his seat in the senate in 1972. The term to which he was sworn January 10, 1984, is his fifth. He was assistant minority leader in the 1972-73 session, and majority whip in 1975. He served as assistant majority leader from 1976 to 1982, when he became majority leader. For the 201st legislature, sitting in 1984 and 1985, his colleagues elected him president pro tempore.

Mr. Speaker, Joe Hirkala had made an outstanding contribution in promoting and encouraging community improvement and has actively participated in many charitable and civic endeavors to help improve the social, cultural, and educational endeavors of our community, State and Nation. He is a member of the Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, Elks, and Loyal Order of Moose; and is a director of the March of Dimes and the Passaic County Mental Health Association. He is a communicant of St. Joseph's R.C. Church of Passaic.

Mr. Speaker, yes, our community, State, and Nation has indeed been enriched by

the quality of Joe Hirkala's leadership and the wealth of his wisdom and caring as the city clerk of the city of Passaic of our great sovereign State of New Jersey. He has truly inspired and enriched the lives of many of our people in his lifetime endeavors. I am pleased to join with the people of the city of Passaic in this tribute to their esteemed city clerk and seek this national recognition of his contribution to the American way of life and the American dream through his compassion and benevolence for his fellow man and an exemplary record of good works in public service on their behalf.

We do indeed salute an esteemed city clerk and great American—Hon. Joseph Hirkala of Passaic, NJ.

LET'S ENCOURAGE OUR TOURISM RELATED BUSINESSES TO ADVERTISE IN CANADA

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, at recent tourism hearings my Small Business Subcommittee on Exports has held, small business owners in the tourism related industry have expressed concern regarding the 10 percent excise tax the Canadian Government has levied on U.S. travel literature. The tax which has been in effect since 1983 is levied on travel literature that is distributed free of charge in Canada. One witness testified that brochures he took to the Toronto Ski Show cost him over \$500 in duties yet the brochures cost less than that to print. Mr. Speaker this tax is impeding our small business owners' ability to advertise in Canada.

Last March, during the summit meeting between President Reagan and Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney an agreement regarding this excise tax was reached. Prime Minister Mulroney gave his word that he would take steps to exempt travel literature that is government-sponsored or printed by chamber of commerce, automobile associations, and "similar organizations" from the 10-percent tax. However, 2 months after the summit the Canadians amended their law to exempt government sponsored literature only. And this repeal is still pending parliamentary action. And, that the second stage of implementation, which will repeal the tax on nongovernment entities may go into effect in a year or so.

Mr. Speaker when our businessmen are willing to take the initiative and advertise without government financial support they shouldn't have the doors slammed in their face. Not only does the Canadian Government financially support their businesses in the tourism industry, we have an open door policy for those businesses to advertise here.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we must continue to encourage our businesses to take such initiatives as to advertise in other coun-

tries. At this time, I am not in favor of retaliatory actions however, I am cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 241 which expresses the sense of this body that the Canadian Government should discontinue its federal excise tax on tourism literature imported from the United States. I believe this is important to our business owners in the tourism related industry and to our balance of trade.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JOHN S. STAUM ON HIS ELECTION AS COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. BILL SCHUETTE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct privilege to congratulate John S. Staum on his election to the position of commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States during the 86th annual convention in Dallas, TX.

Staum, a veteran of the Korean war, has served the VFW for over 25 years. He has held many important elected positions within the VFW, including the position of chairman of the VFW National Convention Corp.

Our Nation owes a tremendous debt to our veterans. We must never forget the men and women to whom we owe our very existence as a free people. This veteran has served our country, not only in war, but also in peace. He has provided able leadership for his fellow veterans all over this Nation, and now he will assume the highest rank in the VFW organization, commander in chief.

Thank you, Commander Staum, for reminding us what leadership is all about. Each position you have held in the VFW organization has been an elected one. You have proven yourself to be a strong leader, and we in Congress wish you well in your new position.

REGARDING THE BUDGET ACT PROCEDURES INCLUDED IN THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 372

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to describe the provisions in the Gramm-Rudman conference report (S.J. Res. 372) which govern the congressional budget process prior to the beginning of the sequestration process, since these amendments to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 may not be as familiar to Members as some of the other features of the conference report.

Most of the revised budget procedures included in the conference report originated

in the House Rules Committee in the 98th Congress. They were the product of the Committee's Task Force on the Budget Process, a panel of 24 House Members from various committees which spent 2 years, 1982-84, reviewing the Budget Act. The resulting legislation developed by the task force, H.R. 5247, was reported by the Rules Committee last year (House Report No. 98-1152).

The conference committee on House Joint Resolution 372 agreed to substitute most of our Rules Committee bill for the comparable provisions in Gramm-Rudman as originally passed by the Senate. The conference report includes a few provisions which were not in the Rules bill; and, it treats some procedures differently in the House than in the Senate.

While I have serious misgivings about the Gramm-Rudman process as a whole, most of the Budget Act revisions included in the conference report are an improvement over current law. However, there is one change, apparently adopted at the last moment, that I strongly oppose: budget control at the subcommittee level. Up until today, it was understood that the House would apply budget controls at the section 302(a), or full committee, level—as the Rules Committee bill provided—while the Senate would apply controls at the section 302(b), or subcommittee level. The section 302(b) point of order, in my opinion, is unnecessarily stringent; it does not give committees the flexibility that they need to make tradeoffs among programs; and it diffuses responsibility for staying within budgetary limits. Who is to blame if the section 302(b) amount is exceeded: the subcommittee or the full committee? The Rules Committee considered section 302(b) controls and rejected them for the reasons just mentioned.

In brief, the general intent of the Budget Act revisions included in the conference report is to strengthen and streamline the budget process. These new requirements do so by: Accelerating the budget timetable, to make it easier for Congress to get its budget work completed by the start of the fiscal year; strengthening controls, mainly by enforcing the budget resolution at the subcommittee or programmatic level; and expanding the scope of the process to ensure that all forms of Federal financial activity—credit programs and off-budget activities in particular—are included in budgetary review. The conference report includes a number of requirements to ensure that budget-related information is provided to Members on a timely basis and to facilitate the operation of the Budget Act in the House of Representatives.

Unlike the rest of Gramm-Rudman, which expires in 1991, these Budget Act changes will remain in law unless they are revised.

The following explanation covers House rather than Senate procedures, some of which are different, and includes all but the most minor additions to or changes in current requirements of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

ONE ANNUAL CONCURRENT BUDGET RESOLUTION

Congress will be required to adopt only one budget resolution each year, as has become current practice. However, the budget will be binding immediately upon its adoption rather than on October 1. The budget resolution will be substantially the same as under current practice; its required content has been updated to include credit levels and 2 planning years.

Congress may adopt a subsequent budget resolution any time after adoption of the first if it so desires, but it is no longer required.

It will not be in order to consider a budget resolution if the resolution exceeds the maximum deficit amount for the coming fiscal year. The same prohibition applies to amendments to the budget resolution and to the conference report on the resolution. This is a new point of order which originated with the Senate as a way of enforcing the maximum deficit amount early in the process.

In the House, the point of order on a conference report exceeding the maximum deficit amount can only be waived by three-fifths of the Members voting. However, all other points of order either already existing in the Budget Act or created by this Act, may be waived by majority vote.

ACCELERATED TIMETABLE

The schedule for adoption of the budget resolution and passage of budget legislation will be accelerated and compressed in order to allow Congress to finish work on the budget earlier in the year than it does at present. Accelerating the timetable is desirable under any circumstances, but it is particularly important under the new deficit-reduction budget process because CBO will be looking at the budget legislation Congress has actually passed as of August 15 when it issues its August 20 report on the projected deficit level for the coming fiscal year. If Congress has not passed the necessary budget legislation by that date, we probably won't have a chance of avoiding the sequestration process.

After 1986, the new deadline for submission of the President's budget will be the first Monday after January 3. Beginning in 1986, Congress will adopt a budget resolution by April 15. Dates for submission of CBO's report and committees' views and estimates are moved ahead to February 15 and 25, respectively, to conform to the new budget resolution deadline. The House Budget Committee's reporting deadline is repealed; the Budget Committee is expected to report its budget resolution early enough to allow Congress to complete action on it by April 15.

To help the House get an early start on its budget work, the conference report requires House elections of committees to be held within a week after Congress convenes.

The May 15 deadline for reporting authorizations is repealed. If authorizing committees want their bills considered before Congress acts on appropriation bills, then they will have to report them early enough in the year to ensure that there is adequate time to consider them prior to

June. The conference committee agreed with the House Rules Committee that the current authorization deadline has been counterproductive since authorization committees tend to bunch the reporting of their bill around May 15. If committees report earlier in the year, the House and Senate will be better able to assure floor consideration of those bills prior to consideration of the relevant appropriation bills.

In the House, the Appropriations Committee must report the last of its 13 regular appropriation bills by June 10. It is anticipated that Appropriations will begin reporting its bills as soon as possible after adoption of the budget resolution. If Congress has not adopted a budget resolution by May 15, appropriation bills will not be subject to the section 303(a) prohibition against consideration of budget legislation prior to adoption of a budget resolution. House passage of those bills is required by June 30. Congress must pass reconciliation legislation by June 15.

Deadlines for appropriations and reconciliation are enforced in the House by providing that it will not be in order to adjourn for more than 3 days in July unless the House has passed its 13 appropriation bills and reconciliation legislation. Thus the House will be prohibited from adjourning for the traditional Independence Day district work period unless its budget work is done.

STRENGTHENED CONTROLS

There are several new provisions to ensure that Congress' actions on budget legislation conform to its budget resolution.

After adoption of the budget resolution, each House committee with jurisdiction over a portion of the budget will receive a section 302(a) allocation for budget outlays, budget authority, entitlement authority, and credit authority; those allocations will be divided into mandatory and discretionary amounts, as in current practice.

Each committee that receives a section 302(a) allocation will be required to subdivide that allocation by program or subcommittee—the section 302(b) level. Committees will be prohibited by a point of order from having a reported bill considered on the floor until they file their 302(b) reports.

Any bill which exceeds its section 302(b) level of discretionary budget authority will be subject to a point of order against its consideration. This is a far more stringent control on budget legislation than anything that exists under current law.

The conference report maintains the section 311 point of order against legislation which exceeds totals of new budget authority or new entitlement authority, or reduces total revenues but, as in current practice, measures reported by a committee that would not cause the committee's own allocation of discretionary budget authority to be breached will not be subject to a point of order. An exemption to the section 311 point of order, often referred to as the Fazio exemption, will allow a bill which exceeds budget totals to be considered if the bill is within a committee's 302(a) allocation. With this exemption, committees will

be held responsible for what they can control—keeping budget legislation within their allocated level—but not for what they cannot control—for example, changes in the economy which cause changes in budget totals, or action by other committees which exceed their allocations.

Reconciliation will be strengthened in two ways: One, in the House, if a committee fails to report reconciliation legislation as directed, the Rules Committee may make in order amendments fulfilling those directives. Committees given a directive to change both spending and revenues may substitute up to 20 percent of one for the other at their discretion.

Two, a point of order will lie against any amendment to a reconciliation bill if it would add to the deficit; that is, any amendment that would reduce revenues would have to reduce the equivalent amount of spending; any amendment that would increase spending would have to be offset by an equivalent increase in revenues. This is a requirement which originated in the Senate bill.

As in current practice, reconciliation directives may cover 1, 2, or 3 years. A new requirement was added in conference to exclude Social Security [OASDI] from the reconciliation process.

EXPANDED SCOPE OF THE BUDGET PROCESS

The conference report expands the scope of the budget process in two ways: by bringing off-budget items on budget, and by subjecting credit programs to nearly the same controls as direct spending.

All Government entities which are currently off-budget will be placed on budget. Social Security [OASDI] is taken off budget, but included in budget totals for purposes of determining the deficit amount. For purposes of the President's budget and the congressional budget process, Federal Financing Bank receipts and disbursements will be attributable to the agency for which those transactions were made.

The House of Government Operations Committee will have jurisdiction over any legislation proposing to take an agency off budget.

Direct loan obligations and primary loan guarantees will be included in the budget resolution, allocated to committees, subdivided within committees, may be included in reconciliation directives, and will be subject to the section 302(b) point of order ensuring that Congress does not consider legislation that would cause the relevant subcommittee amount to be exceeded.

Furthermore, measures providing new credit authority shall be subject to a point of order unless the credit authority is limited to amounts provided in appropriations acts.

FACILITATION OF THE BUDGET PROCESS

Also included in the conference report are a number of provisions which will help facilitate the budget process either by providing opportunities for review of budget procedures or by requiring certain budget information at critical points in the process.

To ensure that any new procedural provisions included in a budget resolution receive adequate review, a House Budget Committee-reported budget resolution which changes House procedures will be referred to the House Rules Committee for 5 days—concurrent with a shortened 5-day layover period.

The Speaker, in consultation with the minority leader, may appoint a Member User Group to review budget scorekeeping rules and practices of the House and report to the Speaker from time to time on their effect and impact. This group is intended to promote support for and compliance with the often complicated scorekeeping rules, and to advise the Speaker on the need for necessary changes. This provision is not intended to interfere with the authority of the Chair to rule on points of order or with the responsibility of this Parliamentarian to advise the chair on such rulings.

The conference report does not include the Rules Committee's provision requiring the Budget Committees' reports to display, for each function, the amount of Federal financial commitment in spending, credit activity, and tax expenditures. This provision was intended to facilitate the evaluation of the mix of different forms of financing used to achieve similar objectives. However, the joint statement of the managers strongly urges the Budget Committees to include this information in their reports.

Along the same line, the conference report requires CBO to conduct continuing studies to enhance comparisons of budget outlays, credit, and expenditures. As with the budget report provision, the intent is to provide Congress with a better understanding of the full Federal financial commitment in each programmatic area and to aid consideration of whether certain activities might be more appropriately financed in a different way.

The joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on a budget resolution will be required to include a statement of the common economic assumptions on which it is based. This provision is intended to encourage the Senate and House to work out any differences over economic assumptions before the conference stage.

The Budget Committees will be required to consult with other standing committees during the preparation, consideration, and implementation of the budget resolution.

The requirements for budget information from CBO are increased in several areas so that Members will have better and more timely information about the costs of legislation being considered and about that legislation's relationship to the overall budget.

Section 308(a) reports, prepared by CBO, will be required not only for legislation providing budget authority and tax expenditures, but also for legislation providing new spending authority, new credit activity, or changes in levels of revenue. This information will also be required for committee amendments, and it will be required to be made available to Members prior to a vote on a conference report. Furthermore, for the first time, it will be required that these

reports include information about outlays as well as budget authority and comparisons with budget levels provided in the previous years. These new requirements are intended to ensure that Congress is fully aware of the budgetary implications of its actions.

CBO will be required to issue scorekeeping reports to committees at least once a month, rather than just periodically. In the House, the Budget Committee summary scorekeeping reports will be submitted to the Speaker.

Several new definitions are added to the Budget Act: Entitlement authority is defined, credit authority is defined, and the definition of budget authority is expanded to include the collection of offsetting receipts. The definition of spending authority will be expanded to include two new items: monetary credits—the authority to forgo collection by the United States of proprietary and offsetting receipts not provided for in advance by appropriation acts—and residual spending authority—all forms of spending authority for the U.S. Government to make payments other than those already described by the act not provided for in advance by appropriation acts.

CBO will be required to include in its cost estimates a description of each method for establishing a Federal financial commitment contained in a bill or resolution. This provision is intended to help identify the way a legislative proposal would result in a Federal outlay or a loss of revenue and to help ensure that Members are aware of any backdoor financing mechanisms contained in a proposal under consideration.

In order to help Congress identify spending which is part of existing law and which escapes annual review, GAO will be required to catalog all of the provisions in existing law which provide permanent appropriations and to report, within 18 months, its recommendations for the appropriate form of financing for such programs or activities. That report is to be revised from time to time.

In order to help the leadership and committees of Congress identify what authorizations need to be renewed prior to the start of the fiscal year, CBO will issue a report on January 15 of each year listing all expiring authorizations, as well as programs which have been funded but not authorized.

Finally, House rules will be amended to permit consideration of rescissions of appropriations and transfers of unexpended balances within the department or agency for which they were originally appropriated if those provisions are included in a general appropriation bill. The conference committee agreed with the Rules Committee that is appropriate to allow such rescissions and transfers to be included in an appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to describe these new Budget Act provisions, and I hope that this explanation is of assistance to my colleagues.

EDWARD M. O'CONNOR

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, Edward M. O'Connor, a distinguished citizen of my hometown of Buffalo, NY, who had a lengthy and varied career in Federal service, died recently at the age of 77.

The scope of Mr. O'Connor's career of public service was detailed in the following obituary which appeared in the Buffalo News on November 26, 1985.

EDWARD M. O'CONNOR DIES; DIRECTED
REFUGEE AGENCY

A Requiem Mass will be offered Wednesday for Edward M. O'Connor, the country's first and only commissioner of displaced persons and the man who brought nearly a half-million World War II refugees to the United States. O'Connor died Sunday (Nov. 24, 1985) in his Buffalo home. He was 77.

For almost 20 years, O'Connor, a Buffalo native, sat in the inner councils of government, helping to shape postwar foreign policy. His rise to influence began after graduating from St. Joseph's Collegiate Institute, receiving two degrees from the University of Notre Dame—where he played halfback on Knute Rockne's last "Fighting Irish" football team—and serving in several probation and parole jobs throughout New York State.

"I'm an ordinary man," O'Connor said in a 1978 interview as he reflected on his success. "I was well prepared for life, but I had some unusual opportunities."

And some unusual luck. On July 28, 1945, because of a spirited discussion he was having on the subway with a New York Times correspondent, he was a few minutes late arriving at his New York City office with the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Being late saved his life.

A B-25 bomber lost in the fog had crashed into the 79th floor of the Empire State Building moments before his arrival, killing 12 members on his War Relief Services staff. His own desk was burned, except for a picture of his wife and children.

"What a sad, sad thing that was," O'Connor recalled many years later. "Members of my staff killed, all my records gone."

A few months earlier, O'Connor had gone behind German lines, with a pass from Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, to assess the emergency relief needs of Western Europe. Eventually he served on the board of or as an advisor to American Relief to France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Philippines and China.

O'Connor subsequently persuaded Presidents Harry Truman to take interest in the estimated 6.5 million persons facing forced deportation to Russia and other Eastern bloc nations after the war. The president named him commissioner of displaced persons, and O'Connor shepherded 430,000 refugees here, with another 1.4 million going to Allied countries. He served on the National Security Council under Presidents Harry Truman and Eisenhower, directed a select congressional committee investigating postwar communist advances, was a senior consultant to the U.S. Information Agency from 1955 to 1958 and, as staff director for the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy from 1962 to 1966, draft-

ed immigration laws in effect through the 1970s.

He also served as director of Special Projects at Canisius College from 1958 to 1962. O'Connor retired from federal service in 1966, explaining later, "I was sick of government. I was becoming a career man."

He returned to Buffalo and helped direct the Community Welfare Council here. O'Connor also served as a consultant to some African nations, advising them on the exchange of American know-how for natural resources.

In 1950, O'Connor received an honorary doctor of law in political science degree from the University of Munich. Among the decorations from European governments are Officer, Order of Orange Nassau, the Netherlands; Officer, Order of Oak Leaf Crown, Belgium; Medal of Gratitude, France; Medal of the Blessed Hand of St. Stephen, conferred by the imprisoned Hungarian Cardinal Josef Mindszenty; Knight of St. Agatha, Republic of San Marino, and Knight, Order of Merit, Republic of Italy.

A founder of the National Captive Nations Committee, chartered by Congress in 1959, he was still on the national board and chairman of the Western New York chapter at the time of his death.

He is survived by his wife, Geraldine; a daughter, Maureen Bailey of Silver Spring, Md.; a son, Mark J.; eight grandchildren, and three great grandchildren.

The Mass will be offered at 11 a.m. Wednesday in St. Mark's Catholic Church, with burial in Mount Calvary Cemetery.

Mr. O'Connor's contributions to the Government during and after World War II included service as the Nation's first and only Commissioner of Displaced Persons and other executive and legislative branch assignments. Mr. Speaker, I bring Mr. O'Connor's career to my colleagues' attention as a well-deserved tribute to this gentleman, whose accomplishments I hope will serve as a standard of excellence and inspiration to those engaged in government service or contemplating such a career. In offering sincere condolences to his family, I also trust they will find consolation in the high regard Mr. O'Connor was held in our community in Buffalo and also in the Nation.

SIGGI B. WILZIG TO BE HONORED BY HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I am not a religious historian. Nor am I a spiritual leader or preacher. But the story, the "true" story you are about to hear is nothing less than a modern-day miracle.

The "miracle" revolves around Sigi B. Wilzig, chairman and president of the Trust Co. of New Jersey and former chairman and president of Wilshire Oil Co. of Texas. He is the "only" Nazi concentration camp survivor "in the world" to have headed both a major New Jersey Bank and a New York Stock Exchange listed oil company at the same time. Mr. Wilzig is a firm

believer that this could only have happened in America.

To even begin to appreciate the magnitude of this man and his accomplishments, one has to first look at his tragic past. For it is surely this "tragic" past that inspired Sigi B. Wilzig to reach the highest heights in both the business world and the more noble world of charitable endeavors. Yesterday he was—"a victim of history." Today he is—"a creator of history."

In fact, on this very day the Sigi B. Wilzig Center for Banking Law is being established within the Hofstra University School of Law and a professorship is being named in his honor in perpetuity. It is the only center of its kind in the country.

Sigi B. Wilzig was born in Germany in 1926. By the age of 14, his formal education had ended; a year later he was doing forced labor in Nazi Germany.

He was shipped to Auschwitz at the age of 16. In May 1945, Wilzig was liberated from Mauthausen, coming to the United States 2 years later. Those sparkling "teen" years Americans take so for granted were a nightmare for Sigi Wilzig.

The son of a middle class textile dealer whose family had lived centuries in Germany, his family moved to Berlin in 1936, hoping that conditions would be more tolerable there than in the small town of his birth, Krojanke, West Prussia, which had a thriving Orthodox Jewish community.

But Berlin turned out to be a deathtrap for its Jews; and in 1942, at the age of 16, Sigi Wilzig was taken to Auschwitz. He told his captors he was 18, only to discover later that all those under 18 and over 45 were killed immediately—thus he passed the first of nearly 20 "life or death" selections.

His mother arrived in Auschwitz 2 days later and was immediately sent to the gas chambers. His father died in Wilzig's presence after being beaten by the Gestapo. In all, 59 relatives were killed, including three brothers, a sister, a 2-year-old niece, and a 7-year-old nephew.

In the camp, Wilzig was younger than most. He kept alone, away from the calamity criers. His intellect argued that he couldn't survive, but his heart and faith in God overpowered the thought of doom.

His "quick, fox-like mind" was his main asset in his struggle to survive, "knowing when to volunteer, and when not to—when one meant life and the other death." His parents and other members of his family were not so fortunate.

Wilzig, who still carries a tattoo number on his arm, was one of a group of prisoners and guards who, in January 1945, was forced to leave the Auschwitz death camp before the Russians liberated the camp—going on a 3-week "death march" and open "cattle car" train ordeal and being forced to march through Czechoslovakia at below-zero temperatures into Austria. Finally, he was rescued by the American Army in Mauthausen, Austria, on May 7, 1945—ironically, the last day of the war. At his liberation, Wilzig weighed 88 pounds.

After recovering in an American Army hospital, Wilzig went to work for the Amer-

icans, serving the Army Counter-Intelligence Corps in Austria and Bavaria without compensation, as his thanks to his liberators. Among the most prominent of the Nazis apprehended by Wilzig during this period was the brother of the notorious propaganda minister, Dr. Joseph Goebbels.

Wilzig entered the United States in 1947, and became a citizen 5 years later. His arrival in America coincided with the famous blizzard of December 1947. Wilzig's first job in America was shoveling snow in the Bronx, NY.

Once the snow melted, he was off to other things, such as becoming an assembly worker for the manufacturer of leather briefcases. He earned \$28.50 a week at that job, and worked as a janitor 1 night a week for an extra \$1.50 to bring his salary up to a total of \$30!

But other horizons beckoned, and Wilzig next became a bow tie presser at a "real Brooklyn sweatshop—27 people in a small store." Next came an even briefer career as a necktie salesman.

Wilzig's major entry into the business world came with Nieswand & Son, a Hillside and Newark manufacturer of fine furniture. It was also Wilzig's entry into New Jersey; and he's been there ever since.

At Nieswand, he became sales and general manager after 1 year, tripling the business in 2 years. Then he went to work for a monument company, which went from a one-man operation to the largest firm of its type in New Jersey in just 3 years. Wilzig ultimately became executive vice president of the company in 1960.

While all this was happening, Wilzig started to study and successfully invest in Canadian oil and gas stocks. He saw Canada was the most important source of future energy for North America, equally as important as Texas and Louisiana.

Because Canada is located at America's doorstep, he envisioned that country serving as a backup for supplying energy and minerals to Americans in the future. His success at that time attracted some important people in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania, and about 20 families, including Wilzig, formed a combine to invest in Wilshire Oil Co. of Texas.

In 1965, the president of the company died and Wilzig was elected chairman and president. At that time Wilshire Oil had sales of less than \$1 million. At this time, after expanding its domestic oil and gas exploration program, Wilshire now has interests in over 1,400 wells in North America.

Wilshire subsequently acquired The Trust Co. of New Jersey, whose assets have grown under Wilzig's direction from \$180 million to over \$1 billion. It is now one of the largest banks in New Jersey with 25 branches. The Trust Co. of New Jersey is known as the Bank With Heart and it has certainly lived up to this reputation by being a community-minded bank, by supporting both the black and Hispanic communities and by making substantial funds available to the car and housing industries when they fell on bad times. It is the only bank in the history of New Jersey to reach

\$1 billion in assets without mergers or acquisitions. Wilzig didn't buy deposits, he earned them.

His lectures on "The State of the Economy" and "The Holocaust" are given without honorarium before large civic, religious, and school audiences. Wilzig is dedicated to informing Americans that this type of horror is not to be forgotten, since it may then be repeated.

He was the first Holocaust survivor to appear before an audience of 500 cadets and officers at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, speaking on the Holocaust. He has also lectured on the Holocaust at Brown University, The University of Pennsylvania and Boston University. He was invited to address a joint session of the New Jersey Legislature and he was appointed by President Carter and confirmed by the Congress to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

Despite his hectic business schedule, Wilzig finds time for philanthropic and community activities. Currently listed in "Who's Who in America," he is a member of the National Israel Bond Cabinet of the United States and has been the recipient of the Prime Minister's Medal of the State of Israel for aiding in that Nation's economic development. He is also chairman of banks and financial institutions, Israel Bonds for the States of New Jersey, Delaware, and eastern Pennsylvania.

He also serves on the boards of Congregation Adas Israel in Passaic, the Hillel Academy, the Daughters of Miriam Center for the Aged in Clifton, the Jewish Hospital and Rehabilitation Center of New Jersey, and the Fiscal Advisory Board of Jersey City.

Wilzig was appointed by Governor Brendan Byrne to the New Jersey State Banking Advisory Board, and is a director and fellow at the Benjamin N. Cardozo Law School of Yeshiva University. In addition, Wilzig recently received an honorary doctorate of law at Hofstra University.

Forty years ago, Sigi B. Wilzig was liberated from the Nazi death camps in Europe. Millions of his people had been murdered—including those most dear to him—his immediate family, relatives, and friends. At the age of 16, the living hell of Auschwitz had stripped him of everything a normal human being needs to live—food, clothing, love, and respect. After this kind of torture, one would expect a man to emerge as a lost soul. The deep and ugly wounds the Nazis inflicted upon his heart and mind should have become permanent scars of hatred. Yet this was not the case.

Sigi B. Wilzig possesses the rare combination of a compassionate heart and a brilliant mind, which has enabled him to find meaning of life, and has made the United States most proud to have him as a citizen. His contributions to the State of Israel reflect his desire for world peace, whereas his generous gifts to the sick and poor reflect his infinite love for all mankind. Humanity needs men like Sigi B. Wilzig in order to stay human.

Wilzig lives in Clifton, N.J. with his wife, Naomi, and their three children, Ivan,

Sherry, and Alan, whose teen years, thanks to the United States, have not been, and will never be, anything like their father's.

I know that all my colleagues here in the House of Representatives will want to join me today in a salute to this outstanding man. Throughout his life he has demonstrated a unique capacity to build success from adversity. His accomplishments are an example to us, and his many contributions have enriched us all.

HELSINKI: TEN YEARS LATER

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague on the North Atlantic Assembly's Civilian Affairs Committee, Mr. Frans Vangronsveld, recently retired from public life. Before retiring, he submitted a report on the Helsinki accords as the rapporteur of the Committee's Subcommittee on the Free Flow of Information and People.

I am inserting in the RECORD excerpts from his excellent report so that my colleagues can take a look at his evaluation of the accords, and so they can also have a better idea of the excellent work done by the Civilian Affairs Committee and the Assembly. In addition, I can make available a copy of the complete report for anyone who is interested.

One more word about Mr. Vangronsveld. As a member of the Belgian Senate and the North Atlantic Assembly, he served his country well. It is also important to note that he was a hero of the resistance during the Second World War. We who have come to know him through the Assembly will miss him.

NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY SUBCOMMITTEE
ON THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION AND
PEOPLE, INTERIM REPORT—HELSINKI: TEN
YEARS ON

(Mr. Frans Vangronsveld (Belgium)
Rapporteur)

SUMMARY

The report aims to take stock of the situation with regard to certain aspects to implementation of the Helsinki Final Act, on the occasion of its tenth anniversary.

Chapter I—Poland: Five years after Gdansk—looks at the conflict-ridden relationship between the Polish state and the civilian community, giving examples of a trend towards totalitarianism, after the assassination of Father Popieluszko and the trial of his murderers. The community rejects its leaders and the leaders cannot change the community. The current situation is fragile, with the leaders alternating between hard-line methods and more sophisticated means to break down the resistance of the community.

Chapter II—The Trials in Yugoslavia—describes the trials of the six Yugoslav intellectuals accused of "counter-revolutionary" activity and wonders how they should be interpreted, since the sentences handed down were too moderate to intimidate intellectuals as a whole, while this seems to represent the sole aim of the proceedings. The public

protests at the Writers' Conference were also noteworthy.

Chapter III—The Persecution of the Turkish Minority in Bulgaria—surveys what is known about this massive infringement of the rights of a minority, and the attempts to rob this minority of their very names. The Rapporteur calls for a wider publicity for these outrages. There have been numerous murders, and a public and diplomatic campaign is the only way pressure can be brought on the Bulgarian government and party.

Chapter IV—The Violations of Human Rights in the Soviet Union—denounces the anti-semitic campaigns, the considerable decline in Jewish and German emigration, and ponders the prospects opened up by the change of leadership. The fact that the retention of power by the ruling class, the Nomenklatura, depends on the advantages enjoyed by this class vis-à-vis the general public, leaves the Rapporteur less than optimistic.

Chapter V—Towards Democracy: The Case of Turkey—takes note of the progress made in Turkey over the last year: a reduction in the period of provisional detention, the possibility of partial amnesty, the law on "repentance", wider freedom of the press. It welcomes the role of the Turkish parliament and hopes that it will hasten developments. It voices certain reservations about recent presidential statements, on the new law relating to the police and on the regulations governing the universities.

Chapter VI—A Plea for the Helsinki Process—sets out the reason why it has been positive, within its own limits: the Final Act did not impose the status quo of boundaries, and the Principles and Basket dealing with human rights encouraged a differentiation between the communist countries, which is encouraging. The right to raise human rights questions—a right not constantly being exploited by the West, is a beneficial consequence of Helsinki, and provides the Western countries with a valuable diplomatic weapon. The Rapporteur considers that the Final Act, by encouraging public participation in international relations, has become a key element in Western diplomacy in Europe.

INTRODUCTION

1. The year 1985 marks both the fortieth anniversary of the Yalta Agreements and the tenth anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act. There is a common misapprehension regarding Yalta that needs clearing up. The two great Western powers never subscribed to any "share-out of Europe". On the contrary the Big Three defined their respective zones of liberation of the countries occupied by Nazi Germany and undertook free elections in these countries as soon as the war was over. Germany's fate was in turn defined under the same conditions in Potsdam some months later. Thus, there was never any Yalta "share-out", but rather, the repudiation of a promise by Stalin. The Western powers are in no way responsible for the postwar fate of the countries occupied by the Soviet Union in contravention of the Yalta commitments, except inasmuch as they trusted Stalin to keep his word. Whatever the responsibilities, however, the fact remains that the geographical division of Europe in 1985 is very much what it was in 1945. The last 40 years have failed to lift the Iron Curtain.

2. A modest attempt to restore European communication was made at the end of the period of détente with the creation of the

CSCE process, whose tenth anniversary is celebrated this year. The 1975 gamble was based on the idea that an agreement covering strategic, economic, human rights and cultural questions, between almost all the European countries and the North American countries which kept troops in Europe would to some extent make it possible to limit the differences between the two political systems dividing Europe, by encouraging the "Socialist" countries to evolve towards a greater pluralism. Our Sub-Committee's 1984 Report showed that this gamble did in fact bring about a greater differentiation between the countries of the Eastern bloc.

VI. A PLEA FOR THE HELSINKI PROCESS

43. Human rights are no more respected by the Soviet Union in 1985 than they were in 1975. Does this mean that the Helsinki process should be dropped, as some argue? The Rapporteur would reply with a categorical "no". In his opinion the balance of Helsinki is anything but negative. It only becomes so when compared with the now recognized unrealistic nature of the expectations that the signing of the Final Act raised in many people of all nations.

44. As regards the recognition of the territorial status quo in Europe, far too much has been made of the implications of the Final Act, which only forbids the modification of frontiers by "threat or use of force". The text of the Act is clear: "They (the States Party) consider that their frontiers may be amended". Thus, the myth that by signing the Final Act the Western states accepted the inviolability of post-war frontiers is an invention of Soviet propaganda. In banning their amendment by force, the Western States merely remained consistent with their purely defensive doctrine, adopted as from the end of the war. "The inviolability of frontiers" is no more than the consequence of this choice, which was quite natural for the democracies.

45. On the other hand, by forcing through the adoption of Principle VII on respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, of Principle VIII on the equal rights of peoples and the right of peoples to self-determination, and of the Third Basket on co-operation in human rights and other fields, and by ensuring a follow-up to the conference, thus bringing into being a process, the Western states saw to it that human rights questions became a legitimate object of discussion in relations between signatory states. These states can no longer invoke the argument of non intervention in connection with the human rights undertakings listed in the Final Act. Each state therefore no longer has legitimate competence in these fields.

46. The Ottawa Expert Meeting on Human Rights, despite its failure to adopt a concluding document, had the positive aspect that the Soviet Union never invoked the argument of non intervention in its internal affairs at the meeting. The right to raise these questions was thereby strengthened. It also should be acknowledged that the failure to adopt a concluding document resulted from the unwillingness of signatories meaningless document as favoured by the Eastern bloc. The excessive reactions against the Helsinki process itself that have appeared recently in both spoken and written form, particularly in the United States, are a further consequence of that. The Ford Administration had to insist that all European states signed the Final Act. Now it is the European states, who set out with fewer

illusions, who see the benefits of the process more clearly than their American partner. If Ottawa sounded the death-knell of illusion regarding the CSCE process, this setback has a positive aspect.

47. The most important conclusion to be drawn from this setback, however, is that the greater the publicity given to the CSCE follow-up meetings in the press and the media, the greater their chance of success, since such publicity puts the Warsaw Pact states "in the hot seat". The Soviets' ability to resist Western and neutral pressure was considerably strengthened by the fact that the press and the media gave very little coverage to the Ottawa meeting, possibly because of its technical nature and because they were not permitted to cover the meeting. The lesson to be learned from this for the future is that the participants should preferably be senior government officials and parliamentarians, as this would focus attention on the meeting. The free movement of information, so necessary from West to East, is no less so from East to West: public pressure constitutes a diplomatic instrument of prime importance in the field of human rights.

48. This is in fact one more reason to welcome the existence of the CSCE process. Without it, the now constant reference to human rights questions, affecting both individual cases and collective persecution, at meetings between political and administrative officials of West and East would not be possible. As it is, at all levels, from ordinary foreign secretary to heads of state, Westerners are now exploiting their contacts with the East to raise these problems tirelessly. The mention of Professor Sakharov's name by President Mitterrand at an official dinner at the Kremlin is echoed by the pilgrimage made by Sir Geoffrey Howe, Foreign Secretary, to the grave of Father Jerzy Popieluszko, on the occasion of Sir Geoffrey's official visit to Poland. Moreover, these startling initiatives represent only the tip of the iceberg. The Ottawa Human Rights Experts Meeting should be assessed in historical perspective. The cause of human rights as an expression of freedom and democracy and a concern of international diplomacy is a relatively new phenomenon which emerged after the defeat of Nazi Germany at the establishment of the United Nations Organization on the basis of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, followed by UN covenants. The Helsinki Final Act, whose tenth anniversary is celebrated this year, is the latest international declaration of human rights. As a signatory of the Helsinki Accords, the Soviet Union is not yet prepared to recognize human rights as a legitimate concern of international diplomacy but has not repudiated the matter completely. The CSCE process is gradually becoming institutionalized internationally. It will take time and a continuing struggle to realize the full implementation of the Helsinki commitments. For the sake of peace in the world, we must continue to be optimistic.

49. The attitude of the Alliance countries on these questions echoes concerns shared by all and has thus led to the creation of a consultative process within the NATO framework which, while leaving each state free to make its own decisions, has ensured co-operation and follow-up in these fields, as was in fact demonstrated at Ottawa, and also in the United Nations.

50. Helsinki, within its own limitations, thus plays a positive part in the implementation of a model for international relations

that reconciles realism with the moral strictness invoked by the democracies. The differentiation between the internal systems of the Communist countries is also a sign of this. Is there really any likemindedness between Hungary and the Soviet Union?

51. In this connection, we can only reaffirm the unwavering position of our Sub-Committee and the North Atlantic Assembly: anything that promotes fluidity through publicity favours the amelioration of human rights, which itself helps to humanize régimes and hence international relations. This is why the Western radios broadcasting to Eastern Europe and the USSR, the press releases on human rights, the transmission of Western press to the East and its readership there, the activities of non-governmental organizations, the scholarships given to students to analyze these questions and the participation of the elected delegates of the population in follow-up conferences form, with the Act itself and its follow-up, a single whole. It is by reinforcing the role of the public in this new type of diplomacy, which concerns men just as much as states, that results can be obtained. The men and women who represent the electorate owe it to themselves to play a leading role in this process.

STANDARDS FOR ASBESTOS REMOVAL INDUSTRY MUST BE PROMULGATED

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, school districts around the country are currently spending millions of dollars on contractors to abate hazardous asbestos in school buildings. Unfortunately, this money is often spent on incompetent abatement work. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] surveys show that perhaps as much as 75 percent of all local asbestos abatement work has been done improperly. The result of this shoddy work is that almost 1,200 additional schoolchildren will contract cancer, according to EPA estimates.

One reason for the improper abatement work is that EPA has never established a model contractor certification plan. Without contractor certification, reputable asbestos abatement firms are having difficulty competing in the marketplace.

According to one such contractor, C.B. Miller of the Petrin Corp., located in Baton Rouge, LA:

The only problem we have with competing against asbestos abatement contractors who perform shoddy work is that we are usually not as competitive on our pricing as they are because of our philosophy on doing the work the right way. Subsequently, they are awarded the work for the low price on the majority of federal, state and local projects.

Mr. Miller describes an alarming situation. Government projects are being awarded to contractors that Mr. Miller terms "pirates—here today and gone tomorrow." The reputable firms are unable to compete with these so-called pirates because proper asbestos abatement is an expensive process.

As a result, we are left with shoddy work that could be causing 1,200 additional schoolchildren to contract cancer because of their exposure to deadly friable asbestos.

To make matters worse, internal EPA audits prepared by the Agency's inspector general revealed that EPA has improperly implemented its asbestos-in-schools program. A recent article by Associated Press reporter David Goeller details EPA's inability to protect our Nation's children from the hazards of asbestos in the schools they attend.

The audits contain a devastating indictment of EPA's asbestos program by documenting a pattern of lax inspection and enforcement procedures and failures to distribute EPA guidance material, the only information the Federal Government currently uses to assist schools in dealing with the asbestos hazard.

Standards defining just what an asbestos hazard is as well as the establishment of a model contractor certification program and regulations prescribing recommended abatement procedures are urgently needed. The asbestos problem is not going away by itself. In fact, the longer we wait, the worse it gets.

Mr. Miller and the AP article both provide important information about the disaster that is EPA's asbestos program. I commend to my colleagues Mr. Miller's insightful letter and Mr. Goeller's excellent article.

PETRIN CORP.,

Baton Rouge, LA, November 22, 1985.

Re Improper Asbestos Removal From Schools By David Goeller, A.P.
U.S. Representative JAMES J. FLORIO,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLORIO: I read with interest the above referenced article (see copy enclosed) on "shoddy abatement work" in the asbestos removal industry. I hope you will take the time to let me introduce you to our company and to read my following comments:

The Petrin Corporation is an industrial insulation and asbestos removal contractor, incorporated in the State of Louisiana and performing work throughout the continental United States. Petrin employs 200-plus American Citizens on an annual basis and we are very proud, not only of our reputation in the industry, but also of our excellent "safety record" as our insurance modification factor of .72 is 28% better than the average for companies of our size.

The newspaper article touched on "shoddy abatement work" and in Louisiana we call contractors who perform this type of work *pirates*—here today and gone tomorrow. We, at Petrin, feel that there is only one way to remove asbestos—"The Right Way". The right way costs money not only in equipment but also in education. How many asbestos abatement contractors around the country have sent their first and second line supervisory personnel to the Asbestos Abatement Seminars in Dallas, Texas, the University of Kansas Abatement Workshop for supervisors, and The Georgia Institute of Technology Asbestos Abatement Workshop? We have, and, even though it is very expensive, we feel that it is worth every penny if one plans on performing the work the right way.

The only problem we have with competing against asbestos abatement contractors who perform "shoddy work" is that we are usually not as competitive on our pricing as they are because of our philosophy on doing the work "The Right Way". Subsequently, they are awarded the work for the "Low Price" on the majority of the Federal, State and local projects.

For this reason, I applaud you and your efforts in seeing that Asbestos Abatement work is executed properly and hope that you can appreciate the fact that reputable Asbestos Abatement contractors are as concerned as you are.

Thank you for your efforts in this regard and I only wish more elected officials were as concerned as you are for the American people.

Sincerely yours,

C.B. MILLER,
Vice President.

ASBESTOS REMOVAL FROM SCHOOLS CARRIED OUT IMPROPERLY, EPA REPORTS SAY

(By David Goeller)

WASHINGTON.—The federal program to remove cancer-causing asbestos from schools has been carried out improperly in three of the most populous areas of the nation, according to Environmental Protection Agency documents released Saturday.

The reports, prepared by EPA inspectors general for the New England, mid-Atlantic and Midwest regions, said the agency had failed to give local school officials technical information needed to comply with its asbestos-removal rule.

The reports also said the EPA was not adequately conducting follow-up inspections at schools to ensure that local officials were finding asbestos and removing it safely.

The documents were released by a frequent critic of the EPA's asbestos removal program, Rep. James Florio, D-N.J., chairman of the Energy and Commerce subcommittee on commerce and transportation.

"These audits contain a devastating indictment of EPA's asbestos program by documenting a pattern of lax inspection and enforcement procedures and failures to distribute EPA guidance materials, the only information the federal government currently uses to assist schools in dealing with the asbestos hazard," Florio said in a letter to EPA Administrator Lee Thomas.

One audit report said that as of last month, the six-year-old program had not been fully implemented in EPA Region III, consisting of Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia and the District of Columbia.

The auditors said that local school officials responsible for asbestos removal "did not implement a proper asbestos program because the agency did not distribute a key 1980 guidance document."

A similar complaint about distribution of the so-called "Black Book" was made by inspectors general in Region I, New England, and Region V, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Among other things, the document tells local officials how to properly sample their schools to find asbestos and how to remove it without endangering schoolchildren or removal workers.

Jack Moore, head of the program at EPA, said the "Black Book" had received only limited distribution because it was too technical and complex to be of much practical use to local school officials.

He said that draft copies of a more readable version were mailed last month to 45,000 school districts.

Moore said that "we probably should have been more aggressive in getting technical information out. . . . As you get into tens of thousands of schools, you're going to find something that isn't correct. Nobody is infallible. No program is perfect."

The audits questioned not only the adequacy of asbestos inspections by school districts but also the use of random follow-up inspections by EPA personnel. Two of the reports said EPA should target districts with known problems.

The Region III report said EPA inspectors found violations of the removal rule in only seven of 85 districts checked. The inspector general said a survey of 50 districts found 13 that "were not aware of the requirements of the rule or . . . did not maintain required records."

"Based on past performance, it will take the (EPA) inspectors approximately 36 years to inspect the remaining" districts in the region, according to the report, which said that EPA took as long as 226 days to notify districts of rule violations.

"These delays mean that districts in violation of the inspection rule are not notified in a timely manner, thus delaying corrective actions," Florio said.

The Region I report cites a failure of local inspectors to follow inspection procedures recommended by EPA, resulting "in students and employees becoming exposed to asbestos hazards or (schools) spending thousands of dollars removing material that may not contain asbestos."

In Region V, the inspector said that EPA inspectors checked 2,674 private schools in Illinois, Wisconsin and Minnesota in 1982-83. "We found that Region V's inspections . . . were not properly performed."

Dave Ryan, an EPA spokesman, said that "many of the substantive issues in the reports have been addressed in large measure already." He said that charges such as Florio's "tend to divert attention from the real progress made" in getting asbestos out of schools.

Florio said the three reports "do not even begin to address the serious problems caused by shoddy abatement work. . . . A recent EPA survey of its own regional officials indicated that as many as 75 percent of the abatement actions conducted to date may have been performed in an inadequate and hazardous manner."

BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY MARKS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the Blue Ridge Parkway, that beautiful ribbon of highway that courses down the crest of the Blue Ridge Mountains from northern Virginia to Cherokee in western North Carolina.

It is a most appropriate time, I think, to reflect on the history of the parkway and those visionary Members of Congress who forged the legislation that made it possible. All this is contained in an excellent paper by Philip A. Grant, Jr., associate professor

of history at Pace University in New York State.

The Blue Ridge Parkway was spawned during the depths of the Great Depression as part of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal Program to combat unemployment and improve highway transportation. Construction of the parkway meant employment and income for many embattled residents in the mountains of North Carolina and Virginia. It also opened up an almost unimaginably beautiful vista of some 400 miles, which has been enjoyed by tens of millions in the succeeding 50 years.

I am pleased that the entire North Carolina congressional delegation of that day was at the forefront in pushing this and other similar legislation through the Congress. None played a more important role than North Carolina's Representative Robert L. (Muley Bob) Doughton, longtime chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who was author of the bill which authorized the parkway and other similar projects. Congressman Doughton, a favorite son of the area I am now honored to represent, a true servant of all the people, and a great inspiration to me, served in this body for 42 years. His record and reputation have been matched by very few who have been privileged to serve here.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD the paper by Professor Grant:

STATEMENT OF PROF. PHILIP A. GRANT, JR.

On March 4, 1933 Franklin D. Roosevelt was sworn in as the Thirty-Second President of the United States. Five days later the newly inaugurated Chief Executive summoned the Seventy-Third Congress into emergency session. Between the opening ceremonies on March 9, 1933 and the formal adjournment of the Seventy-Fourth Congress on June 20, 1936 the House of Representatives and United States Senate were to enact a substantial number and wide variety of significant laws. Many of these measures were designed to alleviate the acute sufferings caused by the Great Depression.

The foremost priorities of the First Roosevelt Administration included combatting unemployment and improving highway transportation. Congress eagerly cooperated with the President in these areas and approved an impressive array of landmark bills to effect relief and recovery. One of the most noteworthy developments of the years between 1933 and 1936 was the establishment of the Blue Ridge Parkway.

Among the individuals vested with the responsibility of approving or rejecting Roosevelt's historic initiatives were the two United States Senators and eleven members of the House of Representatives from North Carolina. These gentlemen, like their colleagues from other parts of the nation, would cast votes on an exceptionally large number of bills and resolutions. Five of these congressional measures involved the Blue Ridge Parkway.

The origins of the Blue Ridge Parkway could be traced to the National Industrial Recovery Act. Signed into law by President Roosevelt at the White House on June 16, 1936, the National Industrial Recovery Act provided for a \$3,300,000,000 federal public works program. One of the key provisions of the statute was Section 205(a), the text of which read as follows:

"Not less than \$50,000,000 of the amount made available by this act shall be allotted for (a) national forest highways, (b) national forest roads, trails, bridges, and related projects, (c) national park roads and trails in national parks approved or authorized."

The author of the National Industrial Recovery Act was Democratic Representative Robert L. Doughton of Laurel Springs, North Carolina. Doughton in March 1933 was beginning his twelfth of twenty-one terms on Capitol Hill and his first of eighteen years as Chairman of the prestigious Committee on Ways and Means. Doughton not only served as floor manager of the National Industrial Recovery Bill in the House chamber, but also as a leader of the conference committee reconciling the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill. The North Carolina congressional delegation supported the bill by a 10-0 majority.

On December 5, 1933 the Public Works Administration (PWA), which had been established under the National Industrial Recovery Act, decided that \$4,000,000 would be set aside for the construction of a scenic highway between the Shenandoah and Great Smoky Mountains National Parks. Two weeks later the decision of the Public Works Administration was transmitted to the Director of the National Park Service, thereby according official sanction to the planning of the future Blue Ridge Parkway.

One of the principal questions to be resolved was whether North Carolina or Tennessee would be the location of the southern portion of the Blue Ridge Parkway. On February 6, 1934 a delegation of distinguished North Carolinians testified before a federal hearing, presided over by representatives of the Public Works Administration, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Public Roads. Strongly urging the North Carolina route for the parkway were United States Senators Josiah W. Bailey of Raleigh and Robert R. Reynolds of Asheville and Representatives Doughton, Zebulon Weaver of Asheville, Albert L. Bulwinkle of Gastonia, Franklin W. Hancock, Jr. of Oxford, and William B. Umstead of Durham.

On September 17, 1934 a second hearing was conducted in an auditorium of the Department of the Interior Building in Washington. Directing this hearing, at which spokesmen from North Carolina and Tennessee advanced their respective arguments on the route of the Blue Ridge Parkway, was Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes. The North Carolina contingent at this hearing included Senators Bailey and Reynolds and Representative Doughton.

Ickes finalized his decision on the Blue Ridge Parkway on November 10, 1934. Dispatching identical letters to the Governors of North Carolina and Tennessee, the Secretary concluded that the "decided weight of evidence is in favor of the so-called North Carolina route." The members of the North Carolina congressional delegation were obviously pleased with Ickes' decision.

The second piece of legislation affecting the destiny of the Blue Ridge Parkway was the Federal Highway Act of 1934. This law went into operation on June 18, 1934, immediately after the President affixed his signature. Section 2 of the act was worded:

"To further increase employment by providing for emergency construction of public highways and other related projects, there is hereby also authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$24,000,000 . . . to be expended for the

survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of highways, roads, trails, bridges, and related projects in national parks and monuments, national forests. . . ."

A highly respected North Carolina congressman who was conspicuously involved in the deliberations over the Federal Highway Act of 1934 was Representative Lindsay C. Warren of Washington. Warren, a future Comptroller General of the United States, in 1934 was completing his fifth of eight terms in Congress. In his capacity as the ranking Democratic member of the House Committee on Roads, he helped produce the committee report advocating passage of the bill. Thereafter Warren would be appointed to the House-Senate conference committee having the task of refining the contents of the bill.

Although a few Republicans voiced objections to certain features of the Highway Bill, it was virtually certain that the measure would pass the heavily Democratic House. A Republican motion to recommit the bill was rejected on a 257-85 roll call and minutes later the bill was approved 255-26. Consistent with their stand on the National Industrial Recovery Bill of the previous year, North Carolinians in the House were aligned 6-0 against recommitment and 5-0 in favor of passage.

When the Seventy-Fourth Congress assembled in January 1935, there was a consensus within the ranks of House and Senate leaders that additional funds were desperately needed to mitigate the excesses of the Depression. The most important law approved by Congress during the ensuing months was the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 9, 1935. Especially relevant to the Blue Ridge Parkway was Section 12 of the act. It provided:

"The Federal Emergency Administration in Public Works established under . . . the National Industrial Recovery Act is hereby continued until June 30, 1937, and is authorized to perform each of its functions under said Act and such functions under this joint resolution as may be authorized by the President. All sums appropriated to carry out the purposes of said Act shall be available until June 30, 1937. . . ."

Serving on the Committee on Appropriations in 1935 was Representative Umstead. Umstead, later to be Governor and United States Senator from North Carolina, was one of the committee members endorsing the report on the Emergency Relief Appropriation Bill. Because of the extraordinary severity of the lingering economic crisis, few observers were surprised when the bill passed the House and Senate by the overwhelming majorities of 317-70 and 66-13 respectively. North Carolinians on Capitol Hill voted 12-0 in favor of the bill's enactment.

Augmenting the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Federal Highway Act of 1934, and the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the Federal Highway Act of 1936 authorized additional money for the Blue Ridge Parkway. Section 5 of the act stipulated:

"For the construction and maintenance of parkways, to give access to national parks and national monuments, or to become connecting sections of a national parkway plan, over lands to which title has been transferred to the United States by the States or by private individuals, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1939: *Provided:* That the location of such parkways upon public lands, national forests, or other federal reservations shall be determined by agreement between the department having jurisdiction over such lands and the National Park Service."

As in 1934, Representative Warren was prominent among the congressmen who shaped both the committee report and the conference report on the Federal Highway Bill. The bill itself was not subjected to a serious challenge until the conference report was submitted to the entire House. Notwithstanding the criticisms levelled by several Republicans, the conference report was adopted on a 238-87 tabulation. Six North Carolinians cast affirmative votes, while not a single congressman from the Tarheel State was recorded in the negative.

On April 24, 1936 Congressman Doughton introduced a bill providing for the administration and maintenance of the Blue Ridge Parkway by the Secretary of the Interior. On the following day the Doughton Bill was favorably reported by the Committee on Public Lands. Only one paragraph in length, the Doughton Bill proposed that "... all lands and easements conveyed or to be conveyed to the United States by the States of Virginia and North Carolina for the right-of-way for the projected parkway between the Shenandoah and Great Smoky Mountain National Parks, together with sites acquired or to be acquired for recreation areas in connection therewith, and a right-of-way of said parkway of a width sufficient to include the highway and all bridges, ditches, cuts, and falls appurtenant thereto, but not exceeding a maximum of two hundred feet through Government-owned lands and designated on, maps, heretofore or hereafter approved by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be known as the Blue Ridge Parkway and shall be administered and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service. . . ."

Securing recognition in the House chamber on June 20, 1936, Doughton offered a motion to suspend the rules and pass his bill to place the Blue Ridge Parkway under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. Because of firm opposition both from Republicans and many Democrats from the populous states of the industrial Northeast, it seemed doubtful whether the Doughton Bill could attract the support of the two-thirds majority required by the House rules. After the prescribed forty minutes of general debate, the House voted 175-125 to suspend the rules. Unfortunately, this majority was twenty-five votes short of the necessary two-thirds ratio of the three hundred House members recorded in the tally.

After experiencing the frustration of having his bill rejected, Doughton succeeded in persuading the Committee on Rules to recommend that his measure be approved by the House. According to House procedures, a resolution emanating from the Rules Committee needed only a simple majority for acceptance. The Rules Committee recommendation was adopted on a 146-139 tabulation, and minutes later the House passed the Doughton Bill by a margin of 145-131. The Senate thereupon approved the bill by voice vote, subsequent to which it was signed by the President.

During the Second Administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt the progress of the Blue Ridge Parkway was expedited by the annual bills funding the multitude of operations of the Department of the Interior. Indeed the "National Park Service" sections

of the Department of the Interior Appropriation Acts of 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1940 provided for an aggregate figure of \$17,500,000, reserved exclusively for the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways.

Determining appropriations for the Blue Ridge Parkway provoked controversy only in 1937. Congressman Doughton, convinced that additional federal money was needed for the parkway, on May 19, 1937 offered an amendment to the Department of the Interior Appropriation Bill. The Doughton Amendment proposed an increase from \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000 for the 1937 appropriation for the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways. Strongly supported by Representative Bulwinkle and Weaver, the Doughton Amendment was adopted on a 221-160 roll call. The North Carolina House delegation, which has been consistently sympathetic to the Blue Ridge Parkway, favored Doughton Amendment 11-0.

Throughout the New Deal era all thirteen North Carolina congressmen were Democrats. Only New York, Pennsylvania, California, Illinois, Ohio, Missouri, and Texas elected more Democrats to the House and Senate. New York, Pennsylvania, California, Illinois, and Ohio were, of course substantially more populous than North Carolina and each of these states also elected a high proportion of Republicans to represent them on Capitol Hill. The sustained presence of thirteen North Carolina Democrats in the halls of Congress at least partially explained why the Blue Ridge Parkway was a key project in a Democratic Administration.

At the beginning of the New Deal North Carolinians had an aggregate total of one hundred and twelve years of longevity in Congress. Four of these gentlemen, Senator Bailey and Representatives Doughton, Warren, and Edward W. Pou of Smithfield chaired major standing committees between 1933 and 1940. North Carolina not only benefited from the solidly partisan composition of its delegation, but also from the exceptional seniority accumulated by several of its congressmen.

Three North Carolina congressmen, Doughton, Bulwinkle, and Weaver, were the spokesmen for districts whose territory included the Blue Ridge Parkway, while Senator Reynolds was a resident of Asheville near the Parkway's eventual southern terminus. Two others, Representatives Umstead and Hancock, were to seek election to statewide office and obviously wished to appeal to voters in the Blue Ridge Parkway counties and the nearby areas of western North Carolina.

Although the Blue Ridge Parkway was admittedly only one of many historic New Deal projects, it was destined to have a noteworthy impact on the future history of North Carolina. By their diligent efforts the North Carolina congressional representatives helped transform the Blue Ridge Parkway from a dream of a comparatively few number of individuals to a permanent reality for millions of Americans.

HYPOTHERMIA—IT CAN BE PREVENTED

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging's

Subcommittee on Human Services, I am pleased to once again place into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a special publication developed by the Subcommittee on Health and Long Term Care entitled "Hypothermia—a Preventable Tragedy—a Cold Weather Guide for the Elderly."

The start of winter is less than 2 weeks away. For many in our Nation especially in the upper Midwest and Northwest, winter's grip has already taken a full hold. Consider that just yesterday Phoenix, AZ, had its first measureable snow in a quarter century.

Winter and its cold and snow has an especially strong impact on the health and well-being of our Nation's elderly population. The incidences of hypothermia increases dramatically in the winter months. Today more than 2.5 million older Americans suffer from hypothermia which means a low body temperature, typically 95° F or under.

This publication is designed to try and give our senior citizens helpful tips to avert hypothermia. They are simple and practical steps which can be incorporated into the daily lives of our seniors with little difficulty.

At this point in the RECORD, and on behalf of the senior citizens of my 19th Congressional District, including a special group from the Co-op City community whom I will be meeting with on Monday, December 16, I now wish to insert this publication.

WHAT IS HYPOTHERMIA?

Hypothermia means low body temperature, typically 95° Fahrenheit (35° Centigrade) or under. When body heat is lost to a cool or cold environment faster than it is replaced, body temperature falls and hypothermia results. A simple drop in skin temperature is not hypothermia. While hypothermia can sometimes develop slowly, it usually occurs fairly quickly, over a period of a few days.

Hypothermia may be brought on deliberately when used as a therapeutic measure. For example, in some types of surgery, the patient is purposely chilled to slow breathing, heartbeat, and other body processes. Accidental hypothermia may occur in anyone who is exposed to severe cold without adequate protection, and some older persons can develop accidental hypothermia after exposure to relatively mild temperatures. In this document, reference to hypothermia should be understood to mean accidental hypothermia.

Body temperature normally is maintained through a number of special mechanisms set in motion when signals from the spinal cord and skin are transmitted to the brain. A small area deep in the brain acts as the body's thermostat while another part of the brain regulates the adjustments necessary to maintain a given temperature.

WHO IS AT RISK?

An estimated 2.5 million older Americans are especially vulnerable to hypothermia and a significant number become victims after exposure to relatively mild cold. Based on recent research, one of the leading experts in the country has conservatively estimated that 25,000 older adults die from hypothermia each year in the United States. This estimate ranks hypothermia as

the sixth leading cause of death among older adults in the United States.

Among the elderly, those most likely to develop hypothermia are the chronically ill, the frail, the very old, the poor who are unable to afford enough heat, and those medically vulnerable individuals who do not know how to keep warm when exposed to low indoor temperatures. It is also important to recognize that many prescription drugs commonly taken by older adults make them much more vulnerable to the threat of hypothermia.

For millions of older Americans, economic hardship has necessitated difficult choices between expenditures for food, transportation, clothing, home heating, and medicine. For thousands, it is not just a question of heat or eat. The real dilemma of hypothermia is heat or die.

Although the condition almost always occurs in a cold environment, temperatures do not have to be below freezing for death to result. It is now well established that lower room temperatures are potentially lethal to millions of vulnerable older Americans who are now being forced to reduce indoor temperatures out of economic necessity. Most hypothermia victims succumb in temperatures between 30° and 50° F and typically suffer a progressive physical and mental deterioration, which, if uncorrected, results in death.

What factors increase the risk?

Older adults often develop low body temperature because they have difficulty conserving body heat. Many things can interfere with their ability to produce body heat or cause an increase in the loss of heat from an older person's body.

Drugs

It has long been known that many drugs affect thermoregulation and that they can precipitate both hypothermia and hyperthermia, or abnormally high temperature. Drugs which disrupt or impair the ability to regulate temperature will effect an increase or decrease in normal body temperature, dependent on external temperatures. The normal physiological mechanisms that compensate for variations in temperature in our environment are generally less efficient in the elderly. For these susceptible individuals, the combined effects of cold weather and drugs can rapidly induce hypothermia, often with devastating results.

The systems by which the body conserves heat and increase body heat production are important to consider when prescribing drugs for elderly persons, especially during the cold winter months. Drugs which interfere with the body's natural temperature-regulating processes can be a precipitation factor in bringing on hypothermia.

Some common drugs often prescribed for the elderly which can seriously impair the body's ability to adjust are: barbiturates, sedatives, tranquilizers, antihypertensives, vasodilators, and antidepressants.

Illness

Certain diseases or disorders can markedly increase the body's vulnerability to temperature change.

Stroke and Nervous System Disorders. Persons with strokes or nervous system disorders have a reduced temperature sense as well as a decreased ability to respond with shivering and other heat conservation measures.

Skin Diseases and Circulation. Problems with skin blood flow can compromise temperature control because the body's first line of defense against a cold environment is

the skin. To conserve body heat in a cold environment, blood vessels in the skin need to be able to constrict and reduce the flow of warm blood near the surface.

Mental Illness. Persons suffering from mental illness may not be as aware of environmental changes or risks and they frequently are receiving therapies which utilize drugs whose characteristics impair thermal regulation.

Immobilizing Diseases. A lack of activity accompanying immobilizing diseases such as arthritis and Parkinson's can result in reduced heat production.

Hypothyroidism. Reduced thyroid function lowers metabolic rate and consequently brings about a decrease in body heat production.

Alcohol

In the United States hypothermia frequently occurs in the alcoholic population. Alcohol predisposes a person to develop hypothermia by dilating blood vessels, depressing the nervous system, decreasing blood sugar, decreasing sensation, and increasing the risk of injury and exposure to cold environment.

Nutrition

Good nutrition is very important in maintaining a normal body temperature. Food provides the energy that the body needs to produce heat. Deficiencies in diet may increase the likelihood of developing hypothermia. An inadequate nutritional balance can lead to a decrease in heat production.

Sensitivity to a Cold Environment

It has been reported that some older persons may be less aware of a cold environment and thus less able to adjust adequately.

Previous History of Hypothermia

Persons who have experienced hypothermia often are unable to maintain a normal temperature if they are later subjected to even mildly cold temperatures.

WHAT ARE THE SIGNS?

It is not easy to recognize that an older adult has hypothermia or low body temperature. Most older adults develop hypothermia over a period of three days to one week. Family members often report that the only "unusual" thing they noticed was a growing confusion.

These signs do not necessarily mean that a person is suffering from hypothermia, but they are warning signals which should be heeded, especially in cool or cold environments.

Common signs and symptoms

- Confusion and reduced alertness.
- Trembling on one side of the body or in one arm or leg.
- Shivering, in the early stages.
- Absence of shivering, as condition worsens.
- Cold and stiff muscles.
- Cold abdomen and back.
- Difficulty in speaking.
- Slow breathing.
- Bloated face, pale and waxy skin.
- Forgetfulness.
- Drowsiness.
- Unconsciousness.
- Low body temperature.

NOTE: The only sure way to determine hypothermia exists is to take a rectal temperature with a special low-reading thermometer.

HOW CAN HYPOTHERMIA BE TREATED?

The hypothermia victim must be rewarmed, preferably by a physician who is

familiar with hypothermia. A hospital or clinic setting is desirable.

A person suspected of having hypothermia should have his or her rectal temperature taken with a special thermometer, if possible. If the person's temperature is below 95° F (35° C) a doctor or ambulance should be summoned or the victim taken directly to a hospital. If emergency medical help is slow to arrive, further heat loss can be prevented by wrapping the victim in a warm blanket. Food and drink can pose dangers for a hypothermic person and should be avoided.

If blankets are not available the body heat of another person lying close to the victim will aid in rearming. Care should be taken in handling a victim of hypothermia. Rubbing of limbs can worsen the condition and cause injury. Sudden movement or rough handling can easily cause a fatal heart attack (ventricular fibrillation).

It is best that the victim not try to walk or move around because he or she might fall and suffer further injury. Care should be taken in moving and handling the victim since the heart muscle is very weak when the body is cold. The victim should not be placed in a hot bath or shower because it could cause fatal rearming shock or after-drip in body temperature.

WHAT ARE THE CHANCES OF RECOVERY?

Mortality from accidental hypothermia is very high in elderly victims, and recent studies have shown a mortality range between 30% and 75%. In other words, roughly 1/3-3/4 of the elderly victims of accidental hypothermia fail to recover. Chances for recovery depend upon a number of factors, and early detection is of particular importance. The victim's age and general health, the degree of internal chilling, the duration of hypothermia, and the method of treatment have all been cited as having a possible bearing upon the victim's ability to survive.

The degree of internal chilling appears to be of greater significance than the relative age of the elderly victims. A number of studies have shown that the lower body temperatures dramatically decrease survival chances. For example, one study showed a 75% mortality for elderly victims admitted to the hospital with temperatures below 86° F as compared with 39% whose temperatures were between 86° F and 95° F. Early detection greatly improves the chances for eventual recovery.

Both body temperature and age appear to be less significant in determining recovery than the presence of an underlying disease. In those cases where hospital admission takes place, the most important condition for survival appears to be the general health of the victim. Consequently the frail, the debilitated, and the sick are at far greater risk.

It is, however, particularly important to remember that many otherwise healthy elderly victims die in their own homes without ever reaching the hospital. Hypothermia dulls the mental faculties to such a degree that the victim is never aware of the condition and is entirely dependent upon the awareness, knowledge and action of others. Unfortunately, accidental hypothermia is often overlooked and dismissed as simple disorientation, lack of coordination or confusion. Without recognition, the elderly victims lack even a chance of recovery, and death is inevitable.

Complications

Accidental hypothermia can worsen pre-existing conditions such as heart disease and diabetes. Fall of the body's temperature below 90° F (32.2° C) is dangerous because cold slows the normal body processes and important body functions are often disrupted. Complications increase as the temperature falls to lower levels, and heart, blood, liver, kidney, pancreas and gastric problems may develop.

Many of these problems automatically resolve themselves during proper hospital rewarming, but some require special attention, especially in older adults with pre-existing conditions.

Hypothermia has been reported to cause permanent damage in some individuals, but further research is needed to determine the risk of permanent damage in otherwise healthy older adults. The most serious complication of a low body temperature is a vulnerable heart. Cold slows and weakens the heart, and it is very important that the victim be handled gently.

HOW CAN HYPOTHERMIA BE PREVENTED?

When it is cold, the body loses heat in many ways. Older persons need to take certain precautions to conserve body heat.

*HEAT CONSERVATION CHECKLIST**Food*

Have you eaten enough food today? Your body needs fuel to run efficiently, and only food will do the job.

Alcohol

Have you been drinking? Alcohol speeds up body heat loss and makes it very hard to keep warm.

Exhaustion

Have you been working too hard and not getting enough rest? Your body needs energy to fight the cold. Rest is important.

Water

Have you been drinking enough liquids? This is very important for energy and adequate blood volume for circulation.

Insulation

Are you using your clothes in a good layer system to trap air around your body? Are you wearing a hat and scarf? Are your clothes too tight? Are you wearing wool or synthetics, rather than cotton?

Wetness

Is your hair damp or wet? How about your clothes? Change into something dry and stay warm.

Exercise

Exercise produces more body heat, and you will be warmer if you are more active during the day. You need more insulation if you are just sitting still.

High risk persons

Have you had hypothermia before? Do you have a chronic physical condition, such as diabetes, circulatory problems, nervous system disorders, etc? You should take special precaution to stay warm and avoid exposure to cold.

COMMON COLD WEATHER MYTHS

Myth: Alcohol helps to keep you warm in cold weather.

Fact: Alcohol greatly increases body heat loss by relaxing skin blood vessels and allowing a greater supply of warm blood to flow near the cold surface. You feel warmer, but cool faster. Hypothermia is far more likely to develop during periods of cold exposure if you have been drinking.

Myth: The best solution for cold hands is thicker gloves.

Fact: Gloves are important, but cold hands usually result from excess body heat loss from the head, neck and chest. If you are wasting heat, the body will try to conserve heat on its own by reducing the flow of warm blood to the skin, hands and feet.

Myth: The air temperature has to be below freezing in order for you to "freeze to death".

Fact: No one freezes to death. Very few people can survive if their deep body temperature falls below 75° F. These people die of hypothermia or complications brought on by this condition. Most deaths occur in air temperatures well above freezing.

Myth: Snow at 15° F air temperature is more dangerous than rain at 40° F.

Fact: Staying dry is the big secret to keeping warm in cold outdoor situations. Snow at 15° F is dry and easy to work in if you are properly dressed. Rain at 40° F is very, very cold. Unless your rain gear is good, you run the risk of becoming soaked and developing hypothermia.

Remember: Most people develop hypothermia in air temperatures between 30° and 50° F. Almost all of these people have allowed themselves to get wet.

Myth: Muscular individuals are not as affected by the cold and can "tough it out" in freezing weather or a short term survival situation.

Fact: Muscular strength is no defense against cold stress or hypothermia. In fact, fat, "out-of-shape" people may do better under cold stress because the fat acts as insulation. Of course, it is best to be in good physical condition and properly dressed.

Myth: After a few weeks of cold weather the body gets used to the cold or acclimatizes, and less clothing is needed.

Fact: Acclimatization does take place in hot weather within about four to seven days, but the body does not really acclimatize to cold weather. Some changes do take place but we still need the artificial insulation of clothing to survive.

Myth: Rubbing snow on a frostbitten area helps to rewarm it by improving the circulation.

Fact: Frostbite is a localized injury caused by extreme cold, and rubbing it with snow makes about as much sense as applying heat to a burn. Snow will simply cause greater damage to the tissue.

Myth: Three pairs of socks are better than two because the thickness will help to insulate your feet. Even if you have a bit of trouble putting on your shoes it's definitely worth the extra effort.

Fact: Tight shoes cut down the warm blood supply to the feet and are therefore a major cause of frostbite. It would be much better to have the shoes a little loose. Loosen your laces a little bit if the weather is really cold, and do not wear too many socks.

THANK YOU, OFFICERS BONAVENTURA AND CIFFO

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, on December 19, 1985 the 19th Precinct Community Council will be honoring its two community affairs officers, Officers Bonaventura and Ciffo.

The Community Council would like both officers to know how much they appreciate the good work that both of them perform every day in dealing with various problems that arise in the community.

As an elected official from the precinct's congressional district, I would like to take this time to offer my thanks to both Officers Bonaventura and Ciffo in working with my district office on various problems that have arisen throughout the year. Their help has allowed my staff and me to be more responsive to the needs of New York's 15th Congressional District, and I know that any Member of Congress would be happy to have either Officer Bonaventura or Officer Ciffo performing such work in his or her district.

A LOOK INSIDE THE CENTRAL- LY PLANNED, OVER-REGULATED DEFENSE PROCUREMENT ESTABLISHMENT

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to my colleagues the following article by Tim Carrington of the Wall Street Journal, because it should be an eye opener to those who like nothing better than to add on another regulation or order up another report from the Pentagon. As the article points out the Pentagon is the last true bastion of pure bureaucracy in Ronald Reagan's Washington, but there is still surprisingly little sentiment in the Congress or elsewhere for reforming this entity in a meaningful way. Only those who consider regulation a true art form could sit down and, with a straight face, write out 15 pages of specifications for sugar cookies or 19 pages of directions for a police whistle. If we are ever to produce large numbers of state-of-the-art weapons in an efficient manner, we simply must start deregulating and dismantling the defense bureaucracy so it can operate in conjunction with an innovative, free-enterprise defense industry.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 27, 1985]

ALTERNATIVE TO AN ARMS UTILITY

(By Tim Carrington)

Ronald Reagan came to Washington five years ago to wage war on the local bureaucracy, but the campaign is only now reaching government's most formidable labyrinth, the Pentagon.

A decade of deregulation in various sectors of the U.S. economy has barely touched the defense establishment, which is still chugging away like some regulated public utility. Indeed, to some, the Pentagon has less in common with America's free-enterprise economy than with the lumbering bureaucratic state it is in place to deter. "This building has a socialist culture," Navy Secretary John Lehman recently complained.

That Ronald Reagan should preside over such an organization finally became too incongruous for the White House to abide,

and last August—over the objections of Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger—the president established a commission on defense management. Hewlett-Packard Co. Chairman David Packard, who heads the commission, promises that “we’re not going to do a whitewash job for anybody,” despite Mr. Weinberger’s concern that the study may provide new fodder for his critics. Mr. Packard says that “things are a lot worse than they were 15 years ago when I was there” as deputy secretary.

The much-encrusted procurement machinery threatens to do more than embarrass the Pentagon or waste more money. The more isolated and arcane the defense industry becomes, relative to the rest of U.S. commerce, the more difficult it would be for the Defense Department to involve the broader economy during a war.

BIZARRE SPHERE OF DAR AND FAR

The vast expenditures of time and money on routine, peacetime acquisitions don’t translate well into any reliable wartime surge capacity for U.S. industry. Nor should the U.S. assume that enterprises currently operating outside the Pentagon’s contracting milieu could quickly adjust to the increasingly bizarre sphere of the FAR and the DAR (acronyms familiar to contractors, standing for Federal Acquisition Regulations and Defense Acquisition Regulations).

William Perry, a commission member and the managing partner of H&Q Technology Partners, notes with horror that there are 44,000 military specifications, a large number of which are applied to even the simplest procurements. For example, the Army has 15 pages of detailed specifications governing the sugar cookies it purchases for soldiers’ desserts. A whistle for the military police was bought only after 19 pages of specifications and description were issued. Without this guidance, an Army official explains to an incredulous questioner, the contractors might err.

Mr. Perry, who directed the Pentagon’s weapons research and development programs during the Carter administration, says that an examination of production lines devoted to military and commercial manufacturing reveal a wide difference between defense industry and the rest of U.S. manufacturing. Similar products, such as semiconductors, are made under radically different processes, depending on whether they’re going to be sold to the Defense Department or to, say, General Motors Corp. Often, the DoD version costs many times more than the commercial version, Mr. Perry says.

It seems doubtful that mild medicine will cure the red-tape disease choking the Pentagon. “The defense procurement system that we have today really suffers from a hardening of the arteries,” says Mr. Perry. “With such a sick patient, there are really two choices: You can try to improve the health of the arteries, or you might prescribe a coronary bypass.” The latter, he adds, seems preferable.

Dedicated public servants inside the Pentagon currently labor against daunting odds. Army Undersecretary James Ambrose recently ordered subordinates to cut in half a 10-inch tome of specifications proposed for a new helicopter engine. A week later, the bureaucrats returned with a sheaf of paper half as thick as the first. However, Secretary Ambrose says he discovered that this was accomplished by using two sides of the pages rather than one. “Good try,” he told them.

Mr. Ambrose likens fighting the proliferation of military specifications to ridding a garden of Johnson grass, a common weed: Every fragment left in the soil takes root and springs up anew. Behind it all is the bureaucrat’s distrust of private initiative—the belief, in Mr. Ambrose’s words, that “Mother knows best.” The Army recently broke out of the usual mold when it acquired existing radio-communications technology for the Army’s Mobile Subscriber Equipment communications system for the battlefield. By forgoing the usual research-and-development work on not-yet-invented technologies, the Army saved a half-billion dollars.

Applying that approach to other systems probably will entail purchasing more equipment already deployed by foreign countries. The Army currently is considering foreign guns and missiles to fulfill the mission previously envisioned for the hapless Divad air-defense gun, which the Pentagon killed after \$1.8 billion had been spent inventing it. Rather than writing pages of specification, Army officials are reviewing the performances of gun and missile systems built by the French, British, West German and Swedish armies.

The mother-knows-best syndrome, and its umbilical cord of redtape, won’t be helped by new layers of requirements drafted on Capitol Hill. Congressional reforms often add requirements to those already in place. For instance, a new procurement law seeks to impose competition on all major weapons programs by requiring program managers to file reports to Congress explaining what steps they took or didn’t take to encourage competition. Meanwhile, many of the regulations drawn up to apply to monopolistic procurement remain in place.

New procurement approaches should be substituted for old, not added. Where it would produce savings, competition should replace regulation, not be added on through a quota system or a blanket requirement. In other places, performance standards should replace rigid engineering specification. Different solutions will lend themselves to different parts of the immense defense program.

“It’s a strange amalgam, the defense business,” says R. James Woolsey, a commission member. “There are parts of it that can be subjected to competition, but there are parts of it that should be tightly regulated.” Competition isn’t always possible. The Navy is trying to stimulate it in the construction of the hugely complex and expensive Trident submarine, which is currently made only by the General Dynamics Corp., but critics contend that establishing a second source’s production line would cost hundreds of millions of dollars, outweighing any savings that might result from the competition.

SOME SPECIFICATIONS ARE SILLY

Military items not only carry dozens of specifications that don’t apply elsewhere, but undergo testing procedures that differ from those exercised in nonmilitary commerce. Some of this is necessary—a semiconductor used in a combat vehicle would have to withstand higher temperatures than semiconductors for a home computer. But some specifications are silly. The \$7,000 aircraft coffee brewer order up by the Air Force was made to survive conditions that would have killed the crew.

There’s reason to think that military and nonmilitary standards will come to resemble one another more. Auto makers are requiring that electronic circuitry be made to sur-

vive the heat and grime beneath the hood of a car. This creates the prospect that some commercially suitable circuits might also fulfill military uses.

The Pentagon’s aversion to equipment not invented in its own corridors is clear in the nomenclature it uses in the procurement process. Thousands of characteristics specified in purchases are called “requirements,” implying that it’s impossible to dispense with them. Mr. Perry says a huge obstacle to simplifying the procurement process is the “unwillingness to compromise” on the myriad stipulations.

At root, the Packard commission needs to decide whether the defense industry indeed should be nationalized into a vast public utility, minutely regulated from Washington, or whether it will someday more closely resemble other sectors of American commerce and industry. Since the current White House professes a staunch belief in businesslike practices, it should cast a skeptical glance toward the Pentagon.

THE LATE ROY WILKINS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of Mr. Roger Wilkins, nephew of the late Roy Wilkins, who was the long-time executive director of the NAACP. Mr. Roger Wilkins’ remarks are addressed to the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Mr. William Bradford Reynolds. As Roger Wilkins points out, the Attorney General’s comments on the late Roy Wilkins are not consistent with our memories of the life and works of Roy Wilkins.

INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES,

November 8, 1985.

HON. WILLIAM BRADFORD REYNOLDS,
Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights,
Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: The report in the Washington Post on Tuesday, November 5, of your interview with Howard Kurtz was astonishing. Subtracting the years of my early childhood, I knew my uncle, Roy Wilkins, very well for forty-five years before his death four years ago.

For you to raise the implication that your conduct of your office over the last four and a half years conforms in any way with his work and thought is indecent. My uncle was a fair, honorable and idealistic man who fought for a large and decent vision of America. Your attempt to link your tawdry, mean-spirited and fundamentally racist policies to his memory is dishonest in general and obscene and insulting to those of us who loved him.

Yours truly,

ROGER WILKINS.

LEADERSHIP AT LEBANON VALLEY COLLEGE

HON. ROBERT S. WALKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, for obvious reasons, all of us have a constant, vigilant interest in the state of education in our country. Each of us is aware of the many reports issued over the last few years decrying the quality of education provided to our Nation's students. There are many bright spots, however. We should use the success stories as models for suggestions, recommendations and new ideas for improving our system of education. In that context, I recommend to my colleagues this report on the educational system and accomplishments at Lebanon Valley College, which is located in my congressional district, and commend the officials at the college for preparing this statement on the leadership they are providing in this vital area.

LEADERSHIP AT LEBANON VALLEY COLLEGE

We at Lebanon Valley College feel that out of all the studies of elementary, secondary and higher education that have been produced recently by public and private commissions and committees, one truth has emerged. Our nation's educational institutions are simply not producing the number or the quality of leaders this nation requires in the challenging decades ahead.

One hundred and eighteen years ago, in the aftermath of the Civil War, citizens of Annville, Pennsylvania, purchased a small academy in their city and presented the academy properties to the founders of a new educational institution, Lebanon Valley College.

The founders of the College accepted the gift, and entered into a covenant to "produce and maintain a high grade college forever." That covenant has been kept through all generations.

Were they to return today, the founding fathers would find pleasure in continued serenity and wholesomeness of the site they chose so well. And, returning 19th century founders would be pleased with the quality of their beloved school.

Lebanon Valley College has indeed earned a national reputation of being a private school distinguished by quality. It is highly accredited; its affairs marked by financial stability; its faculty of impeccable scholarly attainment; and its roll call of distinguished alumni is a star-studded roster of those who have earned prestigious national and international fellowships and scholarships, and those who command leadership roles in the arts, business and professions.

To keep its commitment to "maintain forever" an institution of highest quality, Lebanon Valley College has, while preserving the best of its tradition as a sanctuary for student growth and intellectual inquiry, kept pace with the revolutionary times. Its facilities are modern, and academic programs combine the best of the traditionally sound with the boldly innovative. Its science center is state-of-the-art; its music center has been called the "finest in the East."

As a mark of growth, Lebanon Valley College this year is offering new programs in psychology, computer information sys-

tems, and a series of associate degrees in the rapidly growing hospitality industry of travel and hotel administration and food service. The programs are rich and diverse, suiting the needs of students and changing the world of work.

Lebanon Valley College is very proud to have avoided the pitfall of ever becoming a college which is little more than a "shopping center for degrees." A student of Lebanon Valley College is treated as a whole person. His or her college years are viewed as a time of building foundations, a lasting value systems, and of opening the mind to a lifetime of learning and intellectual inquiry.

Lebanon Valley College attracts and maintains a culturally diverse student body and faculty and welcomes students from all religious faiths and racial and ethnic backgrounds.

LVC AND LEADERSHIP

It is in this setting that students of all ages are introduced to the new central thrust of leadership development.

The days are gone when a leader could depend solely on personal charisma or one inspiring speech for effectiveness. Today's leaders need to combine skills, reinforcing allure with action, reasoning with resolution. Charisma is not enough; in a complex society, a leader must have substantial training in models of management and be totally aware of his own strengths and weaknesses as well as his work colleagues.

Lebanon Valley College has met the challenge of providing leadership training for all segments of a community through its four-tiered leadership development program; an ongoing program for selected high school students; a college-level program consisting of seminars, courses and internships; five-day and three-day development seminars for middle management executives; and a quarterly program for top executives.

Each of these four programs focuses on helping future and current leaders increase their creativity and productivity through self knowledge, sensitivity and management skills.

The program for high school students, developed in cooperation with secondary school teachers and administrators, prepares students for the leadership challenges ahead of them. It is actually a year-long program integrated with their schoolwork which introduces them to leadership principles, skills and behavior. Lebanon Valley College provides materials, speakers, and a site for in-depth seminar sessions.

The introduction to the college-level program consists of seven weekly sessions held at the beginning of each student's college career, followed by several other leadership studies and leadership learning opportunities throughout their four years at the college. Responding to community needs and involvement in extracurricular opportunities, academic course work, and additional lectures and workshops are all components of program being constantly reviewed and reshaped by the dedicated faculty and staff. In addition, members of the Lebanon Valley College faculty, aware of the importance of a new leadership imperative, have incorporated leadership development materials in a large number of already existing courses.

Leadership development seminars for middle managers at Lebanon Valley College are currently being offered on a monthly basis and have been enthusiastically endorsed by a number of businesses, corporations and non-profit organizations in South Central Pennsylvania. A group of high-level executives have formed an advisory commit-

tee to help assure that the intensive three-day and five-day workshops cover the topics appropriate for contemporary leaders. These topics include decision making, situational leadership, innovative problem-solving ethics, creative feedback and goal setting.

Lebanon Valley College's top executive leadership program involves a limited number of chief executive officers who are interested in sharing their knowledge and wisdom on a number of critical problems. The program consists of quarterly meetings which include a presentation by a current authority on leadership or management and a carefully moderated reaction session.

The four-tiered leadership program at Lebanon Valley College is under the overall supervision of the school's president, Dr. Arthur Peterson. Peterson and his staff are continuously refining the new leadership program to ensure that it will meet the needs of all segments of the community. Lebanon Valley College is the only college in the nation offering this total community approach to leadership development and it is an approach that bodes well for the future for not only the college itself, but the community it serves as well.

We at Lebanon Valley College feel confident that the covenant passed to us by the founding fathers—to produce and maintain a high grade college forever—is being carried on in the tradition and style in which it was intended. A sense of history combined with a sense of community provides a much needed backdrop to our everyday activities at the college. We value our heritage and are proud to be able to be forebears to that responsibility.

HAUNTED BY YALTA

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the December 23 edition of the New Republic contained an article on Poland by Tamar Jacoby. I am submitting it for the RECORD.

As chairman of the North Atlantic Assembly's [NAA] Civilian Affairs Committee, I have a special interest in human rights in Eastern Europe. One of the committee's subcommittees, the Subcommittee on the Free Flow of Information and People, monitors the Helsinki accords. The subcommittee, whose members visited Washington and New York last week, met with a number of individuals and organizations concerned about Eastern bloc violations of the accords. Poland is near the top of that list.

What is poignant about Ms. Jacoby's article is her description not of Polish malaise, but of hope—the hope that moved Lech Walesa to fight so tenaciously, the hope of a nation of dissidents.

Ms. Jacoby describes the human side of this struggle. That, after all, is what is important. The people of Poland dare to dream; perhaps they will succeed in making Poland more livable.

I urge my colleagues to read Ms. Jacoby's essay.

[From the New Republic, Dec. 23, 1985]

HAUNTED BY YALTA

(By Tamar Jacoby)

I'd been warned in advance to leave any "subversive" literature behind, and to encode the names and addresses of any dissident contacts. I hadn't done either but the Polish customs officer on the overnight train from Berlin to Warsaw couldn't have been less interested. He didn't even pause over the sheaves of papers clearly visible in my shoulder bag. All he wanted to see was my foreign currency, which he counted to the dollar.

During the week I spent in Warsaw, there was no official surveillance. I traveled about the city as I pleased, visiting well-known Solidarity leaders and other activists. I did try to avoid using the telephone, and several people thanked me for it, but apart from that I acted virtually as I would in a Western country. I'd been warned that people might hesitate to talk openly, and others would suggest that we talk outside. Nothing of the sort happened.

It is common enough in the Eastern bloc to hear people talking about bits of news they had picked up on Radio Free Europe. But in Poland, things don't stop there. At lunch one day at the American Embassy coffee shop, I met a group of foreign reporters who had just come from the weekly press conference held by government spokesman Jerzy Urban. They'd been questioning Urban about Poland's increasingly serious pollution problem. None seemed to find it extraordinary that a Communist government spokesman holds weekly news conferences to reply to the Western press.

Poles also seem to take the underground press for granted. Like Solidarity's broadcasts from clandestine radio transmitters, the opposition media is now less a form of defiance than a way of life. Underground activities say there are hundreds of underground publications in circulation and new ones spring up regularly. One of the few times I felt that either Polish or foreign journalists shared my exhilaration was the day that Solidarity managed to intercept the nightly TV news, running a line of print calling for an election boycott right over the talking head of the official newscaster.

Every conversation I had eventually turned to the subject of what Poles still call "the Yalta system"—to the possibility of revising the assumptions that have underpinned the division of Europe for the past 40 years. How do Poles manage to maintain such extravagant hopes? Bronislaw Gerek, a medieval historian and former Solidarity adviser, explained: "You have to forget your European Cartesian way of thinking when you think about Poland. Everything that seems impossible in another country, we have to try it." For five years, they have been trying against all odds.

Within the last year, the authorities have gotten significantly tougher, amending the penal code to make "social parasitism" a crime. The harsh sentences given this summer to Adam Michnik and two other Solidarity leaders for advocating a 15-minute work stoppage have apparently been followed by a wave of arrests of lesser-known activists. Time is also working against the opposition and its efforts to maintain morale in the long stalemated conflict. Even the most optimistic activists have moments of discouragement. Jacek Kuron, an intense and tireless man who still puts his freedom on the line every day by speaking to journalists and signing protest letters, says bitterly that "nothing has changed"

since the declaration of martial law on December 13, 1981. One woman described a recent evening with other former Solidarity people. "Four years ago there would have been lots of discussion. Some people would have been very hopeful, others would have disagreed with them. Today there's nothing to say."

In these circumstances, merely maintaining the status quo is a victory of a kind, and people derive a tremendous sense of accomplishment from the simple fact that Solidarity is still alive. "In the Solidarity period, we said that black is black—and we weren't afraid to say it," another activist explained. "And even now, no matter what the government says, the people still know it. We still have that feeling that we are a free people."

Kuron says that the underground is now, of necessity, "future oriented—educating youth, shaping national cultural, consciousness-raising." Another tactic talks about small, independent groups "collecting information and books and distributing them, setting up cooperatives and local committees to take care of shops and child care and kindergartens." The Cartesian Western visitor can't help wondering why the opposition bothers. As Kuron says about other kinds of similar tactics, "We all know that the only benefit of a strike is a simple declaration of our presence." In today's Poland, even that is a great deal.

Kuron insists that what he wants is "not revising but renewing Yalta"—reviving at least some of the demands that the West put to Moscow in 1945. He admits that it might not be possible today to insist on free elections in Poland. But he believes that other demands, for economic reform and genuinely free trade unions, could not be made to stick because "there are political forces here within the country now that can fight for these conditions and defend them." What he envisions is nothing short of democratization, induced by the West, in the heart of Eastern Europe—and he apparently doesn't see much contradiction in either this or the original Yalta formulation, calling for free elections within the Soviet sphere of influence.

No one is waiting for active American intervention, and no one expects the formal dismantling of the Soviet system in Europe. Incredibly, it doesn't seem to occur to Solidarity members that the essence of the Soviet system might be precisely its seamless and intractable resistance to the kind of political changes they want. There really is something dreamlike about Poland. These indignant Eastern Europeans still seem to feel that they are entitled to rule of law, to human rights and national sovereignty and a representative government that would respond to "peaceful pressure upon it." Madness? Courage? The Polish national character? Why try to put a label on it? They see, as even I did in my short visit, that Poland is different—and they ask themselves simply: Why not more different? An extravagant question certainly, and probably a dangerous one, but today, five years after the Gdansk agreements, four years after material law, it is what makes life in Poland livable.

A "STAR WARS" COVER UP

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last night this House voted to pass Gramm-Rudman, a measure endorsed by President Reagan who also stated his intention to fight for his military buildup. With cuts coming now from overall defense expenditures, the President's defense spokesman stated that the President would give priority to strategic modernization, readiness, personnel, and naval shipbuilding. Cited to be especially shielded from the impact of Gramm-Rudman is the strategic defense initiative.

With this in mind, I recommend to my colleagues the following article by Flora Lewis which appeared in the December 3 edition of the New York Times. We've already started down the wrong path with bad policy. This article shows that SDI is not only bad policy, it is also bad science.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 3, 1985]

A "STAR WARS" COVER-UP

(By Flora Lewis)

PARIS.—The hyper-selling of "Star Wars" has gone far beyond the childish crayola spot aimed at the general public on TV, beyond the vague claim made to businessmen and allies by the program director, Lieut. Gen. James A. Abrahamson, of progress at an "incredible pace." It has gone to the point of covering up scientific failure in a way that endangers the honesty of research.

Some of the scientists involved are bursting with frustration. They don't know how to cope with this government disinformation campaign. A top official at Livermore and another at Los Alamos, the two national labs where the key research takes place, have resigned, though they are too discreet to explain their decisions.

Ray Kidder, a physicist at Livermore, was quoted in The Los Angeles Times as saying: "The public is getting swindled by one side that has access to classified information and can say whatever it wants and not go to jail, whereas we [the skeptics] can't say whatever we want. We would go to jail, that's the difference."

Energy Secretary John S. Herrington, however, has both denounced the doubters for hurting the national interest in speaking up and called it just a "little squabble" among scientists.

Mr. Herrington said that the next test, scheduled in Nevada this month and named "Goldstone," was going "full speed ahead" despite clear evidence that it cannot be properly measured with existing instruments. The X-ray laser, pet project of the physicist Edward Teller and the centerpiece on which he sold Star Wars to President Reagan, is the current focus of many of the scientists' distress.

It was Mr. Teller, himself, who leaked last April that a test took place on March 23, and his cronies put out word that it was highly successful, it wasn't. It turned out that the monitoring instruments themselves were excited by the X-rays to emit light. Therefore the brightness they measured was much greater than what the device ac-

tually produced and the result was completely unreliable. One scientist in the program concluded that "instead of a weapon we

Undaunted, Mr. Teller went to Mr. Reagan and wangled another \$100 million for the project, including this month's test, which will probably cost \$30 million. Participants urged a delay until the measuring problem could be solved, which would take six months to a year. That was rejected on the grounds that loss of momentum would be politically unfavorable, even though the test is almost sure to be futile in the circumstances.

Furthermore, although the administration keeps saying its antimissile program is nonnuclear, the X-ray laser relies on a nuclear explosion for its energy. Insistence on continuing these tests is a major reason Washington won't even listen to the Soviet proposal for a comprehensive test ban.

There are other well-grounded scientific doubts about the X-ray laser. The assumption that it can kill Soviet missiles while they are being boosted rests on their current technology; they take three to five minutes to burn out and carry warheads some 200 miles above the earth. But American experts know that it wouldn't be hard, nor inordinately expensive, for the Russians to accelerate burning time, bringing it down to some 50 seconds and completing the boost at 50 or 60 miles high.

X-rays can't penetrate the atmosphere, and at that altitude they wouldn't get through even if the loss of shoot time could be overcome. But nothing else has been developed as far, so X-ray lasers remain the chief hope for boost-phase missile defense.

The willful distortion of research is a scandal, reminiscent of Stalin's support of Trofim Lysenko's phony theories of genetics because they were politically pleasing. The result set Soviet biology back a generation.

The American physicists working on the Strategic Defense Initiative aren't threatened with the gulag, but they are being put in a demeaning position that undermines their integrity. It isn't a violation of their high security clearance to say that, but it could be if they gave out details to support their stand.

They have been arguing inside the program for some time, to no avail. Apparently they haven't been able to get through to President Reagan to let him know what is happening. That is why their concerns are seeping into public print, despite the gag rule.

Apart from the other arguments for and against Star Wars, if it isn't based on good science it can never be anything more than what President Reagan calls it, his "dream." But it could be a devastating nightmare, sapping the authenticity of American science.

THE ITALIAN-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

HON. SALA BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, in San Francisco, a distinguished organization will honor an equally distinguished group of jurists known for their incomparable contributions to the law and public service.

The Italian-American Bar Association of Northern California has provided vibrant and effective leadership in the legal community. It is a sign of their commitment to performance and quality in both the bench and bar that they have chosen to honor a group of distinguished judges at a luncheon in which these jurists will receive tribute from their peers in the legal profession.

As a member of the legislative branch of government dealing with wide panoply of issues that affect the daily life of every American, I can readily appreciate the interplay between the legislative and judicial branches of government. The activity of enacting laws and their subsequent interpretation demands the highest standards of performance and commitment to public services.

The following judges honored by the Italian-American Bar Association of Northern California meet these high standards:

Gordon Baranco, Alameda County Superior Court.

Walter P. Capaccioli, San Mateo Superior Court.

Alfred Chiantelli, S.F. Municipal Court.

Alfred A. Delucchi, Alameda County Superior Court.

William F. Ferroggiaro, Jr., Humboldt Superior Court.

Joanne C. Parrilli, Alameda County Municipal Court.

Richard Bartalini, Alameda County Superior Court.

Ina Levin Gycmant, S.F. Municipal Court.

Claude Perasso, S.F. Superior Court.

Philip Moscone, S.F. Municipal Court.

John Ertola, S.F. Superior Court.

Raymond Arata, S.F. Superior Court.

Richard Figone, S.F. Superior Court.

Victor M. Campilongo, S.F. Superior Court.

Frank Piombo, San Mateo Superior Court.

Joseph Desmond, S.F. Municipal Court.

Robert G. McGrath, Contra Costa Superior Court.

Wayne A. Westover, Contra Costa Superior Court.

Coleman Fannin, Contra Costa Superior Court.

Joseph A. Matera, State of California.

Timothy A. Reardon, S.F. Superior Court.

I congratulate the Italian-American Bar Association of northern California for honoring these distinguished Californians.

FEDERAL ASBESTOS STANDARDS ARE URGENTLY NEEDED

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, the public health threat posed by asbestos in our school buildings is a problem that calls for prompt Federal action. The Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] has a limited Asbestos-in-Schools Program which simply

requires school districts to inspect for asbestos and then post the findings. EPA has essentially left to the States the responsibility for setting inspection, abatement, and contractor standards.

New Jersey is one of the few States that has an Asbestos Program in place. Heraldized a year ago as the strictest program in the Nation, the program is now in disarray. In a highly critical self-appraisal, the New Jersey Department of Health admitted that the State's Asbestos Program failed in its central purpose of assuring the health and safety of schoolchildren, according to a recent article in the Record of Bergen County. This excellent article details the painful failures of the State's Asbestos Program.

If New Jersey, which has the most stringent standard in the Nation, failed to protect schoolchildren and school employees, where does that leave asbestos abatement programs in the other 49 States? I fear for the health and safety of our Nation's most important resource—our children.

Clearly, the New Jersey situation is another example of why Federal asbestos standards are urgently needed to protect our Nation's schoolchildren and school employees from potentially deadly exposure to friable asbestos.

I commend to my colleagues this most informative article as well as an editorial that followed from the Record regarding New Jersey's failed Asbestos-in-Schools Program.

[From the Record (Bergen County, NJ),
Nov. 26, 1985]

ASBESTOS CLEANUPS FAIL

(By Rod Leith)

New Jersey's asbestos program failed in its central purpose to assure the health and safety of schoolchildren, hundreds of whom returned to classrooms this fall before the state had written confirmation that the schools were safe, state officials have acknowledged.

In a highly critical self-appraisal, the New Jersey Department of Health this month acknowledged that the state's asbestos rules need strengthening in several key areas, particularly in regulation of the private firms hired by school districts to monitor asbestos removal and test buildings for safe reoccupation.

The appraisal, dated Nov. 6, says rules are needed to police asbestos-consulting firms, or air-monitoring companies, and their laboratories, echoing recommendations made a year ago by aides to the New Jersey Asbestos Policy Committee, chaired by Dr. J. Richard Goldstein, the state health commissioner.

Along with the appraisal, a panel of state officials reporting to Governor Kean is studying proposals to shift much of the state's asbestos enforcement to county and municipal health agencies, says a separate report obtained by The Record. If the plans are accepted, the state could ask county health departments next year to take over inspection of daycare centers, schools, and municipal buildings.

Administration of last summer's school asbestos program, the internal Health Department report states, broke down on the crucial monitoring function.

The centerpiece of the state's program is a \$600,000 electron microscope that was to be used, among other things, to check on the laboratory work of the private monitors. However, the device was useless when it was needed last summer while asbestos was being removed from 40 public schools. When it was used, it malfunctioned.

"Two problems with the electron microscope only served to complicate and confuse the cleanup process at the very time the schools were opening for the year," the internal report states. Not only did the microscope malfunction, but "the Health Department has yet to receive one major component it ordered for asbestos testing," states the report, authored by Assistant Health Commissioner Peter D. Stratton.

A year ago, Goldstein and Kean jointly announced that New Jersey would enforce the nation's strictest standard for asbestos in the air. In March, Goldstein said the electron microscope would be installed by the summer to be used for research and double-checking private firms. Goldstein and Stratton were unavailable for comment yesterday.

"This is an effort to tear the whole program apart and have a good, rigorous view of it," Kenneth D. Merin, Kean's policy and planning director, said yesterday of the appraisal. "There were clear problems, but it was better than the summer before."

Without the tools and stiff rules to regulate the private monitors, the state relied on industry self-policing. Two federally sponsored programs meant to check the competence of private firms are voluntary. The same deficiency was cited by the state public advocate in a scathing 1984 indictment of the state Health Department's asbestos-enforcement activities.

One finding of the Health Department report disclosed that as many as 28 school buildings were reopened with only oral assurances from the private monitoring firms that the work was performed correctly. The private firms' laboratories are not inspected or required to meet any state certification for quality or competence.

Some of the 28 include schools in Englewood, Glen Rock, and Wallington in Bergen County; Clifton and West Milford in Passaic County; Kinross, Rockaway, and Boonton in Morris County, and West Caldwell and West Orange in Essex County, Health Department records show.

The tardy monitoring firms were identified by the Health Department as Ace Associates of Hainesport, Environmental Monitoring and Consulting Associates of Somerville, Princeton Testing Laboratories of Princeton, Testwell-Craig Testing Laboratory of Mays Landing, and Alternative Ways Inc. of Haddon Heights.

"As last summer's experience showed, regardless of qualifications, all too frequently the monitors failed to perform their jobs adequately," states the internal report. Although these private monitors are required to oversee removal work at all stages of the project, the report acknowledged the state's regulations lack the teeth to penalize firms if they fail to perform these functions.

The Health Department report also suggests that some private firms may not have performed properly because of potential conflicts.

"Although the monitors are supposed to be independent of the contractors they are monitoring," the internal report states, "in actuality many of the monitoring firms hired by the school districts last summer frequently work with the same contractors

they monitor for the school districts in other, unrelated jobs."

State officials are reviewing written test results submitted this month by four private monitors, responsible for assuring the safety of 25 classroom buildings. The state has yet to receive written reports from the Ace Associates on the safety of three school buildings in the Camden school district, a Health Department spokeswoman said yesterday.

The 28 school buildings have not been declared unsafe, but state health authorities cannot state with certainty that the work of both the removal contractors and the independent air monitors was performed correctly in each school.

"By and large, the removal went pretty well," Merin said. "Even in those schools, like Paterson's, that had to be shut down, exposure was relatively limited." Two schools in Paterson had delayed openings this year because of asbestos-related problems.

THE ASBESTOS FIASCO

Health Commissioner J. Richard Goldstein says that New Jersey has "the toughest asbestos-abatement program in the nation." Maybe it does, but its record in carrying out that program doesn't inspire much confidence.

Two summers ago the state set out to remove every trace of airborne asbestos—a substance that can cause cancer and other serious respiratory problems—from its public schools. What ensued was a fiasco: Dozens of schools couldn't open on time because private asbestos removal contractors had either botched the job or simply not finished.

Last summer private contractors were assigned to clear the asbestos out of 40 schools. Things went a good deal better than the summer before—but, it turns out, not well enough. Four schools—three in Paterson, one in Newark—were opened in September after being certified as safe by private consultants. Subsequent monitoring found low levels of asbestos in each. As many as 28 other schools—including three in Bergen County, two in Passaic, and three in Morris—were reopened with no more than oral assurance from private consultants that they were safe.

As the experience in Paterson and Newark makes clear, the assurance of some of these consultants is suspect at best. The state Health Department should have verified their findings independently. But the department lacked the proper equipment.

The Health Department has acknowledged these failings. In a self-critical report, disclosed on Nov. 26 by the Record's Rod Leith, it calls for tighter regulation not only of asbestos-removal contractors but of the firms that are supposed to monitor their work. The following day, Commissioner Goldstein gave a curious press conference in which he appeared to disavow some of the findings of the report. Happily, however, he didn't back off from its sensible recommendations.

Meanwhile, a cabinet level task force assembled by Governor Kean is unwisely recommending that much of the state's asbestos enforcement duties be shifted to county or local health agencies. Perhaps this should be done at some later time; local inspection and enforcement have their merits. But first the Health Department must be prepared to make sure that the local agencies are doing their job. Its performance over the past two summers leaves too many

doubts on that score. Let the Health Department get its own house in order, then consider devolving its responsibilities to the towns and counties. When it comes to the health of children, even one loophole is too many.

EQUAL ACCESS IN SCHOOLS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following is a challenging editorial from the December 9 Christian Science Monitor describing the equal access law and how it conflicts with the Constitution's requirement that government and religion remain separate.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 9, 1985]

ON EQUAL ACCESS IN SCHOOLS

At first glance it would seem a matter of fairness: If any single group is permitted to hold meetings in a school's facilities, every other responsible group should be allowed to—whether cheerleaders, French club, or student religious organization. The concept is central to the Equal Access Act that Congress passed slightly more than a year ago.

Yet when the orientation of a club is religious, other important issues intrude. This term the United States Supreme Court is expected to decide the case of a religious student group that wanted to meet in the Williamsport, Pa., high school before the start of the school day. The outcome of the case, on which the court heard legal arguments last month, may well decide the future of the Equal Access Act.

The fundamental question is whether meetings of religious groups would breach the essential constitution separation of church and state. Such meetings could put school officials in a position they should not have to occupy: deciding the boundary between a mere meeting, and religious proselytizing. To determine exactly what was occurring, school officials would have to monitor the group and its meetings. It is difficult enough for the Supreme Court to determine whether religious activities are permissible on public property, let alone shifting the burden to individual school districts.

The monitoring and the potential for having to decide about proselytizing appear to entangle state officials, in this case school employees, in religious issues, thus eroding church-state separation.

Any actual proselytizing, of course, would be a totally impermissible breach of that wall of separation.

When Congress passed the Equal Access Act last year, some opponents warned it could lead to less access, not more. In several school districts this has begun to happen. School officials have resolved the potential problem of watch-dogging meetings of religious student groups by canceling all extra-curricular activities: For students in these schools, "equal access" has become "no access."

No federal law stops students from privately praying, in school or elsewhere. But the state should mandate neither a specific place for religious meetings nor a time for praying: Private, individual prayer is always appropriate.

THE SUMMIT: A FAILURE ON SOVIET JEWRY

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has been an eloquent spokesman on behalf of Soviet Jewry. He has promised that, in every discussion with the Soviets, on every level, we would bring to the table our concerns, as a Nation, for the right of Soviet Jews to enjoy the guarantees of the Helsinki accords, including freedom of emigration and their right to practice their religion without intimidation or coercion by the state.

Although the President's intentions are laudable and his words noble, his record leaves so very much to be desired. The sad fact remains, after 5 years of administration efforts, fewer Jews are leaving the Soviet Union today than at any time in recent memory. Less than 900 are expected to emigrate this year, a sad trickle compared to the torrent of 50,000 permitted to leave in 1979, during the Carter administration. The recent Soviet gesture on behalf of Yelena Bonner must not obscure the fact that hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews are languishing under the yoke of repression, fear, and terror. The continuing brutal imprisonment of Anatoly Shcharansky, Ida Nudel, and countless others in the Soviet gulag is a shameful indictment of Soviet policy that compels our attention and ceaseless efforts.

President Reagan pledged that he would forcefully raise the issue of Soviet Jewry with General Secretary Gorbachev at the Geneva summit. Perhaps he did, in his 5 hours of fireside conversations with the Soviet leader. But it remains that only cursory attention to freedom for Soviet Jewry was given in the final joint communique. The Soviet propagandists in Geneva took every opportunity to shamelessly distort the grim facts of life that afflict Soviet Jews. The President apparently came away emptyhanded from Geneva, dashing the hopes and prayers of so many. With such pitifully meager results, the summit must be judged a failure on this critical issue.

This week, Commerce Secretary Baldrige led a delegation of corporate leaders to Moscow to discuss the prospects for improved trade relations. The potential for easing trade barriers between our countries presents the opportunity to assess progress on an easing of the Soviets' repressive internal policies. It is in our benefit—and theirs—to increase our exports to the Soviet Union. But we must not pursue commercial ambition without regard to this most fundamental issue of the continuing plight of Soviet Jewry. We must seek meaningful progress in both areas.

Particularly in these days of the Festival of Lights, Hanukkah, when the candles of menorahs throughout the world symbolize the victory of freedom over tyranny, and illuminate our fondest aspirations, we must

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

rededicate ourselves to freedom for Soviet Jewry.

EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT OF ASIAN-AMERICANS

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, our Secretary of Education, William J. Bennett, is to be greatly admired for his courageous and principled work on behalf of President Reagan and quality education in this country. Specifically, I applaud his efforts to make good on another of President Reagan's campaign pledges—education vouchers to benefit disadvantaged students.

Secretary Bennett has traveled across the country to speak to groups about education in America. He recently addressed the Vietnamese League of Orange County, CA, and acknowledged the impressive educational achievements of Asian-American immigrants to the United States.

The Secretary couldn't have been more right when he said,

What I believe the success of Asian-Americans demonstrates is the importance of values—values which people carry with them in their heads and in their hearts, values which remain with them when their possessions are gone, and their homeland just a memory. One such value of particular significance in educational performance, is the existence of close ties between parents and children, and the willingness of parents to sacrifice for the sake of their children's education.

I commend Secretary Bennett's remarks to my colleagues' attention. I insert them here as they were included in the December 1985 issue of Catholicism in Crisis.

[From Catholicism in Crisis, December 1985]

REPAYING A DEBT: THE EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT OF ASIAN-AMERICANS

(By William J. Bennett)

EDITOR'S NOTE: The address which follows was given by Secretary of Education William J. Bennett on October 22 to the Vietnamese League of Orange County, California. Acknowledging the impressive educational achievements of a new generation of Asian-American immigrants to the United States—and in particular the refugees from Vietnam—Dr. Bennett emphasized the crucial importance of the family in academic performance. The address is published here with the kind permission of Secretary Bennett.

Tonight, in this brief talk, I want to focus on the educational achievements of Asian-Americans; I wish to discuss some of the lessons which their achievements can teach the rest of us, and to talk a little about some of the obstacles which still stand in their way. Last but not least, I hope that you and I can get to know each other a little better this evening, and begin what I hope will become an ongoing conversation about the future of American education.

Let me start with a personal recollection: Shortly after becoming Secretary of Education, I participated in a White House cere-

mony honoring the 1985 National Teacher of the Year, a thirty-two year old high school history teacher named Therese Knecht Dozier. The National Teacher of the Year awards program is the most prestigious of its kind in the United States, and Mrs. Dozier, who had been chosen from among the nation's more than two and one-half million elementary and secondary school classroom teachers, was obviously a very remarkable young woman. Not the least remarkable thing about Mrs. Dozier is her background: Born in Saigon of a Vietnamese mother and German father, and orphaned as an infant, she had been sent to a French orphanage, and was eventually adopted by a U.S. Army officer. In fact, Mrs. Dozier and her brother are believed to be the first Vietnamese children adopted by Americans and brought to this country.

Upon receiving her Teacher of the Year Award, Mrs. Dozier explained that her Vietnamese background had a lot to do with her choice of a career in teaching. "I have always been very conscious of having been given a chance to make something of myself," she said. "I want to give that chance to others and to share the excitement of learning that I have always felt. Teaching is my way of repaying a debt."

Now, I know that it is very dangerous to generalize about any cultural group. And in the case of "Asian-Americans"—an umbrella term which actually covers over twenty nationalities, and countless ethnic identities, each with its own language and culture—generalizations are particularly hazardous. Nevertheless, it seems to me that Mrs. Dozier's remarks touched on a number of themes that reverberate throughout the Asian-American community: a love of learning, a love of the United States, a feeling of genuine gratitude for the freedom and opportunities that this country offers, and above all, a deep determination "to make something out of oneself."

And, indeed, Asian-Americans have made something of themselves. According to the 1980 census, Asians have the highest median family income of any group in the country: \$23,600, compared to \$20,800 for other American families. This in turn reflects the educational achievement of Asian-Americans: three quarters of Asian-Americans are high school graduates, and fully 35 percent of the Asian-Americans age 25 and older have graduated from college—more than twice the proportion of other Americans.

Indeed, it is in the area of education that Asian-Americans have made their most spectacular gains and have taught us the most profound lessons. At selective universities, for example, the proportion of Asian-Americans is extraordinarily high. Asian-Americans comprise 8 percent of the student body at Harvard, and 10 percent of its freshman class, up from 3 percent a decade ago. Here in California, Asian-Americans constitute 22 percent of all students at Berkeley, and 21 percent at UCLA.

Equally telling are the results of a three year study of some 1,400 Indochinese households conducted for the U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement. Now this study, directed by Professor Nathan Caplan of the University of Michigan, concentrated on the most recent Indochinese refugees who risked their lives to escape the persecutions afflicting their homelands. Collectively, these refugees are often referred to in the press as the "Boat People." Their escape—as I need hardly emphasize to members of this audience—was a truly fearsome and heroic

ordeals. Literally adrift at sea, exposed to brutal pirate attacks and other cruel hardships, tens and perhaps hundreds of thousands of "Boat People" never made it to safety and today lie beneath the South China Sea—the victims of Communist oppression and tyranny. Still, more than 730,000 Indochinese refugees made it to this nation. The United States was proud to welcome them. The United States is proud to have them, as our newest immigrants—our newest citizens.

Unlike the more educated Vietnamese refugees who came to the United States in the immediate aftermath of Saigon's fall, the Boat People who arrived in this country had been farmers, fishermen, craftsmen, laborers and students in Southeast Asia. Arriving with little or no knowledge of English, with no savings or other resources, and with few marketable skills, the obstacles seemed insurmountable. "And yet," says Professor Caplan, "considering their hardships and all the odds against them, this group of immigrants has in fact demonstrated remarkable progress."

Nowhere has this progress been more remarkable than in the area of education. On national standardized tests of academic achievement, 27 percent of the refugee children scored in the 90th percentile on math achievement—almost three times better than the national average. And although they scored somewhat lower than the national average in English language proficiency, they outperformed their school-aged peers on general grade-point average, with 27 percent—more than a quarter—earning A or A-minus. Overall, their scholastic average was 3.05 on a 4.0 scale, or slightly above a B. As Professor Caplan observed, this is a truly remarkable achievement by any group—let alone by a group facing all the odds against them that this group faced.

How can the success of these immigrants, and of Asian-Americans in general, be explained? Clearly, many fashionable theories about educational and social achievement, theories which emphasize the deterministic role of class, of the environment, of material factors, of "society"—do not apply here. On the contrary, what I believe the success of Asian-Americans demonstrates is the importance of values—values which people carry with them in their heads and in their hearts, values which remain with them when their possessions are gone, and their homeland just a memory.

One such value, of particular significance in educational performance, is the existence of close ties between parents and children, and the willingness of parents to sacrifice for the sake of their children's education. At the Department of Education, we have been saying for some time now that in education, the parent is the child's most important teacher, even the indispensable teacher. There is by now a good deal of evidence, both statistical and anecdotal, which emphasizes the concern of Asian-American parents for their children's schooling. For example, a teacher at the Bronx High School of Science, a very selective school with a large proportion of Asian-American students told of a conversation she once had with an Asian-American parent: "He said that when he was younger, he couldn't decide whether he should work in a restaurant or in laundry. He decided that when you work in a restaurant, you're away too many hours. 'If I work in a laundry,' he said, 'I can see my children and ask them: What did you learn in school today? Show me what you learned today.' He told me

he'd gone to work in a laundry, and he said: 'I got a doctor, I got a lawyer.' No one can be more deserving of tribute—of honor—than parents like this one."

Another story which makes much the same point concerns an Asian-American community residing in Riverdale, New York. School teachers and principals in Riverdale were surprised to discover that each Asian-American family was buying two sets of textbooks. After doing a little investigating, they found that one set was for the child and the second set was for the mother, who could better coach her child if she worked during the day to keep up with his lessons. These teachers said that children entering school in the fall with no English ability finished in the spring at the top of their classes in every subject.

Asian-American parents do not make these sacrifices simply so their children will do well materially. They do so out of a deep respect for learning. I am told that in Vietnam—when Vietnam was a free nation—it was the case that teachers were revered by both parents and children. They rank, I believe, just below kings, and above fathers, in the Confucian ethical system. When Vietnamese are asked to describe their culture, "love of learning" is a characteristic frequently mentioned.

For most Vietnamese, this emphasis on learning has been maintained in the United States. A 1983 study by the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington, D.C., noted that:

"The Vietnamese students' respect for teachers is a very noticeable characteristic in a typical American school, as it promotes behavior which is in contrast to that of some American students. The Vietnamese students, in general, are well-behaved, quiet and polite in the classroom, and some of our interviewees reported being horrified at some of the behaviors of their fellow classmates, such as talking back to teachers, telling a teacher to "shut up," talking in class, and putting their feet on a desk."

Yet another Asian-American value which has a great deal to do with educational success is self-discipline, a willingness to do things the hard way, if that's what's required. A recent study prepared by Dr. Samuel Peng, of the Department of Education, demonstrated that Asian American high school students spent considerably more time on homework than any other students. Dr. Peng's study also demonstrated that Asian-American students were less likely than other students to be absent from school and had higher educational aspirations than other students.

Of course, the virtues which characterize the Asian-American community, and account for its success—hard work, self-discipline, perseverance, industry, respect for family, for learning and for country—are not confined to Asian-Americans alone. They are in fact traditional American virtues. These are values familiar to readers of Benjamin Franklin's *Autobiography*, or to generations of American school children who learned from McGuffey's Reader. They are the virtues preached down through the ages by the greatest Americans. Listen to the distinguished black American, Frederick Douglass, one hundred and thirty years ago: "What we want is character. . . . It is a thing we must get for ourselves. We must labor for it. It is gained by toil—hard toil. . . . It is attainable; but we must attain it, and attain it each for himself. I cannot for you, and you cannot for me." Today, Asian-Americans are reminding all of us of these fundamental truths.

So far, I have focused on the strengths of the Asian American community. They are considerable, and remarkable. Let me now turn to some of the obstacles facing Asian-Americans in their attempt to succeed in American society.

Many of the problems Asian-Americans—and especially Southeast Asian refugees—face in the country have to do with the strain of social and psychological adjustment to a foreign culture, a foreign language and a foreign way of life. According to a 1980 study, for example, even after 5 years, 81 percent of Southeast Asian refugees still had serious concerns about being separated from missing family members; 67 percent had painful memories of the war and their departure from home; 59 percent were homesick; and 58 percent were worried about difficulties in communicating with those in the home country. That such concerns for loved ones left behind can affect a child's school performance is obvious. Thus, a teacher recently recounted a conversation she had with a Vietnamese girl in the third grade. The teacher wanted the girl to look at her while speaking, so she gently touched the girl's chin and raised her face. At that point, the child suddenly burst into tears. When the teacher asked the girl what she had done wrong, the child responded, "Nothing, your hand just felt like my mother's hand used to feel, and she's still in Vietnam."

There is little the government—or anyone—can do to relieve this sort of anguish. We can express our deepest sympathy, and our faith in the strong character of our newest immigrants. We recognize this loss, this pain. We grieve with their suffering. But there is another obstacle facing Asian-Americans, and other Americans too, that we can do something about. That is the need to attain English language skills.

We believe that the proposals recently advanced by this Administration to reform bilingual education will help in this regard. Under the current system, local school districts in dealing with the federal government often have little flexibility in responding to the particular needs of students whose home language is not English. If local school districts want to receive Federal assistance, they are virtually compelled to follow a particular method of instruction. The reforms which we are currently exploring with Congress will allow local school districts to choose the sort of program, or to design the combination of programs, best suited to the task of teaching their non-English speaking children English. For school districts serving recent Asian immigrants who speak a wide variety of languages, giving local school districts greater flexibility in designing their programs should enable Asian-American students to get more and better English language instruction. We are not retreating in our commitment to non-English speaking students. Rather we are acting to fulfill that commitment by giving local school authorities and parents the opportunity to do what works best for their children.

A final educational issue of concern to Asian-Americans is the issue of discrimination. For several years now, Asian student associations at Ivy League universities have cited admissions figures showing that a smaller percentage of Asian-American students than other applicants are being accepted. These figures might indicate that unofficial quotas are in effect in some universities limiting the number of Asian-American students. But the evidence is less

than conclusive, and it is possible that factors other than anti-Asian discrimination are at work here. If, however, concrete evidence of quotas and anti-Asian discrimination does come to light, we will take the appropriate action to remedy the situation. Discrimination against Asian-Americans is as unacceptable as all other forms of racial or religious discrimination.

Let me conclude by referring once again to the Caplan study on the scholastic achievement of Southeast Asian refugee children. "The main reason for the success of these children," Professor Caplan writes, "appears to be due to the compatibility of what they bring with them—traditional cultural values, cohesive family structure, achievement orientation . . .—with the requirements for success in the United States. This may account for the rather rapid achievement of economic self-sufficiency by the parents, as well as the scholastic success of their children." These qualities—traditional values, strong families, an orientation toward achievement—are by no means exclusively Southeast Asian. They are in fact traditional American qualities. More important, they are universal qualities—universal prerequisites to the success of individuals and the well-being of a free society.

Our newest immigrants remind us of one additional point, as well the tremendous burst of creative energy that is released when former victims of tyranny and oppression are presented with the very special opportunity which American society offers. For our free country offers the opportunity, as Lincoln put it, of "an open field and a fair chance" for every American's "industry, enterprise and intelligence." Our country promises that we "may all have equal privileges in the race of life, with all its desirable human aspirations." Many Americans take this promise for granted. But perhaps because so many Asian-Americans have personal experience of the massive apparatus of repression, they may have a greater appreciation of the gift of freedom. And perhaps because of what they endured to become citizens of this nation, they bring with them a determination to make the best use of the opportunities America offers. Thus they struggle and sacrifice and work hard in order, as Mrs. Dozier put it, "to make something of themselves" and "repay a debt."

In doing this, Asian-Americans in fact put the rest of us in their debt. For they remind us of both the opportunities and the responsibilities of American citizenship. And they remind us—as Lincoln said—that a nation like ours "is worth fighting for, to secure such an inestimable jewel."

A TRIBUTE TO EVANGELINE GOULETAS-CAREY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Evangeline Gouletas-Carey, a truly giving and compassionate woman.

Mrs. Gouletas-Carey, a former first lady of the State of New York, has devoted her life to community improvement and philanthropic generosity. Her causes have included school lunch programs, elderly meal programs, nutrition education, and the ef-

fects of inadequate nutrition on children and pregnant women. She has been a successful businesswoman, a teacher, a lecturer, and a supporter of cultural and religious organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following speech made by Mrs. Gouletas-Carey when she was presented the Eleanor Roosevelt Humanitarian Award of the Year by the Career and Professional Women's Division of the State of Israel Bonds.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY EVANGELINE GOULETAS-CAREY OF THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT HUMANITARIAN AWARD OF THE YEAR PRESENTED BY THE CAREER & PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S DIVISION OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL BONDS—FEBRUARY 6, 1983

Thank you, Ms. Winikow, district chairwomen, committee members, guests and friends. I am very honored by your presence here this morning and to have been asked to join you.

The high award given to me on this occasion symbolizes service to a cause which awakens the memory of our national development. In Israel's progress we see mirrored our own. In Israel's struggle to make her land productive, to defend the freedoms of her people, and to lead toward frontiers of knowledge, we identify our pioneer hardships, the judicious safeguards in our constitutions, and our sojourns to the forefront of science and technology. We can appreciate this in an age where but one in five human beings lives in freedom, and 45% of the world's population lives under tyranny.

I have always been particularly impressed with the intensity and dedication of the Israeli people—their determination to make their country a success. This is one reason my brother Nick and I have endowed a park near Nazareth that will be open to all people, regardless of their ethnic origin, to be known as the Evangeline Gouletas-Carey and Nicholas S. Gouletas Recreational Park.

Evidence of the technological achievements and their practical application in business and industry is everywhere apparent in Israel, and this includes the latest achievement—a miracle in itself—the mediterranean—dead sea—canal. This blend of resolve and pragmatism has overcome countless obstacles. Thus, for example, agricultural production has risen more than 15 fold, lifting the country which faced severe austerity in its early statehood to a nation now producing more than four-fifths of its own food requirements.

To make the desert bloom, more than 800 square miles were brought under irrigation. Record milk production has been achieved through the scientific feeding of livestock, and the application of science to farm output has made Israel's orchards among the most productive on Earth. Overall agricultural yields continue to increase at least 5% per year.

Israel bonds have helped finance every key aspect of this economic development. Bonds have enabled large-scale expansion of the country's communication and transportation networks. Bonds have financed ambitious projects to augment the production of phosphates, copper and oil, as well as to create and expand seaports and other facilities. Since Israel imports goods and services worth \$2 billion from the United States—more than it imports from any other country, many of these bond dollars return to the United States.

It is significant that, even under adversity, Israel had found unswerving financial support through Israel bonds. But, just as with

the economic development in the United States, financial support did not come without effort. We also recall that we, as a new nation, had our indispensable friends (the dutch and the french) who helped our cause, and enabled us to become a strong and mature nation, to stand as a world symbol of democracy with the vast human potential such freedom unshackles. Now, this effort on behalf of another free nation is our continual commitment.

We know that staunch faith and optimism that have characterized our common histories have often made possible that which was considered impossible. Indeed, shalom Aleichem, who was the source and inspiration for the musical, "Fiddler on the Roof", captured this philosophy of greatness when he wrote, "the word possible has the following comparative forms: possible, more possible, and 'what do you mean, impossible?'"

And so, it is with this profound respect for the courage and conviction of a people in its steadfast struggle to maintain freedom that I am honored this morning to accept the Eleanor Roosevelt Humanitarian Award.

Thank you—and shalom.

MONSIGNOR BYRNE MARKS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Msgr. Harry J. Byrne, a loyal friend and constituent of mine, who marked the 40th anniversary of his priestly ordination on Sunday, December 1. The ceremony was held at Epiphany Church, located at 22d Street and Second Avenue, of which he is the pastor.

Formerly chancellor of the New York Archdiocese, he served as pastor for 12 years at St. Joseph's Church of Yorkville on the Upper East Side. His many community positions include that of vice president of the Ronald McDonald House, a hostel for children cancer patients and their parents, and board memberships for Doctor's Hospital, the Asphalt Green, and the Burden Center for the Aging. By appointment of Mayor Koch he served from 1978-81 on the New York Rent Guideline Board. Presently he is chairman of the Interfaith Community Religious Leaders organization for East Midtown Manhattan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Monsignor Byrne of the 40th anniversary of his priestly ordination and in thanking him for his many years of dedicated and unselfish service to his community.

**MOTE MARINE LABORATORY
CELEBRATES 30 YEARS OF
SERVICE**

HON. CONNIE MACK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, this past week the Mote Marine Laboratory of Sarasota, FL, in my congressional district, celebrated its 30th anniversary. From its founding as the Cape Haze Marine Laboratory in 1955, this independent, not-for-profit facility has grown to become the preeminent marine science laboratory in Florida and a respected world leader in the fascinating field of marine science. The goals of Mote Marine Laboratory are centered on providing opportunities for basic research, environmental assessment services, and public education.

Its research projects span a wide range of scientific endeavor—from traditional studies in marine biology to technologically complex studies contributing to the development of understanding in fields such as neurobiology and biomedical and behavioral studies. Mote scientists are investigating questions that have direct human implications, such as why sharks resist cancer, and how toxic substances affect marine environments.

The laboratory's work in environmental assessment has contributed to man's understanding of our natural environment and our ability to live in concert with it. Studies in coastal and estuarine ecology, water quality, and fishery management provide vital information for decisionmakers on the local, State, National, and international levels. The work of Mote Marine is dedicated to the preservation, conservation, and enhancement of our natural resources.

Hand in hand with research and assessment work is Mote Marine's commitment to education. The marine science center is the centerpiece of this public education effort, with its living and artifact exhibits, and lecture series. The laboratory supports the educational efforts of students at all levels with programs that include collegiate internships, high school learning camps, and liaison with the public grade schools.

All of this is made possible through the efforts of many distinguished scientists that have worked with Mote Marine through the years. One of the most notable is Dr. Eugenie Clark, under whose direction the lab was established in 1955. Dr. Perry Gilbert became director in 1967, the same year in which the institution was renamed in honor of its principal benefactors, William R. Mote and his sister, Elizabeth Mote Rose.

Mr. Mote continues a high level of day-to-day involvement as chairman of the board of the Mote Marine Foundation, which oversees fund raising activity and operation of the lab.

Mote Marine Laboratory, under the current direction of Dr. Robert F. Dunn, with the assistance of Dr. Richard H. Pierce, director of the marine sciences division, and

Dr. Kumar Mahadevan, director of the environmental assessment division, is poised to enter its next 30-year phase with a continuing commitment to scientific excellence and integrity, an enthusiasm for contributing to the body of knowledge, and the hope of enhancing the quality of life for ourselves and future generations. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend Mote Marine Laboratory for its contributions of the past and to extend my best wishes for the future.

POLITICAL SOLICITATION BAN

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a new House rule to prohibit the solicitation of campaign contributions in the House of Representatives.

Ninety-three years ago President Chester A. Arthur called on Congress to outlaw the solicitation of Federal workers by Members of Congress and other Federal officials. In his message of December 4, 1882, the President wrote:

It goes without saying that such contributions are not voluntary, and in my judgment they should be prohibited by law.

The following year, Congress responded with the Pendleton Act which barred such solicitations of Federal employees and in Federal buildings.

Mr. Speaker, that Federal ban is still in the law today. However, our Ethics Committee recently ruled that it only applies to "coercive" solicitations—a standard used by the Justice Department as a threshold for prosecution.

Mr. Speaker, I think this House should have a higher standard of conduct and a lower threshold of tolerance for such activities between Members and employees. If we don't bar the House door now to political solicitors, we'll soon find ourselves back in that murky era of a century past when one man's voluntary solicitation was another man's political shakedown. Congress was the ultimate loser then and could be again unless we adopt the rule I am proposing. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this worthwhile endeavor.

**TRIBUTE TO TOM
WINEBRENNER**

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, my friend Tom Winebrenner is leaving his position on the House Republican floor staff for a new career. I want to wish Tom great success in his new endeavors, but I did not want his leaving us here to occur without saying a few words about this fine man who has

done such an outstanding job for all of us over so many years of dedicated service.

Tom Winebrenner was here serving on the floor staff before I was sworn in as a freshman Member of Congress in 1963. From the beginning and over all the years since I first came to know Tom he has always and without exception proved himself my friend and an excellent staff assistant.

I don't know how he managed it over the years, but Tom was always there with accurate answers to difficult questions regarding the ebb and flow of legislative activity on the House floor. Somehow, he always seemed to know what was going on, what was coming next, and its content. So I just want to say, Tom, that our loss is your new employer's gain, because your new firm has got itself a first-class employee and fine fellow in the bargain.

**JAPANESE-AMERICANS IN-
TERNED DURING WORLD WAR
II**

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to bring to the attention of this distinguished body a report prepared by the Redress Committee of the Salinas Valley Chapter of the Japanese-American Citizens League. This report provides justification for providing financial redress to those Americans of Japanese descent who were interned during World War II.

My colleagues know that this is a controversial issue that has sought solution for over 40 years. Although all Americans of Japanese ancestry on the west coast were interned during World War II, fully 75 percent of these internees were American-born. They were held in violation of seven articles of the U.S. Constitution without charge, trial, or evidence of disloyalty or espionage. Some were held until October 1946. Not only were the internees subject to emotional trauma, they suffered enormous financial and material damages, as well as the disruption of many years of professional and educational experience. It has been estimated by the Congressional Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians [CWRIC] that these financial losses would be the equivalent of as much as \$2 billion in 1983 dollars.

Mr. Speaker, Congress is presently considering H.R. 442, the Civil Rights Act of 1985, which would formally accept the findings of the CWRIC and recognize that a grave injustice was done to both citizens and resident aliens of Japanese ancestry by the evacuation, relocation, and internment of civilians during World War II. This legislation would involve legal pardons and financial restitution to those who suffered during the intern period.

Recently, I was contacted by the Redress Committee of the Salinas Valley Chapter of the Japanese American Citizens League.

The group had prepared an information sheet analyzing this issue and I would like to take this opportunity to summarize this report for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On February 10, 1942, 10 weeks after America's entrance in the war, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 giving the Secretary of War and regional military commanders the power to exclude any and all persons from designated areas for security reasons. In the end, more than 120,000 persons of Japanese ancestry—two-thirds of whom were American citizens—were uprooted from along the coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington and interned in remote relocation centers.

The internment violated seven articles of the U.S. Constitution including article I which guarantees freedom of assembly, article IV which guarantees freedom from unreasonable search and seizure, and article VI which provides for the right to a speedy, public trial.

Families that are interned could take only what they could carry. Internees were housed in tar-paper barracks, with one family or more per barrack. Privacy was practically impossible and doctors were in short supply. Schools were conducted with inadequate facilities and with books only when they were available.

Those who experienced the camps carried the stigma with them as a result of the defamiation of character, emotional and psychological trauma, and loss of livelihood and income. The Japanese American internees suffered enormous damages and losses, both material and intangible. To the disastrous loss of farms, businesses and homes, must surely be added the disruption of many years of career and professional lives, as well as long-term loss of income, earnings and opportunity, and their lifetime savings and assets.

An analysis by the Congressional Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians [CWRIC] of the economic losses suffered as a consequence of the exclusion and detention estimated that in 1945 dollars, the internees lost between \$106 and \$164 million in income and between \$41 and \$208 million in property for which no compensation was made after the war. After adjusting for inflation, these figures amount to up to \$2 billion.

In 1981, the CWRIC called 750 witnesses to appear before hearings on this issue. As a result of these hearings, the CWRIC recommended that Congress pass a joint resolution recognizing the injustices done to internees and offering a formal apology. In addition, the Commission recommended that financial redress be provided to internees or the survivors and that a fund be established for educational and humanitarian purposes.

The Redress Committee of the Salinas Valley Chapter of the Japanese American Citizens League supports H.R. 442, which would adopt the recommendations of the CWRIC. The redress committee believes that it is important for the United States to recognize that an injustice was done and provide compensation for this injustice so

that a similar policy will never again be allowed. When the rights of the few are in jeopardy, after all, the rights of the many are also in danger.

DISTRESSED COMMUNITIES WILL NEED HELP

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I represent an area of western Pennsylvania once known as part of the "Steel Center" of the United States.

Today, it is part of what now is known as the "Rust Bowl" of America.

There are 72 communities in the 20th Congressional District and a number of them face, or will face, municipal bankruptcy. The serious erosion of general tax revenue, brought about by the economic recession and worsened by the decline of the region's steelmaking facilities, has reached the point where communities can no longer meet ordinary operating expenses.

In communities such as Clairton, McKeesport, Duquesne, Braddock, Homestead, West Homestead, and others, the recession is not only alive and well, it is prospering.

Unemployment, true unemployment, is running two and three times above the national norm in these areas. Thousands of people have no jobs, no prospect of finding one, and no income. They long since have given up the niceties of life for the necessities of living.

Their despair spreads like cancer. When unemployed steelworkers quit buying, it isn't long before local merchants feel the pinch. Auto dealers, shoe stores, barbers, tavern owners, and so forth, start seeing their own incomes shrink. They begin cutting expenses, including laying off extra personnel.

That's the way it is in areas bypassed by the economic recovery. And now, the cancer has reached the vitals of the community itself. The closing of mills, followed by the closing of shops, has sustained a high rate of unemployment. In turn, that has eroded local tax revenues, leaving municipal officials with two alternatives: Raise taxes, a futile gesture in stricken municipalities, or cut public services.

They were literally forced to take the latter option. Municipal employees, including police and firemen, have been laid off because the community ran out of money. They could not pay salaries. In many instances, employees work voluntarily, performing their jobs until the Treasury is replenished by whatever tax funds can be collected.

Officials find their priorities have changed. No longer do they strive to improve their community. Today, they strive merely to survive as a community.

It is tragically ironic then, that at the very time when such communities need help, it is being denied them by the Federal

Government because it, too, is being forced to put its own financial house in order.

Because of the country's soaring national deficit, marching orders have gone out to cut Federal spending. Virtually every agency, every program, every project has been given the word. Among the programs slated for deep cuts and even elimination are some that have provided direct assistance to distressed communities—general revenue sharing [GRS], community development block grants [CDBG's] and urban development action grants [UDAG's].

Last month, Mr. Speaker, I wrote the Office of Management and Budget, requesting information on any current or future plans that address this problem of municipal bankruptcy. I asked OMB if there were any existing contingency or discretionary funds that could be used to assist financially drained communities. The response was disappointing to me and, I fear, disastrous for many cities and towns across the country.

I am inserting my letter to OMB and its response into the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues. I urge them to consider the situation for I believe they will be hearing more about it. What is happening in western Pennsylvania today could occur elsewhere tomorrow.

The letters follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, October 28, 1985.

HON. JAMES C. MILLER III,

Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MILLER: A situation has developed in Western Pennsylvania whereby several communities stand on the verge of municipal bankruptcy because of the severe decline of the steel industry in their area.

Huge losses of local tax revenue have pushed these municipalities to the point where they are unable to meet general operating expenses, despite deep retrenchment in local expenditures and services.

A case in point is the City of Clairton. Once a thriving community of 25,000, its population has shrunk to 12,000 and its tax base has shriveled as a result of the curtailment of steel production there.

Unable to pay its bills from general revenue, the City of Clairton has taken drastic measures. Its 14-member police force and 10-member fire department have been laid off. Police protection now is furnished by the Pennsylvania State Police; fire protection is being handled by city firemen on a voluntary basis while counting on assistance from neighboring communities in the event of an emergency. Other city employees also are working voluntarily while their next paycheck remains in limbo.

The city is unable to secure loans from private sources and its legal taxing powers are at the maximum. Were it in a position to raise taxes, the only source would be property owners and such a step would create a tidal wave of personal bankruptcies in view of the continued rate of high unemployment in Clairton.

Inquiries for emergency aid to alleviate Clairton's immediate fiscal needs have been made to the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development, as well as the Economic Development Administration. The likelihood of such assistance, however, ap-

pears bleak at best under current regulations.

A similar situation exists in the Borough of Braddock, Pennsylvania, where officials have been unable to pay most of the community's bills since July and where 66 employees face payless paydays for the rest of this year.

Comparable problems are encountered by the City of McKeesport and the Boroughs of West Homestead and Homestead.

The dilemma confronting these municipalities assumes a "Catch 22" appearance when it is realized that existing programs which might have helped them stay afloat—Revenue Sharing, Community Development Block Grants, Urban Development Action Grants, etc.—have been severely curtailed with deeper cuts contemplated in the future.

In view of this worsening financial crisis, I ask your assistance in informing me of any other current or future plans for addressing this problem and whether there is any latitude which might be granted in the use of existing contingency or discretionary funds.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH M. GAYDOS,
Member of Congress.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE
PRESIDENT,

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, November 19, 1985.

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GAYDOS: Thank you for your letter describing the fiscal condition of Clairton and other communities in western Pennsylvania.

I share your concern for communities that are suffering from the negative effects of economic change. In part, areas such as western Pennsylvania suffer from America's current trade imbalance. Recent administration actions taken in coordination with our trading partners are designed to ease that imbalance.

The administration believes that the best way to assist communities is to ensure continued economic growth nationwide. One of the keys to continued growth is bringing down the overly large Federal deficit. To do this, we must curtail Government expenditures, including spending on programs to which you referred in your letter—General Revenue Sharing, Community Development Block Grants and Urban Development Action Grants—programs which simply shift resources from one set of taxpayers to another set of taxpayers.

Despite these deficits, our country is enjoying a robust expansion. It is unfortunate that the present recovery has not significantly improved the condition of some of the communities in your district. While it might be desirable for the Federal Government to assist troubled communities during difficult periods, the current budget deficit is so large that it simply precludes any additional Federal Government activity.

Although the Federal Government cannot pursue more programs than it is now undertaking, current programs are providing significant assistance. In 1985, the Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) program allocated almost \$45 million to Pennsylvania to distribute to small cities and rural areas such as the ones you describe. HUD also allocated about \$1.5 million of CDBG funds to McKeesport to support community development activities. Furthermore, since 1982, the Urban Development

Action Grants program has accepted more than 100 applications for funding for projects throughout Pennsylvania, including a project in McKeesport and many in and around Pittsburgh. The CDBG and UDAG programs, of course, are only two Federal programs among many that provide funds which might be used to ameliorate the current situation.

Additionally, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania may be able to supply some State funds to your area. In general, States are now more fiscally sound than the Federal Government. Since Pennsylvania has run a general fund budget surplus in fiscal years 1984 and 1985, it may be able to assist troubled areas in the Commonwealth. This approach has the advantage of retaining State responsibility and control, which is consistent with the Federalism principles that President Reagan strongly supports.

Thank you again for bringing your concerns to my attention. I hope this response is helpful.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. MILLER III,
Director.

DUMPED PENSIONS SPUR CRISIS

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article that appeared in the New York Times last month. It provides a very clear and disturbing picture of the deficit facing the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. The PBGC was established in 1974 to protect pensions of retirees whose former employers are experiencing financial difficulties. Unfortunately, over 1,000 companies with underfunded pension plans have "dumped" their liabilities on the PBGC creating the potential for bankruptcy of the Corporation. Although a provision to increase employer premiums paid to the PBGC was included in the House Budget Reconciliation Act, it is unclear if a conference agreement can be reached. I recommend this article to my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 8, 1985]

DUMPED PENSIONS SPUR CRISIS

(By Steven Greenhouse)

WASHINGTON.—When Congress set up the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation in 1974, the aim was to protect the retirement income of workers at companies in trouble. But recently, after the Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corporation terminated its pension plan, it seemed to some people that it was the companies that are being protected.

"The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is now being prostituted to help companies avoid going out of business," said William H. Knoell, chief executive officer of the Cyclops Corporation, a Pittsburgh-based steelmaker.

He believes that the agency was "put together to be a provider of last resort to pensioners whose companies have gone out of business." And he complained that "in the particular case of our competitors at Wheeling-Pitt, it will give them a competitive advantage."

Mr. Knoell is one of the most outspoken corporate officials calling on Congress to make it harder for companies to dump their underfunded pension plans on the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. And legislators are finally responding to such appeals to toughen up the law.

More than 1,000 companies have dumped their unfunded pension liabilities on the agency since it was founded. Pension agency officials worry that the assumption of all these obligations could cause the agency, within the next few years, to run out of money to pay for all the pensions.

DEFICIT CRISIS

Wheeling-Pittsburgh's move, in particular, has greatly heightened the pension agency's deficit crisis. The troubled steelmaker's pension plan was underfunded by \$475 million. (Such underfunding occurs when the contributions that a company has made into a plan are insufficient to cover the pension obligations made to the plan's participants.)

Speaking about Wheeling-Pittsburgh's plan termination, Kathleen P. Utgoff, the pension corporation's executive director since July, said, "It's enormous; it nearly doubled our deficit." Her agency insures the pensions of 38 million Americans, and in the past has stepped in to protect workers at Braniff, Rath Packing, Allis-Chalmers and White Motor.

The agency's deficit now stands at an estimated \$1.2 billion for single-employer pension plans. Agency officials say that the deficit means that investment income and insurance premiums paid by employers will not be enough in coming years to pay the agency's steadily growing obligations. A single-employer plan is one where a company sets up a plan for its own workers only, unlike a multi-employer plan, where several companies make contributions into a joint plan.

To help end the agency's deficit crisis, committees in the House and Senate have passed bills that would more than triple the annual pension insurance premium that companies in single-employer pension plans must pay per worker. These premiums, which help finance the pension agency, would jump to \$8 or more per worker, from the current level of \$2.60. In addition, the bills would, as Mr. Knoell wishes, make it harder for companies to unload their pension plans upon the agency.

ALMOST ANY REASON

Under current law, companies can terminate pension plans for almost any reason, and the Pension Benefit Corporation is required to assume responsibility for them. But under the House Labor Committee bill, for instance, a company could unload its pension plan on the agency only if the company were in financial distress, such as bankruptcy.

According to Mrs. Utgoff, the agency has handled more than 50,000 terminations, most of which were adequately funded, or even overfunded. The agency does not serve as trustee of these plans, but instead distributes the assets of these plans by providing annuities to the plan participants. If a terminated plan is overfunded—that is, if the plan's coffers have more than is needed to pay the pension obligations—the excess goes back to the company.

For the 1,000 underfunded plans that were terminated, which cover 150,000 workers the agency has become trustee. When an underfunded plan is turned over to the agency, it uses its trust fund, plus the pre-

miums it receives, to pay out the pension obligations that it has assumed.

I.R.S. WAIVERS

Nowadays, troubled companies often fail to fully fund their pension plans. Such companies sometimes ask the Internal Revenue Service for a waiver that frees them from the obligation of making their annual minimum contributions to their pension plans. Seeking to help these troubled companies, the I.R.S. often grants the waiver requests. In the past, pension agency officials have criticized the I.R.S. for being too willing to grant such waivers.

Wheeling-Pittsburgh received such a waiver, and that was one of the reasons that its plan was so underfunded. Pension agency officials hope that the new legislation allows the agency to become a secured creditor to companies that receive waivers, to insure that they ultimately pay any contributions that are waived.

Mrs. Utgoff, a 37-year-old former economist with the Council of Economic Advisers, said many companies terminate their plans after underfunding soars. The reason is that the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, which set up the agency, allows it to claim 30 percent of the net worth of the terminating company. But for troubled companies, that 30 percent often represents far less money than the amount of the underfunding. Besides, the company often does not have the money to pay the agency 30 percent of its net worth.

"A TREMENDOUS LOOPHOLE"

"It wasn't clear," Mrs. Utgoff said, "that Congress recognized what a tremendous loophole this would be."

Under bills passed by committees in the House and Senate, the pension agency would gain the right to take 10 percent of the terminating company's pretax profits for up to 10 years, should the company survive. This would help repay the agency for the underfunding it has to cover and, at the same time, would make companies more reluctant to dump their pension plans on the agency.

The House Labor Committee's bill also aims to stop strong companies from transferring underfunded pension liabilities to weak companies that fail, thus forcing the agency to cover the underfunding. Agency officials say this was what happened when the International Harvester Company sold its Wisconsin Steel subsidiary to a small company with meager capitalization, a company that subsequently failed. The result was that the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation absorbed \$63.3 million in liabilities in 1980 from Wisconsin Steel's underfunded plan.

Many corporate officials support the idea of increasing premiums that businesses with single-employer plans would have to pay to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

"We don't take issue with the need for a premium increase," said Stuart J. Brahs, executive director of the Association of Private Pension and Welfare Plans, a Washington-based group that represents plan sponsors and providers. "We're just not convinced that the dollar figure arrived at by the P.B.G.C. or by the Congressional committees is appropriate."

The House Education and Labor Committee has voted for an increase to \$8.50 per worker, and the Senate Labor Committee has approved an increase to \$8.10. In addition, the House Ways and Means Committee has voted an increase to \$8, with the rise ending after three years.

Phyllis Borzi, a pension counsel for the House Labor Committee, said, "An \$8 premium, with a three-year sunset provision is clearly inadequate to deal with the financial difficulties of the P.B.G.C."

RECONCILIATION BILLS

The different bills are part of budget reconciliation bills in the House and Senate. When the conference committee arrives at a compromise bill, pension experts say, it will likely keep provisions that raise premiums and make it harder to unload underfunded pension plans.

Pension agency officials say that if premiums are increased to \$8.50, the agency will be able to eliminate its deficit within 30 to 40 years, so long as there are not many more extraordinarily large underfunded terminations such as Wheeling-Pittsburgh's.

Victoria Caldeira, associate director of employee benefits for the National Association of Manufacturers, said her association supports a temporary increase, but wants it linked to a study of a risk-related premium.

PRIME MINISTER GANDHI'S PLANS FOR INDIA

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the publisher of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Thomas Vail, had the opportunity to meet with Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India and discuss with him at length the future of the "world's largest democracy."

I found the interview insightful and revealing. Mr. Vail paints a portrait of our friend that few Americans have had the chance to see. Mr. Vail's personal remarks regarding the Indian Prime Minister are honest. He says, "The prime minister * * * is straightforward, candid, practical, and nonideological—neither liberal nor conservative—with no apparent hidden agenda nor any hangups about colonialism. He seems neither an intellectual nor a philosopher. I liked Rajiv Gandhi. When you stop to think of it, so do most of the people who have met him."

The interview not only speaks well of Rajiv Gandhi, but also of Thomas Vail. Mr. Vail has distinguished himself as a successful publisher, as well as a concerned and active citizen. This is a noble feat in the fast-paced, competitive, and sometimes merciless world of the media. America needs more citizens like Thomas Vail.

I commend the interview and Mr. Vail's accompanying remarks to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

[From the Plain Dealer, Nov. 10, 1985]

RAJIV GANDHI TELLS PD'S VAIL OF PLANS FOR INDIA

(Thomas Vail, publisher and editor of The Plain Dealer, interviewed Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India last Tuesday in Delhi. The interview took place almost one year to the day after Gandhi became prime minister, succeeding his mother, Indira Gandhi, who was assassinated by Sikh extremists.)

(Since taking office as leader of the world's largest democracy, the 41-year-old

Gandhi has met with many world leaders, including President Reagan and Mikhail S. Gorbachev, the Soviet leader. He represents a new era of youthful leadership for India, and is emerging as one of the most important figures in the Third World.

(Vail asked the prime minister about his plans for India, his observations about other world figures and many other issues. Among the significant points: Gandhi, from his talks with Reagan and Gorbachev, feels they can come together on some important agreements. Gandhi also lists his domestic priorities as electric power generation, transportation and communications. This is an edited transcript of the Vail-Gandhi interview.)

VAIL: Prime Minister, when your time as leader is over, what would you like to have accomplished for your country?

GANDHI: Well, I would like to feel I have alleviated the frictions in the country, that perhaps most of all I would like to bring human development or spiritual development on par with technological development. I find the gap between the two is increasing very rapidly. Perhaps the educational system, perhaps the technology itself is holding people, sucking them into this direction. But I feel that this difference between the development of the human being as a human being and the development of technology as a sort of hard product—the gap is becoming too much.

VAIL: You have mentioned in almost all your speeches as problems to solve: poverty, population, industrial development and . . .

GANDHI: Education.

VAIL: Yes. So I take it you expect to achieve the aim of human development and unity through education.

GANDHI: With more than—yes—through education but in a wider perspective, not just school and college. That is why we have made a new Ministry in Human Resources Development, which for the first time puts a lot of things together with education, not under education. We have not put them under education, but we have put them with education under one head.

VAIL: Very good. Now, you have carved out a unique place for yourself in your non-alignment. You are not with one side or the other. You have had unique access to all sides. Do you find as you go around—take Russia and the United States as an example—as you seem to be trusted by both sides, does it seem to you that Russia and the United States are going to come together in some way, to make an accommodation of sorts?

GANDHI: In Geneva?

VAIL: All right, in Geneva. That's a good start.

GANDHI: Well, in Geneva it could only be a start. I hope that there will be a start. I did get the feeling in the U.S. and in Moscow that both countries do want peace.

VAIL: That's very significant.

GANDHI: But both have got their own, what should I say, from our point of view perhaps "hang-ups" would be the best word. But I don't think either of them has a different ultimate end. I am not talking of the competition between the two different societies, which will be there. I am talking on the disarmament and the nuclear weapon angle.

VAIL: Did you find President Reagan easy to deal with? How did he strike you as a person?

GANDHI: I found President Reagan easy to talk with. Straightforward, and I like to talk straight also.

VAIL: I was saying to somebody earlier that having talked to you earlier and read what you have said, that you and President Reagan are similar, that you are both candid and that there is nothing else to it. You mean what you say. Is that right?

GANDHI: Yes. I try not to hide what I mean.

VAIL: What about Mr. Gorbachev?

GANDHI: I find him very similar.

VAIL: So you have a rapport among these personalities. When you deal with the poverty of India, which you mentioned in many of your speeches, how do you expect to approach that? That is a big question, and you mentioned population growth, which is about 2% annually. You don't feel these are insurmountable problems?

GANDHI: It's a tough situation. It's not insurmountable. We've already done a lot about it. If you look at India 40 years ago and you look at India today, there's a tremendous difference. Some people believe that the rich have gotten richer and the poor have gotten poorer. I don't think so. A handful of people have gotten very rich. But what we have developed is a very large number of people who are not very rich, middle class or upper middle class. It's all brand new after independence. As an indicator of their economic power and strength we loosened up on certain rules and regulations on certain taxes, and certain incentives in holding private investment in shares, specific industries, and we have had a tremendous response. By reducing our taxes, we have collected on average 22% more.

VAIL: You sound like President Reagan.

GANDHI: Well it works, it works. And the share market, I forget the exact number. I think we have collected something about \$5 billion. But we have not collected, we have pulled it out of what we call the second economy, or the black economy, into the main economy. So this is the sort of money which is floating around, and 40 years ago it was in the hands of maybe half a dozen families. It is in the hands of hundreds of millions of people today.

VAIL: In regard to foreign investment—some people feel that India has been up to now a difficult place for foreign investment. Do you plan some liberalization or change in foreign investment?

GANDHI: Well, we've done something. Now here we look at things in two or three boxes. One is what we really need and cannot get ourselves, develop ourselves. Certain technologies—when I talk of high technology, I don't necessarily mean sophisticated computers or space technology or electronics necessarily. We are also talking about biogenetics, agriculture seeds, and on a more mundane level the best technology for any particular task. It might be in just producing a screw or a nut or bolt in a factory. It is not necessary that you have to have a super computer. Shop floor ethos, or work ethos, which we have not been able to develop, that also I would have to categorize as a type of technology.

VAIL: Like Japan?

GANDHI: Like Japan. Like some of the southeast Asian countries. That type of thing. That's what is missing. In areas where we feel that we cannot achieve this, we allow foreign investment.

VAIL: So Japan and the United States would be your main sources?

GANDHI: Well, they would, yes. Some West European countries. Then there's another area where have made it absolutely open, and that is our free trade zones, where you can do what you like, 100% investment, we

don't want to know what you are doing as long as it goes out. Even there, we have loosened up certain rules because earlier we would not allow—people in India were not allowed to import from a free trade zone. It was ridiculous. What was in fact happening—a particular case in point—we had a U.S. company which had a branch in one of the trade zones manufacturing a product. Our rules said that they (Indians) cannot buy from a factory on Indian soil (in the zone) so they bought from the same company but from the factory in the U.S. So that modification we have done so we can buy as an import from our own free trade zones.

VAIL: Are you going to get the government out of any special industry in the near future?

GANDHI: Well, we have got them out to a very large extent from communications.

VAIL: The communications system of India, the transportation system, these things that are part of the commerce of the nation, I know you have in high priority. Do you feel that you can come on with a major communications program, not just in the media, but the telephone system? Is there any way to get a good one going?

GANDHI: We are. We are trying to do that. Now, before I get to communications I would just like to put the priorities in line on the plan. The seventh plan which we have just produced.

The first priority we have given is to power generation. Almost all our factories are running at about 40%. Agriculture is not running properly because we have not been able to give power. So the first thing is going to be to get 100% output, or whatever is the best they can do, from the investment that's already been made in factories, in agriculture and other areas.

VAIL: And that would be nuclear and hydro?

GANDHI: There's very little nuclear. It's mostly thermal and hydro. Some gas and none of the new is oil, but some of the older generation is oil. Next is going to be transport because we are already in a crunch. And the minute all these factories and agriculture start functioning at double efficiency we'll have to carry double the amount of goods, so that's the next . . .

VAIL: The road system?

GANDHI: The road, the rail, air much less. Railways are our primary hauling system, more than the roads. We are also looking at roads and we doing an experiment on a motorway where we are trying to get somebody from the private sector to make it and charge a toll on it, and watch to see how it works. If it works well then we can adopt it in other areas.

VAIL: So those would be your top priorities at the moment?

GANDHI: Yes. Well, communications of course. What we are doing for communications immediately is to offload the data communications which is going through telephones. We hope in the next few months to be in a position to start offloading certainly the heaviest circuits. All business communications could go through data links, telexes, computer to computer, like that. So that would offload the telephones and hopefully the telephones would then in those areas be available to be used as telephones instead of transmitting really what should go over a data link. We have also discovered that we've got very good switching technology which we have developed for our defense forces and it's been in use for the defense forces, which is as good as anything you've got and we are going to put that into the civilian field as well.

VAIL: One thing I keep hearing is that we in the media are overestimating differences between India and Pakistan, and we keep hearing from sophisticated people here that your differences with Pakistan are not that great. We keep hearing that America is giving big hardware to Pakistan and that makes you mad. Is it true that we are overestimating this and that things can be worked out?

GANDHI: Well, things not only can be worked, they must be worked out. We are very clear about that. We want true friendship with Pakistan. And it's not just because they are a neighbor. Yes, they are a neighbor and we want friendship with all our neighbors. Pakistan is not a geographical division, it's not a division on any ethnic or any other line, it's just a line that the British drew like that. In fact, I believe at one particular point, I believe there was an argument, and they said, well, all right, we will just change it like that, so you know, it just fell there. So you know, this division is not a division of differences between the people. When we meet Pakistanis and I am sure when Pakistanis meet Indians, there is no difference. We are absolutely on the same wavelength. I have just been back to my old school on Sunday, and we have a large contingent from Pakistan, old boys with their families. There's no difference between us.

VAIL: The fact that Americans are supplying a lot of things to Pakistan, that's something you think you can work around in some way.

GANDHI: Well, it worries us. It worries us because we have had three wars with Pakistan. It's a fact of history and we cannot avoid that. They attacked us on each occasion. What worries us is not the arms per se, because you know whether they have less or more, we will have the same. We have to equate them. If we go shooting ahead, they will have to equate with us. What bothers us is that we have to spend that much more money. We would have preferred, both of us, to stay at a very low level and we were both very happy. They had Mirage Threes and this Chinese jet, and we had MIG 21s. MIG 21s, as you know, are Korean war vintage, that's when they came out, and we were both very happy. Then, what made us unhappy, was the last injection of arms, when lot of sophisticated weapons came in and we immediately had to go to new aircraft, and new everything. It stimulates a race. We don't want that.

VAIL: You want to use your resources for internal development?

GANDHI: Absolutely.

VAIL: Tell me, what do you find most satisfying about this job of yours that you didn't expect?

GANDHI: Satisfying, when you actually manage to get things done, especially things that people felt were not easy to do. It does give you tremendous satisfaction.

VAIL: Like the Sikh problem in Punjab.

GANDHI: Yes. Well, it's not worked out yet. But we have made a start, yes.

VAIL: Are there any particular people around the world that you have met that you particularly take to? Do these leaders impress you that you meet?

GANDHI: A lot, yes. I have met quite a lot. As a group, I would say what really impressed me was the attitude of the younger generation of leadership, and the—I won't say common view because in the group there are people with very Western ideas, there are people with very left ideas, there are people with nonaligned ideas. Almost

every single one of them has an open mind and is willing to talk and to discuss and you know, debate points, which I have found the older are less open to do.

VAIL: They're the generation that wants to talk a new language about getting together?

GANDHI: That's right. They don't have the barriers that maybe the fifties or late forties build. I am not just talking of, you know, the more advanced countries or the backward. I am talking of the little island countries and the big massive countries. It's across the board. It's the age which is doing it.

VAIL: Have you ever thought of going over to see Deng Xiaoping of China?

GANDHI: I've got to go to China, yet. I've got an invitation. I met the Prime Minister Zhao Ziyang, we spent an hour together in New York, and we had a very good talk. We've got a group from China in India now talking about the border issues.

VAIL: Have you got a specific date to meet Deng Xiaoping?

GANDHI: No, we haven't. What we decided on is that a proper base must be made so that something conclusive comes out of the visit. Otherwise there would be tremendous disappointment in both countries.

VAIL: Tell me, what do you do for relaxation? What do you do for fun?

GANDHI: I like music. So little time to listen to good music. Photography. I am a radio amateur, but again no time.

VAIL: No more flying?

GANDHI: No more flying, but I am going to renew my license one of these days.

VAIL: Do you have any great disappointments in your experience after a year?

GANDHI: No great disappointment, no. Nothing that is really upset me or worried me, you know, of something not going right. That feeling hasn't come.

VAIL: Nothing that seems impossible, that can't be worked out?

GANDHI: I am a great believer in talking, sitting across the table and talking things out. I find, even if you are not going to remove all the problems, you can increase an understanding of each other's situations.

VAIL: Person-to-person arrangements to reduce barriers wherever they are.

GANDHI: Yes, yes.

VAIL: Are there any particular historical characters you admire?

GANDHI: I don't think I do.

VAIL: But growing up there were no particular people in the past?

GANDHI: No, I thought you meant the past. In the present, of course, we look at our own leadership, at Gandhi, my own grandfather (Nehru).

VAIL: Certainly. It's clan and a tradition.

VAIL: Do you have any particular message for the people of the United States that I could transmit?

GANDHI: Well, it's peace and friendship for both our countries. Really striving for very similar goals. And using not very different methods.

VAIL: On education, which comes through in your thinking so much, do you have a specific program that you have in place or plan to put in place to change or reform the education system in India?

GANDHI: Yes. What we have done is, we have produced what we call a working paper, which is not fully satisfactory, not good enough. I think maybe we did not give ourselves enough time. But, on the other hand, we don't know whether we will be given enough time. So we set ourselves about six months to produce a paper, but it's a beginning. It's a paper that we want debated in the country. And it has provoked debate. We've got a lot of input. Somewhere

around the end of the year we are going to start putting our heads together on the input that's come in. We did not want to do such a major change unilaterally by the government. We wanted the whole country involved in that.

VAIL: Do you feel that the lack of a very good opposition is in the end going to be a difficulty for you? You've got this massive mandate. I get the impression that the opposition in India is weak and is not well led to put it mildly.

GANDHI: I won't comment on that (laughter).

On the other question, yes, I think it can be a problem, although it looks very cushy, the fact is that the real opposition in India ever since independence has not come from any other party, it has always come from the Congress (Gandhi's own political party).

VAIL: That's interesting.

GANDHI: When the Congress is in power, the biggest opposition is from the Congress, and the one time the Congress was out of power, the only time there was an opposition to the government it was also the Congress.

VAIL: Then, of course, your mother found out that the hero today can be the opposite tomorrow. It can swing that much?

GANDHI: Yes, and that really shows the strength of our democracy. It shows that the people know what they want and they know they can achieve what they want.

VAIL: Do you feel that you have made great progress on the corruption issue in India?

GANDHI: That's very difficult, because there's corruption at various levels, various types. We have made headway at the top end, and we are being very tough across the line. No compromise no matter what connections there are, how high up he or she is. The real problem which is going to be much harder to face is the type of corruption which takes place at the lower levels, where it is difficult for government to get down and check each case. That's why what we've done is tackle corruption and the black money economy together, because without the black money there would be no corruption. That is the corruption part of it. It comes from that. If we can pull the money out of the black into the white, it will reduce the money available for corruption. If we reduce the rules, regulations, controls, again it will reduce the corruption.

VAIL: Crime and drugs, which America is wrestling with, are they big problems in India?

GANDHI: No, not like it is in America.

VAIL: Organized crime?

GANDHI: Yes, there is organized crime, very definitely, but we are not in the same league.

Drugs are not a problem yet, but it is beginning to be a problem. Certain routes got closed off some years ago, and they have just started transporting it through India. We want to put a stop to it immediately.

VAIL: One final question. I take it that you feel there is a new era beginning for India, that it's going to be a whole new world for India, more united. A feeling that the violent history of India is a thing of the past, that education, lessening of controls, whatever, is going to bring a new era for India. Is that your feeling?

GANDHI: Much of it is going to be by development of the human being and by economic uplift. Because many of these tensions which become communal or racist are really driven from an economic starting point.

VAIL: I like your point about human development. You don't feel that religion—India is a deeply religious place—that religion is not a detriment to India.

GANDHI: No. It has to be one of the pillars. That is what will strengthen the person, the individual.

VAIL: Well sir, you have carved out for yourself a unique place, and I take it non-alignment will be the policy of India for some time to come. Is that right?

GANDHI: Very much so, yes.

VAIL: You are at ease with the media, I must say.

GANDHI: I talk openly to the media.

VAIL: You tell the truth. That's the most disarming thing.

GANDHI: Thank you very much. It's been a pleasure meeting you again.

GANDHI: CANDID, PRACTICAL AND STRAIGHTFORWARD

(By Thomas Vail)

Rajiv Gandhi met me for our interview in his offices in the main government buildings in Delhi, which were erected by the British during the imperial period. His office is quite simple, with a few knickknacks, nor any major art works.

The prime minister is 6-foot-2, slim and good looking, with a friendly manner and a good sense of humor. He is straightforward, candid, practical and non-ideological—neither liberal nor conservative—with no apparent hidden agenda nor any hangups about colonialism. He seems neither an intellectual nor a philosopher.

I asked him in our interview published here about people he admired, either historical characters or current leaders. He said he has not modeled himself on any historical character. On current world leaders—and he has met a lot of them—he said he mainly impressed by the younger ones in their 30s and 40s because of their willingness to talk, to reach new accommodations to create a new world.

Although he now has little time for pleasures, he still enjoys driving his own cars (fast), photography, music and ham radio, and he intends to renew his pilot's license.

Gandhi, in surprising ways, is similar to President Reagan; what you see is what you get. There are no subtleties, or deep intellectual or philosophical broodings, no trickery. He believes he can deal with and be friendly with anyone: the Americans, the Russians or whomever.

He believes both the Americans and Russians would like to reach an accommodation, but are prevented from doing so because of their hangups. But he believes these are not insurmountable.

Gandhi has a practical personality. Whatever differences he may have with other nations—whether the United States and the Soviet Union or his country's historic enemy, Pakistan—he wants to attempt to solve the differences on a person-to-person basis. He believes in personal politics and personal diplomacy.

He faces monumental problems in India, a country with virtually no infrastructure, bad roads, terrible communications, grinding poverty, terrible air and water pollution, and 60% to 70% illiteracy. If you can name a problem, India, probably has it.

But Gandhi is young enough and new enough in his job to think that something can always be done. He is formulating plans to get started on these problems and he has priorities.

The most interesting thing is that he thinks more about humanity and people than about technology. He didn't say it quite this way, but I got the impression that he believes science and technology have

sometimes moved ahead and left the development of human beings behind.

So Gandhi wants to advance his country socially as well as technologically. He realizes that many of the deep divisions in India have stemmed from differences in the economic well-being of the people. The young prime minister is trying to foster a strong middle class, to eliminate the extremes of wealth and poverty that have marked India's past.

Gandhi is part of a new wave of young leaders all over the world. He represents a new generation and a new era for his country. The final measure of this 41-year-old new star of the Third World will be how much of his program to modernize his very backward country can be put into effect.

I liked Rajiv Gandhi. When you stop to think of it, so do most of the people who have met him.

H.R. 3773

HON. PAUL B. HENRY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to support H.R. 3773, the Federal Science and Technology Transfer Act of 1985. This legislation seeks to build upon the foundation of the 1980 Stevenson-Wydler Act to encourage closer public/private cooperation in industrially related technological research and development. As an original cosponsor of this legislation and member of the subcommittee which held hearings on and reported the final bill, I strongly endorse its provisions.

Federal Government laboratories with their scientific and engineering expertise, their technology base, and their facilities and equipment are valuable national resources. But these resources need to be more readily shared with businesses wishing to develop new products, with universities wanting to enhance research efforts, and with local governments in need of technical solutions to their problems. This legislation goes a long way toward meeting those needs.

H.R. 3773 has three major provisions. It authorizes Government-operated laboratories to enter into cooperative research agreements with other levels of Government, nonprofit institutions, and the private sector. It provides incentives for these laboratories to pursue projects with economic potential. And it establishes by statutory law the Federal Laboratory Consortium for Technology Transfer within the National Science Foundation. These provisions are geared toward encouraging economically productive research and development projects to enable industry to take advantage of the latest scientific developments in their fields, and thereby increase productivity, employment, and international competitiveness.

Currently, there is a wide variability in how Government laboratories relate their research and development work with other parties. Some agencies, such as NASA, have a long history of supporting cooperative research because such authority is clearly

spelled out in statutory law. Other agencies, such as USDA, as yet have not realized their full potential because of limited statutory authority or cumbersome procedures to obtain approvals for joint projects. H.R. 3773 must become law before agencies like USDA can go forward with joint efforts.

Agencies and their laboratory systems are provided with new, strong, and flexible incentives to enter into cooperative research and development agreements. Currently, Federal agencies have statutory authority to pay cash incentive awards up to \$25,000 to their employees for meritorious work. NASA, from provisions in the Space Act, has additional authority to provide awards up to \$100,000. But, by and large, these reward systems are unused, and especially in the Research and Development area.

Although various proposals have been made to mandate specific new incentive programs, what is helpful to one agency may be harmful to another. Therefore, the legislation encourages and directs agency heads to use their current authority to develop and implement a strong awards program specifically for their scientific, engineering, and technical personnel. Agencies are also permitted to retain revenues from royalties for limited and appropriate purposes, including rewarding specific researchers and updating research equipment.

The Federal Laboratory Consortium for Technology Transfer (FLC) is also upgraded. Currently a voluntary organization, it is composed of nearly 300 Federal laboratories from 11 agencies. Its goal is to improve the transfer of Federal Government technological discoveries into other sectors, particularly the private sector. So far, it has shown promise, but its success has been uneven. H.R. 3773 establishes the FLC in law and allows it to use the administrative services of the National Science Foundation to help achieve its goal. To aid the consortium further in identifying appropriate arrangements and projects, the legislation establishes advisory committees in each Federal laboratory consortium region to be composed of representatives from other levels of government, private enterprise, universities, industrial development organizations, and other appropriate persons.

Passage of this legislation will require no increase in Federal outlays. Initial funding of the FLC is through a very small setaside totaling less than \$1 million per year from the budgets of agencies with Government-owned laboratories. Voluntary contributions will provide full funding after 1991. The private sector will contribute greatly to specific R&D projects. Federal revenues are also expected to be generated from royalties on new inventions.

H.R. 3773 is an important legislative initiative. It addresses a critical economic need in a fiscally responsible manner. I am pleased that this body has recognized the importance of this need, and command my colleagues for adopting this legislation.

INSURANCE CRISIS THREATENS COLLEGES

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, as my subcommittee pursues its long-range inquiry into the crisis in the availability of insurance, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the far-reaching consequences of the crisis. The Associated Press article I am inserting here in the RECORD from the Burlington County Times describes the serious disruption of our institutions of higher education created by the insurance crisis. This graphically illustrates an important point about insurance coverage; it is often a public necessity, not a discretionary service that one can forgo until another day. Accordingly, public officials do not have the luxury of ignoring the liability crisis in the hope that it will go away.

[From the Burlington County Times]

COLLEGES GET EXPENSIVE INSURANCE, OR NONE AT ALL

BOSTON.—Faced with a surge in lawsuits, American colleges and universities are finding they must pay up to 10 times more than last year for liability insurance—if they can get it at all.

The University of Southern California, 30 miles from the San Andreas fault, cannot afford earthquake coverage. In January, the premium more than tripled to \$400,000.

"We're rolling the dice," said Alex Ratka, director of risk management and insurance for USC.

At Southeastern Massachusetts University, students are hoisting double dips instead of beers. In March, the school converted the campus pub into an ice cream parlor after an insurer refused to renew liquor liability coverage.

"There are just horror stories all over the place," said William Jacka, president of Moulton, Allen and Williams Corp. insurance brokerage in Birmingham, Ala. "Most underwriters are just scared of colleges and universities because they don't understand the risk."

Michigan State University, which now has general liability insurance to cover claims of up to \$50 million, will be lucky to get a limit a fifth that high next year, said Jerre Ward, risk manager for the 44,000-student school.

"When companies are renewing, they are doing three things: reducing the coverage, reducing the limits and raising the price," she said.

The crisis comes a year after the insurance industry lost \$3.8 billion. Barry Walker, associate vice president of the Chicago-based Alliance of American Insurers, said insurers were trying to recoup by shying away from areas where their risk is most speculative.

The problem is not limited to institutions of higher learning, but huge insurance bills are particularly chilling to college administrators trying to keep spiraling tuition costs under control.

"Premiums have gone up anywhere from four to 10 times," said Jacka. "The other side of this coin is that these costs are going to have to be passed on to the student body."

Insurers blame the higher premiums in part on an explosion in lawsuits against colleges and universities in the last few years and on the unpredictability of court awards.

Suits alleging sex and race discrimination in hiring and tenure decisions are among the fastest-growing areas of litigation, administrators say.

Since 1980, the number of claims filed against the University of Alabama at Birmingham has risen 1,200 percent, said John Walker, director of risk management and insurance. A large proportion of the claims allege medical malpractice at the university's teaching hospital, he said.

Because damages a jury can award are not limited, claims can vary from nothing to millions of dollars.

"There's no consistency. You can't say with certainty when you write a policy that this is what you're going to have to pay out," said Barry Walker of the insurers' alliance.

Since last year, some types of liability insurance have become almost impossible to find at any price, administrators said.

Directors' and officers' insurance, which protects school employees named individually in damage cases, has all but dried up. Universities report they can no longer get coverage against chemical spills or other pollution accidents. Some schools say newer policies won't pay for injuries to students involved in intercollegiate athletics.

"New general liability policies now exclude the very things we buy them for," said the University of Alabama's Walker. "The industry, I would think, should be in the business of visualizing our risk and then writing policies to cover it."

EUROPE AND STAR WARS

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the implications of star wars spreads far beyond our immediate concerns in the United States. It also has profound implications for our European allies.

The New York Times ran an excellent editorial on precisely that subject in today's edition. I submit it to the RECORD for my colleagues' perusal.

SPREADING STARDUST IN EUROPE

For Americans, the Strategic Defense Initiative sprang unannounced from their President's head. For Europeans, this concept of building some kind of an electronic shield against Soviet missiles poses excruciating choices. After months of argument, Britain has agreed to participate in the research, and other European countries will probably do so shortly.

Like most Americans, Europeans believe that no perfect missile defense is technically feasible, while a leaky one would be a dubious bargain. It would be an even worse one for them, because even a leaky Soviet shield could rob the French and British nuclear deterrents of credibility.

So the allies, having met one test of loyalty by accepting American cruise and Pershing missiles on their soil, resented a recent letter from Caspar Weinberger in which the Secretary of Defense invited them to sign up for "Star Wars" research—and to reply within 60 days.

Still, even if the Europeans are not sold on Star Wars as a weapon, they find it compelling as a technological venture. They fear being condemned to a technological backwater if they opt out of Star Wars research and the expected technical spinoffs it may bring. Yet even this fear contains a painful paradox. The European allies also fear that participating in the project may stimulate a new brain drain to the United States.

Britain has responded to these complexities by demanding a \$1.5 billion share of the projected \$26 billion research budget for Star Wars, along with guarantees that it may use its scientists' inventions in commercial projects. Mr. Weinberger signed a secret accord in London last week that apparently meets British concerns without giving any specific guarantees.

European help with Star Wars is likely to be useful, though not essential, and will add to the risk that pieces of the technology may leak to the Soviet Union. The need for Europe's participation is political more than technical. For America to build itself an astrodome shield in which Europe had no involvement would sorely strain the Atlantic alliance.

The United States wants Europeans to share in Star Wars for political reasons, and Europe wants to share for commercial reasons. Marriages have had worse foundations.

ON THE RETIREMENT OF HAL M. CHRISTENSEN

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to note with congratulations and regret the upcoming retirement of a private-sector employee who has dedicated much of his life to work on the public's behalf. At the end of this year, Hal M. Christensen will retire from the American Dental Association, for whom he has directed legislative work for 22 years. While he has built the Washington office of the ADA into a sizable group of professionals, he will be missed.

During Hal Christensen's tenure the ADA has been instrumental in a number of areas of public health and health policy. The Medicaid Program has been expanded to include dental care for poor children. The Medicare Program provides oral surgical services for elderly and disabled beneficiaries. And the National Institute of Dental Research has become a vital part of improving the Nation's health and raising its hope and expectations for even greater improvements. A lawyer by training, he has done remarkable work to make improved dental services widely available.

During these upcoming years of budget danger for many of these health programs, we will be in our greatest need of his skills. Fortunately, he will remain as a consultant to the ADA throughout next year and will, I'm sure, continue as one of the professionals who might help steer the legislative process back to the needs of the public.

For now, however, I do not mean to draft him back into duty before he has managed to retire. Today I would like to thank him for the service he has performed and to congratulate him on a successful career.

TRIBUTE TO GILBERT GUDE

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Honorable Gil Gude, who recently announced his retirement as Director of the Congressional Research Service.

Gil served as a U.S. Representative from the 8th District of Maryland from 1967-76. While serving in the House, Gil worked hard on legislation associated with open space and parks, metro rapid transit system funding, and environment and metropolitan issues. He was cofounder and cochairman of the Environmental and Energy Study Conference.

Since 1977, Mr. Gude has been Director of the Congressional Research Service, whose staff of 850 represents the largest legislative body research organization in the world. We Members and our staffs are greatly indebted to Gil for his excellent work at CRS.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking Gil Gude for his many years of dedicated public service and wishing him the best in all his future endeavors. He will be missed!

A TRIBUTE TO JENNIFER DENISE WATERS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to take this opportunity to congratulate an outstanding member of the St. Louis community, Ms. Jennifer Denise Waters. Ms. Waters is a resident of Missouri's First Congressional District and a recipient of the 1985 Congressional Award Gold Medal for Community Service.

Ms. Waters is a coleader of St. Louis Girl Scout Troop 32467. She is recognized and commended for contributing more than 900 hours of voluntary public service during the past 3 years.

I am pleased to share with my colleagues the following article from the October 3, 1985, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, "North Side Woman Receives Congressional Medal for Community Service."

NORTH SIDE WOMAN RECEIVES CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE

(By Gloria Ross)

"Individual Americans are responsible for the future of America." These are the words and philosophy of Congressional Award gold medal recipient Jennifer Denise Waters.

The 21-year-old Waters was among eight Missourians—including six St. Louis area residents—to receive the Congressional Award during a ceremony in Washington, D.C. on September 26.

The award has been given annually since 1979 to young people between the ages of 20 and 23 in recognition of more than 800 hours of voluntary community service and personal achievement. This was Missouri's first year of participation in the six-year-old Congressional Awards program.

Waters lives in the First Congressional District represented in the Congress by William L. Clay. She was honored for her 988 hours of voluntary public service and personal development during the past three years.

Speaking with a quiet confidence and maturity that belies her 21 years, Waters said of her activities, "I think you gain a lot from volunteer work. You gain experience as well as skills, you gain knowledge about other people's personalities."

"Doing volunteer work gave me an opportunity to work with young people and to give to others, especially teens and children," Waters said. "The help, love and concern that people gave me throughout my life led me to want to give of my time to others."

Waters began as a Girl Scout volunteer because she saw something she didn't like. "When I see something I don't like, I want to change it," Waters said.

Waters was a Girl Scout until about age 11. She left Scouting after reaching the Cadette level because she felt her Scouting experience lacked substance.

She has picked up where she left off. Waters is now trying to provide Cadette Senior Girl Scout Troop No. 32467 in north St. Louis with some of the substance she felt was lacking in her own Scout experience.

As co-leader of Troop No. 32467, along with her sister Maureen Young, 33, she is sharing her love of the performing arts. Waters and Young both enjoy, dancing and their troop specializes in dance.

"Maureen's style is more modern dance, while mine is jazz/ballet," Waters notes. The Troop will benefit from both styles.

"This year they're going to not only go to cultural events, but will perform," she said. The Troop is planning a Christmas production.

But Waters says she's teaching more than an appreciation of the performing arts, she's also trying to teach practical skills and responsibility.

Toward that end, Troop members are active in their own administration. "They need to learn how to keep accounts," Waters said.

Jennifer Waters lives with her mother, Romelda Waters, a registered nurse, at 3947 Palm. Romelda Waters says she's "very proud" of her daughter's award. She expressed some surprise, but wholeheartedly agreed that her daughter deserved the award, noting, "Jennifer has always been the kind of child who's willing to do something for others."

Romelda Waters' influence on her daughter is quickly evident. Waters quotes her mother frequently. She says her mother advised her to, "Go to sleep on it," or "learn something from each experience," when Waters became discouraged by a project which later became instrumental in her receipt of the Congressional Award.

The award-winning project was the Sumner High School Hall of Fame Awards.

Waters established the Awards while serving as president of the Sumner Honor Society.

The Awards pay tribute to famous Sumner graduates as a means of presenting positive role models to current students.

Waters says her mother's encouragement helped her maintain the drive needed to complete the Awards project. Romelda Waters admits telling her daughter, "If you start it, you have to finish it."

The Hall of Fame was established and, thus far, honorees have included such notables as tennis star Arthur Ashe, comedian-activist Dick Gregory and KMOX-TV anchor Julius Hunter.

Waters counts among her personal achievements a degree in civil engineering, which she received from the University of Kansas at Lawrence last may.

Waters says she chose civil engineering because, "I wanted to use the skills I already had: my knowledge of math and science." She is now employed as a traffic engineer with the St. Louis Street Department, where her long-range plans include work in traffic analysis.

Waters says she plans to continue her civic activities. When she is congratulated on her Congressional Award, she offers a modest, "Thank You," and quickly steers the conversation to work to be done, to her plans for her Troop.

Waters and other area Congressional Award recipients will be honored again in a local ceremony at the Marriott Pavilion Hotel on October 7.

HIGHER EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the administration asked Congress to slash Federal student aid. Today, by approving H.R. 3700, the Higher Education Amendments, we're saying "no."

We're saying no because the administration proposals would have cut college assistance so deeply that 800,000 students across this country would not have been able to complete their education. If the House of Representatives had agreed to these changes, we would have robbed this Nation of a new generation of highly educated individuals ready to lead our corporations, our universities, our Government.

The effects would have been especially severe in my State of Oregon. Despite efforts at cost containment, college tuition in Oregon has increased by more than 200 percent over the last 10 years. During that time, the Federal Government has helped more than half the full-time public college and university students in Oregon finance their education. For private schools, the numbers are even higher. Eighty percent of students attending private schools in Oregon wouldn't be there without Federal loans or grants.

H.R. 3700 insures that Guaranteed Student Loans, Pell Grants, College Work Study, and other programs will be available to those who need them. At the same time, the bill reduces spending for higher educa-

tion programs by \$1.3 billion from last year's level. How have we reconciled these seemingly incompatible goals? By tightening eligibility standards, distributing loan payments in increments instead of one lump sum, instituting a tougher system for collecting delinquent loans.

The bill also takes into account a dramatic change taking place at colleges and universities across the United States. Non-traditional students such as displaced homemakers, part-time and returning students already account for most of the enrollment at some schools and are quickly becoming the majority on all college campuses. H.R. 3700, recognizing the different needs of these students, allows students to receive loans even if they attend school less than half the time, and authorizes payment for important services such as day care.

The bill also provides new programs for teacher training and recruitment, strengthens foreign language, library, and other institutional aid programs.

The improvements contained in H.R. 3700 go hand in hand with improvements that have already been made in Oregon. We've adopted tighter standards for Oregon graduates, instituted economic development programs that pool the resources of Government and higher education, and established new programs to train workers for our expanding electronics industry and retrain those who have been displaced due to the economic downturn of the past several years. Oregon has also instituted tight collection procedures for delinquent loans, giving us a 98-percent repayment rate—one of the highest in the country.

What's the payoff of these investments? Access to quality education institutions for students. A better chance for Oregon and the United States to compete in the international marketplace. And increased tax revenues because of the higher paying jobs college-educated individuals qualify for.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation. Cutting the Federal budget by forcing students out of college is a "cost-savings" this Nation cannot afford.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 372, PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, passage of the Gramm-Rudman Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act is a historic event in our Nation.

Passage of Gramm-Rudman is the most important action to be taken by Congress in many years. We have created a program to deal with the most important issue in the Nation—the need to require accountability in Federal spending to bring down the disastrous Federal deficit.

This legislation mandates deficit targets of \$144 billion in fiscal year 1987; \$108 billion in fiscal year 1988; \$72 billion in fiscal

year 1989; \$36 billion in fiscal year 1990; and, by fiscal year 1991 the budget must be balanced.

Congress may reach these deficit targets by enacting its own program of budget cuts, tax increases or a combination of both. Only if the Congress fails to adopt its own budget within the deficit targets would the President administer an across-the-board reduction in Federal spending. This sequester reduces discretionary accounts by an equal percentage with 50 percent of any automatic cuts coming from domestic spending and 50 percent from defense spending. While the President is responsible for exercising this sequester, he is compelled to maintain congressionally established spending priorities.

Because this budget balancing mechanism only goes into motion if Congress fails to act in a timely way to bring down the deficit, it provides a strong incentive to meet our commitments to end deficit spending by 1991.

Programs protected from automatic cuts include Social Security, Medicaid, aid to families with dependent children, nutrition programs, supplemental security income, food stamps, veterans' compensation and pensions. Other programs that are provided special protection include Medicare and veterans' health-care programs.

Many people have called upon me to reduce this deficit, and I have responded by cosponsoring legislation to require a balanced budget through a constitutional amendment and by cosponsoring and voting in favor of Gramm-Rudman. Although I would have preferred passage of the balanced budget amendment, I am satisfied that the Congress has finally acted to relieve this country of this \$200 billion Federal deficit.

Indeed, we should follow this vote with an approval of a constitutional amendment to ensure that efforts to balance the Federal budget will be continued as Federal law and policy.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE SUPERFUND PROGRAM

HON. TIM VALENTINE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House of Representatives had approved a 5-year renewal of the Superfund Toxic Waste Cleanup Program. The proper and safe disposal of toxic wastes must be among our highest priorities, and I applaud the efforts of my House colleagues in passing this vital legislation.

We must ensure that our legacy to future generations includes an environment that has not been permanently despoiled by toxic waste dumping. This reauthorization of Superfund is a large step toward that goal.

Although I recognize the need for this legislation and the costs involved in regaining lands and waters which have become

unfit for human habitation and consumption, I am concerned about the authorization level for this program. The \$10 billion authorized by our bill is \$2.5 billion more than the amount in the Senate version and almost twice the amount requested by the administration.

During this period of record budget deficits which have put intense pressure on every Federal spending program, we must be sure that every tax dollar expended is truly needed. I am concerned that \$10 billion is more than the Environmental Protection Agency can spend effectively. I am hopeful that when the House and Senate conferees meet to iron out the differences in the two bills, adjustments will be made in the final authorization level for the Superfund Program.

It is essential that we authorize what is needed, but it is equally essential that we not authorize more than we can use effectively.

THE NATIONAL MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS SOCIETY

HON. GERRY SIKORSKI

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, which today is one of the largest nonprofit health agencies in the United States, originated nearly 40 years ago with an idea—and a small three-line classified advertisement that appeared in the May 1, 1945 edition of the New York Times. The printed appeal for help was placed by Sylvia Lawry, our founder, whose late brother suffered from multiple sclerosis. In her ad, Miss Lawry asked anyone who might know of a cure for MS to contact her.

Thus was born the organization which today serves a membership of 400,000 through 113 chapters and branches. It is the only organization supporting both national and international research into the cause and cure of multiple sclerosis.

The Nation is very proud of the work of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society and the contribution it has made to biomedical research. Since its founding, the society has invested more than \$80 million in scientific grants.

As a result, we are much closer today than ever before to understanding what causes multiple sclerosis and how to treat it. Someday soon we may possibly learn to prevent and cure it. Enormous strides have been taking place in the neurosciences recently, giving rise to a real hope that this may happen soon.

Sylvia Lawry is still very much active in the affairs of both the national and international multiple sclerosis societies. She is a tremendously energetic, dedicated woman whose strong will and perseverance are literally a worldwide legend and an inspiration.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, on December 11 I was unable to be present for rollcall No. 449, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3838, and rollcall No. 550, the rule providing for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 238. Had I been present, I would have, in both instances, voted "no."

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DALTON LIONS CLUB

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce the 25th anniversary of one of the chapters of Lions International, the Dalton Lions Club, of Dalton, MA. They have been one of the chapters of this fine organization which has contributed most of its time, resources and money to helping those people who need basic health care for hearing and eye problems.

The Dalton Lions Club was chartered in 1961, sponsored by its parent chapter, the Cheshire Lions Club. Since this chapter was established, it has been the parent of two other clubs, sponsoring the establishment of both the Cummington and Windsor chapters. Its greatest satisfactions have been in being the top club in the district for the past 4 years, reaching its 25th year since being chartered and knowing that many have benefited from their generosity.

The Lions International, established in Chicago in 1917 by Melvin Jones, was challenged by a famous American, Helen Keller, to help the deaf and the blind. Since then, Lions clubs have been disposed to helping those with hearing and sight problems. The Dalton Lions Club is a long-standing and outstanding example of the power and generosity for which these clubs are best known.

Of the funds which the club raises, there are four areas where the funds are contributed. The club gives out scholarships, helps pay for its locals to have hearing aids and eyeglasses, and it contributes to a local and State organization for the interest of hearing and sight problems. The scholarships provided are for senior high school students who are in need. A few scholarships of this sort are given out each year with all the remaining funds which the club raises.

The primary concern of the club is to its local population, protecting children and the aged who are least able to pay for services they may need. Sixty percent of the club's budget is paid out for such necessities as hearing aids and eyeglasses; this also includes funding to needy families for operations which they could not otherwise afford. It is those who are most in need

who get the greatest consideration and assistance, as it should be.

Other funds go to the emergency sight and hearing fund, a local fund, and a large State organization, Massachusetts Eye Research. The emergency fund is local to western Massachusetts, and assists those who are unable to pay for operations and aids which they may need. This is important there are no other programs for these people to help them receive the aid which is required. The State organization is a major research center which has researched the "fake eye" and has done extensive research on eye problems.

On January 18, 1986 they will be celebrating their 25th anniversary. They have shared camaraderie in the club which has kept it together for these many years, and they have worked together to benefit their community and expansive research. The research of human health care problems is something which I have ardently advocated throughout my many years in the U.S. House of Representatives. It is highly admirable work, helping those people in need, and it is the genuine interest which is shown through this longstanding club which is an inspiration and a challenge to other groups to do their part for human services.

TARIFF REDUCTION FOR GLASS LINERS

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will restore some necessary tariff equity to a company in my district that is making a serious effort to continue manufacturing at least some of its product in the United States.

The Thermos Co., of Norwich, CT, manufacturers the vacuum bottles for its well-known product in the United States, and imports its glass liners from Great Britain. Other distributors of similar products import the entire product.

Until the late 1950's, both vacuum bottles and liners were grouped under one duty classification, but thereafter, separate classifications were established, apparently for statistical purposes. The rates of duty for the two items, however, remained identical.

In the mid-1960's, however, the rate of duty for vacuum bottles began to decline, while the rate of duty for glass liners remained the same. The complete product, when imported, was taxed at the rate for a vacuum bottle. Today, the rate of duty for glass liners is considerably higher than that for identically designed, and totally foreign produced, complete products.

The bill I am introducing today would reduce the tariff rates for glass liners to bring them into parity with the rates for completed products. This legislation will enable the Thermos Co. to save approximately \$200,000 annually, and will provide tariff equity to a company that has made a

concerted effort to keep some of its operation in the United States. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

TRIBUTE TO ROMAN L. MIELCAREK

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week my district lost one of its most respected leaders. Roman L. Mielcarek, 81, of Elm Street, Toledo, was a civic, political, business educational, and spiritual pillar of our community. He left lasting impact on every organization in which he participated.

Roman Mielcarek was a lifelong resident of Toledo. He and his wife Jeane founded and published the Shoppers Herald, a community weekly for 50 years. Mr. Mielcarek served as a deputy clerk for 40 years at the Lucas County Board of Elections. He held a host of other city, county, and State positions and did so with great enthusiasm, dignity, and integrity.

Active in every aspect of community life, Roman Mielcarek was a member of the board of directors of the International Institute of Greater Toledo, Inc. [NIFTI], and the Toledo fire commissioner's board. He led important efforts to improve community life such as the razing of the abandoned Parkland School at Lagrange and Central and turning the site into the Lagrange-Central Senior Citizens Center.

Mr. Mielcarek was president of the Central Committee of Associated Societies of north Toledo and held membership in the Old Newsboys Goodfellow Association, Jewish Community Center of Toledo, Fourth Ward Democratic Club, Msgr. O'Connell Council, and the Knights of Columbus. He also served as president and founder of the former Lagrange Commerce Club and trustee of the Lagrange Business and Professional Men's Association.

Roman Mielcarek was a special man. He shaped the life of a great ethnic community and his beloved city of Toledo. I know my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in offering our deepest condolences to the family and friends of Roman Mielcarek. It is our hope that the fond and living memories will carry you through these difficult times.

CHILD CARE INSURANCE CRISIS REQUIRES ACTION

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, the unavailability and unaffordability of liability insurance is affecting child care centers across the country. I have commenced a series of hearings to examine the insurance crisis.

I am inserting in the RECORD a letter to the commissioner of insurance in my own State. The letter describes very troubling developments regarding the insurance situation for child care centers and calls for corrective regulatory action. We in Congress must monitor this situation closely to determine whether the States have the ability to deal with this very serious problem.

The letter follows:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
TRANSPORTATION, AND TOURISM,

Washington, DC, December 9, 1985.

Hon. HAZEL FRANK GLUCK,
Commissioner of Insurance, New Jersey Insurance Department, Trenton, NJ.

DEAR COMMISSIONER GLUCK: I am writing to express my support for action to address the insurance crisis and its impact on child care centers. This situation is discussed in the enclosed letter from Daisy Ward-Roman, Vice President of All My Children. Child care facilities are of crucial importance to our communities in New Jersey and must receive protection from arbitrary action which could effectively cripple child care services throughout our State.

As you know, the current crisis in the unavailability and unaffordability of liability insurance extends to many lines of insurance coverage. In my capacity as Chairman of the House Subcommittee with jurisdiction over insurance, I have commenced a series of hearings to examine this problem. Historically, however, it is the States that have had responsibility for the regulation of insurance. It may be that support will develop in Congress to change this, at least in some respects. Until and unless there is such change, however, we must rely on State insurance departments as the first line of defense for the public.

Please advise me of the steps you are taking to address the problems described by Ms. Ward-Roman. I very much appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely,

JAMES J. FLORIO,
Chairman.

Commerce, Transportation and Tourism.

ALL MY CHILDREN INC.,

Atco, NJ, November 16, 1985.

Re: Child care liability insurance situation.
Commissioner HAZEL GLUCK,
Department of Insurance,
Trenton, NJ.

DEAR COMMISSIONER GLUCK: We, the voting, tax paying, small business women and families of New Jersey need your HELP in dealing with the UNJUST liability insurance problem affecting child care centers throughout New Jersey; thus affecting many New Jersey families.

Itemized below is a recap of events to date:

1. In August of 1984 I signed with the Continental Insurance Company (through Gallagher Associates) for a three year policy (inclusive to August 1987).

2. For the first year August 1984 through August 1985 there were no problems.

3. On August 26, 1985 I received an insurance premium finance agreement stating I would pay \$396.00 down and finance the remainder over the next five months at 22% interest. As this was acceptable I wrote a check for the \$396.00 down payment and signed and returned both the check and the agreement on August 26, 1985.

After the policy was already in force, on September 13 I received a telephone call from Gallagher Associates that our insurance premiums had been raised \$473.00. In comparison to other child care centers who have had their premiums increased by thousands of dollars I am told \$473.00 is not so bad. In reality \$473.00 to a small privately owned child care center does make a difference!

I understand that on September 17th Governor Kean approved an emergency regulation prohibiting insurance companies from imposing premium increases during the term the policy is in effect. However because I was notified on September 13th, I am not receiving any relief under this emergency regulation. It is appalling to realize that there were no provisions in our old insurance laws to prevent this type of occurrence.

I have personally corresponded and spoken with both Assistant Insurance Commissioner Joseph Kenney and Mr. Dick Crane of the Division of Youth and Family Services and been told by both of these gentlemen to pay the increase! Their solution is completely unacceptable!

We are providing an absolutely essential service to the community. If child care centers are not protected from these outrageous premium increases, many will have no choice but to raise their prices or close their doors. Either solution will cause economic disruption in many families throughout the state.

In retrospect, there must be some control over the insurance companies to prevent them from doing as they wish. We must demand fixed rates on a permanent basis. We need security which will prevent this sort of atrocity from occurring again.

If we allow insurance companies to raise their rates: After quoting a "firm" price; after accepting a down payment; after signing a finance agreement; after accepting monthly premiums; and then impose non-retroactive emergency regulations—aren't we really locking the chicken coop after the fox finished dinner? Shouldn't there be a reversionary clause to help both the child care centers and the families they serve from sure economic disruption?

Cordially,

DAISY WARD-ROMAN,
Vice President.

GRAMM-RUDMAN

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, today we approved a balance-the-budget plan called Gramm-Rudman. The measure forces Congress—by law—to cut the dangerous federal spending deficit by 20 percent for five years to balance the budget by 1991.

The bill gives the President the power to make across-the-board cuts if Congress fails to reach the 20 percent goal each year. It also represents the best hope I see for action by the President and Congress to avert a new recession by promoting growth.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation. In cards and letters, in phone calls, and at meetings, my Oregon constituents have told me to make deep deficit cuts—now. As we all know, what Washington has tried so far

has been either too little or too weak to make a difference.

The Gramm-Rudman plan is not perfect. It doesn't do anything Congress and the President can't do right now. The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, that they can't agree. Emergency measures are needed for an emergency situation.

At least this plan has teeth. It provides a binding system, in law, to stop the budget from spinning out of control.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third deficit-reduction plan we've voted on in 5 years that is disciplined enough to work.

The first was the "Pay-As-You-Go Budget" of 1982. I supported it, but it didn't pass. Too many people back then thought the deficit didn't really matter.

The second was the "Across-the-Board Freeze." I supported it, too, but it didn't pass. Too many Congressmen in both parties wanted to protect their sacred cows.

The plan we approved today starts cutting the deficit immediately. That's important. We can't continue to allow jobs—in Oregon and across the Nation—to be sacrificed to finance a \$200 billion a year Federal deficit.

Some people I admire don't like this plan. They say it's too rigid, and may give too much power to the President. They don't like the idea of setting mandatory targets.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I see it, time has run out. These high deficits are inflicting tremendous harm on our economy. And economic recovery just won't happen unless the deficit is slashed. In Oregon, we're still trying to recover 40,000 jobs lost during the last recession.

Passage of this bill is the best economic news for Oregon in years. We can't focus on rebuilding our economy with a Federal deficit that continues to spin out of control.

THE CARDEROCK SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHORUS BRINGS JOY TO THE U.S. CAPITOL TREE LIGHTING CEREMONY 1985

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening, some of the Members of this House paused from consideration of the weighty issues of tax legislation, the budget deficit, the farm bill, and similar matters to join in a truly delightful event which, each year, brightens our spirits and brings joy to our lives: the annual U.S. Capitol Christmas tree lighting ceremony.

The magnificent 55-foot white spruce was provided by the State of Michigan and the U.S. Forest Service; the music was offered by the U.S. Coast Guard Band and the Carderock Springs Elementary School Chorus; and the lighting of the tree was performed by the Speaker of the House, the Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., who, in a gra-

cious gesture so typical of the Speaker's personal warmth and love of people, invited his grandchildren, my daughter Monica, and Congressman LANTOS' granddaughter to join him in pressing the button which illuminated the 4,000 lights on that magnificent tree—the people's tree.

It was my great privilege to introduce the chorus yesterday evening, and I include my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

U.S. CAPITOL TREE LIGHTING CEREMONY 1985

The U.S. Capitol Christmas tree lighting ceremony is always a special event. This year we enjoy an added touch of holiday spirit with a unique musical flair provided by the Carderock Springs Elementary School Chorus. The Chorus includes some one hundred students of the fourth, fifth and sixth grades from the Carderock Springs Elementary School in Bethesda, Maryland. The Chorus has performed at: the National Cathedral, the Hebrew Home of Greater Washington, and the Pageant of Peace on the Ellipse south of the White House. Several of the Chorus members attended the Boys Choir Festival in Saltillo, Mexico, in 1984. This year the Chorus will also perform at: the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, the Hebrew Home of Greater Washington, the Pageant of peace, and, on December 21, at the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

All of the children in the Carderock Springs Chorus are special people. They have worked very hard with a great of enthusiasm, dedication, and intensity in preparing for their Christmas season performances.

I am sure they and you in the audience won't mind if I single out just one special performer: our daughter, Monica Oberstar, who each day brings home with her the joy, the wonder, the excitement of music and has infused our family with the enthusiasm of the entire Carderock Springs Chorus.

A musical group is probably only as good as its director. This group is superb and so is their Director, Mrs. Nancy Nuttle. As you will see, Mrs. Nuttle puts her entire being into each practice, as well as every performance. She is an inspirational and dedicated leader whose own example draws the very best out of her performers. She has opened their minds and their hearts to the joy of music and now she and they will enrich our appreciation of the holiday season with a truly enjoyable and memorable performance.

It is a great personal honor to present to you the Carderock Springs Elementary School Chorus.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, owing to not being well, I was not able to vote on Gramm-Rudman.

Had I been present, I would have voted for the bill.

**PRESIDENT REAGAN'S REMARKS
ON INTERNATIONAL HUMAN
RIGHTS DAY**

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, each day this week I have been proud to contribute some remarks in commemoration of the 37th anniversary of the signing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. On Monday, our cochairmen of the Human Rights Caucus, Congressman LANTOS of California, and Congressman PORTER of Illinois, led a special order in preparation for Tuesday's commemorative events. On the anniversary itself, I felt it proper to share with my colleagues a recent Wall Street Journal article submitted by Avital Shcharansky. And yesterday, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a Washington Post summary of how International Human Rights Day was celebrated in the Soviet Union. Though a small group of individuals met at Pushkin's statue to pay their respects, several were arrested by the KGB. Unfortunately, this is standard operating procedure in the Soviet Union.

It was, however, refreshing to hear President Reagan's remarks upon his commemoration of International Human Rights Day. His words reiterate what many of us feel, and I would like to take this opportunity to share his remarks with my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the President's speech be printed in full at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that his strong commentary will be duly noted by us all.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT SIGNING CEREMONY FOR INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

The PRESIDENT. Thank you very much. [Applause.] Thank you. Please, sit down. And I wish I knew where the light on this thing turned on. I can't find it, so I'll do it in the dark. [Laughter.] Well, good afternoon and welcome to the White House.

Today we mark the 37th anniversary of the signing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a document to which virtually every nation on Earth subscribes. It's a day for us to take stock, to survey the globe with an eye not so much in—to words, as to actual deeds; to measure the world against the noble assertions of the Universal Declaration and to reaffirm our commitment to the cause of human dignity.

America has, since its founding, been a refuge for those suffering under the yoke of oppression. A belief in the dignity of man and government by the consent of the people lies at the heart of our national character and the soul of our foreign policy. I had the pleasure of explaining that to a gentleman in Geneva not too long ago. [Laughter.] But, here, the difference is our documents, such as the Constitution, say we, the people, will allow government to do the following things.

Today more than ever we're proud to be champions of freedom and human rights the world over. So in observing Human Rights Day, we celebrate our commitment to the beliefs and moral teachings on which our own nation is founded: a belief in liberty, in the dignity of man, and in the inalien-

able rights of free men and women to choose their destinies. We have not hesitated when these rights and freedoms have been threatened.

Last month on Veterans Day, I visited the graves of our soldiers who gave their lives so that the rest of us might know the blessings of peace and freedom. Our sons, brothers, and fathers also lie in cemeteries and fields from Flanders to Manila under undying testimony to our determination that these rights shall not perish.

We've learned from history that the cause of peace and human freedom is indivisible. Respect for human rights is essential to true peace on Earth. Governments that must answer to their peoples do not launch wars of aggression. That's why the American people cannot close their eyes to abuses of human rights and injustice, whether they occur among friend or adversary or even on our own shores. And we must be particularly appalled that, on the threshold of the 21st Century, when man has made gigantic strides in opening the universe of space and finding cures for dread diseases, millions of our fellow men still suffer the grossest abuses. There are regimes, some friendly, some adversarial, that engage in frequent violations of human rights. There are other regimes which by their very nature are built upon the denial of human rights and the subordination of the individual to the state.

In Afghanistan and Cambodia, for example, alien dictatorships with the support of foreign occupation troops, subject their peoples to unceasing warfare. Today, six years after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, up to 120,000 Soviet troops remain. They have slaughtered innocent women and children. They have employed poison gas. And they have loaded toys with small explosives, an attempt to demoralize the people by crippling Afghan children. Some 3.5 million Afghans, fully one-fourth of the pre-war population, have been forced to flee to Pakistan and Iran.

The communist rulers of Vietnam have launched vicious attacks upon Cambodian refugees, refugees who were fleeing a communist regime in Cambodia itself, which led to the deaths of up to one-quarter of the entire Cambodian population.

In Ethiopia, a Marxist government has used famine to punish large segments of its own population. Vice President Bush visited a camp for Ethiopian refugees in the Sudan last March. Men and women of all ages were dying. But the Vice President told me, there's something unbearably painful about seeing the eyes of the children, the huge, sad eyes of starving children. And the peoples and governments of the democracies have responded generously to those pleas with tangible evidence of our concern.

In the Western Hemisphere, where so much progress toward democracy has been made, Cuba stands out as the country where institutionalized totalitarianism has consistently violated the rights of the citizens.

Unfortunately the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua seems determined to embark on the same course.

On three continents we see brave men and women risking their lives in anti-communist battles for freedom. We cannot and will not turn our backs on them. This year the House of Representatives has heeded their call and voted aid to the freedom fighters in Cambodia, Afghanistan, and Nicaragua, and repealed a ban on aid to freedom fighters in Angola.

Elsewhere we have seen considerable progress toward observance of human

rights. In El Salvador, Grenada and Honduras freely selected—or elected governments. I should say—represent the best hope of their peoples for the future.

And just over the last weekend, a new civilian president was elected in Guatemala—that's the first time in 15 years. We laud those achievements. But our concern remains for those who are still captive and oppressed. This is where our voices just speak for justice, for the force of world opinion can and does make a difference.

One of the more tragic cases today is that of the Baha'is, whose leaders are with us today. The government of Iran is engaged in rampant religious persecution, especially against the Baha'is. Since 1979, 198 Baha'is have been put to death, 767 are imprisoned, some 10,000 made homeless, and over 25,000 forced to flee their country. Only the continued world outcry can help bring an end to their suffering.

In South Africa the inhuman policy of apartheid continues. The declaration of a state of emergency has given the police in that country essentially unlimited powers to silence critics of the government. Thousands of South African citizens have been detained without cause—or charge. I should say, and denied even elementary judicial protection. I have said that apartheid is abhorrent, it's time that the government of South Africa took steps to end it, and to reach for compromise and reconciliation to end the turmoil in that strife-torn land.

In Chile and the Philippines too, we've shown our strong concern when our friends deviate from established democratic traditions. In Eastern Europe, the hopes and aspirations of millions of people for religious freedoms, civic rights, remain alive despite years of repression. The Solidarity Labor Union is still outlawed in Poland and the Polish regime has once again moved to restrict the few freedoms that its people still enjoy. In Romania, religious persecution includes the destruction of Bibles, while in Bulgaria, the repression of the Turkish minority and the Islamic faith are witness to the unyielding denial of the basic freedom of speech, assembly, religion in this region.

I addressed human rights in my meeting with General Secretary Gorbachev, and I made it very clear to him that human rights are an abiding concern of the American people. We had a long and confidential discussion and at the conclusion of our meetings, we declared in a joint statement that humanitarian issues would be resolved in a humanitarian spirit. Americans will be watching hopefully to see whether that pledge is observed.

Make no mistake about it, human rights will continue to have a profound effect on the United States-Soviet relationship as a whole, because they are fundamental to our vision of an enduring peace. President Lincoln once called America the last, best hope of man on earth. Mr. Lincoln's remark has special poignancy today when American determination and strength are central to the peace and freedom of the entire democratic world. It is therefore incumbent upon us to work for the expansion of freedom throughout the world.

In this great effort, my friends, I deeply believe we have a good cause for hope. Evidence of the triumph of the ideal of freedom and respect for human rights can be seen in every corner of the globe, and this is because freedom is not only morally right, but practical and beneficial.

Indeed, governments that rest upon the consent of the governed and the rule of law

are more successful in fulfilling their people's aspirations for a better life.

Democratic government and economic freedom have turned a number of small nations into economic giants. It even appears to have roused a giant nation from its economic slumber.

Permit me in closing to return to Mr. Lincoln:

"What defined America, what gave our nation its purpose and mission," he once said, "was something in that Declaration of Independence giving liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world. It was that which gave promise that in due time, the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men."

Well, let us always be true to that distinctly American cause. Let us never cease to work and pray that the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men.

Thank you and God bless you, and I will now sign the proclamation designating December 10th as Human Rights Day and December 15th, 1985 as Bill of Rights Day, and the week beginning today is now recognized officially as Human Rights Week. [Applause.]

[The bill is signed.]

Judge NELSON. Mr. President, you have mentioned in your remarks the relentless persecution of the Baha'is in Iran, and though the Mullahs of that country may choose to perpetuate these atrocities, they must know that because of you and the voices that you will encourage to speak out against it, these cannot now be perpetrated, except in the full light of public opinion. For this, we are deeply and eternally grateful.

We are aware also, Mr. President, that this is not a one-dimensional commitment; that in addition, you are normally and spiritually committed to the establishment of the peace we all want among the nations of the world—peace, the most pressing of all issues facing humanity today and for which the Baha'is ardently pray and that this country will help lead the world out of its current predicament.

Therefore, Mr. President, in recognition of your devotion to human rights, the National Spiritual Assembly presents to you on behalf of the 100,000 American Baha'is, a commemorative plate, and in recognition of your continuous commitment to world peace, we have the honor, Mr. President, to transmit to you from the Universal House of Justice, the international governing body of the Baha'is of the world, a statement on world peace.

Thank you, Mr. President. [Applause.]

The PRESIDENT. Thank you very much. Well, thank you very much and thank all of you for what you're doing in this.

I had the pleasure of quoting a statement of Thomas Jefferson to my colleague there in Geneva and he called it after he had heard it, "Very profound," when Thomas Jefferson said, "If the people know all the facts, the people will never make a mistake." So you, the people, and all of us together I think can continue to be a tide that will prove irresistible. Thank you all very much. [Applause.]

ARGUMENT FOR THE WAYS AND MEANS TAX REFORM BILL

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on December 12 which I believe gives perhaps the most compelling argument for the Ways and Means tax reform bill—the relief from poverty for millions of Americans. The article gets to the heart of the key issue in this debate, that is the fairness question. Few would agree that it is fair to impose Federal income tax on millions of citizens whose incomes fall below the poverty line. The Rostenkowski bill eliminates this perversity and does even more. It focuses on the needs of the middle and low income taxpayers in this country and creates an equitable tax system that we could all be proud of. I urge my colleagues to closely consider the points made in this illuminating editorial. If you care about fairness, if you care about the well-being of millions of individuals living in poverty, and if you care about the average taxpayer in your district, you will come to the same conclusion as have I: the Ways and Means tax bill deserves the support of Congress.

The article follows:

A STUNNING WIN, OR LOSS, FOR THE POOR

Silently, while hundreds of lobbyists have clamored for this loophole or that special interest, an immense victory for millions of poor people has been germinating in the House Ways and Means Committee. Any minute now—assuming the President corrals enough Republican votes to undo yesterday's parliamentary setback—the House will vote on the committee's tax bill. While there are many reasons to vote yes, here is the best one:

This bill would do more to relieve poverty than any social welfare measure in 15 years. Republicans should favor it. Not only does their President want it; the bill squares with their approach to social welfare. Democrats—especially those who represent impacted urban districts—should favor it because in the next five years it would funnel \$30 billion in tax relief to American families who earn less, many much less, than \$20,000.

Instead of continuing to tax people into poverty, this bill would, shrewdly, untax poor people out of it.

When Lyndon Johnson declared war on poverty in 1965, and when Richard Nixon declared war on hunger in 1969, both pursued a strategy of providing services to meet needs. Then the Nixon Administration, with Daniel Patrick Moynihan teaching it that what poor people lack most is money, pressed instead for an income strategy, some form of guaranteed annual income.

But the proposed Family Assistance Plan failed, and, looking back, that was probably a good thing because America found it easy to let financial assistance to the poor be vastly eroded by the soaring inflation of the Ford and Carter years.

The Reagan Administration brought more woe. It purposely slashed social programs. Every bit as bad, it passively accepted the

inflation erosion, which has especially hurt people who earn only poverty wages in full-time jobs. Instead of a services strategy or an income strategy, the Government has gradually twisted into a perverse position. Instead of shifting tax dollars to the poor, it has been taking more tax dollars from the poor.

Consider these findings, from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a private research group in Washington:

Between 1979 and 1983, the number of households below the official poverty line (now about \$11,000) who had to pay Federal tax tripled.

The taxes of middle- and upper-income Americans have declined since 1981. Meanwhile, however, poor people's taxes as a percentage of income have increased fivefold.

Under current law, a single parent with three children who earns the poverty-level wage must pay \$1,424 in Federal taxes. A couple with two children must pay Federal tax even though their income only brings them to a level 20 percent below the poverty line.

Hard as it may be for middle-class citizens to believe, America is now taxing people into poverty, by the millions.

All the recent tax reform proposals would address this perversity. But by far the best remedy is offered by the bill that Representative Dan Rostenkowski of Illinois has coaxed through the House Ways and Means Committee. In a stroke it would regain all the ground lost to inflation in recent years. The bill would eliminate Federal taxes for 6.5 million poor households and reduce taxes for millions more, including the blue-collar working poor.

No magic is required to accomplish this miracle; only a sense of fairness. The Rostenkowski bill would restore what inflation has stolen away from three ribs of the tax structure.

One, carefully focused on working poor families with children, is the Earned Income Tax Credit, which has hardly been adjusted for the cost of living since it was instituted in 1975.

The second is the standard deduction, taken by people who don't itemize—which is to say, virtually all low-income Americans. The Rostenkowski bill would increase it by about \$1,000 (to \$3,840 for a married couple filing jointly) to compensate for past inflation, and would index it to protect against future inflation.

Third, the personal exemption would be increased from \$1,130 to \$2,000 (but only \$1,500 for people who itemize deductions, to avoid a costly windfall for the affluent).

Taken together, these changes would dramatically reduce the tax burden on people struggling to survive: poor, working poor and near-poor. That is, people like that hypothetical woman who is trying to raise three kids by herself on wages that just meet the official poverty level.

Recall that, under current law, she'd owe Federal taxes of \$1,424 in 1987. Under the Rostenkowski bill, she'd have to pay only \$399. That's family assistance for a working mother, in the form of a tax reduction worth \$1,025.

All by itself, such a prospect makes the Rostenkowski bill worth embracing. Any member who claims to represent or care about poverty in America and votes against this tax bill will have a lot of explaining to do to millions like that woman. Her tax saving would be about \$85 a month. To her, and her children, that's a fortune.

MIDEAST: HOT AND COLD

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the attention of my colleagues a column which appeared in the Wednesday, December 11, 1985, edition of *The Washington Post*. I feel that it merits the scrutiny of every Member of this body as well as anyone who desires peace in the Middle East. Philip Geyelin very accurately sums up the role the United States could play in the peace process—if we desired.

I urge all of my colleagues to support a U.S. role in the peacemaking efforts in the Middle East. A stable, secure Middle East is to the advantage of all of us, and it is a peace which can be achieved through cooperation and support of all concerned parties.

MIDEAST: HOT AND COLD

King Hussein's once brightening hopes for movement in the Arab-Israeli "peace process" are collapsing almost as fast as they were building up, with active U.S. encouragement.

As recently as October, the king was at the White House and Ronald Reagan was praising him for "moving steadily and courageously forward" in search of ways to get the Arab negotiations under way. Even congressional skeptics were modestly upbeat about the king's performance on Capitol Hill. Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres was publicly praising Hussein for the "vision" he showed in his United Nations speech.

There was a widespread belief that the prickly issues of international "cover" and appropriate Palestinian representation could be worked out in time for Israeli and some joint Jordanian-Palestinian negotiating team to get to the bargaining table by year's end. Now the year is up and it is nearly impossible to find a valid reason why the outlook is so bleak.

The king has not abandoned his efforts, and Jordanian officials are remarkably generous in the credit they give Peres for his good faith. Not so with the United States; the king is putting it about that the Americans have lost interest—for reasons he cannot fathom.

That's the nub of it: there is no rational or respectable explanation for a diminished U.S. interest. The spoiler in the "peace process" now appears to be nothing more than the vagaries of Ronald Reagan's attention span.

It's true some significant events have occurred since the king's October visit. Even as he was making his case to members of Congress, the Israelis launched an air attack on PLO headquarters in Tunis. But the immediate fear that this would torpedo the "peace process" proved unfounded. Then came the hijacking of the Achille Lauro, with all the diplomated uproar that followed.

There were also the heavy demands of the Geneva summit. Finally, there was a direct U.S.-Jordanian issue involving congressional efforts to shut off U.S. arms sales to King Hussein—a tug of war that was resolved by putting the question off until March.

But the "peace process" appeared to be weathering all these storms and distractions.

tions. According to reliable reports, at the end of October Reagan telephoned Hussein and got the impression that the King was prepared to "swallow" the delay in the arms deal. For his part, Hussein thought he had a commitment from Reagan to take up with Mikhail Gorbachev the question of some sort of international "cover" for Israeli-Jordanian negotiations. Hussein thought he had an agreement, as well, that the Reagan administration would be ready after the summit to give the whole Mideast peace effort a strong nudge forward.

According to some accounts, Richard Murphy, assistant secretary of state for the region, drew up a post-summit plan of action for Secretary of State Shultz. The President was to consider it over his Thanksgiving retreat to the California ranch. But somewhere in the bureaucratic machinery the plan got chewed up.

In any case, Murphy's recent call on the King as something of a bust—as the Jordanians see it. Murphy arrived more or less empty-handed. He could report nothing much from the summit because, as it turned out, the Mideast "peace process" was scarcely mentioned.

You could argue there were more than enough hard cases to discuss at Geneva. Besides, Shultz's enthusiasm for bringing the Soviets into the Middle East act is said to be minimal. If that's the case, somebody at least ought to tell Hussein roughly where the "peace process" resides on the administration's list of priorities. You can make a case (a bad one, in my view) for a low priority. Or you can make the right case for a consistent follow-through on one of the few foreign policy issues that bear the stamp of a distinctive Reagan initiative.

But there is no case for blowing hot and cold for no good reason—other than the administration's inability to establish an agenda of serious concerns and to hold to it under the pressure of the inevitable distractions. That is a certain invitation for Hussein to give up on what is, for him, at best a chancy "peace process." It is an incentive as well for him to tend to his kingdom's shaky security by looking for a more dependable source of arms and other support.

RESTRICTIONS ON BELL
OPERATING COMPANIES

HON. ED ZSCHAU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the broad bipartisan concern which has been expressed recently regarding the provision of telecommunications services in this country. That concern involves the effects on the Bell Operating Companies [BOC's], their customers, and the Nation, which many believe are being caused by the restrictions contained in the Modified Final Judgment [MFJ] which divested the BOC's from American Telephone and Telegraph Company. Of particular concern have been the restrictions which prevent BOC's from providing information services and from manufacturing telecommunications equipment.

These concerns have been surfacing for some time, but they coalesced upon the re-

lease, in July of this year, of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration's [NTIA's] report, "Issues in Domestic Telecommunications: Directions for National Policy". Regarding information services, NTIA said:

... prompt attention to eliminating the prohibition on "information services" is required. The clearest effect of this prohibition, in too many instances, is to deny the public choices which otherwise would be available. The prohibition is also unfair since it places the Bell Operating Companies at a distinct disadvantage in relationship to AT&T, IBM and its planned affiliate, MCI, and other companies that are increasingly entering the local exchange services market on a selective basis. If AT&T and others are to be allowed to offer customers the convenience of "one-stop shopping" for a diversity of services—and we strongly believe that should be permitted—to unfairly hinder the local telephone company in offering similar service clusters will cause marketplace distortions. Success in the marketplace will be dictated not by superior efficiency, diligence, and foresight, but rather by the happenstance of judicial regulations.

Since NTIA's statement, a series of bipartisan letters and speeches regarding this matter have come to my attention, and I would like to quote from a few of them.

On September 25, 1985, Senator PAUL LAXALT said in a letter to Attorney General Edwin Meese:

I am writing to express my concern about the effects of the restrictions contained in the AT&T consent decree on local service in rural areas of states such as Nevada. I fear that unless some of these restrictions are modified, local rates will continue to rise and universal service will be threatened.

In particular he said:

Nevada Bell could generate additional revenues with which to offset this [lost] subsidy [from long distance service] and to retard the necessary increases in local rates if it were not impeded by federal restrictions on intraLATA information services. In addition, this freedom would help provide multiple service choices for all residential and business customers, particularly smaller and rural ones, which other providers may not find attractive to serve. On the other hand, if Nevada Bell continues to be unable to provide intraLATA services that other companies can provide, it will lose large customers to those other providers. Not only will this prevent customers from receiving the benefits of true competition in those services, but it will result in stranded investment and higher local telephone rates for all subscribers.

The next day, September 26, 1985, my colleague JOHN D. DINGELL in a speech before the Consumer Federation of America lamented the way in which the Justice Department continues "to tie up half the telecommunications resources of this country". Referring to the FCC's Computer Inquiry III Proceeding, he asked:

What good does it do for the FCC to authorize the Bell companies to provide new advanced communications services inside the public networks if the Justice Department insists on prohibiting them from providing these services at all?

Finally, with regard to this Nation's trade deficit he stated:

In effect, the current policy of encouraging companies and customers to place technological enhancements outside the local public network has provided an unnecessary market advantage to foreign suppliers.

Correcting the balance by allowing the Bell companies more freedom to upgrade their networks would help to reduce this advantage.

A few days later, on October 1, 1985, William P. Clark sent a letter to Attorney General Meese saying that:

The restrictions prevent the BOCs from offering new services that more fully utilize their equipment and business expertise to provide an expanded array of services to consumers. Moreover, as pointed out by NTIA, the restrictions unfairly limit the ability of the BOC's to compete with AT&T, IBM/MCI and GTE at a time when the customer base which must support local service is being eroded by those competitors.

On October 29, 1985, my colleague Senator DONALD RIEGLE, Jr. said in a letter to Secretary Baldrige that "... since information services in many instances are closely related to local exchange service, relaxation of this restriction should be carefully considered." He explained his concern by stating:

In an era of rapid technological innovation as well as worldwide competition throughout all sectors of the telecommunications industry I think every effort should be made by this Administration to take steps to best serve the needs and demands of the consumer, maintain United States technological superiority, and preserve competition in the telecommunications sector.

I believe that these various goals can best be achieved by allowing our operating telephone companies to enter into businesses that are either closely or functionally related to their basic local telephone business on a timely basis so long as adequate safeguards against anticompetitive practices are provided.

In addition to these letters and speeches, bipartisan legislative activity has begun. On October 8, 1985, House Republican leader, ROBERT MICHEL, introduced H.R. 3522, the "Trade Partnership Act of 1985", which would establish a decisionmaking process involving the FCC and Commerce Department in order to determine whether to allow the BOCs to manufacture telecommunications equipment in the United States. On November 5, 1985, my colleague RON WYDEN introduced a bill, H.R. 3627, which would give State utility commissions the authority to allow BOC's to provide information services and to manufacture telecommunications equipment, so long as revenues from regulated services were prevented from supporting the costs of these new services. And on November 20, 1985, my colleague THOMAS TAUKE introduced a bill, H.R. 3800, which would permit the BOC's to provide information services and to manufacture telecommunications equipment, subject to regulation by the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. Speaker and fellow members, I believe that the broad bipartisan support for removal of these restrictions, the importance of the issues involved, and the speed

with which they are moving forward suggests that each of us should become better educated on these issues.

ROBERT J. BRAUN ON COMPETITION AND EDUCATION VOUCHERS

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, in "Special Interests Use Fear To Fight Voucher Plan", Newark Star-Ledger, December 6, 1985, Robert J. Braun focuses on the most important element missing in all Federal programs aimed at improving education opportunities for disadvantaged children: the ability to choose.

The way education is structured in this country it is really only the affluent family who can select a public school through choice of neighborhood or a private school. Under the legislation introduced by Congressman PATRICK SWINDALL, low-income families who qualify for chapter I assistance would be provided with a degree of choice in the form of education vouchers worth the amount of chapter I money they now receive. These vouchers would be put toward the cost of tuition at any education institution they might select, whether it be the current school, a public school in another district or a private school. What is important here is that these families would be given the opportunity to choose the institution which best serves the needs of their children.

As Mr. Braun points out, beyond the benefits to disadvantaged children, this proposal promises to benefit all public and private schools, and the students they educate, by forcing public schools to compete with alternatives. Competition frightens these schools which are fat and happy under the monopoly system currently in place. So, it is up to Congress to force public education into self-improvement by supporting this important program.

SPECIAL INTERESTS USE FEAR TO FIGHT VOUCHER PLAN

The U.S. Department of Education has announced its intention to introduce a voucher bill sometime soon and already the screams of outrage can be heard in the land. All the large educational lobbies have issued press releases denouncing the idea. There's certainly more to come.

Under a voucher plan, parents are subsidized so they can choose schools for their children. The way things are in this country now only the rich are really free to choose, opting either for expensive private schools or expensive homes in communities that lavish resources on their public schools. The poor get to choose what they've always been allowed to choose, the public schools.

The idea of vouchers comes up, cicada-like, every few years. It provokes a lot of noise and then disappears for awhile. Since the taxpayer-fed weight of the entire public school establishment is against vouchers, the idea is never likely to get very far.

A few years ago, Assemblyman Michael Aduato (D-Essex) introduced a voucher bill

in the Legislature. It seemed like such a good idea that the bill quickly gained more than enough co-sponsors for passage. In a matter of weeks, however, after all the various educational groups in the state reminded the lawmakers what they were supposed to believe about such matters, the cosponsors gradually removed their names from the bill. Aduato found himself alone with his good idea and gave up the fight.

Why do public school educators oppose vouchers? The question has a one-word answer and the word is competition. If parents could choose where to send their children to school, then all schools would actually have to work to be attractive to parents. The public schools would have to compete with private alternatives.

The chances are pretty good that the public schools would win such competition, but they are too nervous even to try. The people in the schools know that with the existence of viable alternatives open to everyone, and not just the wealthy, the schools would have to continue to work to be successful with kids, pleasant to parents, safe, orderly and so on.

Imagine the parents in Newark and other large cities endowed with the freedom to choose the schools they want their kids to attend. Would the school board in the state's largest city so easily spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on contract buyouts then? Of course not. The board might even be tempted to pay attention to what's going on in the schools for fear parents would vote with their feet.

From time to time, the public school ideologues cite various polls in support of their contention that parents are just overjoyed with the public schools. This is proof, it's said, that the schools are really doing such a bang-up job that criticisms are unwarranted inventions of contentious minds. What these statements overlook is that parents really don't have very much with which to compare. Would the polls look the same if there were viable alternatives to the virtual public school monopoly?

In higher education, colleges and universities are in a state of constant self-review as they compete for a dwindling number of students. Functionaries are reminded to exercise politeness with inquiring students. Weak areas are overhauled or eliminated in order to strengthen the most promising offerings. Competition has brought renewal and thoughtfulness about questions of purpose. It's a matter of survival for higher education which has been operating on a de facto voucher system for years through state and federal grant and loan programs. Vouchers work in higher education and there's little reason to believe they would not work for elementary and secondary schools.

Parents and children would be the big winners under a voucher plan, but they would not, by far, be the only winners. Good, ambitious, achieving educators would be provided with the opportunity to establish and operate their own schools. In limited voucher experiments in California, the biggest supporters were classroom teachers who were finally given the resources and autonomy professionals need to flourish.

Educational lobby groups, however, not only tell legislators what to believe, they also tell their members. Although vouchers could revolutionize the teaching profession, the teacher unions won't tolerate them, so they create all manner of nonsensical fears in the minds of their members. But it

wouldn't be the teachers hurt by vouchers, it would be their unions.

The same is true of other groups, those representing school boards and administrators, for example. The best private schools in New Jersey and the nation have very few administrators, unlike the almost incredibly overadministered public schools. If, under a voucher plan, all schools became quasi-private (or quasi-public), then all those deputy assistant associate superintendents for curriculum facilitation and others of their ilk would have to find something else to do. Like teach, if they remember how.

By the time the self-serving fear mongers are through with the idea, only the most thoughtful and independent members of Congress, or those already planning to retire, will vote for the plan.

It matters little whether the idea might actually improve education. Improving education too often ranks second behind protecting the status quo among those with the power in school politics.

VOYAGER AT URANUS: JANUARY 1986

HON. WYCHE FOWLER, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, in a little more than 1 month, the world will once again look to the U.S. space program for mankind's first close-up glimpse of another world. At 10 a.m. Pacific standard time on January 24 America's Voyager 2 spacecraft will pass within 66,000 miles of the planet Uranus.

The Voyager mission to the seventh planet from the Sun, its rings, and its moons will produce a quantum leap in our knowledge of the Uranian system. It is but another example of the many benefits our space science program has provided us in terms of scientific knowledge, spinoff applications, and national prestige. And we have received these rewards at relatively little cost to the taxpayer: We now expend less than one-fifth of 1 percent of our gross national product for all civilian space activities.

In October I introduced three resolutions aimed at insuring the same kind of strong and affordable space science program as is represented by the Voyager mission. House Concurrent Resolution 204 is concerned with solar and space physics, House Concurrent Resolution 205 covers solar system exploration programs—like Voyager—and House Concurrent Resolution 206 addresses astronomy and astrophysics. The texts of these three proposals appear starting on page 26126 of the October 3 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would welcome additional cosponsorships.

At this time, I would like to submit for the record excerpts from the fine publication, *Voyager at Uranus: 1986*, prepared by NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

VOYAGER AT URANUS: 1986

Uranus, the seventh planet from the Sun, is so far from Earth, at a distance of nearly two billion miles, that its discovery in 1781 doubled the size of the known solar system.

The third largest of the planets, Uranus is circled by at least nine charcoal-black rings. Unlike any of the other planets except Pluto, Uranus lies on its side. It may have been at an early stage of formation when it was tipped off its original axis in a violent collision with another body.

As Uranus travels the solar system in this unusual position, one pole remains in sunlight for 42 years while the other is dark. Then, for the next 42 years, the situation is reversed. Currently, its sunlit southern pole is framed at the center of the nine rings, like a giant bull's-eye.

The Voyager 2 spacecraft is now headed toward that distant target, after having completed highly successful investigations of Jupiter in 1979 and Saturn in 1981. Voyager will fly past Uranus at 10 a.m. (PST) on January 24, 1986, passing within 107,000 kilometers (64,500 miles) of the planet's cloudtops. The spacecraft trajectory, which will eventually take it out of the solar system, offers the only opportunity in the foreseeable future to conduct closeup studies of Uranus, and later, Neptune.

Thus, Uranus will be the third planet encountered by the spacecraft in the first nine years of its three-billion-mile path looping through and then out of the solar system.

Because of its remoteness, Uranus is difficult to study, but a surprising amount has been learned through painstaking studies from observatories on Earth. Even so, information about the planet is sparse when compared to what is known of planets nearer to Earth.

The Voyager encounter will be the most intensive study of Uranus ever undertaken, with initial observations beginning November 4, 1985. The spacecraft's last look at the planet will occur on February 25, 1986. Many of the highest-priority measurements will be obtained on January 24, 1986, during the six hours it takes Voyager to sweep through the Uranian system. In half a day, scientists will gain more knowledge of the planet and its moons, strange ring system, and unique magnetic field than has been learned about Uranus in more than 200 years of astronomical study.

At Uranus, Voyager 2 will:

- Determine the rotation rate of the planet.
- Profile the structure (pressure and temperature) of the atmosphere and determine the atmospheric composition at depth.

- Measure how much sunlight is absorbed by the atmosphere, and how much energy, if any, is emitted from the deep interior.

- Map the location of clouds and hazes.

- Measure wind speeds at various latitudes in the sunlit, southern hemisphere.

- Search for and map auroral activity at both poles.

- Listen for planetary radio emissions.

- Determine the size, composition and distribution, and reflective properties of ring particles.

- Profile the location and eccentricities of the rings.

- Search for new rings.

- Look for shepherd satellites.

- Measure the masses of some or all of the moons.

- Obtain the sizes, surface features, and densities of the moons.

- Identify geologic processes that have altered the surfaces of the moons and map surface features.

- Measure the strength, orientation, and rate of rotation of the magnetic field.

- Determine the charged-particle population trapped in the magnetic field.

Locate the position and character of the bowshock—the environment where the solar wind meets the planet's magnetic field.

Determine the structure of the magnetotail.

PRIORITY OBSERVATIONS DURING VOYAGER'S CLOSEST APPROACH

Instrument abbreviations:
IRIS—Infrared Interferometer Spectrometer

PPS—Photopolarimeter

PWS—Plasma Wave

UVS—Ultraviolet Spectrometer

PLS—Plasma Detector

All times are Pacific Standard Time.

Jan. 15 (minus 9 days from closest approach)

Observation: Uranus
Instrument: IRIS
Objective: Measure thermal energy emitted by planet from illuminated hemisphere.

Jan. 23 (approximately -1 day)

Observation: Magnetopause and bowshock crossing

Instrument: Fields and particles instruments

Objective: Search for and characterize edge of magnetic field.

2 p.m. (-20 hours)

Observation: Rings
Instrument: Cameras
Objective: Series of photos for mosaicking.

4 p.m. (-18 hours)

Observation: Umbriel
Instrument: Cameras
Objective: Color photography.

9 p.m. (-13 hours)

Observation: Rings
Instrument: PPS
Objective: Four-hour study of ring characteristics while occulting star (Nunki Sigma Sagittarii).

Jan. 24 12:48 a.m. (-9.2 hours)

Observation: Oberon
Instrument: Cameras
Objective: Highest resolution photos.

1:08 a.m. (-8.9 hours)

Observation: Titania
Instrument: Cameras
Objective: Color photos.

1:40 a.m. (-8.3 hours)

Observation: Sunlit auroral zone
Instrument: UVS

Objective: Highest resolution mosaic of sunside auroral zone.

3:04 a.m. (-6.9 hours)

Observation: Uranus
Instrument: PPS
Objective: Measure solar energy absorbed by Uranus.

3:45 a.m. (-6.3 hours)

Observation: Umbriel
Instrument: Cameras
Objective: Photos at closest approach—365,000 kilometers (226,000 miles).

4:26 a.m. (-5.6 hours)

Observation: Uranus
Instrument: IRIS
Objective: Atmospheric chemical composition at location of radio science occultation point of Earth.

6:16 a.m. (-3.7 hours)

Observation: Titania
Instrument: Cameras
Objective: Highest resolution images.

6:36 a.m. (-3.4 hours)

Observation: Ariel

Instrument: Cameras
Objective: Color photos.

7:01 a.m. (-3 hours)

Observation: Miranda
Instrument: Cameras
Objective: Color photos.

7:14 a.m. (-2.8 hours)

Observation: Uranus
Instrument: PPS
Objective: Measure solar energy absorbed by Uranus.

8:09 a.m. (-1.9 hours)

Observation: Ariel
Instrument: Cameras
Objective: Highest resolution photos.

8:37 a.m. (-1.4 hours)

Observation: Miranda
Instrument: Cameras
Objective: Highest resolution photos.

8:54 a.m. (-1.1 hours)

Observation: Miranda
Instrument: Radio
Objective: Determine Miranda's mass.

9:08 a.m. (-0.9 hours)

Observation: Rings
Instrument: Cameras
Objective: Search for moons embedded in rings at ring-plane crossing.

9:15 a.m. (-0.7 hours)

Observations: Rings
Instrument: PWS
Objective: Ring crossing: search for ring particles near Miranda's orbit.

also:
Observation: Magnetic equatorial plane crossing
Instrument: Fields and particles instruments
Objective: Observe expected maximum in magnetic field, plasma torus, and trapped radiation.

9:18 a.m. (-0.7 hours)

Observation: Uranus
Instrument: UVS
Objective: Study composition of sunlit polar atmosphere while focusing on star Algenib (Gamma Pegasi).

9:38 a.m. (-0.4 hours)

Observation: Uranus
Instrument: PPS
Objective: Measure solar energy absorbed by Uranus.

10 a.m. pst, January 24, 1986: Uranus Closest Approach—107,000 kilometers (66,000 miles)

10:14 a.m. (+0.2 hours after closed approach)

Observation: Rings
Instrument: UVS
Objective: study composition of dark polar atmosphere while occulting star Algenib (Gamma Pegasi).

10:26 a.m. (+0.4 hours)

Observation: Rings
Instrument: PPS
Objective: Study of ring characteristics while occulting Algol (Beta Persei).

11:22 a.m. (+1.4 hours)

Observation: Rings
Instrument: PPS
Objective: Ring occultation of Beta Persei.

11:44 a.m. (+1.7 hours)

Observation: Rings
Instrument: Radio
Objective: Occultation of radio signal by rings.

12:06 p.m. (+2.1 hours)

Observation: Uranus

Instrument: UVS
Objective: Atmospheric studies while occulting Sun.

12:36 p.m. (+2.6 hours)

Observation: Uranus
Instrument: Radio
Objective: Atmospheric studies; occultation of radio signal by planet.

2:35 p.m. (+4.6 hours)

Observation: Rings
Instrument: Radio
Objective: Occultation of radio signal by rings.

7:42 p.m. (+9.7 hours)

Observation: Auroral zone on dark side of planet.
Instrument: UVS
Objective: Highest resolution mosaic of darkside auroral zone.

9:27 p.m. (+11.5 hours)

Observation: Uranus
Instrument: PPS
Objective: Measure solar energy absorbed by Uranus.

Jan. 25 3:55 a.m. (+17.9 hours)

Observation: Uranus
Instrument: PPS
Objective: Measure solar energy absorbed by Uranus.

6:00 a.m. (+20 hours)

Observation: Rings
Instrument: Cameras
Objective: Series of photos for mosaicking.

Jan. 28 (approximately +4 days)

Observation: Magnetopause
Instrument: fields and particles experiments
Objective: Measure environment as spacecraft leaves magnetotail.

Feb. 2 (+9 days)

Observation: Uranus
Instrument: IRIS
Objective: Measure thermal energy emitted by planet from dark hemisphere.

RURAL CHARM BLOWN AWAY BY FARM CRISIS

HON. GERRY SIKORSKI

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, this moving story by John Camp, which recently appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press-Dispatch, eloquently illustrates the tragic consequences of the crisis in rural America. Farmers, who have a long and proud history of self-sufficiency and independence, are particularly vulnerable to the stress that comes from being helpless. They are working harder than they've ever worked, and still having to give up farms that have been in their families for generations. When this happens, they don't just lose their job—they lose their way of life and their sense of self-worth.

Farmers have had to deal with natural disasters all their lives. They have handled floods, tornadoes, droughts, and fires. What they can't handle—shouldn't have to handle—is Government policy that prevents them from getting the prices they deserve for their crops. They are a hard-working people, the backbone of this great

Nation, and they feel like they're failing. Most of them haven't yet realized the truth—that their Government has failed them.

RURAL CHARM BLOWN AWAY BY FARM CRISIS

The things I remember about Hills, Iowa, are the apple trees, the grapes and the wine, the pigs, the city dump and a snowfall so light and beautiful that my wife and I put a snowsuit on our year-old son, and we all went out and watched the flakes come down through the street lights.

We lived in a little white clapboard house, rented with money from the GI Bill while I finished a master's degree at the University of Iowa. The university was nine miles away down a tar road that ran over an iron bridge out the backside of town past the city dump where country boys hunted rats with 22s—and into Iowa City.

The Hills house came with a garden plot, two or three apple trees and a grape arbor. Susan put up apple sauce and made pies and planted a big garden in the spring. During the year, some pigs escaped from a nearby farm and ran through our yard, producing the kind of scene not encountered in your everyday suburb.

The farmer who owned the house had said we could have half the grapes from the arbor, he'd use his half to make wine. That sounded fine to me. I got a friend with a pickup truck, drove down to the Amana Colonies and bought an oak barrel (used only once, to make Jim Beam bourbon), and ran up 55 gallons of wine.

My friend and I were a little naive about winemaking. We actually took more care than most amateurs do. He and his girlfriend, and Susan and I picked boxes full of grapes and carefully crushed and strained them before we poured the juice in the barrel. Most farmers, we found, simply squashed the grapes and threw the whole carcass into the barrel.

What they got was a strong but rough red wine. What we got was a smooth, somewhat nutty white wine. The farmer couldn't believe it—it may have been the only thing a college kid ever did that impressed him. I was more than happy to unload a few gallons on the farmer, and he was more than happy to get it; he was more than happy to come back for more, actually.

The school year itself was tumultuous. With an uncommon piece of luck, I thought, I'd gotten an appointment as a full-time adviser and employee of the student newspaper. Shortly after my appointment, the paper went through the annual year-end change of staff.

The new staff was made up of political radicals and radical feminists (not necessarily the same thing.) I got along fine with the staff and even received a thorough and continuing grounding in feminist theory, free of charge.

While I was getting along fine, the paper's relationship with outsiders was not so good. It was, in fact, one long war. It got so hot that television stations would come to our board of directors meetings and film the fireworks.

With the war in Iowa City, Hills was a good place to hide out. It was quiet. Peaceful. Bucolic. Fireflies and apple trees.

On Monday last, a Hills farmer shot and killed his wife, drove into Hills and shot the bank president to death, then went to a neighbor's farm, where he killed a neighbor with whom he'd had a disagreement over land rentals.

Perhaps you'd have had to live in Hills to understand exactly how outrageous these murders are. You would have expected the pyramids to fall down before this could happen. There was simply no violence in that countryside—everything was too contained. The psychological and social fabric was so dense with family, friends, and neighbors with shared schools and political groups, that pathological impulses simply did not occur.

Or if they did—and I suppose they do everywhere—they were somehow controlled, or channeled. It's hard to explain, exactly, but there was no safer place in the world than Hills, Iowa. It was the eye of the universe.

But things have changed, haven't they?

And not just in Hills, Iowa. Minnesota bankers have been murdered. Minnesota farmers commit suicide. Minnesota farm kids confront problems they can't deal with. The stress out in the countryside is enormous and growing.

The nation has the resources to deal with the problem, but, frankly, the national leadership doesn't seem interested. The Reagan administration and the old line Senate conservatives take care of their farm friends—millions for tobacco, but foot-dragging on farm credit—and let the small guys go.

I'm not optimistic. Given the characteristic insensitivity of the administration, I think we'll see more Hills. The countryside will get bloodier long before things get better.

APPRECIATION OF MS. PATRICIA A. CARRAGHER

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, for the past 4 months my staff and I have had the privilege of working with Ms. Patricia A. Carragher during her internship. I wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation of her contributions to my office and constituents of the 31st Congressional District of California.

Ms. Carragher is a third-year student at American University, Washington, DC. She was selected as one of six honored students from that institution to participate in the American University-Leeds University Congressional/Parliamentary Program. This special year-long program involves six American students and six British students from Leeds University. They are required to serve internships during the fall semester with Members of the United States Congress, and spring semester with Members of the British Parliament. Ms. Carragher selected my office for the first half of her program, and I am very proud to have provided her this opportunity.

In her internship, Ms. Carragher covered my membership on the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs. Her interest in this region and understanding of our foreign policy in those countries contributed significantly to meeting my responsibilities on that subcommittee. In addition, Ms. Carragher assisted me and my staff greatly in respond-

ing to my constituents' questions and problems. She answered questions about both domestic and international matters. She displayed competence and ability, both essential qualities of a good leader.

Mr. Speaker, from September to December, I have witnessed the work of a product of our educational system, and am pleased the British will have a chance to appreciate her. I say this with a satisfied smile, a smile of vindication for education was the sole reason for my leaving Trinidad—a former British colony—and migrating to the United States. The British system failed me in its college entrance examination. I came to the United States so I could continue my education. Well, here I am in Congress and here goes Ms. Carragher to the Parliament. As they say on the streets of Compton, "Take That."

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me and my staff in thanking Ms. Carragher for her service in Congress, and wishing her the best in London. Thank you Patricia and best wishes.

EAGLE AWARD TO CHRISTOPHER AND KURT EVANS

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to express my congratulations to two young men from Lewisburg, PA, who will receive the Boy Scout Eagle Award this Sunday in Winfield, PA. This event is always a special time for the family and friends of a man who receives such an award because it is a recognition of his dedication to his community and country. This presentation ceremony on December 15 will have an added significance because it is being awarded to twin brothers, Christopher Joseph and Kurt Joseph Evans.

Both of these men have been involved in the Scouting Program since 1976 when they joined the Bobcat Cub Scout Pack 3509 in Lewisburg. Since their start in Cub Scouts and through Webelos and Boy Scouts they have participated in hiking and camping expeditions including the 1977 National Scout Jamboree at Moraine State Park and the 1981 National Scout Jamboree at Camp A.P. Hill. In 1984 they were part of the Susquehanna Council contingent to the Boy Scouts of America High Adventure Sea Base in the Florida Keys.

Christopher and Kurt are both active members of Explorer Post 2583, specializing in archery and have competed and have won awards in archery. Kurt is currently president of the Explorer Post while his brother Christopher is second vice president.

In working toward their Eagle Scout Award both worked on wilderness trails. Kurt rebuilt the "Old Boundary Trail" in the Raymond Winter State Park including the clearance of the trail from Coppermill Road to Bake Oven Trail, a distance of

three-quarters of a mile, and building two foot bridges and a corduroy road. Christopher blazed a 2-mile trail from Old Shingle Road north over the north branch of Buffalo Creek and Panther Run in Bald Eagle Forest and Hook Natural Area. This also included building two foot bridges as well as erosion control and blazing the trail.

These two men have shown excellent service and leadership capabilities in their work with the Scouts and should be congratulated for earning this very distinguished achievement. I wish them good luck and great success in the future.

A TRIBUTE TO BELLE MORRISON ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today in honor of Belle Morrison, a constituent of mine who will celebrate the joyous occasion of her 100th birthday on December 24, 1985.

Belle was born in Russia and lived there for 5 years before her family immigrated to the United States. Her family originally settled in Philadelphia, but she lived most of her life in Chicago where she was quite active in community affairs. Belle and her late husband, William, were blessed with three children, four grandchildren, and eight great-grandchildren.

Belle has lived in California for more than 35 years and currently resides in Santa Monica. One of her grandchildren said that one of her secrets to long life has been her favorite motto: "Please don't ask me not to worry, because you know the things I worry about never come true." Whatever Belle's secret is she's obviously doing something right. Belle still enjoys good health and will soon join her family in celebrating this wonderful milestone at a big party planned in her honor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in sending birthday greetings to this extraordinary American and that they wish her many more years of continued health and happiness.

FLAWED VERSION OF TAX REFORM

HON. THOMAS F. HARTNETT

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Speaker, approximately 1 year ago, President Reagan suggested that Congress reform the Federal Tax Code in the name of simplicity, fairness, and economic growth. Our current Tax Code is so immense and complicated that the only people who fully approve of it are tax consultants. Therefore, from the very beginning, I have been a strong advo-

cate of achieving the President's tax reform goals. The House Committee on Ways and Means has produced a bill that in the opinion of a majority of the members of that committee fulfills these goals. It does not.

The Ways and Means proposal is 1,379 pages of legalese aimed at explaining the 1,602 separate sections of the bill. That is not simplification. The next goal that the authors of this bill claim to have satisfied is fairness. Of course, fairness is a very subjective term; but, it seems most inappropriate for legislation which imposes double taxation on the pensions of 19 million Americans, makes unemployment compensation fully taxable, and discourages business modernization. In fact, legislation that impairs the ability of corporate America to modernize will force companies to lay off employees in an effort to keep prices down and remain competitive. As such, this bill certainly fails to generate economic growth. I find it hard to believe that the taxpayers of this country will care if their marginal tax rates have been lowered slightly once they have lost their jobs.

Obviously, Congress has failed to develop a Tax Code that achieves the goals of simplicity, fairness, and economic growth. However, some people have suggested that Members of the House should vote for this flawed version of tax reform and rely on the Senate to correct the existing inequities. Contrary to the logic of those advocating this political philosophy, I have always followed the thinking of a wise man who said, "When you first see a rattlesnake, kill it."

**DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERV-
ANT: SYLVESTER L. ACKLEY**

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, one of the Department of the Air Force's most distinguished officials plans to retire on December 31, 1985. Sylvester L. Ackley, a Government employee for over 38 years, leaves the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, Legislative Liaison, as the Deputy Chief of Air Operations.

"Ack" Ackley joined the Army Air Corps in 1943 as a B-24 radio operator and gunner. Serving on 28 combat missions over southern Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Italy, he was shot down and crash landed twice without injury. Reentering the newly formed Air Force in 1950, he continued as a radio operator and then as an air operations supervisor serving in several locations including West Germany as an inspector general team member. The Air Force assigned "Ack" to the Secretary of the Air Force, Legislative Liaison, as an air operations superintendent in 1959. After serving in that position for 10 years, he retired from active duty as a chief master sergeant. The Air Force, recognizing the truly outstanding contributions of Chief Ackley, hired him as

a civilian employee to continue to manage the operations office.

During these past 16 years as the Deputy Chief of Air Operations, "Ack" has set standards that, I believe, will never be surpassed. The true dedication to "doing it right," the absolute insistence on honesty and integrity, and the patience under extreme daily pressure are the standards that Mr. Ackley leaves for all those who follow.

I join with many of my colleagues who have benefited from the direct professional support of Mr. Ackley and wish him and his wife, Marilyn, the very best in their retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Ackley for his unselfish dedication to duty and his outstanding performance as a Government employee.

He is truly a great American.

BUDGET CROSSROADS: IT'S TIME FOR ACTION

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I joined a bipartisan majority in the House and Senate in voting for the compromise version of House Joint Resolution 372, legislation to reform the budget process and force hard decisions aimed at balancing the budget by 1991. The President has signed this historic legislation into law. This was one of the most difficult votes I have cast since coming to Congress, and I would like to explain why I support this law.

We have come to a crossroads on the Federal budget. Yesterday, we had two choices—to continue under the old budget process, or to adopt this reform law. I do not like this law, but I am frustrated in the extreme with the failures of the old process.

We must act decisively to force a change, if Congress is to make good to the American people on our promise to bring Federal spending back under control. I believe that the bipartisan compromise we enacted yesterday is the best alternative to current law that is likely to win agreement from a majority in Congress. By no means will this law end our budget crisis. My hope is that it will begin a national debate, and force a resolution of our deficit problem. For this reason, I supported its enactment, and will do my best to see that its promise is realized.

The old road is familiar and leads only to dangerously higher deficits and frustrating political deadlock between Congress and the President. We have continued on it this long only because the House of Representatives, the Senate and the President have not been able to agree on an alternative. Meanwhile, in the last 15 years, the national debt has doubled. About 15 percent of our budget—\$142 billion this year—now goes just to pay interest on the national debt, and continued deficits will mean ever-spiraling interest costs. By continuing to

borrow, we make ourselves poorer today and we leave an economic time bomb for our children.

The farm economy has been devastated by two consequences of the budget deficit: high interest rates and the overvalued dollar. The former has added heavily to the cost of credit and debt; the latter has made our grain uncompetitive in world markets. The repercussions have been felt by everyone in my district. Farmers are forced to leave their land, workers are losing their jobs as factories slow down their operations and rural communities are suffering as businesses close and people move out.

This law will help us put our fiscal affairs back in order. It will put new teeth in the budget process. It will force action where none has been forthcoming because Congress and the President have been locked in disagreement. Essentially, the law says that, if Congress and the President do not enact through the normal process a responsible budget, spending is automatically cut according to a predetermined formula. The hope is that the mere threat of the automatic cuts will be so terrible that Congress and the President will instead agree through the normal process on a responsible budget. The law's real teeth are its mandatory deficit ceilings, which begin at \$172 billion this year and decline by about \$30 billion each year to zero in 1991. If total spending proposed in the budget for any year exceeds the ceiling, spending will be automatically cut enough to bring it under the ceiling. Generally, an equal percentage must be cut from each program, project or activity.

If it sounds simple, it is not. Rather, it is one of the most sweeping and complicated pieces of legislation Congress has produced since I came here 11 years ago. Because it changes how—or if—the Government spends the taxpayer's money, this bill will affect every Government program, from our national defense to our children's education.

The original version of this bill that was proposed and passed in the Senate was the worst kind of legislative rush job. As the majority leader of the Senate said in pushing for a quick vote, "The longer something sits around here, the staler it gets. People start reading it." Many Senators voted on the bill without reading or understanding the bill's fine print, so the bill was deeply flawed and unfair. First, it would have delayed significant deficit reductions until after the next election. Second, it would have devastated many domestic programs, but left much of the military untouched. Finally, it would have given the President too much discretion over cuts that are supposed to be equal and automatic.

The House then passed an alternative version that was better but still contained many problems. For the last month, negotiators for the House and Senate have worked very hard to resolve these problems and differences and to agree on a responsible and fair alternative to current law. While still not perfect, the compromise version is a vast improvement over the origi-

nal proposal, and the best alternative to current law that could win broad support.

First, the compromise version begins serious deficit reduction this year, before the next election. The original Senate version would have allowed a \$193 billion deficit this year, but the compromise would begin spending cuts if the deficit exceeds \$171 billion. The House version would have set the ceiling even lower, at \$161 billion.

Second, the compromise version ensures that defense spending will bear 50 percent of any automatic budget cuts while domestic spending bears the other half. Each type of spending will then take a share of the cuts equal to its share of total spending. Within the defense spending category, the compromise applies a formula that will cut each part of the defense budget equally. The Defense Department does not like this compromise, which must mean that this law is tough stuff. The original Senate version would have preserved defense's "sacred cow" status by making half the cuts in Government programs with COLA's and half the cuts in all other spending—including defense.

Finally, the compromise version greatly reduces the opportunity for political manipulation of the automatic cut process, and ensures that such cuts would be fairly made. Under the law, the U.S. General Accounting Office has final authority to estimate the deficit, calculate the necessary cuts under the formulas, and list the specific cuts to be made in each program. The General Accounting Office is a nonpartisan office whose director is appointed for a 15-year term, and is responsible to both the President and Congress.

The compromise exempts interest on the national debt, Social Security, railroad retirement, veterans' pensions and compensation, State-funded unemployment compensation, civilian and military pay rates, and six other low-income programs from the automatic cuts. Retirement and disability programs with COLA's could not be cut by more than the amount of the COLA, and cuts in veterans' health care and Medicare are limited to 2 percent. Medicare cuts would be made only in payments to health care providers.

I am pleased that, under the compromise, automatic cuts in agricultural price support payments could only be made in contracts entered into after the cuts are effective, and uniform reductions would have to be made in all payments for a particular crop—even if this means delaying the cuts until the next crop year.

Working within the current budget system, I have supported several deficit reduction initiatives. I have supported an across-the-board budget freeze with no increases for inflation. I have voted for cuts in many programs I believe in to bring their spending down to a freeze level. Earlier this year, I voted against the final House-Senate compromise budget resolution for this year because it allowed a \$10 billion increase for defense and did not reduce deficits enough. When the House considered this year's military spending bill, I voted twice this year against increas-

ing military spending when other programs were being frozen or cut. I am a cosponsor of stiff minimum tax legislation that would ensure that every individual and corporation pays a fair share of taxes.

I have stood up against waste and abuse. Last year, I took on the Defense Department and defense contractors over the \$435 hammer, and succeeded in passing two important laws that could save \$8 billion in military spare parts costs. Since coming to Congress 11 years ago, I have bucked congressional traditions and successfully fought to stop wasteful water project boondoggles like the \$1.6 billion Garrison diversion in Nebraska, and the \$200 million Oahe project in South Dakota. Three years ago, I took on some big oil companies and succeeded in closing two of their tax loopholes worth hundreds of millions of dollars. But more must be done, and I believe this law deserves a try.

I have concerns about how the law's automatic cuts might affect agriculture, education, local government programs and many other very important programs that I have fought hard for in the past. Unfortunately, these worthy programs have been losers under the old system. They have already taken more than their share of budget cuts in the last few years, while defense contractors win huge increases for wasteful contracts, and sometimes for weapons that do not work or make us safer. This law may bring some fairness to the budget process, because defense and nondefense programs would each be asked to take half of any automatic cuts.

In every one of the two dozen open door meetings I have held in Iowa this year, my people have told me that they are willing to accept an across-the-board freeze, and even take their fair share of cuts, if everyone else will too. Now a bipartisan majority in Congress has agreed on this law and committed itself to achieving a balanced budget in a strict but fair manner.

We need President Reagan's help, but his real intentions are still not clear. Even after he had endorsed this legislation, the President publicly said that Defense spending will continue to grow by 3 percent more than inflation in the next few years. If this law is taken at all seriously, then that level of increases for Defense is a fantasy. It is essential to accept that we will have only a limited number of bucks, and concentrate on getting more bang for our buck. There are still enormous amounts of money in the Defense that could be saved by increasing competition in military purchasing and canceling weapons that we do not need.

By signing the bill, President Reagan has signed an agreement to abide by this law and work with us toward the goal of a balanced budget. I look forward to working with him.

TO INCREASE BANKRUPTCY JUDGES IN SOUTH TEXAS

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation to increase the number of bankruptcy judges in the Southern Judicial District of Texas from three to six. This legislation is needed to rectify the serious shortage of bankruptcy judges in south Texas, and thus ease the burden on the economically distressed.

South Texas is being decimated by a wave of bankruptcies which has not been seen since the Great Depression half a century ago. Business bankruptcies in this judicial district are up 41.8 percent over the already high levels of a year ago. The total number of bankruptcies in the district are up 15.8 percent over 1984. Worst of all, the pace of bankruptcies is on the increase.

Mr. Speaker, the epidemic of bankruptcies currently overwhelming the south Texas region has many causes: The depressed energy industry, a crisis on farms, job losses, flat real estate sales and slow development of land and housing. Bankruptcy courts are backlogged as 3 Federal judges, out of 232 nationally, try to address the needs of one of the more economically struggling areas of the country. Currently there is just one bankruptcy judge for every 6,000 cases to be heard.

Furthermore, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts has studied the situation and recommended that the south Texas Judicial District receive three additional bankruptcy judges. I have been in close contact with Federal judges and State officials in the area who understand the situation and support this remedy to a serious situation.

INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS WEEK

HON. DOUGLAS H. BOSCO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. BOSCO. Mr. Speaker, the week beginning December 10 is traditionally recognized by many United Nations countries as International Human Rights Week. This week has been set aside to observe the unanimous adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the U.N. General Assembly on December 10, 1948. The document guarantees to all people fundamental human rights, including the right to the freedoms of religious expression, conscience, and emigration. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the 37th anniversary of this landmark agreement and recommit ourselves to the principle of human rights, we must not forget the victims of human rights abuses around the world. Rather, we must intensify our efforts to ensure that all

people are accorded these basic human rights.

Of particular concern to me is the plight of Soviet Jews whose mistreatment and persecution by Soviet authorities has been well documented. In the U.S.S.R., Jews are denied the right to worship free from the threat of reprisal. Yet, at the same time they are denied the right to emigrate to Israel or other countries where they might live a full Jewish life. In the Soviet Union, Jews that have applied for exit visas but have been turned down are referred to as *refuseniks*. As a participant in the Congressional Call to Conscience, I am proud to have adopted two brave young *refuseniks*, Pavel Astrakhan and Alexander Kushnir. I recently received a brief update on Alexander Kushnir which I would like to share with my colleagues.

Since 1976, Alexander, a leading activist in the Jewish *refusenik* community of Odessa, has been trying to emigrate to Israel to join his family. He has been turned down for an exit visa six times. By profession, Kushnir is a construction engineer but since his first application he has been unable to find work in his field. According to this latest report, Alexander has been working as a night watchman and is plagued by severe back problems. In addition, this report indicates that Alexander is under constant surveillance and has been told by Soviet authorities to stop giving out information and meeting with tourists. Moreover, the KGB is pressuring him to denounce Israel on Soviet TV and radio.

Unfortunately, Alexander Kushnir's predicament is not uncommon in the Soviet Union. Thousands of Jewish men and women there struggle against religious repression while awaiting permission to leave. As we observe International Human Rights Week, it is important that we remember individuals around the world like Alexander Kushnir who are not granted such liberties, and we must continue to push for actions to alleviate human rights abuses.

BALANCING THE BUDGET—THE HARD CHOICES ARE YET TO COME

HON. JIM ROSS LIGHTFOOT

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, this week Congress took an historic leap when it passed the conference report to House Joint Resolution 372, otherwise known as the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Emergency Deficit Reduction Act. It is serious medicine for a serious disease. Although I do not take this action lightly, I am proud, nonetheless, to have played a part in restoring fiscal sanity to our country.

Why is it an emergency bill? With interest compounding on our \$2 trillion public debt, and with annual deficits of nearly \$200 billion, this country cannot survive. Government deficits hurt every American—

those in farming are keenly aware of the deficit-induced high interest rates and trade deficit. We have been spending our children into financial slavery by borrowing to fund programs which we cannot afford, and never in history have tax increases prevented Government expenditures from rising. Our only answer is to cut spending—quickly and radically.

Of course, Gramm-Rudman calls for harsh steps. Many Government programs will be affected. Most Americans realize how serious our Nation's financial problems are, however. I took on as a top priority the task of working to reduce Government deficits when I first came to Congress, and I will not avoid this task because it is difficult. The measure requires 50 percent of all cuts to come first from the Defense Department with the other 50 percent coming from all other agencies, excluding several poverty programs.

Some protections have been built into the budget-cutting measure. For example, agricultural commodity contracts already signed cannot be broken. Also, the Secretary of Agriculture must abide by the provisions of the farm bill as passed by Congress. As for public assistance and poverty programs, no program can be entirely eliminated and certain programs are protected from more than a 1-2 percent cut below baseline spending. Nonetheless, Gramm-Rudman will help us to begin making the difficult fiscal decisions required, and I see no higher priority as a U.S. Representative.

In fact, one of the first pieces of legislation I cosponsored upon taking office was a measure to enact a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Unfortunately, this measure has been around Congress for a number of years with little chance of success. When Gramm-Rudman was proposed, it was the first real opportunity to achieve a balanced budget, therefore I became a cosponsor of the proposal.

Furthermore, I have voted against most spending bills considered in the House of Representatives and will continue doing so until spending is under control.

While the next few years will be difficult ones, the choices we will be forced to make are necessary. I look forward to the opportunity to continue in this effort to restore our Nation's economic health, and I am pleased my colleagues have helped to get the process started.

POLYGRAPH TESTING AS 20TH CENTURY WITCHCRAFT

HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with today's debate on H.R. 1524, the Employees Polygraph Protection Act, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article about this issue that appeared in a recent edition of the Washington Post.

Mr. Speaker, the polygraph is not a lie detector. The polygraph machine detects

stress but it cannot detect whether the stress was caused by anxiety, fear, anger, nervousness or some other emotion. It is totally up to the examiner, therefore, to interpret the results of the test. In a recent investigation into the validity of the polygraph by the House Government Operations Committee, it was determined that polygraph tests cannot be trusted to reveal an individual's guilt or innocence. The committee's findings were supported by a 1983 study conducted by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, which concluded that, "The available research evidence does not establish the scientific validity of the polygraph test for personnel security screening," and further that, the polygraph can be fooled by the use of drugs, physical movement, and other techniques.

It is dangerous, Mr. Speaker, to rely on so-called lie detectors for important decisions, particularly for safeguarding information and materials important to our national security. The upshot of the administration's hasty policy of relying more heavily on polygraph machines may be that some innocent people will be denied sensitive jobs, and forever branded untrustworthy, and sophisticated spies and crooks may gain access to government secrets. We know that the professional criminal or the enemy agent familiar with polygraphs, for example, can beat these machines.

The use of polygraph testing by private companies to screen employees, Mr. Speaker, has increased dramatically in recent years. The evidence would indicate, however, that private firms that use polygraph testing may be doing their business more harm than good by placing faith in unreliable machines.

Mr. Speaker, the indiscriminate use of polygraph testing on employees must also be viewed in the context of constitutional protection of individual rights of privacy and presumption of innocence.

The fundamental principal of law in this country, that everyone is considered innocent until proven guilty, is violated by "lie detector tests, which are required to prove one's innocence. And the widespread use of "lie detectors" for employee screening is a massive invasion of privacy that may eventually extend to every level of society. Employee screening could eventually lead to screening of consumers before being allowed to use a credit card or write a check. One can even envision being screened before being permitted to enter a store.

Congress has been investigating the use of polygraph testing for over 20 years. The late Senator Sam Ervin, who as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee conducted his own hearings on the subject, concluded the polygraph is nothing more than "20th Century witchcraft."

Mr. Speaker, the growing use of the polygraph by government and business is unwarranted and a mistake. I urge passage of this legislation.

PROPOSED LIE-DETECTOR BAN SPLITS BUSINESS COMMUNITY

(By Morton Mintz)

Sweeping legislation that would prohibit most private employers from using polygraphs or any other kind of so-called lie detectors appears headed for congressional passage, carried along by strong bipartisan support.

Although the bill has encountered some opposition from employers who favor using the tests, the business community is sharply divided about the highly controversial devices—a rift that increases the bill's chances of passage.

On the House side, a bill sponsored by Rep. Pat Williams (D-Mont.), chairman of the House Education and Labor subcommittee on employment opportunities, has been approved by the subcommittee and the full committee without dissent.

On the Senate side, two powerful sponsors who often are adversaries, Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee Chairman Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah) and ranking Democrat Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), are backing the bill.

Some business interests, including the Jewelers of America, the Association of General Merchandise Chains, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and some drugstore chains, fiercely oppose the legislation.

No major corporation has taken a leadership role in support of the legislation. But many of them, including International Business Machines Corp., never use polygraphs, even where state laws permit the machines and union contracts do not bar them. Other companies, including such major employers as the top national fast-food chains and Safeway Stores Inc., seldom or rarely use polygraphs—and then only for investigations of thefts or other offenses.

Still others who oppose the proposed legislation use the devices for investigations and for pre-employment screening—by far the most hotly disputed use of the machines. Corporations that favor using the machines say the devices are critical to efforts to protect against employee dishonesty.

Zale Corp., a leading owner of jewelry stores, supported their use in a statement presented at a hearing on the proposed legislation. "It is the policy of Zale Corp. to polygraph all of its employees who occupy sensitive positions, [including the] chairman of the board . . ." the statement said. "We feel that, as a result of the availability and use of the polygraph, the Zale Corp. was able to recover money and merchandise during the past four years valued at just under \$2 million."

Polygraph use has been an issue on Capitol Hill for more than 20 years. During that time, a strongly bipartisan base of support for restrictions has been growing, nurtured by a 1983 Office of Technology Assessment research review and evaluation and by the AFL-CIO, mainly through its Food & Allied Services Trades Department, which has lobbied against the devices.

At the heart of the debate is the question of how accurate and reliable the devices are, particularly when used in pre-employment screening. The OTA report concluded that, "While there is some evidence for the validity of polygraph testing as an adjunct to criminal investigations, there is very little research or scientific evidence to establish polygraph-test validity in screening situations. . . ."

*** An OTA estimate of a 5 percent rate of error in analysis of test results, Senate sponsor Hatch said that, "Even under the

best of circumstances, some 50,000 workers may have their employment opportunities terminated, curtailed or blocked each year, due not to their own work record, but due to employer reliance on the results of invalid polygraph tests."

Not everyone shares that assessment of the tests' accuracy. Lawrence W. Talley, vice president for risk management for Days Inn, a motel chain that uses the devices, said recently "there are absolutely hundreds of tests to show that the polygraph is a reliable instrument . . ."

The proposed Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1985 would make it unlawful for an employer "to require, request, suggest or cause any employee or prospective employee to take or submit to any lie detector test." Forbidden tests are defined to include those done with a voice-stress analyzer or any other device—mechanical, electrical or chemical—"for the purpose of detecting deception or verifying the truth of statements."

The bill, as passed by the House subcommittee and introduced in the Senate, has exemptions for only three categories: all governmental employers, CIA and National Security Agency counterintelligence activities, and FBI counterintelligence contractors.

When the full committee passed the bill on Oct. 23, it added a narrow exemption for investigations of thefts or illicit diversions of federally regulated drugs with a potential for abuse. Employers making such investigations—mostly drug manufacturers and wholesalers and retail pharmacies—could give polygraph tests to employees, but only to those who had "direct access" to the so-called controlled substances.

According to Williams, "Polygraphs have become vehicles for employee intimidation, and for screening out employees of political or union beliefs different from those of a particular manager." He added that, in most work places, "Employers can polygraph workers for any reason: to verify employment applications, for periodic surveys of employee honesty, to find out why merchandise is missing or, perhaps just for intimidation."

Williams said in an interview that he expects the House to pass the bill this month "with a considerable majority."

Williams has 164 co-sponsors, including 20 Republicans. One is Rep. Jack Kemp (N.Y.), a presidential candidate who said he is "proud" to be an original backer. "The time has come to proscribe these inaccurate devices from the work place," he said in a June "Dear Colleague" letter urging fellow Republicans to back the bill.

In the key Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, meanwhile, Chairman Hatch and top ranking Democrat Kennedy quietly reached a surprise agreement to co-sponsor the Williams bill in the Senate.

Hatch introduced this bill Nov. 1, nine days after House Labor acted, said research has shown "that even the most respected and reputable polygraphers make mistakes . . . which can unjustly condemn and stigmatize an individual for life, rob him of his livelihood or bar him from just advancement."

"The Hatch-Kennedy combination will make the bill extremely difficult to stop" in the Senate, Williams said. But a leading opponent, Richard L. Leshner, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, has predicted that it will be stopped "before this is all over."

"I just can't see passing more legislation to protect criminals and drug-pushers,"

Leshner said on "It's Your Business" earlier this month. The Chamber of Commerce television program was taped before the introduction of the Hatch-Kennedy bill.

Problems such as "getting drugs off the street" and trying to protect "the future of our children," including those in day care centers, "are just as important as national security issues," Leshner said, adding that polygraph tests in the work place could assist in accomplishing those aims. The chamber favors polygraphing "the executive work force" as well as rank-and-file employees, he said.

Currently, seven states prohibit any use of polygraphs in private employment. In varying ways, 19 other states and the District of Columbia make it illegal for a private employer to require or request polygraphing.

Polygraph tests generally are not admissible as evidence in criminal trials. "How ironic that we protect criminals from these devices, yet subject hundreds of thousands of innocent workers to these devices," Kemp said in urging support for the House bill. "It is time that we extend the same basic protection to workers which we offer hardened criminals."

Many companies have decided on their own not to use polygraphs. IBM told the Senate Judiciary subcommittee on the Constitution in 1978 that it "does not and has not used polygraph or similar types of equipment. . . . IBM is committed to respecting the dignity of its employees, and the way in which the company handles information about them is a part of that basic respect." IBM has not changed its position in the ensuing seven years, a spokesman said recently.

The now-defunct Privacy Protection Study Commission heard testimony about polygraphs from 12 major employers, including Equitable Life Assurance Society of the U.S., General Electric, IBM, Inland Steel Co. Inc., J.C. Penney Co., Ford Motor Co., Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., Exxon Corp., E. I. duPont de Nemours Inc. and Rockwell International Corp. The commission also received written statements from, or interviews with, a number of other employers, including General Motors Corp., Procter & Gamble Co. and Abbott Laboratories.

None of the 12 "used polygraphs in pre-employment screening of job applicants, or regularly administered the polygraph or any similar truth-verifications test to its employees." Chairman David F. Linowes told the Senate subcommittee in 1978.

Other companies use the machines only for special purposes such as investigations, rejecting their routine use in pre-employment screening. Members of this group include at least three large corporations that own and franchise a combined total of nearly 15,000 McDonald's, Pizza Hut and Burger King fast-food outlets; Safeway, the largest supermarket chain; Holiday Corp., which owns and franchises Holiday Inns and also owns Harrah's casinos, and Montgomery Ward.

All of the fast-food firms said their polygraph policies are mandatory for corporate-owned outlets, but voluntary for their franchisees. These independent business operators are encouraged to, and do, follow the corporate policies voluntarily, spokesmen said.

McDonald's Corp.'s "policy is that we do not use polygraphs for pre-employment screening," spokesman Terri Capatosto said. "We prefer to rely on the integrity of our people. . . . I know of no franchises that

are using polygraphs. In particular, they like to develop a family-type atmosphere among their employees, and they put their faith in their people." McDonald's has about 6,700 U.S. outlets and owns about one-quarter of them.

Pizza Hut's policy is the policy of its owner, PepsiCo Inc., which, with 110,000 employees, is the country's 11th largest private employer. That policy is: no polygraphing of job applicants.

"The reason we don't give [pre-employment polygraph tests] is that there's no evidence that they are either valid or useful for this purpose," said PepsiCo. Public Affairs Director James M. Griffith. "And there's also the perception that the tests can be misused."

He added, "We can't dictate to franchisees, but as far as we know, if polygraphs are used, it's on a rare occasion. . . . Virtually everyone follows our lead."

Griffith said his inquiries turned up no one who knew of polygraph use by Pizza Hut. Pizza Hut owns about 2,000 outlets and franchises about the same number.

Burger King has "not used, and [does] not intend to use in the future, polygraphs as a pre-employment screening tool," said Joyce Meyers, a spokesman for Pillsbury Co., the owner. She added that Burger King "apparently never [has] considered using them." Burger King has more than 4,000 outlets, of which Pillsbury owns about 800.

Safeway's "corporate policy is to not use the polygraph as a prescreening device when we're hiring," said public relations manager Felicia del Campo. "We feel there is no proof that the polygraph works for this purpose. . . ."

"We don't have a corporate policy on using polygraphs in investigations," del Campo continued. "However, retail divisions in states which permit their use do sometimes offer a polygraph test to employees suspected of theft when a large loss is involved. But it's not mandated, and we don't use it regularly or to any great extent." Safeway has about 2,000 U.S. stores.

"Holiday Inns does not use a polygraph except in investigations where permissible by law," Holiday Corp., Communications Director David G. Daly said. "It is used with the employee's permission only, as an aid or tool, but never as evidence, and never as the only tool. In none of our properties is it used for pre-employment screening." There are 1,500 U.S. Holiday Inns, including 170 that are company-owned.

Holiday Corp. also owns a Harrah's casino in New Jersey, which does not permit polygraphing, and a Harrah's in Nevada, which does allow it. "Neither East nor West Harrah's uses a polygraph for preemployment screening," Daly said.

Many companies do use the machines for a variety of purposes, including screening would-be employees. These include members of the National Wholesale Druggists Association, the National Association of Chain Drug Stores Inc. and the National Association of Retail Druggists. Those associations take a position on polygraph exams shared by the federal Drug Enforcement Administration.

Ronald W. Buzzeo, DEA's deputy administrator for diversion control, says that the agency supports polygraph use "for pre-employment screening and as a subsequent investigatory tool in appropriate [controlled-substance] cases, provided that it is permitted by state and local laws."

Peoples Drug Stores Inc. Chairman Sheldon W. Fantle said that the nationwide, 835-

store chain uses polygraphs to control drug diversions and thefts. Polygraphing should be "at the discretion of the employer," he said. He termed the House bill "a weak recognition" of the need, and said it will "not get the job done."

Jewelers of America, an organization of 12,000 retail jewelers, and Manufacturing Jewelers and Silversmiths of America, which has 2,400 members, told the House subcommittee hearing that a ban on private-sector use of polygraphs "would have a devastating impact on the jewelry industry."

The machine "is not infallible, [but] it has been my experience, and that of many other jewelers, that it is the most accurate and efficient means of confirming information included on an employment application," spokesman Larry Sherwood said.

Security consultant William L. Cole of Borg-Warner Corp., owner of Wells Fargo Armored Service Corp., Wells Fargo Guard Services and Burns International Security Services, has raised this question: "If the U.S. government, states and municipalities have the right to use polygraph testing to protect themselves from dishonest employees, why should the security industry as well as other employers not have access to the same technology and protection?"

PROFILE OF A POLYGRAPH—How It Works, AND WHAT IT DOESN'T DO

(By Morton Mitz)

Each year, hundreds of thousands of job-seekers take a polygraph test. The prospective employer's assumption and rationale are that it—or any screening technique—will enable the company to predict illegal conduct more accurately than by relying on chance.

A polygraph measures certain "arousal" reactions. Advocates contend that, under questioning by the machine operator, lying or deceptiveness induces fear, the fear creates stress and the stress reveals itself in measurable changes in cardiovascular activity (blood pressure, heart rate, pulse), the rate and depth of breathing, and sweating.

Under this theory, the polygraph is not a "lie detector," because what it measures is the fear of detection, not lying or deceptiveness itself.

Similarly, J. Kirk Barfoot, past president of the American Polygraph Association, said: "The instrument makes no decisions and is nothing more than a diagnostic tool. No bells ring, no lights light, and there is nothing that can be compared to a computer which gives a definitive answer based on the input which is fed into it."

The examiner attaches three devices to a person taking a test (the "examinee," in the jargon): an arm cuff similar to the "cardio cuff" used to measure blood pressure, one tube around the chest and another around the abdomen, and electrodes on two fingertips. The cuff drives one pen, the tubes two more, and the electrodes a fourth. Each pen produces a line on a chart.

Normally, the operator conducts an initial interview to try to generate a psychological atmosphere in which the examinee will accept the accuracy of the test he is about to take and accept also that all of the questions to be put are of equal importance. These include "irrelevant" questions involving usually innocuous matters (such as the person's nickname) and "relevant" questions (such as, Have you ever been fired?). The responses to irrelevant questions yield baselines to be contracted with the lines re-

sulting from responses to sensitive questions.

Commonly, pre-employment screening tests last 15 minutes to an hour, compared with three, four, or more hours for national-security-related and criminal-investigation examinations. During the examination, the operator reviews with the person answers suggesting possible deception.

Finally, after a post-test interview, the examiner assesses all of the results. He is the one who "must make a decision as to truthfulness or falsehood." Lightfoot told a House Education and Labor subcommittee last summer. In screening job applicants, "The examiner should be thought of as a personnel or interviewing specialist, who simply uses a polygraph to assist him in making decisions," he said.

Often, an examiner is paid \$25 to \$50—a fee well below the cost of time-consuming reviews of resumes, checks of references and the like.

The Office of Technology Assessment concluded in a 1983 report "that there is at present only limited scientific evidence for establishing the validity of polygraph testing." OTA said its review of 24 relevant studies meeting minimal acceptable scientific criteria found that, for example, correct guilty detections ranged from about 35 to 100 percent.

"Overall, the cumulative research evidence suggests that, when used in criminal investigations, the polygraph test detects deception better than chance, but with error rates that could be considered significant," OTA said.

OTA also found "that the mathematical chance of incorrect identification of innocent persons as deceptive (false positives) is highest when the polygraph is used for screening purposes."

The report said that "the examinee's intelligence level, state of psychological health, emotional stability and belief in the 'machine' are among the other factors that may, at least theoretically, affect physiological responses."

Supporters of using the results of polygraph tests argue that the results are reliable and that the tests provide a cost-effective method of screening out undesirable employees.

"Hundreds of thousands of companies . . . depend on polygraph screening to maintain acceptable profit margins," Barefoot said. "If [it] were to be denied to these companies, many of them eventually would be forced out of business due to higher theft rates by employees. Those which would not be forced out of business would simply have to raise the prices of their products. . . ."

Douglas G. Williams, a former Oklahoma City detective sergeant and author of a widely circulated underground manual on how to beat the machine, told House hearings on whether to bar the results of polygraph tests that it is possible to defeat the machine.

"I can tell the complete truth, or a complete lie, or anything in between, and still pass any lie detector test given any time, by anyone anywhere," Williams testified.

The OTA report cited "limited" evidence that deceptive persons who use physical countermeasures including meprobamate, a particular tranquilizer, and hypnosis, "and who can distinguish nonrelevant from relevant questions . . . can increase their chances of avoiding detection."

"Employers routinely circumvent Federal law simply by asking employees to take a lie detector test," Williams charged. Although

many areas such as past arrests and sexual habits are off-limits to employers in pre-employment tests, an employer "can disregard the law by paying a 'hired gun' to ask questions he is legally prohibited from asking..." he said.

Sharply contrasting appraisals come from Barefoot and Lawrence W. Talley, Days Inns' vice president for risk management.

"All of the scientific surveys of people who have actually taken polygraph tests show that the great majority do not find the test to be offensive, objectionable, or an invasion of privacy," Professor Frank Horvath, director of the American Polygraph Association Research Center at Michigan State University, wrote in USA Today.

Most polygraphers "have had little scientific or clinical psychological training," said psychologist Benjamin Kleinmuntz of the University of Illinois. "The typical background is a high school education and a six-week-to-six-month course in polygraphic examination and psychology—depending on state certification requirements, if any."

Even under the best of circumstances, when an examiner advises a person not be hired, he doesn't know whether the applicant would have made a bad or good employee, according to opponents of the tests. Nor does he know whether his inferences from the person's past foretell his or her future. And, commonly, the applicant neither sees the results of the exam or of the examiner's assessment nor knows just who may see the results.

TRIBUTE TO LEROY TYUS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and privileged that Mr. Leroy Tyus, a longtime friend and political ally, has been chosen by the Service Employee Union, Local 50, as its "Person of the Year."

This award is given annually to a person or an organization that has given dedicated service to the St. Louis community.

My friend, Leroy Tyus, was born in Brownsville, TN, on February 4, 1916, to Mr. O.T. and Odella Parker Tyus. He began his elementary and secondary education here in Brownsville and later attended Lane College in Jackson, TN. After 3 years at Lane College he decided to enter Lincoln University Law School, which was at that time located in St. Louis, MO. This was the beginning of his service years to the city of St. Louis.

In 1945, Leroy married Marie Holton and from this union two daughters were born, Cheryl and Cathy.

His first years of service to the St. Louis community began when he assumed the operation of the Army canteen from 1942-45. Shortly thereafter he owned and operated the very popular and successful Tyus Hotel and Antler Tavern. Soon after this Mr. Tyus became involved in local politics. He was elected to the Missouri House of Representatives where he served with distinction from 1950-60. He then was elected the committeeman of the 20th ward from 1960-83, at which time he retired. He also served

as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention from 1964-80, was chairman of the first congressional Democratic Party, constable, eighth magistrate district, operated his own private security agency, was a real estate broker, and is now currently a member of the Missouri Democratic Executive Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is altogether fitting and proper that this distinguished, dedicated public servant, and politician has been selected to receive this outstanding award from the Service Employee Union, Local 50. I offer him and his wife and family my congratulations for a job well done and my best wishes for continued success in the future.

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET HELFRICH RETTINO

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Margaret Helfrich Rettino on the occasion of her 90th birthday. Born in Jersey City to William Helfrich and Margaret Reilly, Mrs. Rettino made her home in Moonachie, NJ when she met and married Louis F. Rettino in 1916.

Always actively involved in social causes, Margaret began her participation more than 70 years ago when she marched through the streets of Jersey City demanding the right to vote for the women of America. She is active in the Moonachie Senior Citizens Club, of which she is a past president.

Through the years she has also served her community as a reporter for the record, as a county committee woman from Bergen County, NJ as an officer of the St. Margaret of Cortona Rosary Society, as a member of the Washington Park Hose Co., Auxiliary, the Moonachie Volunteer Ambulance Corps, and has been a visiting homemaker with the Home Health Aide Service of Bergen County.

The Bergen County Board of Freeholders has recognized her work with the Bergen County Senior Citizens by presenting her with several citations throughout the years.

On Saturday, January 11, 1986, I look forward to joining Margaret Helfrich Rettino and her six children—Gesulmina Stagg, Agnes De Santo, Rose Wuestefeld, Louis, Rev. Mr. Robert Rettino and Brother William Rettino—her two sisters—Gertrude McVicar and Genevieve McCarthy—and her many friends and family to pay tribute to this fine woman on such a special occasion.

TORT REFORM RESPONSE TO INSURANCE CRISIS QUESTIONED

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, in seeking solutions to the current crisis of liability insurance availability, it is tempting to blame our tort system and the courts. This inclination is understandable. The courts have the authority to require compensation for injuries, so some people conclude that if premiums are rising, the courts must be entirely to blame.

Others point out that the purpose of insurance is to pay people when they are injured and that many factors besides tort standards affect whether coverage can be provided. They suggest that availability and affordability of insurance are also a function of whether there are enough prudently managed insurance companies financially capable of providing insurance; whether injuries are minimized through careful risk management; and whether regulators are exercising appropriate oversight. An ill-conceived or precipitous revision of the tort system might ultimately make things worse by removing incentives for risk management.

An articulate statement by Marlen Dooley elaborating some of these points appeared in a recent edition of the Camden Courier-Post. I am inserting a copy in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues and the public.

LIABILITY STANDARDS ARE NOT THE CAUSE OF INSURANCE CRISIS

(By Marlen Dooley)

Last August, a legislative commission was formed in New Jersey to examine the reduced availability of environmental impairment liability (EIL) insurance, and the dramatic rise in premiums. EIL insurance covers injury or property damage due to non-sudden, accidental releases of hazardous substances.

Insurance companies blame large awards, judicial interpretations favoring the insured rather than the insurer, and the unpredictability of the high-risk market for their reluctance to cover EIL. The solution they offer is to alter the present liability standards—by legislating a monetary limit for liability, and by weakening the strict liability, or no-fault, standard used in court cases.

While these measures may be a safety net for the insurance industry, they are a disaster for the people of New Jersey. A cap on liability would only require industry to be responsible for claims filed against it up to a set amount. But someone must still pay for damages in excess of that amount. In all likelihood, that someone will be the state and, in the end, the taxpayer. This is wrong. The creators of pollution must be made to bear responsibility for it.

In addition, strict liability makes those who operate hazardous activities liable for damages regardless of how carefully they operate. This is because the industry is aware from the start that a plant, simply by its operation, creates a danger.

This standard does not mean that a victim will automatically win a court case. Plain-

tiffs must still prove that a particular site or chemical was the cause of their injury. This standard does, however, make it easier for victims to have their day in court. It also serves to place the initial burden of proof on the industry. If the standard is changed, the burden will be difficult for the victim to bear, both from a financial and an evidentiary standpoint.

But, there is another reason for maintaining strict liability. The purpose of strict liability is to cause those in control of dangerous substances to take whatever action is necessary to prevent releases into the environment. If those who handle toxic waste are aware that they are responsible for all damages occurring from their activities no matter how careful they are, they will be motivated to use the highest standard of care to avoid accidents.

Rather than seek to change the strict liability standard, insurance companies should play a major role in encouraging safer practices. First, the industry could require safety measures in its EIL contracts. For example, many insurance contracts require smoke alarms or sprinkler systems for fire coverage.

Second, by setting the costs of insurance premiums in relation to the amount of risk involved, those activities that are extremely dangerous would become very costly to insure. At some point, they could be priced out of the market. Thus the market would decide that an activity cannot be continued unless a safer method of operation is used.

But, the insurance companies have not sought to encourage safer practices. Instead, there has been little relationship between the level of risk to the environment and the cost of insurance. A 1985 U.S. Government Accounting Office study shows that for the past 10 years, the casualty insurance industry has charged unrealistically low premiums for high-risk activities. The premiums did not cover the possible claims, but they did provide a steady source of cash for reinvestment purposes. Now that investment rates have fallen, the gap between premium loss and investment gain has narrowed.

To make up for investment income, insurance companies are charging excessive premiums. This cash-flow underwriting practice not only doesn't result in safer practices but also leads to an unstable market and periodic crises, such as New Jersey's.

Insurance companies were given a monopoly under the McCarron-Ferguson Act. They receive substantial tax advantages, and cannot be sued for antitrust violations. The extraordinary economic benefits typical of a monopoly were granted because of the belief that the public good would be served by a uniformity of standards. The public would not be served by changing much needed liability standards. It is time the insurance companies lived up to their responsibility to the public.

Until they do, the state, which was granted power by Congress to oversee this industry, should examine the rate-making practices that have led to this crisis, and more strongly regulate the industry. In the interim, the state should institute measures, such as self-insurance pools, to assist municipalities and private entities that are unable to afford or even obtain EIL insurance.

EAST BAY WOMEN FOR PEACE AND EDITH LAUB CONTINUE TO STRIVE FOR WORLD PEACE ON 24TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to a remarkable group, and invite you and my colleagues to join me in sending greetings to the East Bay Women for Peace, on the occasion of their 24th anniversary celebration, as well as to Edith Laub, who has been its chairwoman for the past 12 years.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting their dedication to the achievement of disarmament under effective international controls, large cuts in the military budget, and fulfillment of human needs. East Bay Women for Peace, which is affiliated with Women Strike for Peace nationally, came into being in 1961 to protest atmospheric nuclear tests. They have continued the campaign over the years to stop all nuclear tests, leading to the thousands of signatures collected for presentation at the summit meeting in Geneva, urging the United States to join the Soviet Union in a permanent comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty.

I take great pleasure in wishing them as productive a record in their next 24 years as in the first and to acknowledge the leadership of their chair, Edith Laub.

Happy 24th birthday, East Bay Women for Peace.

JAMAICA HIGH SCHOOL TO RECEIVE PRESIDENTIAL AWARD FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and praise Jamaica High School, of Queens County, NY, which will receive the Presidential award honoring educational excellence, to be presented by the regional representative of the Secretary of Education, on Friday, December 13.

Mr. Speaker, the truly outstanding and exemplary academic achievements of Jamaica High School make it uniquely deserving of this honor. Through a highly dedicated staff, whose motto is "Standards and Sympathy," along with the introduction of new and innovative programs, this preeminent high school has managed to inspire its students collectively to achieve a graduation rate that is over 94 percent, a dropout rate that is less than 4 percent, and a competency rate of 98 percent. These statistics, along with the fact that approximately 85 percent of its students go on to further their education, place Jamaica

High School well above the national average.

More important than these numbers, however, is the high school's rich tradition of blazing new trails with innovative programs designed to fill intellectual gaps. Jamaica was the first high school in New York City to offer a humanities program. Furthermore, this fine hall of learning does not forsake the underachiever; it has projects that develop and cultivate the potential of young students who may need some additional or intensive instruction. Its math-science institute; a program to develop critical thinking skills; the school's computer science institute; and the Queens Academy of Finance, which the school directs, are just a few of the bold educational initiatives which set Jamaica High School apart.

As further testimony to the exceptional quality of this fine academic institution, it recently received a Carnegie Foundation grant of \$43,000 for humanities research in multiethnic values. It is entirely appropriate that this school should be so honored, for it is itself so ethnically diverse, and it has worked so hard to emphasize the advantages of this diversity and capitalize on it.

I am proud to say that the accomplishments of Jamaica High School are not merely confined to the classroom. Its Action Program, set up at the start of this decade, requires students to complete four terms of community service before graduation, thus giving them a feeling of esteem and positive direction, as well as offering benefits to the school's neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I call now on my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Jamaica High School, its principal, Eileen Petruzillo, its staff, and its student body, for the unique and laudatory academic and social achievements that have earned this high honor.

OREGON JTPA PROGRAM

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, recognizing that it was time for a new approach to the problems of unemployment, Congress passed the Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA] in 1983. JTPA combines Federal dollars with local initiatives, giving States wide latitude to tailor job training programs to meet specific needs.

During the 2 years JTPA has been in operation, my State of Oregon has come up with some innovative training programs. So innovative, in fact, that the National Alliance of Business has singled out Oregon as the premier JTPA program in the Nation. In presenting the award, William Kolberg, president of the National Alliance of Business, stated that "Oregon has been selected as the outstanding example of how a State is working with public-private part-

nerships to solve the Nation's unemployment problems."

Oregon's JTPA Program is administered by an outstanding group of private industry councils. These councils employ the talents of local government officials, business executives and managers—individuals such as Chuck McClellan, Western division manager for Portland General Electric; Chuck Frost, vice president of Tektronix, Inc; Vern Ryles of Poppers Supply, Co. and many other busy executives who have given freely of their time.

The wisdom of this approach is borne out by the number of people who have received services through the program. In 1984, 80 percent of all adult clients, 70 percent of youth, and 86 percent of their dislocated worker participants found jobs.

This year, JTPA has provided services to over 24,000 economically disadvantaged or unemployed individuals. Despite double-digit unemployment in much of the State, three out of four persons who contacted the Oregon Private Industry Council were given the chance to find meaningful, long-term employment.

Oregon's JTPA program has been unique in other ways. We've developed cooperative efforts between JTPA and local economic development agencies, creating a favorable climate for the expansion of existing firms and the location of new business in our State. The involvement of area business has made it possible for JTPA to focus on the needs of the community and fill those needs more effectively and more efficiently.

The Oregon JTPA coalition has also initiated an effort to reduce the number of high school dropouts in Oregon. The coalition is in the midst of a 3-year program to create alternative schools, combining job training with the regular academic curriculum. The goal of the program is to keep kids in school longer, with supplementary job training to help them meet the challenges of the marketplace when they do leave.

I congratulate those individuals involved with the Oregon JTPA Program, and wish them continued success.

VICTORY OVER DRUGS IN PARAGUAY

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, the problem of drug abuse is something that concerns us all.

I hear frequently from parents, teachers, law enforcement personnel, and students about drug problems—problems that infect all communities, all types of schools, and potentially young adults of all ages and social background.

The battle against drugs must be fought in all areas—not the least of which is off our shores. For nearly all abused narcotics, particularly cocaine and heroin, are illegally imported from abroad.

That is why it is vital our State Department through its Bureau on International Narcotics Matters continues to urge other countries to cooperate with us in eliminating international traffic in narcotics.

I want to report a tremendous success in this war against drugs in Latin America to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker.

In October 1984 some 49,000 gallons of chemicals—ether, acetone, and hydrochloric acid—obviously intended for use in the manufacture of cocaine, were seized in Paraguay.

Paraguayan officials at first refused repeated requests by our Ambassador to meet to discuss the seized chemicals, and it was only natural that officials at the Bureau for International Narcotics Matters believed that the material seized would eventually wind up producing cocaine.

When I visited Paraguay in January of this year as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee with my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], I raised this issue with Gen. Alfredo Stroessner, the President of Paraguay.

Mr. TORRICELLI and I pressed the issue, and I told General Stroessner that there were concerns that high Paraguayan officials could be involved in the importation and ultimate use of the seized chemicals. I urged him in the strongest possible terms to destroy these chemicals.

General Stroessner assured me that the chemicals would not wind up in the drug trade. I am happy to inform my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that today I have received confirmation from the State Department that after a lengthy legal process in Paraguay, the chemicals have been returned to Germany, where they were manufactured. This transfer took place under U.S. supervision. The U.S. Consul in Frankfurt cabled Washington that the chemicals, sent by ship through Bremerhaven, have been received at their place of origin, the German chemical firm, Merck.

I want to commend the State Department for following through on this case. The cooperation of other governments has not always been what it should be in matters involving narcotics trafficking. In this instance, pressure was brought to bear, and we have achieved a significant victory. The 49,000 gallons of chemicals seized, if used by drug traffickers, could have produced 8 tons of cocaine—the equivalent of fully 10 percent of the estimated United States annual consumption.

I would also like to thank 59 of my colleagues who joined me in writing to General Stroessner last February to express our concern.

We must continue to work with Latin America and other countries to halt drug production at its source. This type of effort is worth it in the long run, Mr. Speaker.

SALUTE TO TOMMY WINEBRENNER

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the genuine and sincere outpouring of farewell wishes for Tommy Winebrenner, whose departure takes away a part of this great institution, the U.S. House of Representatives.

Like some other Members, I had experience in the State legislature before being elected to this body, but I quickly found that the differences were legion. As a freshman, the complexities and confusion here in the House were overwhelming at times. Tommy Winebrenner, with courtesy and without fail, was enormously helpful in assisting me to get my bearing. He made me realize that there was indeed some hope that I would survive my first term.

I know that we've all probably gone to Tommy with what might charitably be described as inane questions, yet he handled even these with grace and aplomb. I think that he proves without question that merely having the information is not enough, you have to care about others and know their needs if you are to be a success in life. Tommy's great skill lies not just in his knowledge of this House, but in his appreciation of it and his willingness to help in any way possible.

Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to say that I hope Tommy doesn't really enjoy his new career, and that he will come back and work with us again. But I will not. He has given more of himself than anyone could possibly ask. He has made contribution to the success and prestige of this body any elected official would be proud of.

Tommy, you have been part of the fiber, unseen by the public, which nonetheless keeps our great experiment in democracy alive and well. I am, personally, grateful, for your patience and assistance to me, and for your undying faith in the American Republic.

PEGGY GOLDWATER WAS A FRIEND

HON. JOHN MCCAIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1985

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who were fortunate enough to have known Peggy Goldwater, who passed away Wednesday, were inspired by her compassion, intelligence, and sincere consideration for everyone she met. The 1964 convention is so memorable because of the picture of Senator GOLDWATER with a very lovely, striking woman at his side. I sincerely hope

that all America will remember her this way.

For many years, sometimes trying years, Peggy stood beside her husband, providing support and inspiration to one of the country's most distinguished leaders. She touched the lives of thousands through her work for Planned Parenthood, Phoenix's St. Luke's Hospital, and Mount Vernon College in Washington, DC. Few have accomplished as much in one lifetime as Peggy Goldwater and few could ever hope to match her dedication to serving mankind.

I consider myself a very lucky person to say Peggy Goldwater was a friend. Treasuring that friendship forever, I will turn often to my memories of this remarkable woman for inspiration.

HOLLYWOOD, FL, CELEBRATES 60TH BIRTHDAY

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I salute 60 great citizens who have made contributions to the past, present, and future of the city of Hollywood, FL. These people came to Hollywood and fell in love with this oasis on the exciting gold coast and not only made it their home, but made it bigger and better. These people live and raised families in Hollywood and put back into the community what they took out to ensure that our city has another 60 vibrant years.

These citizens were recently honored by the Hollywood Democratic Club at a wonderful dinner and they are so deserving of honor that I want to personally record their names in this record. I salute the following people: Wilson Atkinson, Hank August, Ross Beckerman, Claude Blocker, Harvey Breeding, Dave Coay, Maurice Connell, Walter Cope, Irv Cowan, Betty Derington, Doug Donn, Barry Epstein, Bill Foster, Ed Foster, Art Frimet, Issac Gammel, Harry Gampel, Henry Graham, Myrtle Gray, Skip Grkovic, Jeff Gross, Gleason Holloway, Jim Hartley, Keith Hessey, William Horvitz, Doug Kaplan, Charles Lantz, Molly Leban, Quentin Long, Stan Margulies, Mike Marinelli, Jesse Martin, Marilyn Morris, Bill Moy, Sal Mudano, Charlie Nelson, August Paoli, Charles Paoli, Michael Phillips, Frank Pinter, Arthur Raymond, David Rusah, Edward Salzman, Sheldon Schlessinger, Ronnie Schlichte, Art Segall, Al Serman, Phyllis Silverman, Mark Siple, Slatts Slater, Lew Soli, Ted Sorin, Cedric Start, Ben Tobin, Gert Tulk, Elmer Weigle, Rodney Young, George Young, Donald Zeller, and George Zinkler.

CALL TO CONSCIENCE

HON. BEN ERDREICH

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to those of my colleagues who speak out on the deplorable situation of those in the Soviet Union who wish to emigrate but have over and over been denied this very basic human right.

Having returned from a trip to the Soviet Union this summer and meeting with many Soviet Jews, and those of other faiths, I am as committed as ever to continue our efforts to help those who have sought to emigrate, be reunited with family and have the freedom to follow their religious beliefs.

The recent summit with President Reagan and Secretary Gorbachev has produced little hope that the situation will change for people like the Boris Ghinis family or the Mikhail Kazanovich family who have been trying to emigrate for years but because of absurd reasons have not been granted visas. I was able to meet Mikhail Kazanovich while in Leningrad and have been in touch here in the United States with Irene Ghinis' family. I was moved by the courage and continued sense of hope that these people displayed in spite of the loss of employment, restrictions on university enrollment, illegal searches of homes, and an endless list of harassments of those who have tried to exercise their right to emigrate.

Mr. Speaker, I implore the Soviet Union to uphold the treaties and agreements they have signed and allow those that wish to emigrate so that husbands, wives, and children will be reunited to live as a family and live a life that they seek.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE RICHARD M. NIXON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill, at the unanimous request of the Yorba Linda City Council, to establish the Richard M. Nixon National Historic Site at the place of his birth in Yorba Linda, CA. The site will consist of his birthplace home and a visitor service center in existing facilities on 7.2 acres of land located in my congressional district.

This small one and one-half story frame bungalow was the home of Frank and Hannah Nixon for 10 years. Frank Nixon built the house in 1912 on the 9-acre farm where he raised citrus. The following year, on January 9, 1913, it was the birthplace of their second son, Richard Milhous. In 1922, when citrus farming became unprofitable, he sold the property and moved the family to Whittier. A small rear addition was put

on the house at an unknown date and would be removed during restoration.

The property was owned by various individuals and by the local school board before the Nixon Birthplace Foundation gained title in 1978. The foundation owns a 1.1-acre tract in the immediate vicinity of the house. The Yorba Linda Elementary School District owns 6.1 acres of the original property which includes buildings ideally suited for the visitor service center envisioned by the bill. Private residents own the remaining 1.8 acres which would not be affected by this bill. The birthplace, which is in good repair, is currently leased out and not open to the public, although the exterior and historic markers may be viewed.

President Nixon expressed a preference for the birthplace as a National Historic Landmark at the time the issue was considered and ultimately agreed to by the National Park Service in May 1973. Representatives of former President Nixon, in response to recent inquiries, have confirmed that he still regards the birthplace as the most significant of the sites associated with him.

Specifically, the bill does the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This section states that this act may be cited as the "Richard M. Nixon National Historic Site Act".

SECTION 2. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This section states that the purpose of this act is to preserve and interpret the birthplace of Richard M. Nixon for the benefit, education, and inspiration of present and future generations.

SECTION 3. ACQUISITION AND RESTORATION OF PROPERTY

This section authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to:

First, acquire the birthplace property and improvements located at 18061 Yorba Linda Boulevard in Yorba Linda, CA;

Second, acquire the adjacent property and improvements owned by the Yorba Linda Elementary School District;

Third, restore the birthplace home and property surrounding the home within this historic site to its condition at the time of the birth of Richard M. Nixon; and

Fourth, develop the existing buildings within the site as a visitor center.

The Secretary is authorized to acquire and restore the property in this section by donation, or with donated or appropriated funds.

SECTION 4. ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE RICHARD M. NIXON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

This section establishes that the property acquired under section 3 shall be known as the Richard M. Nixon National Historic site and shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the act of August 25, 1916 (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) the act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), and the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 et seq.).

The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with public or private entities for the operation and maintenance of the

site under the law cited in this section. The Secretary is also authorized to collect entrance or user fees under this section.

SECTION 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE RICHARD M. NIXON NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK AT THE SITE OF HIS FIRST LAW OFFICE IN LA HABRA, CA

This section requires the Secretary of the Interior to list the former law office of Richard M. Nixon on the National Register of Historic Places if it satisfies the criteria established by the Secretary for listing on such Register.

Because of the size and location of the office, it is not feasible for the National Park Service to operate and administer the site. Since listing property on the National Register does not require any appropriations, it is an appropriate method for recognizing the significant role of Richard Nixon's legal background in his political career. This bill does not change current criteria for listing property on the National Register of Historic Places and expenditures beyond commemorating the property with announcements and plaques are specifically prohibited.

While my bill focuses on the Richard M. Nixon National Historic Site, I understand that the National Park Service has recommended passage of legislation to authorize historic sites for all three living former Presidents. I support this effort and hope that the committee will act favorably on this bill in tandem with legislation for the other living Presidents.

BALANCING ACT

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, after 4 years of ballooning deficits, the administration has finally come to its senses and, for the moment at least, has agreed to cut defense spending equally with domestic spending. As I said yesterday during the discussion on the Gramm-Rudman budget proposal, this administration has a history of insisting on increased defense spending while lowering taxes despite the size of the deficit. If, as they say, history repeats itself, we can predict from now the breakdown of the Gramm-Rudman reduction process. It almost sounds like some new diet—let's hope new weapons do not prove to be too much of a temptation.

Where has this administration been for the last 4 years, that they have just now begun to wake up to the dangers of their economic policies? The question of why the President is willing to do a complete turnabout on his pet program was succinctly answered in an article in today's Washington Post.

One reason, they said, is that with three years left in his term, Reagan has come to view the \$200 billion deficits as a potentially serious blot on the record of his presidency. For several years, Reagan ignored those aides—such as then-director of the budget

David A. Stockman—who warned of peril in big deficits. But last summer, officials say, Reagan began taking a different—and more urgent—view of the red ink.

"He said, 'I am going to be judged on it,'" says the senior official. "That's made it real for him."

This deficit has been real since this administration took office. All of a sudden the fear that history may show that this President left office with the most staggering deficits in our country's history has put the fear of spending into the President.

The Congress, in passing this legislation, has bound itself to reducing deficits. Let us hope that the President will feel equally bound when it comes time to do the cutting.

GRAMM-RUDMAN AMENDMENT

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1985

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act, frequently referred to as the Gramm-Rudman amendment, which has been incorporated into House Joint Resolution 372, the debt limit increase. After a great deal of deliberation, I find that in the interests of my constituents, I must vote against this measure, and did so last evening.

Initially, I opposed the Gramm-Rudman proposal to incorporate a balanced budget mechanism into the debt limit bill. My reasons were twofold. First, if this type of reform had merit, I believed that it could and should withstand the rigor of the committee process. A bill which is addressed by the full House and Senate without deliberation by the appropriate House and Senate committees, has more than ample room for serious flaw. As Representatives of our fellow countrymen, we are entrusted to review, to the fullest extent possible, every measure which is to become the law of the land. In a matter of such magnitude, this responsibility is especially present. I continue to believe that we cannot justify bypassing the committee process with such haste on a matter of such grave importance.

Second, I did not believe that this proposal was either fair or responsible. The original Gramm-Rudman proposal exempted several important, and costly, programs—totaling roughly one-half of the Federal budget—from the automatic reduction mechanism created by the amendment, leaving the burden of deficit reduction to America's veterans, needy, handicapped, and elderly. The President and the Senate were especially protective of defense programs at the expense of much needed social programs. It was with great consternation that I noted the exemption of prior-year contracts and obligations under the defense program, representing 38 percent of the total defense budget. I support a strong national defense. However, I do not

believe that it can only be maintained by gouging Federal programs which are designed to provide the basic needs of our Nation's children, veterans, elderly, disabled, and needy.

While the conference agreement attempts to alleviate some of the burden placed on the recipients of certain low-income and pension programs, I do not believe that it fully satisfies my original concerns.

As in the original proposal, the agreement fails to address the matter of automatic reductions in the most fair and responsible fashion. It sets fixed dollar limits on the deficit, declining steadily until a balanced budget is reached in 1991. Further, the agreement also establishes a process referred to as "sequestration," that would make automatic spending cuts if the deficit limits are not otherwise met.

To make matters worse, however, the deficit targets for fiscal year 1986 were lowered considerably from what the Senate had proposed, thus ensuring that the process of making further cuts in the deficit will begin this year. The revised year-by-year limits would be as follows: fiscal year 1986, \$179.9 billion; fiscal year 1987, \$144 billion; fiscal year 1988, \$108 billion; fiscal year 1989, \$72 billion; fiscal year 1990, \$36 billion; fiscal year 1991, \$0. There will almost certainly be cuts in social programs this year if this measure is adopted.

Congress as a body has not prepared for the level of deficit reduction required by this measure. We can not now say that we would like to have a deficit of \$179.9 billion in 1986. That is something that we should have prepared for. It is our job to ensure that the purse is divided in a fair and responsible fashion. We can not shirk that responsibility by saying at this late hour that everyone—no matter what the circumstances—must pay a fair share to achieve our whim.

Some of my colleagues will argue that this is a fair compromise. After all, the conference agreement requires that half of the necessary spending cuts come from defense and half from nondefense programs. In addition, some programs would be exempted from automatic cuts, and cuts for others would be determined by special rules and limitations. While this is a more reasonable approach to deficit reduction, we can not be so blind as to assume that this type of radical reduction will not do harm—both in the short and long term—to our economy.

Furthermore, in so short a time, can we be certain that we have thoroughly reviewed this measure? We must not jump on the bandwagon of deficit reduction without first checking that the wheels are secure. I urge my colleagues to think about this measure. See it for what it is—a hastily conceived attempt to address one of the most serious issues of this decade. I for one believe we owe our opponent—the Federal deficit—a more thorough review. We can no longer afford to be hasty in determining budgetary matters.