

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TANCREDO NEVES AND HIS
LEGACY TO BRAZILIAN DE-
MOCRACY

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, Latin America has lost a great leader who exemplified the democratic tradition of millions of people. The President-elect of Brazil, Tancredo Neves, was chosen to head the first Brazilian civilian government in 21 years. But on the eve of his inauguration, Mr. Neves was hospitalized. After several operations and complications, he died on April 21.

Mr. Neves was a political veteran of 40 years. He personified the dreams of 130 million people who, while anxious for a democratic government, recognized the challenges and difficulties that it would have to confront. I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Neves during his trip to Washington last March. We discussed his views on the future of democracy not only in Brazil, but throughout the entire hemisphere. His death is a terrible loss to his country and the world, but his legacy lives on. I would like to share with my colleagues several articles that appeared in the press on Mr. Neves and his democratic legacy.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1985]

WHEN A GOOD DEMOCRAT DIES IN LATIN
AMERICA

(By Meg Greenfield)

The death of Tancredo Neves—the 75-year-old man who was elected president of Brazil but taken mortally ill before he could be sworn in—will strike many people here as a kind of freak accident, an antic turn of fate. In Brazil it will be regarded differently—as a cosmic act of cruelty and injustice. Something akin to exultation marked that country's attitude toward its return to civilian democratic rule this winter, and something akin to reverence had come to mark its feeling for Neves, who had done so much to help accomplish the transformation. Late last month when I was in Brazil, between the second and third of what were to be seven operations on poor Neves, two emotions seemed to prevail. One was dejection that Neves was so sick; the other was determination that the democratic constitutional order should survive, no matter what happened to the ailing president.

You heard this determination expressed everywhere. And you heard comparable commitments to a new effort at democracy throughout the hemisphere. In fact, the parts of South America I visited—Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay and Peru—seemed to be experiencing a kind of frenzy of democratic politics, an overwhelming rush of excitement at the return of civilian government

after a prolonged spell of military rule and roughly half a century of instability and coups and tugging and hauling among strongmen and charismatic loonies and such normal democrats as from time to time held away. Both Brazil's misfortune and its coming effort to hold the new democracy together in trying times and under a far less popular leader than Neves can only be understood in this larger context.

In a way the political frenzy put me in mind of Spain and Portugal a decade ago. There too you could see Catholic countries coming out of 50 years of authoritarian rule with an exuberance for democracy and a gift for it that confounded expectation. (The political pin-up boy of the South American countries I visited by the way, frequently mentioned as an example for newly liberated Latin politicians, is the young, pragmatic Socialist prime minister of Spain, Felipe Gonzalez. His is considered to be a success story in overcoming some of the same obstacles now facing his South American counterparts.) But in some ways I was more powerfully reminded of post-colonial Third World countries than I was of Spain and Portugal. It is as if these places are coming out of colonialism. There is a comparable kind of spirit in the air.

There are also, of course, comparable troubles. Recently in Uruguay, Argentina and Brazil, and a little farther back in Peru, military governments were eased or shoved out not because (as some of them claimed) they had achieved the stability and security for the country that was their only goal in taking power, but rather because they had fouled up. This was especially true in relation to the wrecked economies over which they had presided. So now you have a difficult situation in all these Latin countries that is very similar to one that has afflicted many countries newly freed from colonial control: There is elation that the old order is gone, but the rewards of the new order seem nonexistent. The first call of the democratically elected government must be for cutbacks and sacrifices to achieve economic stability and pay off the errors and aggrandizements of the past. In Zimbabwe or Brazil it is the same in this respect: "Welcome to democratic self-rule. It is going to cost you plenty. There may be no material improvements at all to show for it for years to come. Your government will be busy undoing past damage and demonstrating to other countries that it is responsible. Isn't freedom wonderful?"

The added difficulty is that once the strongman government is gone, labor unions and other economic and social groups feel safer in demanding better wages and fuller benefits, which run directly counter to civilian government's austerity programs. So the people who run those civilian governments require extraordinary personal authority to generate the required painful support for their policies. It was thought that Tancredo Neves had such authority, which is why his death was so especially cruel for Brazilians and why his successor, Jose Sarney, faces such a formidable challenge. But in fact any president of Brazil (or Argentina or Peru or even Uruguay with its longer, though interrupted democratic tradition) would find this a challenge. That is because much of the in-

stability of recent decades in South America, the social and political turmoil of the region, is due to a very thin and chancy sense of the legitimacy of government institutions in the first place.

In Brazil people cling tenaciously these days to the word and letter of the constitution, citing it literally to answer perplexities. It is as if there were no larger, informal understanding of where authority lies and how it works and actually there is none. In Argentina it is being severely questioned whether the present government has the mandate or the strength to do any of the things it considers essential to governing. Taxes are a joke in many of these countries. A huge "informal" sector exists in Peru, which means huge numbers of poor people appropriate land, build unauthorized hovels on it, steal electricity off main lines to light and power it and then just settle in. The independent, roving band is a model of enterprise and settlement in many places on the continent. The history of one system's displacing another over the years in politics has made all of them suspect and weak. The toughest job facing all of these new governments is that of establishing its own legitimacy and thus its claim on the loyalty of its citizens, its claim, at the simplest level, to be listened to.

That, interestingly, is what Tancredo Neves had managed, all but miraculously, to establish in Brazil. And that is why his death is so consequential. It's not that people fear a grab to retrieve power by the military there. It's that they fear no one else has Neves' authority or his presumed legitimacy with the people. This is a problem—the problem—for all the newly elected democratic governments of South America.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 24, 1985]

THE LEGACY OF BRAZILIAN DEMOCRACY
SURVIVES THE DEATH OF NEVES

(by Alan Riding)

BRAZILIA, April 23.—Even though Brazil's late President-elect, Tancredo Neves, never took office, his personal prestige and skillful preparations for the transition from military to civilian rule have enabled the country's fragile democracy to survive the threat posed by his death Sunday.

Such was the political support that Mr. Neves generated during his campaign and the sense of national unity awakened by his five-week-long illness that, for the first time in memory, a succession crisis has been resolved without the involvement of the armed forces.

Further, while his successor, José Sarney, lacks the political backing enjoyed by Mr. Neves, polls indicate that the vast majority of Brazilians want the new President to carry out the Government's program without an interruption of the constitutional order.

NEW NEED OF DEMOCRACY

Since 21 years of military government ended on March 15, the administration has been largely paralyzed by the uncertainty created by Mr. Neves's absence. Yet already a new mood of democracy is apparent, with the long-dormant Congress increasingly

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

vocal and proscribed labor and political groups able to resume their activities.

Reflecting Mr. Neves's talents for conciliation, there is also no apparent demand for retribution against past military regimes. "In a country that had become polarized, Tancredo rebuilt the center," a Congressman said today.

In the presidential palace here where Mr. Neves's body lay in state for 17 hours, mourners included a Dominican friar who was jailed by the military Government, a former leftist guerrilla who is now an opposition legislator and Giacondo Dias, head of the still-banned Brazilian Communist Party. But they also included Gen. Ernesto Geisel, who governed Brazil from 1974 to 1979, and a right-wing Congressman who, as an army major, led a counterinsurgency campaign a decade ago.

After a religious ceremony here today attended by foreign delegations, including the Presidents of Colombia, Venezuela, Uruguay, Paraguay and Portugal, Mr. Neves's body was flown to Belo Horizonte, where he served as Governor of Minas Gerais State until last year.

AN APPEAL FOR CALM

Hundreds of thousands of people crowded the city's streets to receive the coffin, many holding banners and throwing flowers. Such was the hysteria outside the palace where the late leader lay in state that his widow, Risoleta, had repeatedly to appeal for calm. Mr. Neves's body will be buried Wednesday in his birthplace of São João del Rei.

The powerful emotions stirred by Mr. Neves's death may nonetheless add to the headaches awaiting the Sarney administration. Many politicians here noted that, had he assumed office, Mr. Neves's popularity would inevitably have been eroded by a continuing economic crisis. But now, they said, Mr. Sarney will be measured by the hopes and delusions that Brazilians had for a Neves presidency.

As a result, disappointment that the new Government cannot rapidly improve living standards could create a vacuum to be exploited by ambitious politicians.

Those ambitions, held in abeyance by Mr. Neves's political strength, are already becoming apparent in the debate over how long President Sarney should remain in office and whether he should change the Cabinet that he has inherited.

Under the present Constitution, Mr. Sarney could serve until March 1991 but, having been chosen by an Electoral College, Mr. Neves had pledged to call direct presidential elections in November 1988. Now different voices are being heard calling for elections in 1985, 1986 and 1987, although no consensus has emerged.

CRUCIAL WEEKS AHEAD

Further, Mr. Neves named a Cabinet that carefully combined the two political forces that supported his candidacy—the Brazilian Democratic Movement Party and the Liberal Front Party—but several key posts were also filled by close aides, who may be replaced by Mr. Sarney.

Politicians here believe much depends on how Mr. Sarney handles his first weeks in the presidency. Many of Mr. Neves's allies, among them Ulysses Guimarães, president of the Chamber of Deputies, and Franco Montoro, Governor of São Paulo State, are demanding a voice in the new administration, but other groups believe Mr. Sarney must provide strong leadership to forestall instability.

Next week, the new President will face a first test. A strike of 200,000 metal workers

in São Paulo was suspended during the eight days of official mourning proclaimed after Mr. Neves's death, but it will resume Monday and its solution could have a major impact on the Government's economic policy.

Paradoxically, since March 15, the armed forces have emerged as the main guarantors of the succession. In the hours that followed Mr. Neves's hospitalization on March 14, amid disputes over whether Mr. Sarney or Mr. Guimaraes should take office, it was the Army Minister, Gen. Leonidas Pires Goncalves, who interpreted the Constitution and pointed to the Vice President.

Unlike the crises provoked by the suicide of President Getulio Vargas in 1954 and the resignation of President Janio Quadros in 1961, the legal successor was therefore able to take office without incident. In a country where only one elected President has completed his term since 1950, the armed forces are also expected to discourage any scramble to replace Mr. Sarney.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Apr. 23, 1985]

A BLOW TO BRAZIL

Brazil has suffered a tragic blow in the death of its president-elect Tancredo Neves, the man who was to lead South America's largest nation back to civilian government after 21 years of military rule.

That transition would not have been an easy one even had the 75-year-old Mr. Neves lived to assume the presidency to which he was indirectly elected in January. Though Brazil avoided the extremes of violence and polarization that occurred under military regimes in neighboring Argentina and elsewhere in the region, it still faces grave social and economic problems. Half of its 130 million people live in dire poverty, while perhaps 40 per cent of the labor force is unemployed or underemployed. The inflation rate exceeds 200 per cent a year, while the foreign debt of over \$100 billion is the world's largest.

To cope with the conflicting pressures for economic discipline, social progress, and consolidation of democracy would have taken all the conciliatory talent for which Mr. Neves became known in nearly a half-century of political life. Now, those pressures fall on his successor, Jose Sarney, who has neither the stature nor popular affection commanded by Mr. Neves. Because he was never associated with the ruling generals' Democratic Social Party, Mr. Neves embodied the national desire for a return to democracy. Mr. Sarney, by contrast, belonged to the official party until he defected during pre-election maneuvering last year. That move left a legacy of distrust both in the Democratic Social camp and in Mr. Neves's Brazilian Democratic Movement. The former sees Mr. Sarney as a traitor and the latter regards him with misgivings because of his past links with the military government. Thus, instead of a leader with enough popularity to take necessary but unpopular decisions without destroying the consensus for orderly political change, Brazil's future rests on a president without broad support and without the mystique that seemed to be Mr. Neves's strongest political weapon.

One probable consequence of Mr. Neves's death and Mr. Sarney's succession to the presidency will almost certainly be increased pressure for direct elections, replacing the indirect system under which Mr. Neves was chosen. Mr. Neves had promised to restore direct elections, possibly as early

as 1988. Speeding up that timetable could involve both opportunities and risks. It could provide a leader with a stronger mandate than Mr. Sarney now enjoys, but it could also lead to demagogic politics raising unrealistic hopes and possibly reopening the political rifts—between liberals and conservatives and between military and civilians—that Mr. Neves's personality and talents seemed to bridge. Whatever happens, Brazil's political maturity will be subject to tests far more severe than anyone would have imagined before Mr. Neves's illness and tragic death.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 25, 1985]

ON TOWARD BRAZILIAN DEMOCRACY

(By Alfred Stepan)

The death of the President-elect of Brazil, Tancredo Neves, is a great loss for his country and the world. It should not, however, dash the encouraging prospects for Brazil's transition to democracy.

The consummate political skills that "Tancredo" brought to the transition are lost. No other official can hope to enjoy the fervent trust he inspired. The new President, José Sarney, is suspect among both the outgoing military and the incoming democratic forces. But the rebirth of Brazilian democracy does not depend solely on leadership.

For one thing, most of the country's other political leaders remain committed to democracy. For all their initial doubts about Mr. Sarney's legitimacy and capacity to govern, the people who worked with such exemplary skill to make Tancredo Neves the first civilian President in more than 20 years will now rally behind Mr. Sarney simply because he represents constitutional and democratic continuity. Mr. Neves's electoral calendar—direct elections in the state capitals in November 1985, elections for a Congress to serve as a Constituent Assembly in November 1986 and the possibility of direct Presidential elections in November 1988—is likely to gain increasing support. It is the least confrontational and most constitutional path. It would also give the left time to organize under democratic conditions.

Second, the military is unlikely to cause trouble. The officers have their own, complex reasons to respect the transition under Mr. Sarney. They know that Nuremberg-style trials of military abuses are much less likely in Brazil than in Chile and Argentina, where deaths and disappearances caused by the military may have been as much as 100 times more common (counted on a per capita basis). The desire to return to civilian rule was also strengthened by the Argentine-British war for the Malvinas, or Falklands Islands, which forced a debate in the military on the need to restructure its institutions.

This alleviated an identity crisis, giving the military a sense of mission that has nothing to do with direct rule. Certainly, the military will continue to play a significant economic role in Brazil, the sixth largest arms exporting country in the world. In short, unless President Sarney and the political parties prove totally unable to control domestic political conflict, it is very unlikely that the military will feel called upon to topple the new Government with a coup.

Finally, Brazil's much neglected poorer classes favor a strengthened civil society. There will of course be great demands to service the country's staggering domestic "social debt" of poverty, sickness and unem-

ployment. But even the Brazilian left is firmly committed to democratic procedures—not just as a temporary tactic, but as an enduring value.

Lacking Tancredo Neves' credibility, Mr. Sarney will undoubtedly find it hard to impose austerity measures. He will also have to go further than Mr. Neves would have in pursuing visible social reforms—and will be hampered all the while by his country's external debt, the largest in the world. Yet even here he has some leeway. Unlike Argentina or Chile, Brazil recently developed a major industrial plant. This new capacity is waiting for a revival of internal and external demand; already, in 1984, Brazil had a record year of exports.

The world debt crisis is not over however. Ask anybody in Brazil—especially the poor and their leaders—about the effect of spending some 5 percent of its gross national product merely to service the external debt; Tancredo Neves once called it "taxation without representation." The debt crisis was containable last year, thanks largely to declining interest rates, declining oil prices and booming exports to the United States, but no one knows how long these favorable conditions will last.

It is a time of sadness but not despair in Brazil. The country has some room to develop democracy and temporarily, at least, a tiny bit of room to develop its economy. History will deal harshly with the United States if it fails to help the world's third longest democracy to evolve successfully—even as we continue to pursue a military obsession in Central America. There is no excuse for our political and moral neglect of Brazil.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1985]
TANCREDO NEVES

Brazilians have suffered an unkind blow in the death of their recently elected but unaugmented president, Tancredo Neves. Mr. Neves, who endured a month-long medical ordeal, had appointed only some of the top members of the government he intended to run before he fell ill. In the month since, the man elected vice president with him, Jose Sarney, has taken some further steps to get the democratic system and the new government in place. But Mr. Sarney, necessarily, moved slowly, waiting for public pressure to build for him to take actions and proceeding with immense caution.

There were a couple of reasons for this. The obvious one was that the vice president (who became, while Mr. Neves was ill, the acting president) did not wish to appear overeager or in any way ambitious to assume Mr. Neves' place. Another reason was that Mr. Sarney, who came over from the military government's party to run with Mr. Neves against a man that military government favored, does not begin to enjoy the popularity or support that Tancredo Neves did. Mr. Sarney will now have a huge political chore to accompany his formidable task of governing.

Although there seems to be no prospect of an effort to revoke or overturn the new democratic dispensation, there will be much controversy as to how soon direct elections for a successor government should be held. There will probably be an effort to have them held very soon. And there are also politicians in Brazil of Tancredo Neves' party who are stronger and more popular than Mr. Sarney, politicians who will be very much trying to arrange things for the new president.

None of this will make Mr. Sarney's ability to preside any easier, and the new president has much to do. Brazil, as other countries in the region, is obliged to fight a ferocious inflation with steps that are alienating workers and threatening a part of the population that is already inordinately poor. Its export earnings, spectacularly high last year, may be sharply reduced this year. Brazil has sent one failed letter of intent after another to the International Monetary Fund, and is now in another round of negotiations with it. The emergency measures that have enabled the country to carry its debts so far will not be adequate indefinitely—particularly if and when the North American economy, with its gigantic demand for Latin exports, begins to slow down.

Governing Brazil is going to require immense skill and steadiness. It is going to require a high degree of trust between the people at the top and the people at the bottom. It is not an opportune moment for a long hiatus or a debilitating quarrel over who's in charge and who possesses the title to legitimate authority. The country's financial position requires decisions that cannot be postponed. The sudden death of the man who won the election, in the moment of his triumph, puts enormous tests ahead of Brazil and its new democracy. But Brazil and its political leadership have shown, over the past year, that they are capable of great things.●

"LADY LANCERS" SPEAR STATE
TITLE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the "Lady Lancers," the girls basketball team from Deer Lakes Junior-Senior High School, will be honored Monday, May 13, as section AAA champions of the Pennsylvania Interscholastic Athletic Association [PIAA].

The girls won their crown the hard way, putting a season record of 25-2 in section AAA of the Western Pennsylvania Interscholastic League [WPIAL]. They captured the section title by defeating North Catholic of Pittsburgh, 42-32. The win not only gave the "Lady Lancers" the WPIAL title, but it averaged the two regular season losses to the Pittsburgh school.

From there, the Deer Lakes girls went on to Hershey, PA, where they wrested the State championship from Palmyra High School in a down-to-the-wire nail biter, 45-43. The "Lancers" were down 17 points at the half and as much as 19 in the third quarter before staging their dramatic comeback.

As a result of the girls' double win and the fine showing of the boys' team, which made it to the WPIAL semifinals, a group of citizens banded together to give the teams some richly deserved public recognition. The result is the May 13 testimonial dinner in their honor at Jack's Restaurant in Sarver, PA.

Members of the State champions, the "Lady Lancers," are:

Terri Gizienki, Kathy Suvoy, Shawn Rearich, Amie Siekierski, Michelle Fletcher, Michelle Murray, Carla Smay, Jill Switalski, Gíngy Hahn, Buffey Martinez, Dee Dougherty, Ron Cikora (trainer), and Kenneth Ladish (assistant coach).

Erica Goodrich, Missy Overly, Valerie Chauvin, Stacey McCaskey, Joelle Wise, Jill Savero, Sandy Martin, Francie Rombaldi, Colleen Shaffer, Sue Green, Sue Smith, and Donald Savero (head coach).

Members of the citizens' committee staging the banquet included Jim Yaconis, Joe Yourish, JoAnn Ellison, Carol McCaskey, Carol Bock, Patricia Rehner, Ida Shoop, Joyce Salsbury, Terri Gizienki (representing the girls' team), and Jim Yaconis, Jr. (representing the boys' team).

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States, I congratulate the "Lady Lancers" on their title as State champions and wish them well for the coming season.●

CONTINUE FEDERAL
ASSISTANCE TO AMTRAK

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Star-Ledger explains the effect of the administration's proposal to eliminate all funding for Amtrak, our Nation's rail passenger system. To eliminate all funding for Amtrak will effectively eliminate the railroad. All lines will stop on October 1.

As the article points out, last year, Amtrak carried about 18,000 passengers daily between Washington and New York. All the airlines combined carried only 12,000 passengers daily between the two cities. The elimination of Amtrak will mean massive highway and airport congestion in an area already operating at capacity.

Further, according to the Star-Ledger, commuter service may be halted, stranding 35,000 additional passengers. Over \$2 billion has been spent on track that will be virtually abandoned, not to mention the billions of dollars spent on rolling stock that will have to be sold for scrap.

I strongly oppose the administration's proposal to eliminate Amtrak and will fight for continuation of the railroad. I urge my colleagues to support the continuation of Amtrak and commend this informative and revealing article to their attention.

The article follows:

[From the Sunday Star-Ledger]
**COMMUTER RAILROADS BRACE FOR
 "DOOMSDAY" IF AMTRAK LOSES ITS SUBSIDY**
 (By David Schwab)

Representatives from commuter agencies throughout the Northeast were summoned to Washington earlier this month to take part in a little disaster planning. Gathered in the offices of the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), they talked about public transit's latest version of the "Day After."

As the scenario goes, it is Oct. 1, the beginning of the new federal fiscal year. Amtrak, the 14-year-old national railroad passenger corporation, has been forced out of business, a victim of the Reagan Administration's latest round of budget cuts.

All of its 250 daily trains throughout the country grind to a halt, including those connecting New Jersey to places from Florida to Chicago to Montreal.

Among those stalled are 18,000 passengers a day who travel the busy, electrified mainline owned by Amtrak between New York and Washington and known as the Northeast Corridor. The corridor, which cuts a 57-mile path through the heart of New Jersey and has undergone a \$1.5 billion renovation, is virtually abandoned. Crucial repair shops and stations are closed.

Commuter service on the line, provided by state transit authorities like NJ Transit, is halted. Thirty five thousand daily New Jersey commuters who travel between Trenton and New York, half of the state's total rail ridership, are affected.

With no place left to go, these travelers jump into their cars or catch planes, further crowding already congested highways and airports.

Faced with this dilemma, N.J. Transit would have little choice but to pay up to \$47 million a year to take over many of the services now provided by Amtrak. And that's not all.

A separate proposal to slash federal Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) subsidies leaves NJ Transit heading for a \$44 million operating deficit. This could only be made up with fare increases of up to 25 percent or increased state contributions. Further cuts of \$99 million in UMTA capital subsidies threaten anxiously awaited improvement projects such as electrification to Long Branch and new bus purchases.

Few expect this nightmare will become a reality.

The Reagan Administration, which has proposed the drastic cuts, argues many of Amtrak's important functions could be assumed by the states or private companies. It disputes predictions of doom and gloom and says its proposed cuts are part of longstanding push by the federal government to get out of areas better left to the states and private enterprise, including the railroad business.

Meanwhile, Amtrak is lobbying hard against the cuts and has been joined with expressions of support from many politicians, including Gov. Thomas Kean and Rep. James Florio (D-1st Dist.). Transit agencies from throughout the Northeast, including NJ Transit, have also joined Amtrak in its fight.

For the next year, Amtrak is asking for a "zero funding" budget of \$684 million, the same amount it receives this year. It insists any cuts will force it to shut down completely.

NJ Transit officials, keenly aware of budget battles of the previous years, are bracing for possible modest cuts in both

Amtrak and UMTA subsidies. But they are not planning for Transportation Armageddon.

The purpose of the Washington meeting was "to begin getting people's thoughts focused on the Domesday scenario," explained NJ Transit's chief financial officer, William Bouffard, who attended. "It's bizarre to contemplate that form of disaster. As a practical matter, we are not sure what to plan for."

But the worst could still happen, state officials say, and the stakes for New Jersey in this budget battle are especially high.

"There is a high probability that the Administration will be successful," said Florio, noting its previous successes in budget cuts in 1981. "Most in New Jersey do not understand the impact, I suppose because of the assault on so many programs," added Florio, the chairman of the House subcommittee that has jurisdiction over Amtrak.

The plan to eliminate funding for Amtrak beginning Oct. 1 is just one of many proposals put forward by the Reagan administration to cut the nation's \$200 billion deficit.

Created in 1971 to provide intercity railroad passenger service, Amtrak has since spent more than \$3 billion to rebuild a system left largely in decay by the private railroads. It has survived previous budget battles by reducing its annual subsidy from a high of \$896 million in 1981 to \$684 million this year.

Traditionally, Amtrak has counted upon support in the Congress to fight budget cuts. The Senate budget Committee held hearings earlier this month and approved a proposal to reduce Amtrak's budget by 30 percent. The House will hold its own hearings and Florio said there is support for a freeze of the Amtrak budget at current levels.

The debate over Amtrak is just one small part of the controversy surrounding the entire federal budget. But it will not likely be resolved until many of the other issues in the budget are finalized. This may not occur until the summer, officials say, compounding the problems of transit planners trying to put together their budgets.

FRA spokesman Thomas Simpson said the decision to cut Amtrak funding is an extension of the Reagan Administration's general philosophy.

"The overall philosophy is that the federal government should not be in the railroad business, whether freight or passenger," he said. For similar reasons, the government recently sold the Alaska Railroad to the State of Alaska for \$22 million and is moving to sell Conrail to the private sector.

Simpson said the government is beginning to look at "alternative funding arrangements," namely getting states like New Jersey to pick up some of the tab for the services Amtrak provided.

If these services could be transferred from Amtrak to the states or other railroads, then there would be no massive layoffs for Amtrak's 25,000 employees and important railroad facilities would not go to waste, the federal government argues. As for long distance service, from New Jersey to Florida for example, "if the states want to band together to preserve service they would have to sit down and figure out how to allocate costs," Simpson said.

These suggestions contrast greatly with the dire forecasts from Amtrak, which says that binding labor agreements would make it more costly to shut down all or parts of the system than to continue operating normally.

Contracts made with railroad workers when Amtrak was created guarantee them pay for six years even if they lose their jobs, according to Amtrak. It estimates the cost of meeting these agreements at \$2.1 billion.

Also, Amtrak argues terminating its trains would allow nearly \$3.1 billion worth of improvements to tracks, stations and equipment to go to waste.

About half of this was spent to turn the Northeast Corridor Boston into one of the most modern systems in the world. Between New York and Washington, for instance, this system carries 50 percent more riders than those who travel the route by plane.

Millions of dollars have also been invested in station improvements along the corridor, including \$20 million at Newark's Penn Station, to encourage travel by train and development in urban areas.

While acknowledging some problems in the past, Amtrak believes it has been successful in trimming costs while improving services for 20 million passengers a year in 44 states.

"I think the Administration is honestly trying to grapple with the deficit but I'm not sure they are aware of the impact," said Amtrak spokesman Clifford Black.

For example, Amtrak operates 80 daily trains that pass through New Jersey, stopping at such places as Newark, Metropark, New Brunswick and Trenton. They connect the Garden State with locations throughout the nation.

For the year ending September of 1984, 1.8 million passengers used Amtrak trains in the state. To provide these services, Amtrak employs about 2,500 persons in New Jersey with a payroll of about \$50 million.

In addition, NJ Transit operates about 200 trains a day on the Amtrak-owned corridor between Trenton and New York. A number of New Jersey commuters rely on hourly Amtrak trains between New York and Philadelphia.

NJ Transit pays Amtrak about \$30 million a year to provide the services associated with its trains. This covers the cost of electricity, track maintenance and signaling. It also covers the cost of maintaining trains in Amtrak's yards and the use of Amtrak's Penn Station in New York.

Were Amtrak to disappear, however, the cost to NJ Transit to provide the same services would jump to about \$47 million, according to Amtrak and NJ Transit officials. This is because complicated agreements between NJ Transit and Amtrak, following earlier rulings by the Interstate Commerce Commission, require Amtrak to bear the large share of costs on the corridor.

While state officials have come to the aid of Amtrak, they believe it could survive some budget cuts. They say some savings could probably be achieved by reducing labor costs and eliminating duplicated services on the corridor.

However, they do not believe, as does the Administration, that Amtrak's important functions can be assumed by the state or others. Instead, they fear a termination or severe cutback of Amtrak, combined with drastic cuts in UMTA funds, would be a catastrophe for mass transit in the state.

"If we get clobbered with the catastrophic cuts proposed, it's going to create a major funding problem for the state," said NJ Transit Executive Director Jerome Premo.

The agency's current operating budget of \$460 million relies upon \$44 million in UMTA operating subsidies and \$160 million from the state. These figures were not expected to change drastically for next year.

The agency also received about \$200 million in UMTA capital subsidies this year.

Any budget cuts would be especially damaging this year because NJ Transit has been successful in rebuilding the state's mass transit system, largely by making major investments and preventing fare increases during the last two years, according to state officials.

During the last six months, for example, ridership on NJ Transit trains has increased by 9 percent and on buses by 3 percent. Fares and revenues now cover about 60 percent of NJ Transit's costs, which is among the best returns in the nation and reduces dependence on government subsidies.

State officials say they do not want to underestimate the drastic possibilities presented by the Reagan Administration's plans. But they believe the crisis may not be as severe as it appears. They are adamant that undue predictions of doom will only scare away mass transit users.

"The sense I get is there may be a small cut. But I don't sense widespread support for the massive cuts the Administration has proposed," said Premo. "I am trying to avoid the Domsday signals of increased fares that may scare away some riders who remember the old days," he added. ●

RELIGION, POLITICS AND JUSTICE IN A DEMOCRACY: A COMMENTARY ON THE U.S. CATHOLIC BISHOPS' DRAFT PASTORAL LETTER ON CATHOLIC SOCIAL TEACHING AND THE U.S. ECONOMY

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, on March 29, 1985, I addressed the first annual Convocation on Peace and Justice at Niagara University. In that talk, entitled "Religion, Politics and Justice in a Democracy," I tried to illustrate how one tries to meld moral and religious principles together with politics in pursuit of a more just society. To do that, I discussed the U.S. Catholic bishops' draft pastoral letter on Catholic social teaching and the U.S. economy. I call this to the attention of my colleagues, in the hope that the moral guidance offered by the bishops may be helpful to all my colleagues regardless of their political or religious persuasion.

The text of my talk follows:

RELIGION, POLITICS AND JUSTICE IN A DEMOCRACY

(Remarks of Congressman John J. LaFalce)

There are few people in history who have had as great a commitment to peace and justice as Niagara University's own patron, St. Vincent de Paul. St. Vincent, the founder of the Vincentians, a hero in 17th century France, exhausted himself working on behalf of others because he recognized that it was every man and woman's obligation to love his neighbor, and to be of service to him, if he was to love God.

We are told that no one was excluded from his ministry—that he organized relief for all: sick children, orphans, the poor, the

destitute, the blind and insane; convicts and galley slaves. His charity extended to every emergency that arose, whether the ransoming of Christian slaves in North Africa or collecting alms for war devastated areas in Lorraine.

Two of his orders, the Congregation of the Mission, commonly called the Vincentians, and the Sisters of Charity, have ministered to the poor and oppressed around the world, since their inception in 1633. It is no wonder that St. Vincent is recognized as the universal patron of charity for the entire Church.

How appropriate it is, then, that this Vincentian University has decided to institute an annual Convocation on Peace and Justice to better carry out its most fundamental missions. With this general background, I sincerely say that it is a great and heavy honor for me to be the speaker at your first Convocation.

My purpose, as your speaker tonight, is to develop the way one works to improve the qualities of peace and injustice in a democracy, and within that context, how religious, moral and spiritual values can, and must, be woven into our political process so that this country's social and economic policies reflect what Cardinal Bernardin has called the "framework of a consistent ethic . . . a seamless garment of reverence for life."

Those who know me are aware that I am no shrinking violet. I am seldom unwilling to wade into the political fray, if armed with what I consider forceful arguments that favor a particular perspective. But, I must confess a bit of uneasiness in taking on tonight's assignment.

Although your invitation is a high honor, it is a humbling experience. Any honest and sensible man should cringe at giving a moral exhortation to others. Considering myself honest and sensible, I cringe, for I know well enough my own faults. It's hard enough to be a good person; even tougher to be both a good person and a good politician.

I also recognize that the words "political" and "moral" are not likely to be found together as synonyms in anyone's Thesaurus. In fact, let me make a second point: Public officials who cry the loudest about religion and morality may often be more pharisee than prophet. All too often, when politicians begin posing for holy pictures, it is time for people to hang on to both their prayer books and their wallets because they are probably about to lose both. The cynical use of patriotism may, in the words of Samuel Johnson, be the last refuge of a scoundrel, but the cynical use of religion is all too often a close second.

So, with both these caveats clearly acknowledged, let me nevertheless go forward.

First, a few personal observations that may be helpful in developing my theme.

I did not enter politics because I wanted to enact legislation as an end unto itself. That's not the point of politics.

I entered politics because I believe in the social gospel and the force for justice that I think government should be. There is, you know, a compatibility between the two, not a contradiction.

I think Christianity and democracy are both based on the value of the human person—individually and collectively; that a principal role of religion is to help people understand their responsibilities toward one another; and that a principal role of government, particularly in a democracy, is to help people meet their responsibilities to each other as effectively and equitably as possible.

As a public official, I try, in my own imperfect way, to apply these beliefs broadly,

so that public positions and decisions will be based on criteria which reflect these basic values and principles.

But whether in Washington, Albany or Peoria, it is very easy to get caught up in the swirl of events, and the crisis of the moment. Public officials in general, and Members of Congress, in particular, are continuously called upon to participate in decisions which affect not only the well-being of our own people, but literally the future of the planet. In this pressure cooker of competing claims and counter-claims, "numbers crunching," and political trade-offs, it is easy to lose perspective; it is easy to lose one's moral gyroscope.

That is why this politician, at least, often needs a moral compass to find his way. Actually, I would also think that all persons and certainly all public officials, need such a moral compass.

In choosing a particular subject to discuss this evening to illustrate how one tries to meld moral and religious principles together with politics in pursuit of a more just society, I considered many issues, especially abortion, about which I differ in thinking from both Governor Cuomo and Archbishop O'Connor; and the nuclear arms race and the moral imperative of ending that race, if we are to preserve the human species.

These are transcendently important issues, involving the creation of life and the end of life. But I have left them for another time. Please invite me back.

For tonight, I have chosen to share with you some reflections on the draft Pastoral Letter of the American Bishops on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy. I do this for many reasons.

First, because, although it does not deal with the creation or the cessation of life, it does deal with the condition of life.

Second, because the draft letter itself may constitute the most ambitious attempt at "participatory democracy" in the Church's history, through discussions that are now being held in most of the dioceses in the United States. Hence, our discussion this evening could help shape the final teaching.

Third, the draft letter raises issues which individuals can affect almost everyday in almost every community in the United States.

Fourth, the essence of the Bishops' message has been maligned and misinterpreted since it was released, and therefore needs exposition, reinforcement and improvement by its friends and allies.

And fifth, I feel a special obligation to speak out on this issue, for I serve as Chairman of the House of Representatives' Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization.

You may remember the flap that arose last November, when shortly after the Presidential election, Catholic Bishops released their draft letter on the economy. One would have thought that a few Bishops had worked secretly together in a backroom to produce a radical document unrelated to Catholic social teachings, and were now trying to foist their thoughts upon an unsuspecting church and public.

Yet, the fact is that the draft letter reflects over 100 years of Catholic social teaching.

Let me share a bit of that background with you, as a "refresher" before discussing the latest letter at some length.

In the modern industrial age, Catholic social teaching has been rooted in fundamental beliefs about the nature of the human person and about how we should live and work together in a society. These con-

cepts can be summed up under the following headings: Human dignity, the common good, the role of government, distribute justice, and the essentiality and dignity of work.

HUMAN DIGNITY

The foundation for all Catholic social teaching has been the dignity of the human person. In the words of the Second Vatican Council "... the beginning, the subject, and the goal of all institutions is and must be the human person."

COMMON GOOD

The "common good" is a second theme which has been integral to Catholic social teaching. Although this teaching strongly emphasizes the human person, it is not an individualistic ethic. On the contrary, the human person is seen as essentially a social being, and human rights are rights held in community.

Further, the common good is not so much the summation of the goods of individual citizens, as it is a set of social conditions which facilitate human development. It stands as a call to responsibility whereby we are all required to work for the general welfare of the entire human family.

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

The promotion of that general welfare, or common good, is, according to Catholic social teaching, the very reason for the existence of government.

The social encyclicals of the Church have recognized that unless government intervenes on behalf of the common good, inequalities in social and economic life tend to increase. As stated by John XXIII in "Pacem in Terris": "Experience has taught us that, unless civil authorities take suitable action with regard to economic, political and cultural matters, inequalities between citizens tend to become more and more widespread."

More recently, Pope John Paul II pointed out in his Encyclical "On Human Labor," that it is the obligation of government to conduct a just economic policy. He stated that government: "... must make provision for overall planning with regard to the different kinds of work by which not only the economic life, but also, the cultural life of a given society is shaped; it must also give attention to organizing that work in a correct and rational way. In the final analysis, this overall concern weighs on the shoulders of the state."

DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

Since there are often valid but competing claims and rights in society, Catholic social teaching has also advanced the principle of distributive justice as a tool for reconciling these conflicts. Distributive justice, therefore, is a particularly relevant guide in the realm of economic decisionmaking. Thus Pope John XXIII wrote in "Mater et Magistra," that: "Economic prosperity is to be assessed not so much from the sum total of goods and wealth possessed, as from the distribution of goods according to the norms of justice."

Pope Paul VI noted in "Populorum Progressio" that when conflicts arise between the claims of those in need and those who are well off, Catholic social teaching gives special priority to the needs of the poor. The Church does not claim to be neutral in its treatment of various economic classes in society. It has a clearly articulated bias on behalf of the poor.

In a similar context, Pope John Paul II has recently declared that: "The present

economic difficulties ... must not become a pretext for giving in to the temptation to make the poor pay for the solutions to the problems of the rich ..."

Note that statement well, given the context of today's prevailing economic philosophy.

THE ESSENTIALITY AND DIGNITY OF WORK

Finally, let me pay particular attention to a theme that permeates the most influential encyclicals of the past century—the essentiality and dignity of work and the rights of workers. From the extensive treatment given this theme in 1891 by Leo XIII in "Rerum Novarum" to its 40th anniversary encyclical of Pope Pius XI, "Quadragesimo Anno," to the most recent statements of Pope John Paul II, the Church has emphasized the importance and dignity of human labor.

John Paul II, in the encyclical "On Human Labor" said: "Man's life is built up every day from work, from work it derives its specific dignity ... through work man not only transforms nature, adapting it to his own needs, but he also achieves fulfillment as a human being and indeed in a sense becomes more a human being ... The role of the indirect employer (government) is to act against unemployment, which in all cases is an evil ..."

THE BISHOPS' PASTORAL LETTER ON THE U.S. ECONOMY

In the richness of this tradition, there now comes the American Catholic Bishops draft Pastoral Letter on the U.S. Economy. It does not come in a economic or moral vacuum. It is a particularized continuum—particularized to this country and to this time.

In 1919, the American Bishops first spoke out on the moral dimensions of economic conditions in the United States. Their message emerged from, and was largely addressed to, a largely immigrant and working class community. The Church then was a "defender of the defenseless, and a voice for the voiceless."

Today, the Church seeks to fulfill the same mission, but in a much different context, and in a much more complicated world. In speaking to American Catholics, the Bishops address a group which has achieved much greater economic security, and is increasingly moving away from its "blue-collar" roots. The question for Catholics, in general, is whether they are tempted, like the people of the biblical Exodus, to forget the powerless they have left behind, to turn their backs on the less fortunate, and dismiss not only their past, but also their traditions.

In addition to Catholics, the Bishops also seek to speak to the entire nation in this letter, and thereby contribute to the debate on economic policy. They say: "Our primary task is to speak to our own community; but our vocation also calls us to address the larger community of this nation."

The Bishops do so at a time of either explicit or implicit challenge to many of the Church's most fundamental tenets of its traditional teachings, both by Catholics, and the society at large.

In response to these societal trends, the Bishops are trying to hold up this country's economic system to the scrutiny of traditional Catholic social teaching, and sound a clarion call to conscience to all those who would listen, whether devout Catholics, "unrepentant secular humanists," or those falling in between.

I don't think it could come at a better time.

The draft letter begins with a simple proposition that "the dignity of the human person, realized in community with others, is the criterion against which all aspects of economic life must be measured."

It goes on to state that "every perspective on economic life that is human, moral and Christian must be shaped by two questions: What does it do for people? What does it do to people?"

In this context, the draft letter directly challenges the American economic and political systems to address the maldistribution of economic wealth and to do a much better job of representing the poor and disadvantaged.

The letter states: "No one can claim the name Christian and at the same time acquiesce in the hunger and homelessness that exists around the world and in our own country. We intend this letter to be an invitation and a challenge ... to those who may be tempted to a narrower perspective."

It is this narrower perspective that is particularly disturbing to me. Over the past few years, interest in economic issues has exploded in this country. It dominates the news media; it dominates debates in the Congress; and it increasingly dominates how people order their lives.

Students get MBAs by the tens of thousands each year, corporate law firms flourish, multi-national organizations expand, and heretofore esoteric subjects such as trade balances, Third World debt, prime rates, and tax write-offs have become the centerpiece of everyday conversations.

But in all of this, we seem to have lost sight of the fundamental fact that economic decisions, policies, and institutions should all be at the service of human beings. The economy was made for people, and not the other way around. It is these disturbing signs of our time that have directed the pastoral concerns of the American Bishops to address the moral aspects of economic activity.

In developing its positions, the Bishops' draft letter lays out three basic principles which should help shape U.S. economic policy:

First, the fulfillment of the basic needs of the poor is of the highest priority;

Second, increased participation for those on the margins of society takes priority over the preservation of privileged concentrations of power, wealth and income; and

Third, meeting human needs and increasing participation should be priority targets in the investment of wealth, talent and human energy.

The Bishops then attempt to apply those principles to four economic issues central to American life: employment; poverty; economic cooperation among business, labor and government; and the United States and the world economy.

With respect to those four issues, the draft letter makes certain value judgments, of which I will posit but a few.

Moral Judgment One: The fact that no less than 15 percent of our nation's population live below the poverty line at a time of unprecedented material well-being is a "social and moral scandal that must not be ignored." In the midst of our euphoria concerning the recent economic recovery, we appear to have ignored the fact that over the past five years, the number of Americans living in poverty has increased by almost 10 million people, rising from 11.7 percent of the population since 1979, to over 15 percent in 1984. This stands in stark contrast to the two decades from 1960 to 1979

when we reduced the number in poverty from 22.2% to 11.7%. The number of children living in poverty has increased by over 50 percent during this time period. We simply cannot accept these consequences as "a cost of doing business." While some might claim that the poor are really better off now than several decades ago, due to programs such as food stamps and Medicaid, the recent trends are clear, and, I repeat, they are morally unacceptable.

Moral Judgment Two: This country should not accept an unemployment rate of over 7 percent, which consigns millions of our people to economic misery and social despair every year. The Bishops letter states that "the most urgent priority for U.S. domestic economic policy is the creation of new jobs with adequate pay and decent working conditions." The moral unacceptability of current unemployment levels becomes vividly clear when we understand that the message delivered to a person looking for a job is: "We don't need your talent, we don't need your initiative, we don't need you." That message is being delivered today to over 8 million Americans.

If every effort were being made to create the jobs required, one might argue that the situation today is the best we can do. But such is not the case. The country is doing far less than it might to generate employment, and it shows no sign of making a full-scale commitment to this goal. Somehow, we have come to accept the notion that massive unemployment in this country is a socially acceptable consequence, if not a necessary condition, of wringing out inflation and moving on to the "high-tech economy" of the future. The Bishops note that toleration of present unemployment rates would have been unthinkable 20 years ago. It should still be regarded as morally and economically unacceptable today.

Moral Judgment Three: It is grossly inequitable that the richest 20 percent of Americans receive more income than the bottom 70 percent combined. In America today, the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. Unequal distribution of income and wealth in the United States has become significantly more pronounced in recent years. The fraction of national income received by the richest 20 percent of the population was lower in 1983 than at any time since statistics began to be collected on this issue in 1947.

The recent poverty trends are even more scandalous. In 1960, 22.2 percent of our people were living in poverty; by 1979 we had reduced that figure to 11.7 percent; but since 1979 it has skyrocketed to 15 percent!

The top 1 percent of families in this country hold almost 20 percent of the net assets; while the bottom 50 percent of American families hold only 4 percent of the country's net assets. These levels of inequalities in the distribution of income and wealth are the greatest of any industrialized country in the world. Simple justice demands that we do better.

Moral Judgment Four: We must do more for the billions of people on this earth who live below any possible definition of a decent life. Half of the world's population live in countries where the per capita annual income is the equivalent of \$400 or less. Almost 500 million people are malnourished or facing starvation. Such examples could be multiplied indefinitely, but they can never adequately portray the tragic disparity between these desperately poor countries in the material wealth of our own country.

The Bishops note that "we can neither understand the problems of the U.S. economy today nor propose plausible solutions to these problems without giving the most serious attention to the links that bind us to the rest of the world." In saying this, the Bishops are doing no more, but no less, than reaffirming the common Brotherhood of Man. As the most powerful nation on earth, we must accept the responsibility that our actions affect those in countries all over the world.

Locked together in a world of limited material resources, we can help or hurt one another by the economic policies we choose. Thus we have to be more responsible than in the past for these choices, because they often adversely affect people who have no opportunity to influence them. When we discuss trade issues in this country, or the impact of Third World debt, we must recognize our obligations to our silent brethren whose names and faces we will never know, but whose lives we touch every day.

RESPONSE

For making these, and many other moral judgments, the Bishops were immediately attacked from a variety of sources as being "well-intentioned, but."

Distinguished businessmen noted that the Bishops were "simply out of their depth," conservative columnists wrote that the Bishops were "cliche-ridden" or "guilty of child-like innocence," and a self-appointed group of prominent conservative lay Catholics attempted "a pre-emptive strike" against the draft letter before it was even issued.

Why was there such a concerted attack against this effort? I believe the answer lies in the state of politics in this country, best exemplified by the national election which had just been completed. The draft letter was withheld until after an election overwhelmingly won by those who ran a campaign on the notion that poverty, unemployment, injustice, and inequality are no longer issues in the forefront of the national consciousness; and that the best way to be elected is to avoid discussing our problems, and, instead, focus exclusively on our successes.

Many conservatives, who had praised the Bishops firm posture on abortion, faulted their latest draft statement on economic justice because it treads on "Caesar's turf." But many others were much less philosophical, and much more blunt.

In the main, opposition to the draft letter came largely from those who advocate policies which try to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy and middle class by slashing programs for the poor; run up dangerous deficits to be settled by future generations; quote slogans such as "a rising tide lifts all boats," while ignoring the fact that millions more of our people—mostly children—have dropped below the poverty line in recent years; believe that people who are in trouble have no one to blame but themselves; and that economic growth is somehow dependent upon the existence of large societal disparities which act as incentives to work, produce, and invest.

The draft letter apparently touches a raw nerve because it insists upon intruding into this make-believe world of political sloganeering and trickle-down economics with the stark reality of 35 million Americans living below the poverty line (with another 25 million just above); 8 million people unemployed (and several million others underemployed); the increasing concentration of income in the hands of the already wealthy;

and record numbers of small business bankruptcies and failures of family farms.

We are often lectured that it is counterproductive, if not actually un-American, to pursue policies designed to distribute wealth fairly. We are given the negative appellation: "Redistributionists." But what is Government, if not a social compact between people designed to maximize the common good? In my opinion, government economic policy should certainly facilitate and promote the creation and expansion of societal wealth, but it must also help achieve the equitable distribution of such wealth throughout the entire society. I have little time for liberals who neglect the importance of the creation of wealth, and even less for conservatives who not only neglect, but deny the appropriateness of a government role in the redistribution of societal wealth. Good government must do both.

The problem with our current policies is not simply that they disregard redistribution, but that they are actually redistributing wealth in the wrong direction.

Reversing this recent trend, as called for by the draft pastoral letter, would, in my opinion, constitute both good economics and good social policy. More importantly, that is precisely the judgment reached by two distinguished Nobel Laureates in Economics—Professor James Tobin of Yale University, and Lawrence Klein of the University of Pennsylvania, when they testified on the Bishops' draft letter a few weeks ago before the House Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization at my invitation.

This is not to imply that the draft pastoral cannot be improved. It can, and undoubtedly, will be. Some of the criticisms such as the length of the letter (55,000 words) and the specificity of many of the solutions need to be addressed. Indeed, the Bishops are certainly not correct in all of their prescriptions—but the most effective ways to implement shared policy goals are always a matter for ongoing debate.

But the Bishops are making the point that, as a first priority, we must be sure that the poor of this country and of the world are part of the debate.

Moreover, it is important that we distinguish between pious claims, and moral action. Simply proclaiming that poverty should be eliminated; that everyone should have a job; and that people should be treated fairly, will do nothing.

The Bishops' draft letter calls upon us to: "... act as individuals, to heal the pain which injustice causes . . . (but we) all have a larger responsibility to remove the causes of injustice . . . This is our responsibility as citizens—a personal responsibility to be exercised through government and the political process."

Let me give you a striking example of how this process is working in the world today. I am proud as an American to see the overwhelming response that our people have made as individuals to the conditions of the starving people in Africa. As a Catholic, I am proud of the work that the Catholic Relief Services are doing not only in Africa, but around the world. But I am ashamed that the United States Government, over the past few years, has been instrumental in substantially reducing assistance to the poor people of the world through such institutions as the World Bank. It is simply morally unacceptable that at a time of such material well-being in the United States, our government has insisted upon reducing its budget deficit on the backs of the poor and defenseless.

The Catholic Bishops' draft Pastoral Letter has set forth a challenging set of moral imperatives and economic objectives. I believe that the American people and their government would do well to rise to the challenge.

The Bishops are undeniably right in calling us forward to a vision of America as a nation of compassion, where our primary commitment is to the common good, and not to seeing the world in terms of "Am I personally better off now than four years ago?"

The Bishops' letter is calling us to a second American Revolution that will be achieved gradually and only with great difficulty, but a far different Revolution than called for in the recent State of the Union address. The Bishops' revolution will require sharing, participating, and cooperating. It is a revolution which would elicit the best from human nature; and would reject the comfortable rationalization and complacent reassurance that competition—social Darwinism—somehow magically transmutes personal greed into social beneficence.

The Bishops are calling us to an opportunity to build a more just society. Past failures and frustrations must not lead us to abandon this goal. Can we not build a public consensus in this country that the common good takes precedence over private gain, that the poor should be fed, clothed and housed as much as the rich should be able to accumulate luxuries?

In sum, the Bishops' draft letter essentially says that this country can do better. At the very least, I think we need to listen . . . and try.

CONCLUSION

In 1960, a book entitled "The Other America" helped to awaken this country to the reality of poverty among us. If the Bishops' letter is taken seriously, then perhaps we won't need a similar book several years from now to shake us out of our lethargy once again.

Over the next few months, the Bishops draft letter will be discussed and debated within the Church. I have attempted, and will continue to attempt, to discuss and debate this issue in Congress. I hope that many of you here tonight will participate in this dialogue wherever possible. In June, the Bishops will release a second draft, and then in November, a third, and final draft, will be voted upon.

Let the debate on this Pastoral Letter become a means of shaking us out of our present lethargy, as others try to lull us into complacency by enveloping us in a cocoon of economic euphoria.

Let us use the time available to us over the next six months, to raise the issues in the Bishops' draft Pastoral Letter on the Economy to the same level of consciousness and discussion that we now experience on abortion and nuclear arms. As I have stated earlier, all three of these issues are interrelated and are part of the same cloth—all three must be woven into a seamless garment of respect and reverence for life. Abortion deals with issues affecting the creation of life, and nuclear arms raise issues concerning the possible end of life on earth. The letter I have spoken about tonight deals with the basic conditions of life as it is lived in this country and throughout the world for almost 5 billion people, day in and day out.

Let me close on a simple note. Niagara University's patron, St. Vincent, lived in 17th century France, the era of Louis XIII and Louis XIV, the "Sun King." Never in

the history of the world had there been such material opulence, and rarely have there been such social disparities. To the outside world, seventeenth century France meant Versailles; but St. Vincent knew better, and worked tirelessly to provide a better life for the poor. The parallels to our time and our conditions are striking.

St. Vincent's life remains a beacon for us as we enter the 21st century. This Convocation on Peace and Justice is testimony that his followers at this University and elsewhere continue to hear the muted cries of the dispossessed, and plan to do something about it.●

THE POLITICS OF PARANOIA IN THE "CONTRA" DEBATE

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Aryeh Neier, vice chairman of Americas Watch, a distinguished and respected human rights monitoring organization, wrote the following in the April 29 New York Times:

A few days before the votes in Congress on President Reagan's plan to aid the Nicaraguan rebels, I testified at a Congressional hearing on their human rights practices. It was an ugly occasion, perhaps the ugliest of the scores of such hearings I have witnessed. It seemed to me to say something about the political climate today and, more troublingly, about the nature of American public life.

Mr. Neier went on to refer to some of the vicious, ad hominem attacks that were made on some of the witnesses by some of the Members in attendance.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this brief article to the attention of the Members because it refers to a hearing of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, which I have the honor to chair. I was personally embarrassed, as I know some other Members were as well, by the rudeness with which some of our colleagues treated witnesses who were appearing at the request of the subcommittee, simply because the views expressed by the witnesses contradicted the policy positions already held by the Members. Unable to attack the veracity of the testimony, these Members attacked the witnesses. They said things about our invited guests that would be ruled out of order if we said them about each other on the floor.

I am disturbed by the loss of civility in our Central America debate. I hope that my colleagues who engage in this behavior will examine their consciences.

The entire article follows:

THE POLITICS OF PARANOIA

(By Aryeh Neier)

A few days before the votes in Congress on President Reagan's plan to aid the Nicaraguan rebels, I testified at a Congressional hearing on their human rights practices. It

was an ugly occasion, perhaps the ugliest of the scores of such hearings I have witnessed. It seemed to me to say something about the political climate today and more troublingly, about the nature of American public life.

Most members of Congress present seemed intent above all on discrediting the witnesses. At one low point, two Congressmen tried to impugn the testimony of a distinguished lawyer by linking his wife's stepbrother to the Sandinistas. What the witness had to say was disregarded.

The hearing struck me as emblematic of much of the debate on the rebels, or "contras." No doubt, the President's overheated rhetoric about the Sandinistas was a factor in poisoning the political atmosphere. Yet it does not seem fair to place all the blame on him. The debate also seems to reflect what the historian Richard Hofstadter described more than two decades ago as "the paranoid style in American politics."

As Mr. Hofstadter pointed out, the practitioners of the paranoid style perceive the enemy as "totally evil and totally unappeasable." In this vein, the Sandinistas have been portrayed as trying to subvert neighboring countries, preparing to wage war against the United States, practicing genocide against their Indian minority and transforming their own country into a "totalitarian dungeon." They are also charged with being anti-Semitic and anti-Pope, driving hordes of "feet people" over the borders of the United States and even trafficking in drugs.

Not that all these things are entirely invented. "What distinguishes the paranoid style," according to Mr. Hofstadter, "is not the absence of verifiable facts (though it is true that in his extravagant passion for facts the paranoid occasionally manufactures them), but rather the curious leap in imagination that is always made at some critical point . . . from the undeniable to the unbelievable."

Mr. Hofstadter noted that a recurring aspect of the paranoid style is the significance that is attached to the renegade from the enemy cause. Certainly, Nicaraguan renegades have recently become celebrated figures in the United States, even though all we generally know about them is that, at some point, they exhibited bad judgment, either when they were allied with the Sandinistas or when they broke with them. Also, Mr. Hofstadter wrote, paranoid movements have "a magnetic attraction for demimintellectuals" of a pedantic bent whose view of events "is far more coherent than the real world, since it leaves no room for mistakes, failures or ambiguities." Among the participants in the debate about the Sandinistas, there is more than one academic become a public figure who would seem to fit that description.

The paranoid, Mr. Hofstadter wrote, "constantly lives at a turning point: it is now or never in organizing resistance to conspiracy. Time is forever just running out." That sense of urgency is difficult to match, which may be why the paranoid style so often prevails in American politics.●

A MODEL FOR CORPORATE
CITIZENSHIP

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, the Upjohn Co. is to be commended for setting a model for corporate citizenship. Last Friday, May 3, 1985, the Kalamazoo-based company announced an act of incredible generosity and public spiritedness.

In celebration of its centennial in 1986, Upjohn is giving \$2 million to the community to develop an advanced math and science center for area high school students and teachers. This innovative project is one of the first of its kind in the Nation.

To further illustrate this act of generosity, I would draw the attention of my colleagues to the following Kalamazoo Gazette editorial applauding the Upjohn Co.'s commitment to the future of the Kalamazoo area.

[From the Kalamazoo Gazette, May 5, 1985]

UPJOHN'S CENTENNIAL GIFT IS
EXTRAORDINARY

The Upjohn Co.'s announcement Friday of a \$2 million gift of a math and science education center is a fine way to kick off Upjohn's centennial celebration in 1986. It underscores the special bond between the international pharmaceutical and chemical giant and the community in which it was founded.

Expected to open in September 1986, in renovated quarters in the Community Education Center ("Old Central") Building, the center will provide accelerated math, science and computer science education for public and private school students from throughout the Kalamazoo Valley Intermediate School District.

There are few similar programs in the country, and even those have key differences. It's expected to be a national model as a partnership between private enterprise and education.

Upjohn officials saw the need for advanced mathematics and science courses in all area school systems and brought their concept of a special center to the Kalamazoo area school officials. School officials, aware of a shortage of highly qualified and trained math and science teachers and the inability of individual districts to fully meet curriculum needs, accepted the concept with enthusiasm.

Moreover, the center operation will be turned over to the schools in a new and welcome blend of cooperation between the various school districts and the teachers unions, under the Kalamazoo Public Schools' administrative umbrella. The gift will provide top-notch facilities and also an endowment to ensure continued operation.

Top students and teachers will be brought together in an advanced technical and research environment equipped to provide instruction well beyond that which any single area high school can offer. The center also will provide area teachers with year-round technical assistance and in-service training, so the benefits will spread even further.

It's an exciting and innovative plan and reflects the positive relationship Upjohn

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

11157

has maintained with its home community over the past century. The \$2 million gift represents a significant contribution even for an international concern with annual sales of \$2.1 billion and net earnings of \$173 million. But the good relationship is not all a one-way street. The area has been hospitable to the company through cooperation in the provision of services and in property tax breaks. The city of Kalamazoo presently is moving into position to grant the company a new property tax break on its proposed downtown research facility that could save Upjohn up to \$1 million a year for up to 12 years.

Still, it would be easy for the Fortune 500 firm, which does business in 150 countries worldwide and owns facilities across the U.S. and internationally, to pay less attention to its own backyard. As Kalamazoo County's largest employer, providing jobs for about 7,800 county residents, Upjohn's impact is hard to measure in full. Property taxes paid by the firm to local cities, townships and school districts amounted to \$11.5 million in 1984, for example. Upjohn officials figure the company's "total economic impact," on the county in 1984, including wages, goods and services procured locally, was some \$441 million.

Over the years, the company has responded to special community problems and needs. There is hardly a facility or good cause that has not benefited from Upjohn support. Last year alone, Upjohn contributed \$1.3 million to local non-profit human service, cultural and civic organizations.

The math and science center is an especially bold and creative venture and we applaud the Upjohn Co. for marking its 100 years as a responsible citizen with the extraordinary gift. ●

THE COMMITTEE OF 21—NEW
SUPPORT FOR SOVIET PRISONERS
OF CONSCIENCE

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today under the sponsorship of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, 21 congressional wives formally launched a new human rights monitoring group focusing on political prisoners in the Soviet Union. The group—"The Committee of 21"—pairs 21 Soviet prisoners of conscience with the same number of congressional wives.

The 21 Soviet Prisoners of Conscience are leaders of the Soviet Refuseniks, Soviet citizens who have been denied the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union. The 21 leaders have been imprisoned by Soviet authorities on charges ranging from "hooliganism" to "anti-Soviet agitation," but the arrests and imprisonment of these individuals is primarily because of their leadership of the Refusenik movement and it is a clear violation of the Helsinki Final Act.

During a trip to the Soviet Union earlier this year, my wife, Annette, was asked by the Refuseniks in Moscow to form a group of congress-

sional wives to monitor the cases of the political prisoners. They were afraid that, with a change in leadership and the possibility that the Soviet Government could again grant a larger number of exit permits, the political prisoners—the Shcharanskys, the Beguns, the Bernsteins—would be forgotten while others were allowed to emigrate. This would be a tragic circumstance, for those political prisoners have suffered the most for the goals of all Refuseniks.

Today at a press conference formally announcing the formation of the Committee of 21, an open letter "to all women of the West" from wives, mothers, fiancées, daughters, and sisters of refuseniks was made public. They told how they "are deprived of the right for happiness, normal life, tranquility and confidence in our children's and our own future." They described how "during the last months of pregnancy, searches are held of our apartments. At these searches the authorities confiscate belongings. * * * It isn't accidental that nearly every woman-refusenik who dares to give birth to a child in such conditions usually suffers from the menace of miscarriage."

Avital Shcharansky—the wife of Anatoly Shcharansky, who is one of the Prisoners of Conscience adopted by the committee—participated in the press conference. She has been separated from her husband now for years, but her commitment and conviction are an inspiration to those who work to see Refuseniks allowed to emigrate.

The Committee of 21 will coordinate efforts with other human rights groups to insure that the West does not forget the courageous men and women who languish in Soviet prisons. Every member of the committee has made the commitment to write to her adopted prisoner of conscience every 6 weeks, as well as writing to Soviet officials. They will also send packages, arrange visits, and carry out other supportive actions of these prisoners of conscience.

The purpose of this committee is not anti-Soviet or intended to be critical of the Soviet Government. In fact, its formation was announced today because of two important events that are taking place at this time.

First, today makes the opening of the Ottawa Conference of government experts on human rights as part of the Helsinki process. It is important that the Soviets observe the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Final Act, which they have already pledged to observe. Any future cooperation with the Soviet Union will be conditioned by Soviet observance of international obligations to which the Soviets have already agreed. If we are to expand cooperation with the Soviet Union, there must be an atmosphere of trust based

upon the presumption that the Soviet Government will observe those agreements.

Second, tomorrow is the 40th anniversary of V-E Day—the anniversary of the Allied victory over Nazi Germany. The key to that victory was the American-Soviet alliance. Together our two countries achieved a most important victory over one of the greatest evils faced by mankind. The purpose today in forming the Committee of 21 with congressional spouses is an effort to help resuscitate the spirit of cooperation which once existed between our two countries.

Mr. Speaker, the 21 congressional spouses with the Refuseniks they have adopted are the following:

1. Delores Beilenson, the wife of Congressman Anthony Beilenson of California—Valery Senderov, a 40-year-old mathematician and resident of Moscow, arrested in June 1982, charged with anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda, and sentenced to 7 years labor camp, 5 years internal exile.

2. Caroline Bonker, the wife of Congressman Don Bonker of Washington—Boris Kanevsky, a 40-year-old mathematician from Moscow, arrested in June 1982, charged with circulation of fabrications known to be false which defame the Soviet state and social system, and sentenced to 5 years internal exile.

3. Sally Dornan, the wife of Congressman Bob Dornan of California—Yuri Federov, a 41-year-old student from Moscow, was arrested in June 1970, charged with treason, anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda, and stealing state property, and sentenced to 15 years in prison.

4. Valerie Frost, the wife of Congressman Martin Frost of Texas—Simon Shnirman, a 27-year-old chemical technician from Kerch, was arrested in January 1983, charged with draft evasion, and sentenced to 3 years in labor camp.

5. Jane Gephardt, the wife of Congressman Richard Gephardt of Missouri—Nadezhda Pradkova, a 37-year-old computer analyst from Leningrad, was arrested in August 1984, charged with "Parasitism", and sentenced to 2 years imprisonment.

6. Rita Gilman, the wife of Congressman Ben Gilman of New York—Feliks Kochubievsky, a 55-year-old electrical engineer from Novosibirsk, was arrested in September 1982, charged with circulation of fabrications known to be false which defame the Soviet state and social system, and sentenced to 2½ years in labor camp.

7. Theresa Heinz, the wife of Senator John Heinz of Pennsylvania—Iosef Bernstein, a 48-year-old engineer from Kiev, was arrested in November 1984, charged with resisting arrest, and sentenced to 4 years imprisonment.

8. Joanne Kemp, the wife of Congressman Jack Kemp of New York—Alexander Cherniak, a 36-year-old construction engineer from Kiev, was tried in March 1984, found guilty of forgery and embezzlement, and sentenced to 4 years imprisonment.

9. Annette Lantos, my own wife—Lev Shefer, a 54-year-old engineer from Sverdlovsk, was arrested in September 1981, charged with anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda, and sentenced to 5 years imprisonment.

10. Kate Lowery, the wife of Congressman Bill Lowery of California—Anatoly Shcharansky, a 37-year-old computer technologist

from Moscow, was arrested in March 1977; charged with treason, anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda; and sentenced to 3 years imprisonment and 10 years in a special regime camp.

11. Kathryn Porter, the wife of Congressman John Porter of Illinois—Zachar Zunshine, a 34-year-old physicist from Riga was arrested in March 1984, charged with circulation of fabrications known to be false which defame the Soviet state, and sentenced to 3 years imprisonment.

12. Landra Reid, the wife of Congressman Harry Reid of Nevada—Aleksandr Yakir, a 29-year-old electrical engineer from Moscow, was arrested in June 1984, charged with draft evasion, and sentenced to 2 years in a labor camp.

13. Nancy Siljander, the wife of Congressman Mark Siljander of Michigan—Stanislav Zubko, a 48-year-old chemist from Kiev, was arrested in May 1981, charged with illegal keeping of arms and illegal possession of drugs, and sentenced to 4 years labor camp.

14. Sheila Smith, the wife of Congressman Larry Smith of Florida—Yuri Tarnopolsky, a 49-year-old chemist from Kharkov, was arrested in March 1983, charged with circulation of fabrication known to be false which defame the Soviet state, and sentenced to 3 years labor camp.

15. Carol Vander Jagt, the wife of Congressman Guy Vander Jagt of Michigan—Yuli Edelshtein, a 26-year-old English teacher from Moscow, was arrested in September 1984, charged with drug possession, and sentenced to 3 years labor camp.

16. Janet Waxman, the wife of Congressman Henry Waxman of California—Mark Ocheretyansky, a 45-year-old construction engineer from Kiev, was arrested in 1983, charged with violation of passport regulations, and sentenced to 1-year labor camp.

17. Carol Williams, the wife of Congressman Pat Williams of Montana—Alexander Kholmiansky, a 35-year-old computer scientist from Moscow, was arrested in July 1984; charged with hooliganism, mailbox tampering, possession of gun ammunition; and sentenced 18 months in labor camp.

18. Wren Wirth, the wife of Congressman Tim Wirth of Colorado—Iosef Begun, a 52-year-old mathematician and Hebrew teacher from Strunino, was arrested for an unprecedented third time in November 1982, charged with anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda, and sentenced to 7 years labor camp and 5 years internal exile.

19. Laurie Wyden, the wife of Congressman Ron Wyden of Oregon—Mark Nepomniashchy, a 54-year-old electrical engineer from Odessa, was arrested in October 1984, charged with circulation of false materials which defame the Soviet state, and sentenced to 3 years labor camp.

20. Millie Yatron, the wife of Congressman Gus Yatron of Pennsylvania—Yakov Levin, a 26-year-old watch technician from Odessa, was arrested in August 1984, charged with circulation of false materials which defame the Soviet state, and sentenced to 3 years labor camp.

21. CeCe Zorinsky, the wife of Senator Edward Zorinsky of Nebraska—Moshe Abramov, a 29-year-old ritual slaughterer from Samarkand, was arrested in December 1983, charged with hooliganism, and sentenced to 3 years imprisonment, which was subsequently modified to "working for the national economy."

Mr. Speaker, this fine committee of congressional spouses will make an important contribution in keeping alive the spirit of the Refuseniks, who have

suffered so much. I am pleased to bring this fine organization to the attention of the Congress. ●

HELP MOROCCO, A FRIEND IN NEED

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the Kingdom of Morocco was one of the first countries in the world to extend diplomatic recognition to the newly independent United States of America in the 1780's. That friendship has deepened over the last two centuries, and today our relationship with Morocco is one of the closest and most important that we enjoy with any country.

Morocco is also a friend in need. Last week's edition of the New Republic has an article that describes the difficulties posed to Morocco by the so-called Polisario Front, yet another so-called liberation movement that in fact has no legitimate claim to the support of anyone in the territory that is ostensibly to be liberated.

The article discusses the specious, even bizarre, nature of the Polisario Front and goes on to present a strong case for maintaining an adequate foreign assistance program for our friend, Morocco. Since Congress seems determined to have a hand in managing our country's relations with Morocco, the New Republic suggests some ideas about how we could best go about it.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New Republic, May 6, 1985]

FRIEND IN NEED

Of all the opera *bouffe* movements for "national liberation" perhaps the most preposterous is the Popular Front for the Liberation of Saquiyya al-Hamra and Rio de Oro. Usually referred to as Polisario, it lays claim to the territory of Morocco that was once the Spanish Sahara. The population of the region, a vast and desolate stretch of desert that contains substantial phosphate deposits, does not exceed 100,000. These souls do not constitute a nation or even a body politic in any meaningful sense of the term. Their struggle is against the elements, a primordial struggle altogether alien to the ideological wars mounted by Algeria (and, in the past, also by Libya) in the name of the indigenous inhabitants.

This, of course, is the key to the conflict: Polisario is a front, but not a front for the Western Saharans, who have neither the time nor the inclination for such politics. It is a front for Algeria, whose ambitions in the area are inversely proportional to the legitimacy of its interests. Not that there aren't any locals enlisted in Polisario; there are the usual sort of restless brigands who, in a time of transition, are drawn to revolutionary dogma and to revolutionary violence. Polisario is heavily armed by the Algerians, who themselves have a long history of animus to the moderate Moroccan mon-

archy. It has taken to shooting up the Spanish fishing fleet off the Saharan coasts and harassing Morocco's soldiers in the desert. It also assassinates, practices sabotage, and tortures. One thing Polisario won't countenance, however, is a referendum. Why not? For the usual reason such "freedom movements" don't want the people to vote: they'd lose. Instead of elections, they've announced a government in exile, which the Organization of African Unity has admitted to its roster as a member state.

In the very difficult political circumstances of the Islamic world, Morocco has been a faithful friend of the United States. It is host, for example, to the largest Voice of America facility in the world. Of course, some of the country's political maneuverings elude understanding. After having prepared the way for the Camp David agreements, King Hassan denounced them. More recently, he has teamed up, at least nominally, with Colonel Ammar al-Qadhafi, the scourge of North Africa. Still, we have a substantial interest in the stability of this pro-Western and moderate Moslem regime only eight miles from Spain. We have acknowledged that interest for some time through economic assistance and military aid, last year to the tune of \$90.7 million and \$44.6 million, respectively. This year the administration has asked for \$88.8 million and \$51.9 million. Some of the money is designed to help Morocco defend itself against Polisario, and that's as it should be.

But there are always a few dreamy congressmen who want us to behave as if the world were a harmonious place. Representative Howard Wolpe of Michigan, chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Foreign Relations Committee, has introduced an amendment to the foreign aid legislation that would prevent U.S. military personnel from training Moroccan soldiers so long as a "conflict between Morocco and the Polisario Front continues in the Western Sahara." Of course, if there were no conflict, Morocco might not need our help. Behind Wolpe's silly language lurks the silly notion that every conflict can be solved through conciliation. But this is precisely the kind of statement that encourages Polisario and its Algerian patrons not to conciliate. Representative Stephen Solarz of New York has introduced an alternative amendment that makes American training in the Western Sahara dependent on "an internationally recognized settlement" of the conflict. It is a distinction without a difference.

Representatives Tom Lantos of California and Gerald Solomon of New York see the situation in North Africa more realistically. They have offered a bipartisan amendment that acknowledges the reasons for our aid: "to support Morocco's legitimate defense needs and to discourage aggression by any country in North Africa against another." One charge no one has made is that Morocco is aggressing against anyone. This is the amendment that should pass. ●

WORDS, WORDS, WORDS

HON. GEO. W. CROCKETT, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the RECORD an article by Anthony Lewis that appeared in the Sunday, May 5, 1985, New York Times.

In his editorial, Mr. Lewis suggests that the Reagan administration tends to rely on inflated rhetoric to help justify foreign policy decisions when it finds that no rational explanations are readily available. The danger of this tendency towards exaggeration is that questions of national interest can hinge more upon Mr. Reagan's choice of words than on consistent principles of foreign policy.

Mr. Lewis points in particular to the administration's recent decision to impose an economic embargo on Nicaragua, a country of 3 million desperately poor people whom the President has described as an "extraordinary" and "unusual" threat to the national security of our Nation. According to Mr. Reagan, the Nicaraguan Government's imposition of "totalitarian internal rule" and carrying out of "aggressive activities in its region" make an embargo necessary to protect our interests.

If we accept these facts, and if we agree that opposition to such activities is one of our foreign policy priorities, how then, as Mr. Lewis asks, can the Reagan administration reconcile its policy of "constructive engagement" with the racist regime in South Africa, which carries out equally "totalitarian" and "aggressive" policies against its own nonwhite population and its neighbors? The Government of South Africa today denies basic civil and political rights to over three-quarters of the population, represses all political opposition, invades, and destabilizes the neighboring states in southern Africa, and defies world opinion by continuing its illegal occupation of Namibia.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read this very important article, and to recognize the grave inconsistencies that lie at the very heart of this administration's foreign policy.

(From the New York Times, May 5, 1985)

WORDS, WORDS, WORDS

(By Anthony Lewis)

There was a time when we expected the President of the United States to use the English language with a certain respect for its meaning and dignity. No more. The degradation of political rhetoric has gone so far that we are numbed. We react not at all when the President uses words as mere instruments of ideology, mocking truth.

How far the process has gone was evident in the Executive Order issued by President Reagan last week to impose an embargo on Nicaragua. "I find," he said, "that the policies and actions of the Government of Nicaragua constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States."

AN EMBARGO BASED ON HYPERBOLE

Stop and think for a moment about those words. Nicaragua is a country of three million people, desperately poor and backward, shattered by a terrible earthquake, riven by a civil war. Can anyone conceivably believe that it presents a "threat" to the United States? An "extraordinary threat"?

What words remain, after such preposterous hyperbole, to describe a situation that would really threaten our national security? That is the trouble with cheapening the coin of language: When everything is urgent, nothing is.

The reaction of our allies to the embargo of Nicaragua is further evidence of what Presidential words have become. If the leading country of the alliance were facing an extraordinary or even a moderately serious threat to its national security, the allies would naturally care. But at the summit conference in Bonn they made clear they did not agree with the embargo—and Secretary of State reported that reaction as if it didn't matter.

Then there are the grounds stated by President Reagan for imposing the embargo. If taken seriously, they would establish an important new principle of American foreign policy: that the United States is prepared to cut off all trade and transportation links with a country that carries out "aggressive activities" in its region, "subverts its neighbors," and imposes "totalitarian internal rule."

Consider, then, the case of Country X. It has illegally occupied a neighboring land for nearly 15 years now, resisting pleas by the United States and most other governments to get out. It has enforced the occupation by Draconian measures, arresting local opponents in large numbers, holding them for years without trial, torturing them.

Country X has also sent its army into another nearby country in recent years. It has supported a terrorist war against still another country. Last year it agreed to stop that war; but the terrorism still has continued.

Internally, over the last 10 years X has stripped eight million of its people of their citizenship. It forbids 73 percent of its people to vote, regardless of their educational or other qualifications, solely because of their race. For 25 years it has imprisoned, tortured, killed and exiled the leaders of the opposition to its totalitarian system.

If President Reagan were serious about the grounds for his embargo on Nicaragua, he would cut off all trade and air links with South Africa. For of course South Africa is Country X. It occupies Namibia. Its army spent years in Angola, raided Lesotho and supported terrorism in Mozambique. Internally, it uses its army and police to enforce a system of state racism that deprives most South Africans of elementary rights.

The Nicaraguan election last fall had its faults. But if anything like it happened in South Africa, it would be regarded as a miracle of freedom—and would surely be so hailed by George Shultz. Imagine a South Africa in which people were allowed to vote regardless of race.

Nobody claims that Nicaragua's Army has invaded another country. The South African Army occupies Namibia and has been in three neighboring countries. By destabilizing activities or political means, South Africa presses the whole region to conform to its views.

South African activities that affront U.S. notions of humanity or respect for frontiers get only plaintive little taps on the wrist from the Reagan Administration. When South Africa arrested leaders of the opposition United Democratic Front this winter on treason charges, the State Department actually issued a statement calling on both the regime and its opponents "to look beyond shortsighted actions and tactical postures."

When the police killed 19 blacks at Uitenhage, President Reagan blamed the victims.

The President's words about Nicaragua, then, express no general foreign policy principle. They represent only an obsessive fear of the Sandinistas. American action designed to limit Nicaraguan connections with the Soviet Union would be understandable. But obsessions do not produce rational results. And words divorced from reason do not increase credibility. ●

H.R. 2410, THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1985

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN], I am pleased to introduce H.R. 2410, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1985. This bill reflects the provisions of H.R. 2251, which was amended and reported favorably by the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment on May 2, 1985. It would reauthorize and revise the health professions educational programs in title VII of the Public Health Service Act.

This legislation should never have been necessary. Last year the work of this subcommittee led to a bill that passed the Congress by an overwhelming, bipartisan vote. But President Reagan pocket-vetoes that legislation, giving the Congress no opportunity to override. H.R. — is essentially identical to the provisions in that vetoed bill.

The President's pocket-veto created chaos among students who do not know if they will have funds to continue, or begin, their professional training. This action has also prevented from taking effect numerous provisions needed to reduce student loan default rates and strengthen collection procedures.

This year the President has again proposed to eliminate the educational assistance programs in title VII.

The administration's rationale for these dramatic proposals is that there is "a steadily increasing supply of health professionals and greatly improved distribution of health care practitioners among medically underserved areas of the country."

That argument draws on the current perception that there is or will soon be a surplus of physicians. The administration, however, ignores the actual purpose of these programs:

Scholarships and subsidized loans are targeted to financially disadvantaged students.

Program support is directed to meet persistent national shortages in primary care, public health and other disciplines, not specialized doctors.

Even with an increase in the total number of physicians, these national needs would go unmet.

Clear national shortages exist in each of these areas. Termination or reduction of Federal support will have numerous disastrous consequences:

Health professional opportunities will be restricted only to the children of wealthy families. Past gains in minority enrollments in the health professions, which already are being reversed, will be lost.

Efforts to meet national needs in primary care, public health and other disciplines will be seriously damaged; faced with rising debts, medical students will prefer more lucrative specialties.

Programs in title VII of the Public Health Service Act include:

First. HEAL insurance for market-rate student loans;

Second. HPSL low-interest student loans;

Third. Scholarships for students of exceptional financial need;

Fourth. Capitation assistance to schools of public health;

Fifth. Support for departments of family medicine;

Sixth. The area health education centers;

Seventh. Support for programs to train physician assistants;

Eighth. Programs and traineeships in general internal medicine, general pediatrics, family medicine, and general dentistry;

Ninth. Assistance for students from disadvantaged backgrounds;

Tenth. Project grant authorities for health professions schools;

Eleventh. Support for schools with advanced financial distress; and

Twelfth. Support for programs and traineeships in health administration, public health and preventive medicine.

This bill would also:

For the first time, set aside 50 percent of new Federal HPSL loan funds for students from disadvantaged backgrounds;

Provide for the improvement of health professional training in geriatrics; and

Substantially strengthen the loan insurance fund and improve collections under the HEAL Program.

We cannot sacrifice such basic needs. These small programs provide critical training necessary for appropriate care of the American people. These programs have enjoyed strong bipartisan support in the past, and I hope that will continue. ●

ERA WINS AWARD AS 1985 SBA PRIME CONTRACTOR OF THE YEAR

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today it is with great pride that I commend Engineering Research Associates [ERA], a northern Virginia firm, for winning the award as the Small Business Administration's 1985 Prime Contractor of the Year.

ERA was founded in 1977 as a high technology organization specializing in computer-based electronic systems. The principal applications of these techniques include: tactical reconnaissance, electronic warfare, and computer-based training systems. During the past year and a half, the company has won two multimillion dollar procurements in competition against some of the country's corporate giants. These procurements are the Air Force's Sentinel Bright Voice Processing Training System and the Navy's Thetis B Program.

ERA is entirely owned by its employees. Since 1978 the firm has experienced a compound growth of approximately 30 percent per year. In 1984, the company's revenues exceeded \$12 million; the company has shown a profit every year since its inception.

ERA's success is a tribute to a free enterprise system which makes it possible for innovation and entrepreneurship to take its place alongside established corporate America in fostering this country's economic growth and national security. Since the award the company has received is such a prestigious one, I am honored to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following names of all ERA employees during the year leading to this award, and offer my personal congratulations to each of them.

EMPLOYEE LIST

Joseph Abell, Edward Alex, Federico Allmusa, William Amon, Jeffery Anderson, Linda Armistead, Paul Arnone, H. Wesley Barnes, Thomas Barkiewicz, Randal Bates, Benjamin Battle, Susan Baumert, Roy Bergeron, Frances Bialek, Deborah Blake, Martin Bondy, Alan Booth, Tahnya Bowser, Lance Boyd, David Brand, William Briotta, Donna Brosmer, Claire Brown, Richard Brown, Elizabeth Butler, Della Calderwood, Marco Caluori, Alice Jo Campbell.

Frank Cangelosi, Dominick Carducci, Xan Clark, Lawrence Clough, Sean Clubb, Jean Collins, Terry Collins, Phyllis Cook-Taylor, Thomas Cooney, Kathleen Cossack, Martin Cury, Vernon Daggett, Timothy Daniel, Kenneth Davidson, Gregory deMilt, John Dickinson, John Dooney, Holly Dorsey, Brian Dutton, Gall Ellingwood, Roena Fenty, Glenn Finney, Thomas Fortier, Terinda Francis, Sarah Freeman, John Gault, Dale Guerkin.

Kenneth Glasser, Christopher Godwin, Lawrence Golding, Sydney Goldlust, Ansel Gould, Cecil Graves, Evelyn Green, David Gurganus, Patricia Hailey, Jay Hallowell, Karen Hanish, Geoffrey Hanson, Kenneth Harden, Edward Henn, James Hitchcock, Denise Hoffman, John Hora, Darlene Howard, Leland Hughes, Julie Jauregui, Donna Jett, Michael Kelly, Robert Kemp, Robert Kettig, Preston Knapp, Martin Koeffel, Monique Kohly, James Krien.

Joseph Krusick, John Kuehn, Kimberly Kunselman, Marilyn Lafferty, Rosemary Lafrance, Cynthia Landon, Sharon Lane, John Lannon, Nina Lansky, Catherine Lapointe, S. Kim Leary, Deborah Lipsey, Peggy Lowe, Linda Mankowski, Leslie Markowitz, Annie Martin, Paul Marvel, Daniel Mattioli, Charles McGee, Alonzo McGuffin, Robert McNally, Carlo Melnick, Susan Mericle, Gregory Michaels, Mary Miller, Laird Moffett, Stephen Moore.

Juan Navarro, David Niccum, David Noble, Thomas Northwood, Judith Novinsky, Elizabeth Oliver, Kristen Page, Joseph Palermio, Bradford Pechacek, Marilyn Peworchik, John Preston, James Putnam, Richard Raines, Bruce Reed, Angela Rickett, Joanna Rinaldi, Deborah Rogers-Stoutenburg, William Roop, Louis Rose, Mary Ellen Rutt, Norman St. Louis, Richard Sandler, John Sciuto, Victor Seller, Julie Setash, William Seward, Rosene Shenk, Margaret Shifflett.

Kathleen Simonini, Leonard Sparks, Catherine Spear, Walter Stein, Mark Stover, David Streit, Richard Sutermeister, Myron Szot, Lance Taggart, Scott Takane, Robert Tamaru, Christina Tancredi, Jimmy Terry, Ron Thomas, Judith Tirpak, Joseph Truelove, Daniel Umphrey, Eileen Voigt, Corbin Ward, Helen Warf, Perry Watts, Vanessa Weaver, Stephen Webb, Paul Weinschel, Lois Wenzell, James Yeargain.●

STOCKMAN SEEMS SIDETRACKED IN HIS CASE AGAINST AMTRAK

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, a sound rail passenger system is indispensable to this Nation's economic infrastructure. As a modern industrial nation, we should be strengthening Amtrak, rather than entertaining proposals which would spell the end of this essential service.

At attempt to reduce the Federal budget by slashing Amtrak's appropriations would rank among the most short-sighted and illusory cuts made by this Congress.

By decimating the Amtrak portion of the Federal budget, we would be cutting bone and muscle, rather than fat.

Tom Wicker has written an incisive article laying out some of the facts and figures behind the Amtrak budget issue.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD:

STOCKMAN SEEMS SIDETRACKED IN HIS CASE AGAINST AMTRAK

(By Tom Wicker)

NEW YORK.—David Stockman, boy genius of the Reagan administration, threw a tantrum the other day before a Senate subcommittee. If senators did not have "the courage, the foresight, the comprehension" to "pull the plug" on what he called an "irre-deemable" Amtrak rail passenger system, he saw little hope for deficit reduction or for avoiding a "whopping tax increase."

There, there, little man. It won't be as bad as all that, if Amtrak survives. Take Elizabeth Dole's word for it.

As secretary of transportation, she affirmed last September that she shared the view of Federal Railroad Administrator John H. Riley that Amtrak had made "great strides" toward "modern, cost-efficient intercity rail passenger service"—running in 1985 "more route miles than it did in 1981 at approximately 28 percent lower funding."

Mrs. Dole, far from sharing young David's hysteria about what he cutely called a "mobile money-burning machine," had asked for a \$765-million Amtrak subsidy for fiscal 1986.

Stockman and President Reagan squawk frequently about a \$35-per-head subsidy that each Amtrak passenger supposedly receives. This prestidigitator requires adding the Amtrak subsidy to the amount that Amtrak business travelers can deduct from their income taxes, and dividing by 20 million passengers; presto! \$35 a head.

Young David is so distraught that he apparently forgets some of the other numbers—surely so brilliant a budget director knows them—he might be expected to crunch. For example:

Sixty-five percent of airline revenues are for business travel; so for each airlines passenger, business travel deductions alone provide a subsidy of \$33. In 1984, moreover, air-traffic control cost the federal government \$2.1 billion, or \$9 for each of 221 million air passengers; so by young David's irrelevant arithmetic, the federal subsidy per air passenger was \$42.

From its ticket revenues—which pay 60 percent of its costs—and subsidy, Amtrak is required to spend \$116 million annually to maintain the Northeast Corridor right-of-way, over which also move the freight trains of Conrail (which earned \$500 million in 1984) and every rail commuter service from Boston to Washington.

If, as young David urges, Congress pulls the plug on Amtrak—a House subcommittee has voted to continue the rail system in operation—the government will have to pay \$2.1 billion in labor-termination costs over the next six years, an obligation inherited from the private railroads; \$3 billion in modern locomotives, equipment, specialized shops and Northeast Corridor plant will be scrapped, with little market for salvage; and about 150,000 jobs in affected business sectors will be jeopardized (25,000 railroad employees will be thrown out of jobs).

But the young genius told the senators that few programs ranked lower than Amtrak "in terms of the good they do, the purpose they serve and the national need." Boyish overstatement again—Amtrak carried 20 million passengers last year, while receiving a smaller federal subsidy (in current dollars) than in 1978; and in the Northeast Corridor 160,000 commuters on various services rode over Amtrak-maintained right-of-way every day.

The Empire State Passengers' Association points out that at least 1,200 people board a

train daily in Albany, N.Y., alone; and asks, pertinently, who—if Amtrak goes—will pay to operate Penn Station for the great tide of commuters from Long Island and New Jersey into and out of New York City? Killing Amtrak also would nullify the two bond issues New Yorkers have voted for high-speed rail service, with \$100 million already invested.

Aside from New York and the Northeast (never high concerns for Reaganites), Amtrak serves 25 American communities (and surrounding regions) that have no air or bus service, 52 more that have no bus service and 94 that have no air service. Almost a million passengers got on or off trains at places without bus service in fiscal 1984.

So young David shouldn't get so wrought up about Amtrak; and returning White House colleagues might calm him with news that the West German government, planning infrastructure investments for the next decade, has decided to put 34 billion marks into its railroads and only 28 billion into its highway network. Now that's a grown-up decision.●

HOUSE CON. RESOLUTION 135

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I voted for House Concurrent Resolution 135, which expressed the sense of the Congress that the President should not visit a cemetery where Nazi Waffen SS were buried. I also was one of dozens of Congressmen who signed a letter to the President making the same point, and encouraging him to visit the site of Nazi concentration camp. In addition to these efforts, I personally called the White House to speak with the President's advisers to counsel against the published itinerary and also signed a letter to Chancellor Helmut Kohl requesting that he release President Reagan from his promise to visit Bitburg Cemetery. I also expressed the hope that if the President decided to go ahead with his scheduled visit he would, using his gift of communication, be able to put the visit in a clear and positive perspective.

I believe that the President was able to accomplish just that and Mr. Speaker I'd like to submit a copy of President Reagan's moving Bitburg speech into the RECORD. The speech was a classic:

I have just come from the cemetery where German war dead lay at rest. No one could visit here without deep and conflicting emotions. I felt great sadness that history could be filled with such waste, destruction, and evil. But my heart was also lifted by the knowledge that from the ashes has come hope, and that from the terrors of the past we have built 40 years of peace and freedom—and reconciliation among our nations.

This visit has stirred many emotions in the American and German people, too. I have received many letters since first decid-

ing to come to Bitburg Cemetery, some supportive, others deeply concerned and questioning, others opposed. Some old wounds have been reopened, and this I regret very much, because this should be a time of healing. To the veterans and families of American servicemen who still carry the scars and feel the painful losses of that war, our gesture of reconciliation with the German people today in no way minimizes our love and honor for those who fought and died for our country. They gave their lives to rescue freedom in its darkest hour. The alliance of democratic nations that guards the freedom of millions in Europe and America today stands as living testimony that their noble sacrifice was not in vain.

No, their sacrifice was not in vain. I have to tell you that nothing will ever fill me with greater hope than the sight of two former war heroes who met today at the Bitburg ceremony, each among the bravest of the brave, each an enemy of the other 40 years ago, each a witness to the horrors of war. But today they came together, American and German, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway and Gen. Johanner Steinhoff, reconciled and united for freedom, they reached over the graves to one another like brothers and grasped their hands in peace.

To the survivors of the Holocaust: Your terrible suffering has made you ever vigilant against evil. Many of you are worried that reconciliation means forgetting. I promise you, we will never forget. I have just come this morning from Bergen-Belsen, where the horror of that terrible crime, the Holocaust, was forever burned upon my memory. No, we will never forget, and we say with the victims of that Holocaust: "Never again."

The war against one man's totalitarian dictatorship was not like other wars. The evil world of Nazism turned all values upside down. Nevertheless, we can mourn the German war dead today as human beings, crushed by a vicious ideology.

There are over 2,000 buried in Bitburg Cemetery. Among them are 48 members of the SS. The crimes of the SS must rank among the most heinous in human history. But others buried there were simply soldiers in the German army. How many were fanatical followers of a dictator and willfully carried out his cruel orders? And how many were conscripts, forced into service during the death throes of the Nazi war machine? We do not know. Many, however, we know from the dates on their tombstones, were only teenagers at the time. There is one boy buried there who died a week before his 16th birthday.

There were thousands of such soldiers to whom Nazism meant no more than a brutal end to a short life. We do not believe in collective guilt. Only God can look into the human heart. All these men have met their Supreme Judge, and they have been judged by Him, as we shall all be judged.

Our duty today is to mourn the human wreckage of totalitarianism, and today, in Bitburg Cemetery, we commemorated the potential good and humanity that was consumed back then, 40 years ago. Perhaps if that 15-year-old soldier had lived, he would have joined his fellow countrymen in building this new democratic Federal Republic of Germany devoted to human dignity and the defense of freedom that we celebrate today. Or perhaps his children or his grandchildren might be among you here today at the Bitburg Air Base, where new generations of Germans and Americans join together in friendship and common cause, dedicating

their lives to preserving peace and guarding the security of the free world.

Too often in the past, each war only planted the seeds of the next. We celebrate today the reconciliation between our two nations that has liberated us from that cycle of destruction. Look at what together we have accomplished. We who were enemies are now friends. We who were bitter adversaries are now the strongest of allies. In the place of fear we have sown trust, and out of the ruins of war has blossomed an enduring peace. Tens of thousands of Americans have served in this town over the years. As the mayor of Bitburg has said, in that time there have been some 6,000 marriages between Germans and Americans, and many thousands of children have come from these unions. This is the real symbol of our future together, a future to be filled with hope, friendship, and freedom.

The hope we see now could sometimes even be glimpsed in the darkest days of the war. I'm thinking of one special story—that of a mother and her young son living alone in a modest cottage in the middle of the woods. One night as the Battle of the Bulge exploded not far away, three young American soldiers arrived at their door—standing in the snow, lost behind enemy lines. All were frostbitten; one was badly wounded. Even though sheltering the enemy was punishable by death, she took them in and made them a supper with some of her last food.

And then, they heard another knock at the door. This time four German soldiers stood there. The woman was afraid, but she quickly said with a firm voice, "There will be no shooting here." She made all the soldiers lay down their weapons, and they all joined in the makeshift meal. Heinz and Willi, it turned out, were only 16. The corporal was the oldest at 23. Their natural suspicion dissolved in the warmth and comfort of the cottage. One of the Germans, a former medical student, tended the wounded American.

Now, listen to the rest of the story through the eyes of one who was there, now a grown man, but that young lad that had been her son. He said, "Then mother said grace. I noticed that there were tears in her eyes as she said the old, familiar words, 'Komm, Herr Jesus. Be our guest.' And as I looked around the table, I saw tears, too, in the eyes of the battle-weary soldiers, boys again, some from America, some from Germany, all far from home."

That night—as the storm of war tossed the world—they had their own private armistice. The next morning the German corporal showed the Americans how to get back behind their own lines. They all shook hands and went their separate ways. That happened to be Christmas Day, 40 years ago.

Those boys reconciled briefly in the midst of war. Surely, we allies in peacetime should honor the reconciliation of the last 40 years.

To the people of Bitburg, our hosts and the hosts of our servicemen: Like that generous woman 40 years ago, you make us feel very welcome. Vielen Dank [Thank you].

And to the men and women of Bitburg Air Base, I just want to say that we know that, even with such wonderful hosts, you job is not an easy one. You serve around the clock, far from home, always ready to defend freedom. We are grateful, and we're very proud of you.

Four decades ago, we waged a great war to lift the darkness of evil from the world, to let men and women in this country and in

every country live in the sunshine of liberty. Our victory was great, and the Federal Republic, Italy, and Japan are now in the community of free nations. But the struggle for freedom is not complete, for today much of the world is still cast in totalitarian darkness.

Twenty-two years ago, President John F. Kennedy went to the Berlin Wall and proclaimed that he, too, was a Berliner. Today, freedom-loving people around the world must say: I am a Berliner, I am a Jew in a world still threatened by anti-Semitism, I am an Afghan, and I am a prisoner of the Gulag, I am a refugee in a crowded boat foundering off the coast of Vietnam, I am a Laotian, a Cambodian, a Cuban, and a Misquito Indian in Nicaragua. I, too, am a potential victim of totalitarianism.

The one lesson of World War II, the lesson of Nazism, is that freedom must always be stronger than totalitarianism, and that good must always be stronger than evil. The moral measure of our two nations will be found in the resolve we show to preserve liberty, to protect life, and to honor and cherish all God's children.

That is why the free, democratic Federal Republic of Germany is such a profound and hopeful testament to the human spirit. We cannot undo the crimes and wars of yesterday, nor call the millions back to life. But we can give meaning to the past by learning its lessons and making a better future. We can let our pain drive us to greater efforts to heal humanity's suffering.

Today I traveled 220 miles from Bergen-Belsen and, I feel, 40 years in time. With the lessons of the past firmly in our minds, we have turned a new, brighter page in history. One of the many who wrote me about this visit was a young woman who had recently been bar mitzvahed. She urged me to lay the wreath at Bitburg Cemetery in honor of the future of Germany, and that is what we have done. On this 40th anniversary of World War II, we mark the day when the hate, the evil, and the obscenities ended, and we commemorate the rekindling of the democratic spirit in Germany.

There is much to make us hopeful on this historic anniversary. One of the symbols of that hope came a little while ago when we heard a German band playing the American national anthem, and an American band playing the German national anthem. While much of the world still huddles in the darkness of oppression, we can see a new dawn of freedom sweeping the globe. And we can see—in the new democracies of Latin America, in the new economic freedoms and prosperity in Asia, in the slow movement toward peace in the Middle East, and in the strengthening alliance of democratic nations in Europe and America—that the light from that dawn is growing stronger.

Together let us gather in that light, and walk out of the shadow. Let us live in peace. Thank you, and God bless you all. ●

A TRIBUTE TO SARAH
McCLENDON

HON. E de la GARZA
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 22, the University of Missouri School of Journalism paid a

deserved and, I believe overdue, tribute to one of this Nation's most effective journalists, Sarah McClendon.

On the concluding day of its Annual Journalism Week Program at Columbia, MO, the school presented its annual honor medals to seven outstanding leaders in their fields. One of the 1985 Missouri honor medals was presented Monday evening to Mrs. McClendon.

I should point out to the House that these medals, coming from one of the Nation's leading institutions in the field of journalism education, are marks of great distinction. They are awarded only to men and women who have made great and lasting contributions to the field in which they work and to the people they serve.

Sarah McClendon, a correspondent who is familiar to many of us in this House because of her long experience in covering Washington, is a native of my State of Texas—and as a Texan, I am proud to salute her. She is also a graduate of the institution which honored her. One of a number of Missouri journalism graduates who have compiled distinguished records here in Washington as well as many other parts of the Nation and the world.

The Missouri medal winners are not cited for one specific story or article. This is a prize given on the basis of contributions to journalism over many years of dedicated service.

In Sarah McClendon's case, this award was based on her record of enterprise and independence in coverage of national and regional news over her years in the Capital—for her courage in asking the hard questions that had to be asked for the sake of her readers in Texas and elsewhere—and for her skill and diligence in digging out the news that matters from the White House, the Congress, and the rest of the Washington scene. And beyond that, I believe Sarah McClendon was also being honored for her determined and continuing work over many years to fight for the rights of women in journalism—a fight that has produced some impressive results.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add my congratulations to Sarah McClendon for this latest public evidence of the high regard in which she and her work are held. But I also want to congratulate the University of Missouri's Journalism School for having the perception to know a distinguished journalist when it sees one. ●

THE ASBESTOS HYSTERIA

HON. WAYNE DOWDY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, much at-

tention has been focused on the problems of asbestos in our Nation's schools. There has been grave concern over the potential health risk to children in schools because of asbestos-containing materials.

It is ironic that asbestos, once specified by building codes, architects, and engineers to protect and save lives from fire, has become a source of anxiety for parents, students, and educators.

It is important that we determine under what conditions asbestos-containing materials pose a significant health risk and how we can best eliminate that risk.

Caution must be exercised in our efforts, because indications are that improper removal can cause relatively high exposures to workers and can leave a residual asbestos concentration in a building that is higher than it was before removal.

The Detroit News recently ran an excellent four-part series on asbestos during the week of March 3 of this year which I hope that all my colleagues will take a moment to read. Because of the length of the article, I have instead submitted the following editorial from the Detroit News for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Environmental Protection Agency long ago should have set a national air monitoring standard for asbestos in schools. Individual States are now beginning to set State standards because our Federal agency has not moved forward. EPA should begin at once its procedure for setting air monitoring standards.

[From the Detroit News, Mar. 7, 1985]

THE ASBESTOS HYSTERIA

Special writer Michael J. Bennett's four-part series on the asbestos dilemma, which ended yesterday, revealed a host of disturbing facts about the way the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is handling the asbestos issue. The asbestos commonly used in school buildings, for example, may not be nearly as dangerous to health as has been alleged. Even if it were, the current hysterical rush to remove it could do more harm than good. We believe Mr. Bennett also raised serious questions of whether science has been twisted to serve political ends.

The EPA ruled three years ago that asbestos posed a serious health hazard, and that school buildings should be inspected for its presence. Asbestos was widely used for a time after World War II as insulation for pipes and to make decorative ceilings. If material that crumbles is found, school boards must notify parents and staff, and then decide on what, if anything, to do about it.

Asbestos in school buildings became a major national issue when the Service Employees International Union got its hands on studies by Dr. Irving J. Selikoff of New York City's Mt. Sinai Hospital. Dr. Selikoff was tracking a high incidence of lung cancer among World War II shipyard workers who installed asbestos as an insulation material. The union that represents school custodians demanded asbestos rules from the EPA, ostensibly to protect members' health. (A major removal program may also provide lu-

crative job opportunities for contractors and unions, it's worth noting.)

The EPA should have recognized early on that there was something imperfect about the Selikoff studies. Other scientists said that the shipyard workers utilized red and blue asbestos, not the white variety used by the building trades. It is true that red and blue asbestos fibers lodge in the lungs and may cause cancer 20 or 30 years later, but it is also true that the lungs seem to easily expel white asbestos fibers.

Further, more than 80 percent of the shipyard cancer victims were heavy smokers, and their lung X-rays show the same lesions that would be on the lungs of heavy smokers. Dr. Selikoff himself has sharply reduced his own estimates of the potential hazards of white asbestos. First, the Quebec government studied the health of women in two asbestos-milling towns, where air and water are laden with white asbestos fibers, and found no link to cancer. Further, some EPA officials have said consistently that it is impossible to write an air quality rule on asbestos that makes any sense because the scientific knowledge about these fibers is so uncertain.

The EPA subjected its studies to the peer review of four scientists who all treated them harshly. They questioned the methodology, and said some of the scientific premises were wrong. In academe, harsh peer review is enough to kill such studies. Nevertheless, the EPA, eager to avoid the wrath of environmental extremists and opportunistic politicians, ordered a school inspection program.

By leaving it to individual school districts, EPA would get political credit for "doing something" but would avoid the sticky question of who should finance an expensive cleanup. Washington offers grants and loan guarantees totaling \$50 million for asbestos removal, but the total cost could be many times that amount. In Michigan alone, the cost would be \$73 million, it's estimated.

New evidence shows that the best thing to do about asbestos is leave it alone if it is not flaking off, or encase damaged areas with plastic paint or other covering. Complete removal coats shelves, furniture, floors, ceilings, hot air pipes, and everything else with the very fibers the program was intended to contain. Removal is therefore a self-defeating option at a cost no school board can afford.

Reporter Bennett made some telling additional points that go to the heart of the whole environmental debate in this country. Environmental extremism is difficult to defend against because scientists can't prove a negative—they can't prove that cancer or other risks from any given substances don't exist. So irresponsible extremists can always play on the fears of risks that might exist.

The asbestos case also rests on the "one fiber can kill" argument. That is, no amount of asbestos can be allowed in the environment, because as little as one fiber supposedly can make the body go haywire. This can't be proved (or disproved), but for extremists seeking to impose their values on society it has the virtue of forestalling attempts to weigh risks versus benefits. As Mr. Bennett pointed out, environmental activism exists not to be satisfied, at least on environmental concerns. Many who profess environmental concerns actually are pursuing larger political goals—to remake society along the lines they prefer. Asbestos is a classic example of the strategy. In that it seeks to use parental hysteria over the

safety of children, however, it is all the more reprehensible.

The series most important contribution was to point out that many supposedly "objective" scientists have willingly lent their prestige to the asbestos scare without careful consideration of the evidence. We suspect it's not the first time that has happened. This sort of abuse, if unchecked, will wind up creating great public skepticism about science and cost society dearly. The EPA should review the evidence impartially, and state and local officials should put a hold on crash programs to remove asbestos until a clearer picture of the risks and benefits emerges. ●

NATIONAL PARKS AND ACID RAIN

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, while much has been said and written about acid rain, the body of information to date on the subject has tended to focus on the Eastern United States. Recently, the World Resources Institute [WRI], a nonprofit policy research center, published a report describing acidic deposition in the West. The report entitled "The American West's Acid Rain Test" was the result of over 18 months of research on the characteristics relevant to acid deposition in the Western United States.

The risk of damage to various Western ecosystems is only now becoming apparent as research information has become more readily available. Under language I coauthored to the Energy Security Act of 1980, a national monitoring system for acid deposition was established. This research effort, the National Acid Precipitation Assessment Program [NAPAP], is expanding the base of information available on acid deposition. Under this program, the Western United States, for the first time, has come under close review.

Those Western monitoring sites are now beginning to report data needed to analyze the potential risk of acid rain to the West. What this data and analyses are pointing to is that the geophysical characteristics of the Western United States make potential for damage from acid rain different from what is being experienced in the Eastern United States. The WRI report notes that the soil characteristics, precipitation patterns, and geological characteristics differ greatly in the West from the East. In certain instances, these characteristics increase the potential acid rain risk; in other instances, the risk is lessened. The WRI report notes that much of the precipitation in the Western United States is in the form of snow. The report noted that studies have revealed that as much as half the acids

in snowpacks can be released in the first 10 percent of melt, creating "acid pulses" that can severely harm sensitive aquatic systems. Even within a given area the potential danger can differ. According to the WRI, indications are that acidic deposition occurs at high elevation because the concentrations of acids exceed those of natural alkaline materials. It goes on to note that at lower elevations, deposition is less acidic because relatively more acid is neutralized.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, I am interested in the acid deposition data being developed in the West because many of the monitoring sites are at or near national park units. Already, collected data has raised some disturbing developments that affect national park units. The WRI report notes that episodes of temporary complete acidification of portions of lakes have been observed in the West. Such was the case at Emerald Lake in Sequoia National Park. The report goes on to note the risk of surface water acidification at 11 national park units located in high mountainous regions. High ozone levels have been documented at Yosemite and Sequoia National Parks. In the Southwest, important archaeological ruins—sandstone formations—at the Mesa Verde National Park are vulnerable to acid damage.

Based on the reports of air quality problems experienced at national park units around the country, the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation has scheduled oversight hearings for May 20 and 21, 1985, on air quality in the parks. We will be interested in further exploring some of the points of concern raised by the WRI report, as well as the air quality problems the national parks in other regions are facing.

Our national park units, so often referred to as our "crown jewels," represent a great resource to the people of the United States. Many of us are renewed and refreshed as we admire the wonder and beauty of these resources. Threats to these resources, be it from air and water pollution or development, must be addressed in a responsible manner if we are to pass on to future generations the majestic legacy of our National Park System. ●

INTRODUCING BY REQUEST THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL TO REAUTHORIZE THE RAILROAD SAFETY PROGRAM

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, by request, the Presi-

dent's proposal to reauthorize the Federal Railroad Safety Act.

This bill authorizes \$27.267 million in fiscal year 1986 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1987 for the Rail Safety Program. Authorizations are not included in the bill for either the State Participation Program or for research and development activities.

The bill also includes a technical amendment to the Federal Railroad Safety Act. Under section 208 of the act, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to issue subpoenas and require the production of documents. However, there is no specific provision for the enforcement of subpoenas and orders in court. The technical amendment would clarify that the Federal district courts have jurisdiction to enforce such subpoenas and orders.

I strongly support the reauthorization of the Federal Railroad Safety Program, and recognize that the safety of rail operations in this Nation is essential to vital passenger transportation services and efficient freight transportation. In recent years, the safety of railroad operations has greatly improved. This improvement has been accomplished in large part through cooperative efforts of both rail labor and management, along with the guidance of the Federal Railroad Administration.

The Energy and Commerce Committee is scheduled to consider legislation concerning reauthorization of the Federal Railroad Safety Program this week. Therefore, I feel that it is important that this bill be introduced so that my colleagues will have the benefit of the administration's position on this issue. ●

JUDGE WILLIAM HENRY HYER RETIREES

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most honorable of professions in our land today is the practice of law. Upholding the will of the people of our great Nation is not an easy task. In this field of checks and balances, constant questioning, and varied interpretations, it is only the most honorable and professional individuals who come to light as men of great deeds. Such a man is William Henry Hyer, bankruptcy judge of the Central District of California.

After a law career that spanned nearly four decades, Judge Hyer will retire on May 31, 1985. His absence from the bench will not go unnoticed.

William Henry Hyer was born in Olathe, KS, on December 3, 1920. Education was very important to young

Hyer. He attended the University of Kansas where he became a life loyal member of Sigma Chi Fraternity. After graduating with a B.S.B. degree in 1942, Hyer joined the U.S. Air Force as an aviation cadet, and served valiantly for 4 years, attaining the rank of staff sergeant.

Again thinking of his education, William Hyer enrolled in the University of California in 1946. He was graduated 2 years later with a juris doctor degree. San Bernardino, CA, was the site of Hyer's first law practice, which he set up in 1949. He served as a legal officer in Civil Affairs Army Reserve Unit, San Bernardino, after being commissioned a first lieutenant in military intelligence.

On February 15, 1964, Judge Hyer was appointed bankruptcy judge for the Southern District of California, now known as the Central District. After his appointment, Hyer's caseload increased steadily, necessitating additional staff and three office moves. Judge Hyer now holds court in San Bernardino, the city where he first chose to practice law.

Judge Hyer is a man of many talents and varied interests. His love for his fellow man is evident in his participation in community events. It is no wonder he is so well respected by the citizens of southern California and admired by his colleagues. Bankruptcy Judge Hyer and his wife, Phyllis Ruth Graeber, have raised two children: a son, William Henry IV and a daughter, Hallie Ann.

After retiring at the end of this month, Hyer intends to keep active. His plans include traveling to visit his friends and family across the United States, improving his golf game, hunting, and fishing.

Mr. Speaker, once again I am proud to represent such an outstanding human being. I ask you and my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join with me in expressing deep appreciation for selfless years of service, strong admiration for an impressive career, and best wishes for a happy and healthy retirement to Judge William Henry Hyer—a remarkable man whose service to his community, his State, and the Nation will stand for years to come as a symbol of the best that each of us can be. ●

IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE JOINT
RESOLUTION 192

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues two editorials concerning House Joint Resolution 192 which would recognize April 24, 1986,

as National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man and commemorate the Armenian genocide which recently appeared in the New York Times. They both concisely argue the importance of this resolution and urge its passage.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 27, 1985]

THE ARMENIAN DEAD

(By Florence Avakian)

This week marks the 70th anniversary of the 20th century's first act of genocide: the massacre of 1.5 million Armenians by Ottoman Turkey. Even today, Turkey has never admitted its guilt. Why must the United States connive at that ugly denial?

In 1923, when the genocide ended, almost one-half of the world's Armenian population had been slaughtered on its ancestral land, which it had inhabited for more than 3,000 years.

Using language reminiscent of his remarks about West Germany and the Nazi Holocaust, President Reagan, in not wanting "to harm relations with an important ally," opposes a pending Congressional resolution memorializing the Armenian martyrs. And in 1983, he said of the 1915-1923 genocide, "There's virtually no one alive today who was living" at that time. Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger has spoken of the "so-called Armenian genocide resolution."

How painful this is not only for the thousands of survivors still alive worldwide but also for the overwhelming majority of Armenian-Americans who for decades have sought peaceful means to redress their grievances and who deplore today's violence by a few young Armenians who, frustrated by years of denials and distortions, are assassinating Turkish officials.

Reagan Administration waffling on Turkish genocide ignores mountains of objective testimony, eyewitness accounts and documents from non-Armenian diplomats, missionaries, journalists and historians, as well as American officials—all authenticating the premeditated, systematic annihilation of a people.

Henry Morgenthau Sr., Ambassador to Turkey from 1913 to 1916, wrote of "sadistic orgies" and "race extermination" in his frantic cables to Washington. Maj. Gen. James Harbord, upon returning from the Armenian areas in 1919, called it the "most colossal crime of all ages." Thirty years later, Rafael Lemkin, deeply removed by the Armenian tragedy as well as the Nazi Holocaust, coined the word "genocide"—a term Hitler put into practice after he chillingly commented, "Who today remembers the extermination of the Armenians?"

It was on April 24, 1915, that the carnage began, after an edict by Interior Minister Talaat Pasha to "destroy completely all Armenians living in Turkey." Community leaders were hanged and all Armenian males were taken away and bludgeoned to death. Women, children and the elderly were rounded up in all towns and villages and marched hundreds of miles to the sun-scorched deserts of Syria. Few made it. Those surviving starvation or thirst were raped, disemboweled, drowned, buried alive or hauled into harems. Women's breasts were cut off and babies were speared; mothers, clutching their children, threw themselves into rivers. The waters ran red.

To help the human wrecks of this mass murder, in 1919 Congress, with State Department cooperation, aided Near East Relief, an American organization.

I know why Turkey denies the genocide. But how can we explain why there are only some 35,000 Armenians now left in Turkey out of a pre-1915 population of more than two million? And why does Turkey now find it necessary to systematically destroy all traces of Armenian culture—monuments, churches, artifacts—in its eastern provinces?

As an Armenian born in this country, I understand why the Administration and the State Department want Turkey's support for strategic reasons, even if this means propping up a despotic regime to the tune of almost \$900 million for fiscal year 1985 alone.

But what is hard to understand is why a great democracy would immorally lend its influence to Turkish propaganda. Over the years, would Presidents from Woodrow Wilson to Jimmy Carter—even Ronald Reagan, in a 1981 proclamation—hundreds of members of Congress, and international diplomats, have paid tribute to martyrs of a "so-called" or "alleged" genocide?

A Congressional resolution that remembers the Armenian victims is a resounding statement to peoples all over the world that America wishes to go on record not only against genocide but also to champion the foremost human right—that of life itself.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 29, 1985]

THE SORROWS OF ARMENIA

Americans with their scant sense of history must be mystified by the resurgence of Armenians' anger about an atrocity that occurred 70 years ago. Impermissibly, that anger has recently been invoked by terrorists to justify the murder of Turkish diplomats. But fittingly, it also moved Armenians the world over to memorial observances last week. They plead that Turkey at least acknowledge the massacres of their ancestors and that the State Department remove the word "alleged" from its references to the 1915 slaughter.

Turkey's indignant rejoinder has been that acknowledging any official guilt for such remote events would only reward terrorism. But that is not a cogent reason.

What did happen in 1915? Armenians assert that two million of their forebears were killed or driven into exile by the Ottoman regime in an attempt to liquidate a long-persecuted Christian minority. They cite firsthand accounts by American and German diplomats, contemporary press reports, the regime's own records and the testimony of survivors.

They are disputed by Turks on every point. Turks maintain that an advancing Russian Army was inciting rebellion among Armenians, requiring their resettlement. Turkish diplomats single out as objective the scholarly history of Sanford and Ezel Kural Shaw, who give this appraisal:

"Armenians, claim that as many as 2 million were massacred, but no counts of the dead were ever taken, and the actual total can only be inferred. These claims are based on the supposition that the prewar Armenian population of the Empire was 2.5 million. According to the Ottoman census of 1914, however, it was at most 1.3 million. Half of these people lived in the areas affected by the deportation, but . . . it appears that about 400,000 people were actually transported in 1915-16. In addition, some 700,000 Armenians fled to the Caucasus, western Europe and the United States. As 100,000 remained in Turkey after the war, one can conclude that about 300,000 died if one accepts the Ottoman census reports, or 1.3

million if the Armenian figures are utilized."

So scholars trusted by Turks put the minimum toll at 300,000. Why then should the State Department call the massacres "alleged"? The official excuse that the numbers are in dispute is obviously not the reason. Turkey is an important ally. Indeed, Defense Secretary Weinberger has even pleaded with Congress not to strain relations by designating April 24 as a day of remembrance for Armenian victims. Armenia's sorrows deserve better than that.●

BILLS INTRODUCED TO IMPROVE SAFETY AND CAPACITY ON TWO WASHINGTON, DC AREA BRIDGES

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation calling for studies on the feasibility of improving the safety, capacity, and operational characteristics of two bridges connecting northern Virginia and Washington, DC—the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge and the Rochambeau Bridge, also known as the 14th Street Bridge.

More specifically, one bill would call for the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a feasibility study of adding two lanes to the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge between the Commonwealth of Virginia and the District of Columbia. The other bill would involve the study of improving the interchange between the George Washington Memorial Parkway and I-395 in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Recent repair work initiated by the National Park Service on Memorial Bridge has once again focused attention on the limited ability of the spans across the Potomac River to handle the normal daily load of traffic.

Unfortunately, even when all the bridges are operating at full capacity, there is a serious congestion problem. It is my belief that improvements can be made on all the Potomac bridges, and I have initiated discussion with the District of Columbia, Virginia, and Federal officials to find workable solutions. Two possibilities have emerged, one short-term on the 14th Street Bridge, and one long-term on the Roosevelt Bridge.

The short-term solution would be to redirect DC-bound George Washington Memorial Parkway traffic from the 14th Street Bridge northbound span to the center span now reserved for high occupancy vehicle traffic. This would remove the dangerous merge that now exists from the GW Parkway to northbound I-395, and could be accomplished swiftly through the construction of a new ramp at relatively low cost.

The long-term solution involves extensive redecking of the Roosevelt

Bridge to accommodate an additional lane in each direction. It is my belief that this solution, which would help smooth out traffic flow to and from Washington, DC, on three major northern Virginia commuter arteries—I-66, U.S. Route 50, and the GW Parkway—warrants consideration.

These major improvements are crucial in this area for those who travel these routes daily and for those who may be visitors and tourists of the Nation's Capital area. I urge the support of my colleagues for these two important projects.●

EXTENSION OF TAX-FREE ROLL-OVER PERIOD

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today the introduction of a bill to extend the time period for tax-free rollovers of qualified retirement plans from 60 to 90 days. The last Congress rectified a defect in the law by requiring notification of the availability of tax-free rollovers upon distribution of retirement plan funds. It is my hope that this Congress will complete the process.

This bill will lend uniformity to the law. Currently, warranties are for 90 days. One has 90 days to respond to a suit. I believe there should also be 90 days to roll over retirement funds.

There has been a great proliferation of investment vehicles for retirement funds, which has presented people with a wide—and sometimes confusing—array of choices. Special care must be exercised when investing these funds, and for many people, 60 days is not an adequate period of time to compare all methods available in order to meet one's retirement needs. Any mistakes are compounded by time, possibly subjecting the retiree to dependence on the Government for assistance. Thus, 90 days is both the logical and needed period of time to facilitate this process.

According to the IRS, many people have been put at a financial disadvantage due to too short a rollover period and a lack of knowledge as to the availability of this provision. This bill completes the reversal of that. It is my hope that my colleagues will join me in this effort and ensure the bill's swift enactment.●

INDIAN COUNTRY GAMBLING REGULATION ACT

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, when I introduced the Indian Country Gambling Regulation Act last October, nearly 80 Indian tribes nationwide were, in the absence of Federal gambling regulations, operating high stakes bingo parlors on their reservations and rancherias. Since that time, the problems which accompany unregulated gambling have proliferated at an alarming rate in Indian country. As trustees for the Indians, Congress should take immediate remedial action to bring order to this chaos.

Indian bingo is an activity which has grown in popularity since the 1981 Seminole Tribe ruling in Florida that Indian gambling is outside the legal jurisdiction of State law. This decision was based upon the Indians' unique position within the Federal system, for while possessing certain governmental powers, they are neither States nor foreign nations, nor completely sovereign. They are instead partially sovereign, and though reservations are located within State boundaries, tribes are generally not considered subject to State or local authority.

In California, the State attorney general reports that the effect of non-regulated, high-stakes gambling is posing serious problems which threaten the peace and safety of the State. Specific incidents of Mafia-backed gaming operators, and establishment of other forms of gambling under the guise of bingo, that is, bingo jack, bingo slot machines, bingo horseracing, bingo roulette, et cetera, are being discovered with alarming frequency. And these incidents are but a sample of what is occurring nationwide.

Thus, in light of the absence of Federal regulation of Indian gambling enterprises, I am reintroducing today legislation which would require the tribes to comply with each State's already established gambling regulations. Specifically, the measure would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to approve tribal ordinances permitting gambling, provided: First, the gambling does not violate the public policy of the State within which the tribal land is located; second, the gambling is conducted only by the tribe's governing body; third, the gambling operation employs only tribal members; and fourth, the proceeds are used for tribal government operations and not for personal gain.

I applaud the Indians' efforts to become self-reliant, and to abolish the curse of the dole by curbing the tragic tides of unemployment and alcoholism

which are found on their reservations. However, Congress should be cautious in its endorsement of just any business endeavor simply because of the revenues which may accrue. In the case of Indian gambling, the monetary end does not justify a means which poses serious risks to Indians and their non-Indian neighbors. Gambling, because of the attraction it holds for organized crime, is both inappropriate and undesirable as an unregulated industry, and is not an activity which Congress, as guardian of the Indians, should be promoting or even permitting on Indian reservations until regulation is established.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues' immediate cosponsorship of the Indian Country Gambling Regulation Act.●

NICARAGUA TRADE EMBARGO

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which invokes a trade embargo with Nicaragua and a resolution calling upon our OAS neighbors to do the same.

Nicaragua today enjoys many trade advantages with the United States. It is a member of the GATT; it holds most-favored-nation status; and it benefits from the generalized system of preferences.

Nicaragua sells a great deal of its agriculture products to the United States. Many of these commodities, such as sugar, tobacco, and beef, compete with American products in depressed markets here at home.

In light of the Sandinistas' revolutionary threat to their peaceful neighbors and their increasing courtship of the Kremlin, I think it's time that the United States began to reevaluate its trade relationship with Nicaragua.

Nicaragua has received and deployed the most powerful army in Central America. It has also failed since 1983 to make any payments of either principal of interest on its debt to the United States. It is high time that the United States ceased its friendly trading practice with a nation that can afford to amass a tremendous military threat, yet cannot afford to live up to its debts.

I urge my colleagues to support this embargo, and I call upon our friends of the Organization of American States to institute similar measures. Our region must join together to demonstrate our outrage over Nicaragua's military buildup and the refusal of the Sandanistas to institute democratic reforms.●

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

HON. JOHN E. GROTEBERG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. GROTEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak on National Library Week, which was observed during the week of April 14 to 20, 1985. This week is a tribute to the libraries and librarians of the country who serve our population of readers. National Library Week is a week to honor our educational institutions and to recognize the fact that we are living in an age of information. Our educational infrastructure thoroughly rests on libraries as a foundation; and the future of our information age depends on the future of public libraries.

I would especially like to mention the Illinois library system as a leader in the Nation. The libraries in Illinois have always been on the cutting edge of advancement in providing library services. When the delegation from the Illinois Library Association was recently in my Washington office, they repeated the past accomplishments and future projects of the outstanding libraries throughout the State of Illinois. I am proud to represent many of them here in the U.S. Congress. Libraries provide hours of pleasure and entertainment and are a link to our cultural heritage. I am, and will continue to be, a strong supporter of the services provided by public libraries and will be a voice in the Congress for their continued growth and existence.●

EXPLANATION FOR ABSENCE

HON. BUTLER DERRICK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on Thursday, May 2, 1985. Thus, I was unable to cast my vote on House Resolution 127, legislation expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."●

CALIFORNIA VETERANS COALITION

HON. SALA BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fine work of the California Veterans Coalition, a Statewide community-based

veterans services organization headquartered in San Francisco, that is working on behalf of veterans of the Vietnam war. The coalition's efforts stand out for their work in providing educational and health services for those veterans who have been exposed to agent orange.

Today, 10 years after all U.S. troops pulled out of Saigon, there is still a legacy of hurt and pain. Many of our soldiers have been exposed to potentially life-threatening chemicals, many emitted from their own weapons, and yet the U.S. Government still moves far too slowly in responding to this public health crisis. During the 98th Congress, we passed the Veteran's Dioxin and Radiation Exposure Compensation Standards Act. This legislation is intended to assure compensation to veterans and their survivors for disabilities resulting from their service in the U.S. Armed Forces.

The California Veterans Coalition has been very active in San Francisco in helping to locate former military service personnel along with civilians who served in Vietnam. They are working to establish prototype procedures for the Veterans' Administration to work cooperatively with local groups in helping place appropriate veterans on the agent orange registry so they can receive proper health education and medical services to offset any adverse health problems.

The California Veterans Coalition performs vital information and referral services in low- to moderate-income areas, six of which are located in the city and county of San Francisco. They advise veterans in the detection and prevention of agent orange-related health problems and inform them of specialized tests and screenings conducted by both private and public agencies. This is part of the group's effort to put together a veterans health care network linked to the local health care system.

More than 200,000 veterans nationwide who have been exposed to agent orange have received physical examinations and filed with the Veterans' Administration. This number is a mere pittance in terms of the 2.5 to 3 million exposure level. Like other sad stories from the Vietnam war, the problem of exposure to agent orange will not go away. But we need to recognize the problem and provide the best possible care to those veterans and their families who are suffering as a result of that conflict. I commend the California Veterans Coalition for their dedication and hard work.●

SOVIET JEWRY

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday was Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry when more than 200,000 people rallied in front of the United Nations to protest the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union. Because in the last year Soviet Jews have endured greater discrimination and persecution than at any other time in recent Soviet history, it is more important than ever that we speak out loudly on behalf of our Jewish brethren in the Soviet Union. Today more than 100 students from the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry are here from New York City and the surrounding area to do just that—to rally and to speak out on behalf of the plight of Soviet Jewry.

The year 1984 marked the nadir for Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union. Only 896 Jews were permitted to leave, the lowest single year total since 1970. In fact, the 1984 total represents less than 2 percent of the 1979 peak year emigration figure of 51,320. The reduction in the number of Jews granted exit visas has meant that the number of refuseniks stranded in the Soviet Union has climbed to over 20,000. This figure, however, includes only those Jews who submitted formal applications to leave for Israel and have received official refusals; it does not include the estimated 380,000 others who have initiated the complex process of applying for a visa.

These numbers are all the more shocking when one considers what is occurring in the Soviet Union right now; namely, a new wave of officially sanctioned anti-Semitism. This campaign to eradicate Jewish culture from Soviet society has taken on many ugly forms, including the stepped-up harassment of refuseniks and the arrest and imprisonment of several Hebrew teachers. Most Soviet Jews who apply to emigrate are routinely dismissed from their jobs and forced to take menial jobs. In addition, they are often attacked in the media, arbitrarily arrested, and their personal property is confiscated by Soviet authorities.

When Mikhail Gorbachev assumed power in the Soviet Union, many hoped that the repression of Soviet Jews would be halted or at least significantly reduced. This has not happened, however. Indeed, only 246 Soviet Jews were permitted to emigrate from the Soviet Union during the first 3 months of this year, and the campaign to eradicate Jewish culture from Soviet society continues unabated.

I find these developments extremely distressing. It is more imperative than ever that we continue our efforts to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ensure that all Soviet Jews are given the right to emigrate and are permitted to freely exercise their religion while they remain in the Soviet Union.●

AIRLINE PILOTS PENSION
RELIEF BILL

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with 13 of my colleagues from the Ways and Means Committee, a bill which is designed to correct an unintended problem created by the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 [TEFRA, Public Law 97-248].

As you know, Mr. Speaker, TEFRA made a number of modifications in the treatment of tax-qualified corporate pension plans. In addition to lowering both the contribution and benefit limits originally established under ERISA, it increased to 62 the age at which the maximum annual benefit could be drawn from a defined benefit plan. Under these new requirements, any retirement prior to age 62 would result in actuarial reductions in the maximum annual benefit. However, these provisions overlook the unique circumstances of one group of employees who are required by the Federal Government to retire prior to age 62—commercial airline pilots. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that commercial airline pilots, are the only private sector employees in the United States with a retirement age mandated by the Federal Government.

For over 20 years, the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] has required by regulation (FAR 121.383(c)) that commercial pilots retire at age 60 for reasons of public safety. This unique requirement was recognized by Congress on two previous occasions when it excepted airline pilots from the national policy established by the Age Discrimination in Employment Act and when it provided an exclusion for airline pilots from ERISA's participation and eligibility standards (section 410(b)(3)(B)).

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is conflicting Federal regulations that result in airline pilots sustaining a substantial penalty in potential pension benefits and never being able to obtain the benefit level available to all other retirees in tax qualified pension plans. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress has judged it sound national policy to encourage longer working careers and has imposed a reduction in maximum pension benefits for voluntary early retirement, it is clearly inequitable to apply this provision to those who, through the actions of the Federal

May 8, 1985

Government, have no choice but to retire prior to age 62.

It is my intention and that of my co-sponsors to correct this inequity at the earliest possible date and I hope that others will join us in supporting this effort.●

A TRIBUTE TO MR. ROLFE
ARNHYM

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize and honor Mr. Rolfe Arnhyim as he leaves his position of executive vice president for the Pasadena Chamber of Commerce.

Rolfe first came to the chamber's attention as chairman of the Armed Forces Day breakfast when, under his leadership, attendance was increased from 100 to more than 500. Shortly thereafter, in September 1978, he began his tenure as the chamber's guiding force.

Rolfe's belief in discipline, order, challenge, long hours and constant activity began to pay off in the establishment of a new role for this organization in the community. Pasadena Chamber of Commerce is currently nationally known and viewed as a leader in chamber circles.

Some of the achievements during Rolfe's stewardship are the adoption by UCLA of the Rose Bowl as home for UCLA football, the St. Patrick's Day parade, the excellent working relationships with all levels of government and the increase in chamber assets from \$100,000 to \$700,000. The role as a key decisionmaker and active partner in the community is one of Rolfe's proudest legacies for the chamber.

As Rolfe leaves Pasadena to take on new challenges with Long Beach, we wish him many years of continued excellence, and thank him for his outstanding contributions to this community.●

MS. WALMAR GRAY CELEBRATES 50 YEARS OF SERVICE
WITH AMERICAN RE-INSURANCE COMPANY IN NEW YORK

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to publicly acknowledge the accomplishments of Ms. Walmar Gray of Forest Hills, NY, who on May 13, 1985, will

celebrate her 50th year of service with American Re-Insurance Co.

Mr. Speaker, American Re-Insurance Co. is a subsidiary of the Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., a well-respected firm in New York. The company has reaped many benefits from Ms. Gray's years of service, and from the enthusiasm with which she approaches her job. As the retrospective premium accountant in the underwriting accounting department, "Wally" Gray performs the vital task of accumulating data needed for corporate financial reports, as well as servicing clients on an individual basis. Her top-notch work has made a significant contribution to the smooth and efficient operation of the underwriting accounting department, in conjunction with the leadership and direction of assistant vice president Kenneth Shefcik and the company's other fine officers.

Mr. Speaker, one of the many talents Wally has brought to American Re-Insurance is her skill in dealing with people. All of us have had occasion, on our interactions with businesses and institutions, to be put off or experience frustration with "the system." But clients of American Re-Insurance who work with Ms. Gray have had a very different experience. Her people-oriented approach to doing business has served the company well, and has been of great benefit to many New Yorkers. Walmar Gray, who is preparing to retire after her 50 years of invaluable service, will be greatly missed by American Re-Insurance and its clients.

I would like to congratulate Ms. Gray on her 50th anniversary with the company, and extend to her my best wishes for the future. She has made an important contribution to the city of New York, and I ask all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in celebrating with her 50 years of service with American Re-Insurance Co.●

A TRIBUTE TO MR. TOM HALL

HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to take a moment to recognize and honor Mr. Tom Hall who has served as general manager of the Industrial Council of the City of Commerce since 1960. He will be honored at a banquet on June 24 in the City of Commerce as his retirement on July 1, 1985, will mark his completion of 25 years of service in this capacity.

As general manager of the industrial council, he has served his community by participating in many activities, including the Rio Hondo Boys and Girls Club of Bell Gardens, where he served

as president and spearheaded a building drive for their new club house and office building; the United Crusade; served on the California Taxpayers Association L.A. Tax; Crippled Children's Society; Community Outreach Program, and is presently president of the Southeast Industry Education Council. He has worked closely with the Montebello Unified School District in their Adult Education Committee and the Vail Career Center.

So, it is with great pride that I congratulate Mr. Tom Hall on both his retirement and his 25 years of dedicated and outstanding service to his community.●

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHILDREN'S NUTRITION RESEARCH CENTER

HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon Johnson once said: " * * * to heal and to build in support of something worthy is * * * a noble task." Such a task is embodied in the development of the Children's Nutrition Research Center [CNRC] at the Texas Medical Center in Houston.

Of the five human nutrition centers in the Nation, the CNRC is the only facility focusing on the nutritional needs of expectant mothers, infants, and children. Last summer, the House of Representatives approved \$49 million for construction of the permanent facility to house CNRC, as a part of the Baylor College of Medicine. With land donated by Baylor and funding from the Federal Government, once again we have a strong partnership of public and private funds working to build a stronger Houston, a better Texas and a brighter tomorrow for all.

Research conducted by CNRC scientists will contribute to the health of all Americans and has proven already to be an integral part of the renowned research community of the Texas Medical Center. The mission of the Center is to establish national standards for the dietary needs of women during pregnancy and nursing, and to determine the most desirable diet for growth and development of children from conception through adolescence.

I am very proud to have the Children's Nutrition Research Center within my congressional district and as part of the Texas Medical Center. The activities undertaken here will reach far beyond our city. I believe that such efforts will make tremendous contributions, through better nutrition, to the health of our Nation's future generations. Those who have been involved with this Center have a vision that the information learned through

hard work and unrelenting research will be used to help assure the health and development of young people throughout the world. A primary obligation of the community of man is to provide for its children. Through the Center we celebrate man's commitment to make this a better world for our children.●

AUTOMATIC COMPENSATION FOR OUR FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced two bills to provide automatic compensation to former prisoners of war held by the enemy in either the Asian and European Theaters of World War II or the Korean conflict. I do so on a date of melancholy historic note. Mr. Speaker, 43 years ago yesterday, May 6, the Japanese captured Corregidor, the strategic safeguard island of the Manila Harbor. With Bataan captured a month before, Corregidor gave Japan control of the Philippines. Scores of valiant Americans on Corregidor held out until May 7 of 1943 before finally laying down arms.

Recognizing this country's responsibility to those held as POW's after Bataan and Corregidor and throughout World War II, Congress passed Public Law 97-37, the Former Prisoner of War Omnibus Act. I, like many of my colleagues, hailed passage of that act as just assistance for the veterans who suffered in the POW camps of our World War II enemies. But the remedy has been neither swift nor satisfactory. The Advisory Committee on Former Prisoners of War, established under Public Law 97-37, recorded the dismaying situation of our former POW's. Let me quote from the committee findings:

It is clear that the progress to date is not satisfactory, the efforts started too late, entirely too many delays have been experienced, and sufficient emphasis and interest by key officials has not always been evident.

They go on to advise:

We are obliged to point out that prompt and effective action is essential. The overwhelming majority of former POW's are from World War II and their average age is over sixty. If the VA does not demonstrate the ability to effectively rate the claims of former POW's in consonance with the medical knowledge now available, we will have no choice other than to recommend that a disability award be made to all former POW's based upon geographical location and tenure of imprisonment. Former POW's cannot, cannot wait any longer for equity.

Late last year, I introduced legislation similar to the automatic compensation bills I have introduced today. Unfortunately, Congress lacked the

time to act in 1984. Today, I urge my colleagues to move swiftly on my two new bills. The need is great and the unpaid debt to our veterans still looms large. Public Law 97-37 provided a good first step. However, the growing body of evidence of the problems suffered by our ex-servicemen dictates that our Government take the final step and grant automatic compensation for our former prisoners of war.

My legislation addresses the veterans who fought in the Asian and European Theaters of World War II and those of the Korean conflict. Automatic disability compensation of 60 percent would be granted to any veteran held by the enemy for more than 30 days. The bills also liberalize the definition of POW to include civilians who were captured and servicemen who evaded capture, but never rejoined our forces. These changes importantly bring American compensation into line with that of other countries, most particularly with that of Canada.

The advisory committee's report provided at least four key reasons why, I believe, automatic compensation is appropriate. Again, I quote from the report.

The adjudication of claims for service-connected disability by former POW's is profoundly and negatively affected by four factors. First, the number of former POW's is very small in relation to the total number of veterans. Second, the POW experience is so different from the experiences of most citizens, most veterans and even more combat veterans. Therefore, adjudicators and physicians who participated in the rating process are rarely exposed to former POW's. Third, former POW's generally have nonexistent or poor medical records covering the period of captivity and immediately thereafter. Fourth, the normal adjudication process requires clear medical evidence or etiological proof of the origin of disabilities. We are concerned that these factors are not sufficiently addressed or compensated for in either the law or VA administrative directives and practices. Because of these factors, it has been difficult to implement Public Law 97-37.

Mr. Speaker, none of these factors since the report has changed for the better. Instead, we confront each day the loss of these men and the suffering of their families.

The former POW's still await just and fair treatment, and I believe the 99th Congress will move swiftly and vigorously to assist these veterans and their families.●

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE PATRICIA SCHROEDER

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today, I, and 24 colleagues, are introducing the Field Office Closing Justifi-

cation Act. This bill requires executive agencies to provide Congress with at least 120 days notice prior to making any significant changes in their field office structure that will adversely affect Federal employees.

Over the last several years, the Reagan administration has sought to cut dramatically the regional structure and field organizations of agencies throughout the Federal Government. Such efforts have met with congressional scrutiny and resistance. In recent months, the Office of Management and Budget has attempted to finesse these changes through administrative sleight of hand.

There is no dispute. Field offices cost money. Yet, apparently it is money well-spent for services well-appreciated. Polls indicate that Americans feel good about those government services with which they have direct contact, be it tax assistance, Social Security information, or soil conservation advice. Their hostility to government comes from the billions and billions of dollars of spending which they do not see.

On February 20, 1985, the administration issued a booklet entitled "Management of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 1986" announcing plans for the closings of hundreds of regional and field offices but providing no details. Earlier in February, the Civil Service Subcommittee sent letters to all Federal agencies with field structures asking for information on their plans for reorganization. Little information was provided. In the meantime, rumors run wild, agency morale sags, productivity sinks and congressional offices struggle to get some answers.

The President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control—the Grace Commission—may have possibly uncovered the reason for such furtive action by the administration.

GAO [the General Accounting Office] has documented that in some cases the opposition to structural reform comes from Government employees directly affected by reorganization. Employees encouraged Congressional intervention using such tactics as: emphasizing human and financial losses when an office within their district is closed or consolidated; applying pressure through protest marches, letters, and telephone calls; using alliances between Congressional staff and agency personnel; and enlisting support and influence of former employees of affected agencies. (Report to the President, Page III-7).

Although the Grace Commission might find such activity by Federal workers and their Congress ominous, I do not.

The Field Office Closing Justification Act does not preclude the administration from streamlining the Government. It does not prevent office closings or consolidations. This bill simply requires each agency to advise Congress of their reorganization plans

and to provide us with the justification and impact of such plans. Hopefully, this will encourage more thoughtful, more deliberate, and more consumer-response activity.●

A TRIBUTE TO JEANNETTE RANKIN

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, today I am paying tribute to a person whose courage and leadership should truly serve as an inspiration to all Americans. Just to say that Jeannette Rankin was the first woman elected to Congress does not illuminate all the fortitude, determination, and ingenuity she possessed as a leader in the fight for those causes she so doggedly embraced.

She worked fervently so that half of the American population would have the right to vote. Three years before her first election to Congress in 1916, she traveled 9,000 miles, sometimes on horseback, speaking and organizing for suffrage.

In recalling Ms. Rankin's bid for Congress, we can also clearly see the qualities that made this woman a great American. Her campaign, she said, was not for Congress, but for women's suffrage and peace. She used a grassroots and direct-mail postcard campaign virtually unheard of in her day—and did all this in a time when only 12 of 48 States even allowed women the right to vote. Once in Congress, Jeannette Rankin authored the first bill for Government-sponsored instruction in maternity and infant hygiene and also introduced measures to provide equal pay for equal work, regardless of gender.

In her commitment against war, she demonstrated the tenacity of a truly great leader. While there are probably few people who do not support the cause of peace, there are also few who would have upheld this cause by opposing America's entry into the world's two Great Wars. Jeannette Rankin was one of those few. Forty-four years ago, as Congress agreed to march head-on into World War II, she stood alone in this Chamber—not only as the sole woman, but also as the sole "nay."

Jeannette Rankin lives on not just as a symbol of dedication to world peace, workers' interests, and women's rights, but as a symbol of ingenuity, determination, and courage. I am proud to do her honor today.●

**THE INTRODUCTION OF A BILL
RELATING TO MOTOR FUEL
BLENDING STOCKS**

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which is designed to correct an anomaly which currently exists in the Tariff Schedules of the United States [TSUS] with respect to the tariff treatment of motor fuels.

Under the current law, the Customs Service has interpreted the tariff schedules to impose substantially higher duties on components of motor fuels than are imposed on finished motor fuels. This classification process has resulted in significant uncertainty with respect to the ability of the companies, who historically have manufactured finished motor fuels from imported components, to continue this activity on an economic basis. Consequently, such manufacturers' ability to supply products to independent marketers of motor fuels at a competitive price has been impaired.

During the debate on this issue in the 98th Congress, several members of the domestic refining industry expressed opposition to legislation to correct this problem. These refiners allege that increased imports pose a significant threat to domestic refiners. It is important that the Congress address this issue with an understanding of the circumstances which led to an increase in imports, as well as an understanding of the minimal effect of these imports on the refining segment of the petroleum industry.

While it is true that imports of finished gasoline and blendstock components have, in terms of percentage, increased, it appears that such imports, as the percentage of available supply, are not a substantial factor. It is difficult to believe that this minimal market penetration imposes a significant threat to the viability of domestic refiners. Rather, imports of finished motor gasoline and blending components perform only the function of exerting appropriate discipline on prices at the wholesale level.

Congress' failure to eliminate this obvious anomaly in the tariff schedules will not avoid the importation of finished motor fuels. Rather it will only ensure that the manufacture of such fuels from blending components of foreign origin will take place outside the customs territory of the United States and will thereby deny domestic entities the ability to manufacture motor fuels from such components.

During consideration of this issue during the 98th Congress the House Committee on Ways and Means and

the Senate Committee on Finance directed the International Trade Commission [ITC] to institute an investigation for the purpose of gathering and presenting information on the tariff classification and treatment of those products potentially affected by a reclassification of catalytic naphtha and other motor fuel blending stocks. The results of this study were released in April 1985. The report addresses three main tariff classifications: First, the tariff treatment of naphthas and other motor fuel blending stocks; second, the tariff treatment of fuel-use ethyl alcohol, gasohol, and other gasohol/ethyl alcohol mixtures as it relates to the possible circumvention of the provisions of TSUS; and third, the tariff treatment of fuel-use methyl alcohol. This legislation would enact the recommendations put forth by the ITC.

It is essential that Congress act to resolve this obvious anomaly which exists with respect to the treatment of motor fuel blendstocks and finished motor fuels under the tariff schedules. I urge my colleagues to support the enactment of this legislation.●

**CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO
THE HONORABLE MARTIN
VERHAGE OF PROSPECT PARK,
NJ, DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN,
COMMUNITY LEADER AND
GREAT AMERICAN**

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 10, the residents of Prospect Park, my Eighth Congressional District and State of New Jersey will join together in testimony to the lifetime of outstanding public service that our people have received from a most distinguished citizen, esteemed community leader and good friend, the Honorable Martin VerHage, whose exemplary good deeds on behalf of the people of Prospect Park have truly enriched our community, State and Nation. 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 Gertrude on this most joyous occasion.

Mr. Speaker, Martin VerHage is an outstanding individual who throughout his lifetime has earned the respect and esteem of all of us who have had the good fortune to know him. He has served the borough of Prospect Park as councilman for 33 years and has been a staunch supporter and active participant in many civic and community improvement programs.

In addition to his faithful service on the governing body of Prospect Park,

he has served 57 years as a volunteer fireman, was police commissioner of Prospect Park for 22 years, part-time patrolman for 10 years during the World War II period and was employed as chief custodian of the Prospect Park Public School for 39 years.

In his daily pursuits Martin has extended the richness of his wisdom and expertise—always giving willingly and unselfishly of his time—in helping others. We applaud his knowledge, training, hard work and personal commitment that has enabled him to achieve the fullest confidence and strongest support of the people of our community. By his example and many accomplishments in civic, community and charitable endeavors, Martin VerHage has personified a special quality of leadership, dedication and sincerity of purpose in his responsible service to our people.

Although he completed his 33 years on the borough council on January 1, 1985, he continues to be of service to the community. His ever presence in the municipal complex and active participation in public affairs attest to his dedication to the community in which he was born.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we reflect on the deeds and achievements of our people who have contributed to the quality of our way of life here in America and I appreciate the opportunity to call your attention to Martin VerHage's lifetime of outstanding public service. As we gather together in testimony to his many contributions to the quality of life and way of life in our community, we do indeed salute a distinguished citizen, community leader and great American—the Honorable Martin VerHage of Prospect Park, NJ.●

**HONORING SOROPTOMIST'S
"WOMAN OF DISTINCTION",
MAGDALENA APARICIO**

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding work of an individual who is being honored as "Woman of Distinction" by the East Los Angeles Soroptomists.

Magdalena Aparicio was born in El Paso, TX and came to East Los Angeles in 1946. She is a graduate of Garfield High School and has worked in the East Los Angeles community for over 30 years.

Maggie, as she is known by her friends and associates, has given many years of dedicated service to her favorite cause. She has worked to increase the number of women and minority owned businesses through her involve-

ment in the banking and business sectors.

I would like to mention just a few of her accomplishments which have earned her this auspicious award. Maggie has spent 18 years working in the banking industry. She was assistant manager for the Pan American Bank, Commerce City Bank, and Bank of America. Later, she became executive director of the East Los Angeles Business Development Center. She organized the first West Coast Business Women's Conference. She was a founding member of the East Los Angeles Sheriff's Youth Athletic League.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that her husband Leo and her four sons Danny, Richard, Michael, and David are very proud of her. She has certainly earned the respect and admiration of her community.

I would like to ask my colleagues to join with me in giving our best to Mrs. Magdalena Aparicio, the East Los Angeles Soroptomist's "Women of Distinction."

CONTRIBUTIONS OF LIONESSE CLUBS

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, as the Member of Congress privileged to represent New York City's 15th District, it is my great honor to rise in recognition of the contributions of some outstanding women of Manhattan, the Lionesses of District 20-R2. Both as Lioness Club members and as citizens these women are valuable participants in our community.

In 65 nations of the world more than 68,000 women in over 2,700 Lioness Clubs are serving the needy of their communities and the world. Lioness Clubs assist their sponsoring Lions Clubs in a vast variety of service activities, and they also plan and implement projects of their own in their communities. Woman's roles in society, combined with her unique talents and capabilities, make Lioness Clubs an invaluable asset to each area they represent and also to the entire world. Among the numerous community activities the Lionesses perform are: work with young adults, child care, health services, helping the aged, ecological concern, and vocational assistance. Additionally, Lioness Clubs participate in international relations programs such as International Club Twinning, whereby clubs enter into a sisterhood alliance that may include cultural exchange, cooperative service projects, and exchange hosting of travelers. Lionesses provide a link between their communities and the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues in the House will want to join me in paying homage to the achievements of these women and the effort they put into their work. They truly epitomize the concept of community service.

MEXICAN HOLIDAY

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, each year Mexico celebrates its national independence day on May 5, a national holiday known as El Cinco de Mayo. It commemorates a battle at the city of Puebla, Mexico, in which Mexican defenders held off an invasion of French troops in 1862.

The significance of the holiday lies in Mexico's spirit of independence. Then, as now, the quest for freedom and self-determination guided the nation, its leaders and its people. The commitment to national sovereignty and dignity was symbolized by the Mexican patriot, Benito Juarez, who orchestrated the defeat of the French.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents in west Texas join their neighbors in the state of Chihuahua and our sister city of Ciudad Juarez in this celebration of freedom, and we offer our best wishes for this day of national celebration.

Thank you very much.

TAKEOVERS

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, most of us in the Congress are aware of the increasing numbers of hostile takeovers of major corporations in this country; most of us are also aware of the negative consequences these takeovers hold for the productivity, the future growth, and the health of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, no one questions the legitimate takeover of a company—this represents American capitalism at its best. But these "takeovers" which I am concerned about are not takeovers in the traditional sense—they are not undertaken with the goal of acquiring a company as an ongoing entity; rather they are financial ploys, the primary goal of which is the enrichment of a few at the expense of the long term health of U.S. companies.

The financing for corporate raids appears to be coming in increasing amounts from banks and thrifts searching for high yield investments to prop up poor profit performance. We could be using capital to modernize housing, plants and farms—instead,

we are encouraging nonproductive and economically harmful activities which have destabilized our credit markets for which the Federal Government bears the ultimate risk.

No one fully understands the impacts these hostile takeovers hold for our economy. We do know that since 1981, 115 of the Fortune 500 companies have disappeared as a consequence of takeovers. Takeover mania is forcing corporate America to focus solely on maximizing current stock prices to the detriment of future growth, jobs and wealth. Long term capital expenditures, research and development efforts and social contributions are being sacrificed because they do not positively affect stock prices in the short run. And management spends an inordinate amount of time devising ways to stop hostile takeovers—this in turn hurts the competitiveness of U.S. companies.

Mr. Speaker, I think this activity raises serious antitrust and national security concerns. I will introduce legislation today which would place a moratorium on takeovers financed by junk bonds. The moratorium would expire on December 31, 1985. The bill is narrow in scope yet would provide Congress the needed opportunity to study this new takeover mechanism and the potentially damaging economic impacts without sacrificing additional companies in the meantime. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing these damaging and unproductive takeovers by supporting this legislation.

CONVEYING FOREST SERVICE LANDS TO BALL, LA

HON. JERRY HUCKABY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to convey certain U.S. forest lands to the town of Ball, LA, located in my Fifth Congressional District in Rapides Parish. The lands to be transferred without consideration total approximately 40 acres east of Ball and would be used as a community recreational complex.

The town of Ball is the third largest incorporated municipality in Rapides Parish and is growing rapidly. In fact, the major Federal highway in the area was enlarged and upgraded to four lanes. However, the town has no recreational facilities to speak of to accommodate the citizens of Ball. It is surrounded by national forest lands or other towns and parishes, leaving Ball virtually no room to expand its city limits.

This 40-acre tract is ideal for development as a public recreation area. Former mayor of Ball, Tommy Hol-

lingsworth, initiated an application for a special use permit 2 years ago to proceed with the construction of a recreational facility there. The town having limited financial resources to pay for the development of this type of recreational complex proposed—which includes tennis, basketball and volleyball courts, ballfields, restroom facilities, picnic areas, trails, and playground equipment—its local civic Optimist Club agreed in a spirit of community cooperation to improve, construct, and maintain this recreation area.

Hollingsworth, the current mayor of Ball, Clyde Moore, and other town officials worked closely with the U.S. Forest Service on this matter. Unfortunately, the Service could not approve a special use permit for this proposed complex because it was not compatible with the type of recreation opportunities normally offered on national forest lands. Significant capital investments of permanent improvements proposed in this project are not considered a judicious long-term allocation of Federal lands. Furthermore, operation and maintenance of public facilities under permit are often higher than what the permittee anticipates or is able to finance over a long period. Other avenues were investigated, such as land exchanges or donations, but to no avail.

Mr. Speaker, because the lands in question are presently being utilized for public purposes and will continue to be managed by the town for such purposes, it seems reasonable to me that this land should be conveyed to the town of Ball without consideration. It will allow this community which is essentially surrounded by federally owned land to accommodate the growing demand for increased recreational opportunities. I urge timely and expeditious consideration of this bill.●

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO LARRY MARSHALL, OUTGOING PRESIDENT OF THE LONG BEACH JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, the Long Beach Junior Chamber of Commerce will hold its 54th Annual Installation and Awards Banquet to honor its new president and incoming officers and directors. I take this opportunity today to congratulate the Jaycee's outgoing president, Mr. Larry Marshall, on a job well done over this past year.

A native of Idaho, Larry first began his involvement in the Jaycees in 1975 in Kennewick, WA. As a member of

the Kennewick Jaycees, Larry served as its director, 1975-76, and State director, 1976-77. He would later serve as district director of the Washington State Jaycees, 1977-78.

Moving to southern California in 1977, Larry quickly joined the Monrovia Jaycees in 1977 and served as State director. The following year, he joined the Long Beach Jaycees and served as director twice, external vice president, State director and, of course, president.

An employee of the Ralph Parsons Co. in Pasadena, Larry was, among other things, selected Key Man of the Year for 1983-84 and is noted as one of the Outstanding Young Men of America for 1984.

Mr. Speaker, Larry Marshall has served well as president of the Long Beach Jaycees. He has earned the respect of his peers, and helped make Long Beach a better place to live and work.

My wife, Lee, joins me in saluting Larry on this special occasion. We wish him continued success in all his future endeavors.●

A SYMBOL OF COURAGE AND DEMOCRACY: KIM SANG HYON OF KOREA

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acquaint my colleagues with a story of courage and commitment. Secure and comfortable, few Americans appreciate the struggle to maintain democratic principles in the Third World. One of America's staunchest allies, the Republic of Korea, has been praised by the Reagan administration and well-intentioned American economists for its recent achievements in the field of economic development. Democracy too, is becoming a part of the Government of the Republic of Korea.

For 32 years, Kim Sang Hyon, a former member of the Korean Assembly, has toiled to safeguard the cause of political freedom in the midst of economic priorities. Often a lonely task, Kim Sang Hyon, like his colleague Kim Dae Jung, has paid the price of this vigilance. The victim of antidemocratic presidential decrees, as well as personal harassment, he has persisted in carrying the message of democratic reform.

Given America's democratic tradition, it is hoped that the U.S. Government will now offer encouragement and support to Kim Sang Hyon and his associates. Sometimes we have confused our defense and strategic interests with our own sense of democratic mission. It is not too late to remedy

this difficulty. Let us offer our warmest praise to Kim Sang Hyon for keeping the flame of democracy alive in Korea. In the face of adversity, he has represented America's true interest in foreign affairs and the best interest of his country, the championing of democracy.●

VITOLS HONORED DURING SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to pay tribute to an outstanding member of the Pennsylvania small business community—Mr. Elmars Vitols, president of Vitols Tool & Machine Corp.

His Philadelphia, PA, manufacturing firm was selected as the outstanding subcontractor in the Small Business Association's region III encompassing all of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia, the District of Columbia, and Virginia.

Mr. Vitols will be honored during Small Business Week, May 5-11 along with other outstanding Federal procurement prime contractors and subcontractors, and small business people and business advocates from each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

Vitols Tool & Machine Corp. is one of only 15 machine shops of its size to have been approved to participate in the Navy Nuclear Spare Parts Procurement Program.

I applaud Elmars Vitols and other 14.2 million outstanding small businesses whose vital role in our Nation's economy should not be overlooked.●

A TRIBUTE TO MR. JARED TRUSSLER

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pride and pleasure to announce to my colleagues that Mr. Jared Trussler, president of Trusco Tank Inc., a small business in San Luis Obispo County which is located in my congressional district, has been selected by the Small Business Administration as the Central California Small Business Person of the Year.

This honor is the result of stringent competition among more than 100,000 small businesses in the central California area, and I believe that it reflects well, not only upon Trusco Tank, but

upon the entire small business community.

Mr. Trussler founded his company in 1970 in a barn loft, which is in the time-honored tradition of American enterprise. Mr. Trussler had little more than an idea and the determination to carry it through, but he was willing to take the risk, and his hard work has paid off. Today, Trusco Tank is one of the central coast's most successful businesses and one of its largest employers.

Mr. Speaker, Jared Trussler's story illustrates why we must continue to keep America the kind of Nation in which individual initiative and ideas can flourish. Small businesses are a tremendous source of innovation, and they are the greatest source of new jobs in this country.

America needs small business in order to keep up its economic growth and generate new ideas and products. If we look at the beginnings of many of today's corporate giants, we see that a lot of them began as small concerns. Eastman-Kodak, McDonald's, and scores of other large corporations were once smaller than Trusco Tank.

Trusco Tank may not ever become as large as an IBM, but it is doing a great job of competing in its market, and I salute Mr. Trussler for being selected as the Small Business Person of the Year for Central California. ●

CINCO DE MAYO—THE HISPANIC CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNITED STATES

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, May 5—Cinco de Mayo—is one of the most celebrated days in Mexican history. This Mexican national holiday commemorates the anniversary of the Battle of Puebla which was fought on May 5, 1862. Mexican troops under General Ignacio Zaragoza—outnumbered 3 to 1—defeated the invading French forces of Napoleon III.

This celebration is not just a military commemoration, Mr. Speaker. More important, it is remembered as a triumph of the human spirit, a triumph of courage in the face of almost certain disaster. It is a celebration of the Mexican national spirit overcoming foreign intervention and imperial domination.

This great occasion is not only observed in Mexico with parades, festivals, dances, and speeches, but Hispanics here in the United States remember this important date as well. It is an occasion when all Americans—Hispanics and non-Hispanics—celebrate and acknowledge the important contributions of Hispanics to our country.

Long before English-speaking colonists arrived at Jamestown and Plymouth Rock, Hispanics were in this country. My home State of California was first settled by Mexican colonists.

Our national culture has been greatly enriched by many Hispanic contributions to our language, art, music, and food, but the most important contribution has been our Hispanic fellow-citizens themselves. Hispanics have shown their patriotism through outstanding service in our Armed Forces. A significant number of Hispanics have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. Hispanics have been outstanding members of U.S. Olympic teams; they are among our Nobel laureates.

Though Hispanics have contributed much to our Nation, they have also faced serious problems—barriers in education, housing, and employment, and discrimination in many areas.

Just as the badly outnumbered Mexican troops at the Battle of Puebla did not despair but went on to achieve a remarkable victory, Hispanics in the United States are struggling to break down those barriers to achieve the American dream. I salute our Hispanic friends and neighbors on this important occasion. In San Mateo County and throughout our Nation they contribute richly to what is our great and pluralistic American heritage. ●

SOLIDARITY SUNDAY FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 5, the 85 constituent agencies of the Coalition to Free Soviet Jewry sponsored Solidarity Sunday to reaffirm the resolve to secure freedom for Soviet Jews and for beleaguered people everywhere. For this reason, it is highly appropriate that we here in Congress salute that event by participating in this special order recognizing the ever-deteriorating plight of the Jews of the Soviet Union.

In recent days, the Soviet Government has sharply increased its discrimination against Jewish culture and religion by arresting Hebrew teachers on false criminal charges, attacking Hebrew teaching circles as subversive and practicing anti-Semitic ideology under the cloak of "Anti-Zionism." One person who has been arrested and incarcerated is Iosef Begun, and I would like to bring you up to date on his deteriorating condition.

In 1983, Hebrew teacher and Jewish activist Iosef Begun was sentenced to 7 years in a labor camp and 5 years of internal exile on charges of anti-Soviet

agitation and propaganda. His family has repeatedly been denied the right to visit him at the camp, and Soviet officials have failed to answer questions about his health, which is known to be in critically poor condition.

In protest to his father's incarceration and being cut off from the outside world, Iosef Begun's son Boris began a hunger strike on March 4, 6 months after the family last heard from him. Western visitors to the younger Begun reported that he looked half-dead, weighed slightly under 100 pounds, that his veins were swollen and popping out of the side of his head, and that he had suffered permanent damage to his vision because of his hunger strike. One eyewitness said that although he was only 19, he—the younger Begun—looked 40.

On April 12, 1985, Boris Begun received a telegram from the Soviet authorities saying that Iosef Begun had been transferred to another prison. The telegram made no mention of the site of this new prison. The authorities also returned to Boris packages and mail that he had sent to his father. As of this writing, Iosef Begun's whereabouts are unknown.

Mr. Speaker, the plight of Iosef Begun and the toll it has taken on his family is but one example of the persecution and terror facing the Jews of the Soviet Union. Every day we read about some new refusenik who has been denied a visa or who has lost his or her job or has been thrown in jail on charges of "anti-Soviet propaganda" or "hooliganism." We have a moral obligation to speak out against injustice in this world wherever it occurs, against whomever it is being committed, and the Jews of the Soviet Union are no exception. Many of the Jews of Russia today are the survivors of or the children of survivors of the victims of Nazi persecution during the Second World War. How ironic it would be if the Jews were to have survived the physical torture of the Nazis only to succumb to the forced assimilation of the Soviet Government.

We cannot sit idly by and watch another great Jewish culture and civilization disappear into the darkness. By means of Solidarity Sunday, we reaffirm our resolve to keep the pressure on the Soviets, to let them know that we are determined to help the Jews of Russia to live as Jews without fear of persecution and to be able to emigrate, should they choose to do so. It is our solemn duty to speak out on behalf of Soviet Jewry, and we can do no less. ●

IN SUPPORT OF CONSUMER AND
HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, for many years vocational home economics education has played an important part in the education of our young citizens. I know that in my home State of Arkansas, the consumer and homemaking education program has helped countless young students get a better start on adult life by giving them the skills necessary to handle a home and family, such as financial responsibility, consumer choices, parenting skills, child development, proper nutrition, and managing home and work responsibilities.

In fact, just last October Congress recognized the contribution of consumer and homemaking education when it passed the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, Public Law 98-524, reauthorizing Federal support for this worthwhile program. Homemaking education has been a line item in the vocational education budget until this year, when the administration proposed eliminating it as a line item beginning in fiscal year 1986, and including the funds as part of the title II basic grant. This proposal could have an adverse effect on homemaking education.

Although the same \$32 million amount that was appropriated in fiscal year 1985 would be added to the basic grant amount for fiscal year 1986, the funds would no longer be earmarked especially for homemaking education. This would mean that States could choose not to fund the program, or to fund it at lower levels.

I believe that this would be a mistake. Homemaking education adds another dimension to the education of our children. Dedicated home economics teachers help young people come to terms with adult life and learn to cope with many of the everyday problems that they will face. In a recent letter to me, Dr. Reba Davis, president of the Arkansas Alliance of Professional Organizations of Home Economics and Related Fields, stated, "I am convinced that without this dedicated group of professionals at work, the social problems of rape, suicide, divorce, drugs, teen pregnancy, and others would drastically increase."

In Arkansas, over 27 percent of all secondary school students elect to take home economics courses, and of that number 39 percent are young men. These statistics speak well of Arkansas' excellent home economics program.

Home economics is unique and vital because it is the only field that has the family as its focus. For the stabili-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ty of our Nation, it must continue to be recognized as a national priority, and should certainly remain a separate line item in the fiscal year 1986 budget.●

JOINT RESOLUTION FOR
NATIONAL HOLSTEIN DAY

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution that May 25, 1985, be proclaimed "National Holstein Day." The Holstein breed of dairy cattle produces upward of 90 percent of the Nation's milk supply, and U.S. holsteins are recognized worldwide as being the superior strain of holstein breeding stock. In addition, the genetic pool of the holstein breed in the United States has become the primary source of genetic material for the development and improvement of dairy cattle in the world, and the Holstein-Friesian Association of America maintains the only official, complete genetic data bank and lineage record for all purebred, registered holstein dairy cattle in the United States.

This association, which is a nonprofit membership organization of more than 44,000 breeders of purebred, registered holstein dairy cattle, was organized May 25, 1885, and chartered by the Legislature of New York as a union of two predecessor organizations dating back to 1871. The association, through its many programs and services to the dairy industry has provided and continues to provide an environment, incentives, and genetic data for continued improvement of the holstein breed.

Accordingly, I introduce this joint resolution today to proclaim May 25, 1985, as National Holstein Day and give the Holstein-Friesian Association of America the recognition they so clearly deserve.●

ELIE WEISEL INTERPRETS THE
IMPORTANCE OF OUR VICTORY
OVER NAZI GERMANY

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this year freedom-loving people around the world are celebrating the anniversary of the victory of America and our allies over Nazi barbarism.

No one has so eloquently captured the eternal moral significance of that triumph as well as the poet and writer, Elie Weisel.

Mr. Weisel, a survivor of the Buchenwald death camp, made the fol-

lowing remarks in an impassioned appeal to President Reagan that the President cancel his visit to the military cemetery in Bitburg. Mr. Weisel's statement came at the White House after President Reagan presented him with the Congressional Gold Medal of Achievement.

Mr. Weisel's statement, though unsuccessful in convincing Mr. Reagan to avoid Bitburg, is enormously moving in its assessment of the importance of allied victory in World War II. He measures well the debt we all owe to the 300,000 American soldiers who laid down their lives in the defense of civilization against the depravity of the Nazis. In that, Mr. Weisel was as successful as any speaker I have ever heard. I wanted to share his statement with every Member of Congress and the American people.

Mr. Weisel's remarks on that day follow:

ELIE WEISEL INTERPRETS WORLD WAR II ERA

Mr. President, speaking of the conciliation, I was very pleased that we met before, so a stage of the conciliation has been set in motion between us. But then, we were never on two sides. We were on the same side. We were always on the side of justice, always on the side of memory, against the SS and against what they represent.

It was good talking to you, and I am grateful to you for the medal. But this medal is not mine alone. It belongs to all those who remember what the SS killers have done to their victims.

It was given to me by the American people for my writings, teaching and for my testimony. When I write, I feel my invisible teachers standing over my shoulders, reading my words and judging their veracity. And while I feel responsible for the living, I feel equally responsible to the dead. Their memory dwells in my memory.

Forty years ago, a young man awoke and he found himself an orphan in an orphaned world. What have I learned in the last 40 years? Small things. I learned the perils of language and those of silence. I learned that in extreme situations when human lives and dignity are at stake, neutrality is a sin. It helps the killers, not the victims. I learned the meaning of solitude, Mr. President. We were alone, desperately alone.

IMPOSSIBLE TO COUNT ALL THE NAMES

Today is April 19 and April 19, 1943, the Warsaw Ghetto rose in arms against the onslaught of the Nazis. They were so few and so young and so helpless. And nobody came to their help. And they had to fight what was then the mightiest legion in Europe. Every underground received help except the Jewish underground. And yet they managed to fight and resist and push back those Nazis and their accomplices for six weeks. And yet the leaders of the free world, Mr. President, knew everything and did so little, or nothing, or at least nothing specifically to save Jewish children from death. You spoke of Jewish children, Mr. President. One million Jewish children perished. If I spent my entire life reciting their names, I would die before finishing the task.

Mr. President, I have seen children, I have seen them being thrown in the flames alive. Words, they died on my lips. So I have learned, I have learned, I have learned the fragility of the human condition.

And I am reminded of a great moral essayist. The gentle and forceful Abe Rosenthal, having visited Auschwitz, once wrote an extraordinary reportage about the persecution of Jews, and he called it, "Forgive them not Father, for they knew what they did."

OPPOSITE OF LOVE IS INDIFFERENCE

I have learned that the Holocaust was a unique and uniquely Jewish event, albeit with universal implications. Not all victims were Jews. But all Jews were victims. I have learned the danger of indifference, the crime of indifference. For the opposite of love, I have learned, is not hate, but indifference. Jews were killed by the enemy but betrayed by their so-called allies, who found political reasons to justify their indifference or passivity.

But I have also learned that suffering confers no privileges. It all depends what one does with it. And this is why survivors, of whom you spoke, Mr. President, have tried to teach their contemporaries how to build on ruins, how to invent hope in a world that offers none, how to proclaim faith to a generation that has seen it shamed and mutilated. And I believe, we believe, that memory is the answer, perhaps the only answer.

TRIED TO CARRY THEM IN TRIUMPH

A few days ago, on the anniversary of the liberation of Buchenwald, all of us, Americans, watched with dismay and anger as the Soviet Union and East Germany distorted both past and present history.

Mr. President, I was there. I was there when American liberators arrived. And they gave us back our lives. And what I felt for them then nourishes me to the end of my days and will do so. If you only knew what we tried to do with them then. We who were so weak that we couldn't carry our own lives, we tried to carry them to triumph.

Mr. President, we are grateful to the American Army for liberating us. We are grateful to this country, the greatest democracy in the world, the freest nation in the world, the moral nation, the authority in the world. And we are grateful, especially, to this country for having offered haven and refuge, and grateful to its leadership for being so friendly to Israel.

And, Mr. President, do you know that the Ambassador of Israel, who sits next to you, who is my friend, and has been for so many years, is himself a survivor? And if you knew all the causes we fought together for the last 30 years, you should be prouder of him. And we are proud of him.

And we are grateful, of course, to Israel. We are eternally grateful to Israel for existing. We needed Israel in 1948 as we need it now. And we are grateful to Congress for its continuous philosophy of humanism and compassion for the underprivileged.

And as for yourself, Mr. President, we are so grateful to you for being a friend of the Jewish people, for trying to help the oppressed Jews in the Soviet Union. And to do whatever we can to save Shcharansky and Abe Stolar and Iosif Begun and Sakharov and all the dissidents who need freedom. And of course, we thank you for your support of the Jewish state of Israel.

But, Mr. President, I wouldn't be the person I am, and you wouldn't respect me for what I am, if I were not to tell you also of the sadness that is in my heart for what happened during the last week. And I am sure that you, too, are sad for the same reasons.

SPEAK TRUTH TO POWER

What can I do? I belong to a traumatized generation. And to us, as to you, symbols

are important. And furthermore, following our ancient tradition, and we are speaking about Jewish heritage, our tradition commands us "to speak truth to power."

So may I speak to you, Mr. President, with respect and admiration, of the events that happened?

We have met four or five times. And each time I came away enriched, for I know of your commitment to humanity.

And therefore I am convinced, as you have told us earlier when we spoke, that you were not aware of the presence of SS graves in the Bitburg cemetery. Of course you didn't know. But now we all are aware.

May I, Mr. President, if it's possible at all, implore you to do something else, to find a way, to do something else, to find a way, to find another way, another site? That place, Mr. President, is not your place. Your place is with the victims of the SS.

Oh, we know there are political and strategic reasons, but this issue, as all issues related to that awesome event, transcends politics and diplomacy.

The issue here is not politics, but good and evil. And we must never confuse them.

For I have seen the SS at work. And I have seen their victims. They were my friends. They were my parents.

Mr. President, there was a degree of suffering and loneliness in the concentration camps that defies imagination. Cut off from the world with no refuge anywhere, sons watched helplessly their fathers being beaten to death. Mothers watched their children die of hunger. And then there was Mengele and his selections. Terror, fear, isolation, torture, gas chambers, flames, flames rising to the heavens.

ONLY THE KILLERS ARE GUILTY

But, Mr. President, I know and I understand, we all do, that you seek reconciliation, and so do I, so do we. And I too wish to attain true reconciliation with the German people. I do not believe in collective guilt, nor in collective responsibility. Only the killers were guilty. Their sons and daughters are not.

And I believe, Mr. President, that we can and we must work together with them and with all people. And we must work to bring peace and understanding to a tormented world that, as you know, is still awaiting redemption.

I thank you, Mr. President.●

REA'S BIRTHDAY

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take note of the fact that on May 11, we will mark the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration, an event that has special significance in my district of Pennsylvania.

The late Gov. Gifford Pinchot of Pennsylvania was one of the leaders in the Nation in bringing electric service to the rural areas of the Keystone State. Governor Pinchot's estate, Grey Towers, is located in Pike County, PA, which is a part of my congressional district. The estate is now owned by the Federal Government and stands as

a monument to Governor Pinchot and his foresight.

Fifty short years ago, many rural farms and rural homes did not enjoy the benefits of electrical power. Today, because of the REA and electric cooperatives, there are very few areas of our Nation without power.

Governor Pinchot ordered a study of Pennsylvania's utility industry and the man who carried it out, Morris L. Cooke, became the first head of the REA. The man who succeeded him, John M. Carmody, was also a Pennsylvanian.

I am proud of what those Pennsylvanians accomplished. The success of the REA becomes evident each evening as darkness falls and the lights click on across rural America.●

BUDGET CUTS OF THE ADMINISTRATION HAVE HURT THE VISITING NURSE ASSOCIATION

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, 1984 marked the 80th anniversary of the Visiting Nurse Association of the Greater Youngstown area [VNA]. For 80 years the VNA of the Greater Youngstown area has provided quality home health care to the people in the Youngstown community. I rise today to commend the VNA for the fine work it has done and for the 80 years of vital service it has provided to the Youngstown community. I also rise to express my concern over the administration's cutbacks in Federal entitlement programs that have significantly hindered the efforts of the VNA across the country. No where are the services of the VNA more vital than in my home district, which has been victim in recent years of some of the highest unemployment levels in the entire country.

The purpose of the VNA is as clear and as necessary as it was 80 years ago—the provision, with a family-centered approach, of skilled nursing and other therapeutic services on a part-time basis in the home or specific clinic settings that contribute to meeting the health needs of individuals and families, and the promotion of health and prevention of illness, both physical and mental. In light of the many changes that have taken place in the health care delivery system in recent years the VNA is committed to meeting the new challenge of the 1980's: to ensure that quality comprehensive coordinated home care services are accessible to all in the community and are utilized by them when needed.

In recent years, Mr. Speaker, the VNA of the Greater Youngstown area

has found it increasingly difficult to meet this challenge. Cutbacks and changes in entitlement programs at the Federal level have adversely impacted upon and continue to effect the VNA. The continued increase in more narrow interpretations of Medicare guidelines and eligibility for service reimbursement had a negative impact on the VNA's staff and patients in the Youngstown area. The disturbing result has been a reduced volume of service, as well as revenues. The overall economy of the Youngstown area has been seriously stifled by mass unemployment. My district has not experienced the so-called economic recovery. The economic situation has impacted on the VNA in that fewer people, because of their financial situation, have any health coverage that includes home health care benefits.

Another growing problem for the VNA has been the increasing numbers of elderly in the Youngstown community. Because of advances in scientific knowledge and technology, advances in medical care and treatment, and improvements in environmental controls, life expectancy has risen dramatically. Today the fastest growing segment of the population is in the age group 85 years and older. It is anticipated that the elderly population in the Youngstown area will continue to increase. In wake of recent cutbacks in Federal funding programs by the Reagan administration, the VNA is faced with a pressing challenge to meet the growing need for long-term home health services. Many times home health care service can prevent or postpone premature institutionalization.

The Visiting Nurse Association of the Greater Youngstown area has provided the people in my district with much needed and quality home health care service for over 80 years. They continue to provide vital services to our community and action must be taken to ensure that vital Federal programs to assist the VNA in their work are not cut back or eliminated. We here in Congress must not turn our backs on this Nation's elderly and those who desperately need the services the VNA provides. I urge my colleague to do the human thing—oppose further cuts and reductions in entitlement programs for the elderly and home health programs.●

**NEW YORK VIETNAM VETERANS
MEMORIAL COMMISSION**

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I invite the Members to join me in commending the New York Vietnam Veterans Memorial Commission. Yesterday they

celebrated the opening of a memorial to New Yorkers who served in Vietnam with an old-fashioned ticker tape parade. The memorial, located in my congressional district in lower Manhattan, is a glass block sculpture etched with excerpts of letters sent to and from Vietnam. The letters will form the basis of "Dear America," a book whose proceeds will be directed to a unique "living memorial" to Vietnam veterans. This living memorial is a program dedicated to resolving the problems of the unemployed and underemployed New York Vietnam veteran. The program includes a model jobs program, job skills training, and specialized employment counseling and support services. This creative initiative, conceived and conducted by the commission, deserves our enthusiastic support. The commission's efforts enable New Yorkers to commemorate the Vietnam veteran.

I am familiar with the needs of Vietnam veterans and the failure of this administration to provide the health, employment, educational, and supportive services they need. One of my efforts in Congress has been to ensure that Federal funds and resources allocated for the Vietnam veteran with readjustment problems actually reaches the veteran in need. In some ways, arriving home was the most traumatic event of all for men and women returning from Vietnam. Returning soldiers and nurses were treated as pariahs, the protagonists of an unpopular war. The monument erected by the New York Vietnam Veterans Memorial Commission serves to remind us of the commitment demonstrated by those who served in Vietnam. Our efforts in Congress can contribute to providing the health and human services deserved by those who served.

Let us express our gratitude to the commission for assuming the task of raising funds to serve those who served in Vietnam, in memoriam and in life. Let us renew our commitment to the veterans of Vietnam by ensuring that those urgently needed services are provided.●

**ALDINE ISD OBSERVES 50TH
ANNIVERSARY**

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, the Aldine Independent School District observed the 50th anniversary of its founding on May 4, and I would like to take this opportunity to commend the administrators, faculty members, students and parents—past and present—on the tremendous progress made over the years in the Aldine ISD.

Fifty years ago, on May 4, 1935, the residents of the communities of Higgs,

Brubaker, Westfield, and Aldine came together to vote on whether or not to merge their schools into one unified system. As a result of that vote, the old Common School District No. 29 was transformed into the current-day Aldine Independent School District.

At ceremonies I attended last Saturday, more than 8,500 guests—and more than 10,000 students—joined together to celebrate the progress Aldine ISD has made over the last half century. Attending those ceremonies were M.O. Campbell, the current superintendent of the Aldine ISD, and the two surviving former superintendents: John Earl Barden, who served as superintendent from 1941-44, and Dr. W.W. Thorne, who headed the Aldine ISD from 1958-72.

With 36,000 students, 2,000 teachers, a total of 3,200 employees—counting support staff—and 34 schools, the Aldine ISD is the second largest school district in Harris County.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Aldine ISD on its 50th anniversary. Those of us familiar with the educational excellence of the Aldine ISD—which, incidentally Mr. Speaker, my mother attended—know that under M.O. Campbell's leadership, that tradition of excellence will continue in the years ahead.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

**VETERANS HEALTH CARE
BUDGET CANNOT BE REDUCED
FURTHER**

HON. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, within the next few weeks, the House and Senate will be making major decisions on the budget for fiscal year 1986. Many Federal programs will be affected. The decisions we must make will not be easy. We all have different priorities.

A very high priority of mine is veterans health care. I want my colleagues to fully understand the impact of any budget reductions in funds to operate the VA's health care system. Who is better able to relate the problems in the field than the people in the field?

According to the Chiefs of Staff at VA hospitals nationwide who responded to a recent survey, inadequate budgets are already taking their toll. More cuts in the budget will mean longer waiting lists, the turning away of certain non-service-connected veterans, and delays in many surgical procedures.

There follows a report from the Chief of Staff at the VA medical center in Hines, IL:

EDWARD HINES, JR., HOSPITAL,
Hines, IL, February 11, 1985.

HOWARD H. GREEN, M.D.,
Chief of Staff (11), VA Medical Center, White
River Junction, VT.

DEAR HOWARD: In response to your letter dated January 2, 1985, I submit the following responses:

a. The Hines VA Hospital is a general medical and surgical health care facility with 1,156 operating beds consisting of 317 medical, 254 surgical, 240 psychiatric, 135 spinal cord injury, 118 intermediate medicine, 47 neurology, 25 rehabilitation medicine, and 20 blind rehabilitation beds. Additionally, Hines currently has 120 NHCU beds with a project in progress to increase these beds to 240.

b. Hines is primarily affiliated with the Stritch School of Medicine and Dentistry, other affiliations are active with Loyola University, the University of Illinois College of Medicine, and Chicago Medical School. These affiliations provide approved residency training programs in 16 medical and 3 dental specialties.

c. We, at Hines, will manage our budget to preclude any dollar deficit at the end of the fiscal year. However, as dollars have been reduced, staffing has been reduced accordingly. We have experienced dollar decreases in both personnel services and all other, while at the same time patient workload continues to increase. These decreases have occurred with some impact on programmatic activities. We have now reached our point of saturation and any further reductions could result in drastic changes.

Patients in health care facilities, such as Hines, with comprehensive rehabilitation programs requiring long hospital stays with intensive nursing care, have caused an additional drain on our resources under DRG reimbursement. The resource allocation model currently utilized indicated for last fiscal year that Hines will lose in excess of five million dollars from its recurring base over the next five years. The amount of loss actually incurred this year was minimal compared to the total figure; however, the message was "loud and clear" that we must make some major programmatic changes or suffer the consequence.

It is a known fact that any DRG reimbursement methodology does not adequately address rehabilitation programs. This fact, along with the fact that Hines Hospital has been given and has internally shifted considerable resources into its rehabilitation efforts, is causing a major allocation problem. Under this allocation methodology, our hospital budget is squeezed to the bone and will essentially mean that in many cases these concepts will erode.

d. Obviously, the monetary deficit on personnel, supplies, and equipment will greatly impair the hospital's ability to function as a comprehensive health care facility. As these resources diminish, so will our ability to recruit and retain the high caliber clinicians and technical staff essential for our various treatment modalities. The continually increasing workload without corresponding budgetary increases has put this facility in a precarious position relative to providing the highest quality patient care. Current resource austerity, felt primarily in the area of personnel services and equipment funding, if continued will soon compromise the services our clinicians are able to provide to our veterans.

It appears that our most logical course of action would be to implement reductions in programmatic services and/or ward clo-

tures. However, if either of these actions were to transpire, the results will not only impact patient care programs and services, but also erode the educational and research activities to the degree of reducing or eliminating affiliations. The end result will be a hospital providing primary suboptimal care to our veterans. On the national basis the VA system will be required to shrink either horizontally, vertically, or both (horizontal shrinkage dictating a dramatic reduction in the services provided nationwide; vertical shrinkage resulting in contraction of the full spectrum of tertiary care programs, many of which are engaged in pioneering research and educational activities).

If such drastic reductions become necessary, then I envision the eventual closing or consolidating of VAMC's rather than reducing programs beyond the point where they cease to effectively function as a viable health care program.

Not only do we struggle with a budgetary deficit, we also must contend with unreasonable mandated regulations—mandates such as the reduction of GS 11-15 positions where, at Hines, the majority of positions classified in these grades are in direct patient care categories; 3.5% pay raises when it would require an 18.3% pay raise to achieve parity with parallel positions in the private sector; elimination of special salary rates for certain hard to recruit category positions, primarily Title 38; 5% reduction in pay for employees who are already underpaid; Deficit Reduction Act (DEFRA), etc.

While we experience these mandates and the continued erosion of the budget, we continue to experience an increase in workload. With the advent of health care management by DRG, DRG dumping and the general economic decline of certain sections of our population have all attributed to this increase.

Capital equipment within the health care arena is in constant technological flux. Advances are rapidly occurring, and outdated what is now considered state of the art. Our equipment must be updated routinely and provided to our clinicians who wish to continue advancing treatment modalities. For the recent past, equipment funding has been, for all practical purposes, nonexistent at this hospital as well as others in this district. Funding for both additional and replacement equipment has not kept pace with needs (both fair wear and tear, as well as acquisition of new technology). Again, I point out that without the timely maintenance, replacement, and acquisition of appropriate and adequate technologies, retention of quality staff will be problematic resulting in further reduction of quality patient care. Physicians, nurses, and other health care personnel will not provide care at institutions where equipment is outdated and life-threatening. I also mention the legal liability we have towards our patients in assuring them of safe and appropriate treatment.

As new facilities are constructed, equipment money is readily available to purchase modern technology. These facilities are equipped with "state of the art" equipment having an average life of approximately ten years. What the planners fail to consider is what happens in ten years when this equipment becomes worn out and ready for replacement. No provisions have been made to fund this expense, and the hospital is faced with a dilemma.

We have not experienced a backlog in patient surgery due to specific dollar deficits. We continue to perform our surgical proce-

dures in addition to the limited referrals from other VAMC's within normal waiting periods. However, as stated previously we have reached the point of saturation, and any additional dollar reduction will impact our ability to provide service to the veteran. We could anticipate either a large backlog or reduction of cases or both.

WILLIAM R. BEST, M.D.,
Chief of Staff.●

REQUESTING THAT A MEDAL OF
HONOR BE AWARDED TO JOHN
YANCEY (USMC RET.)

HON. TOMMY ROBINSON

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join with my fellow Arkansans in honoring the courage of Capt. John Yancey of Little Rock, AR.

On December 8, 1941, the day after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, John enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps. This was just the beginning of a long series of heroic acts and sacrifices by Captain Yancey on behalf of his country. In November 1942, while still a first lieutenant, John Yancey, with a small group of men, took and held an important piece of jungle.

John Yancey, in the finest tradition of the Marine Corps, once again displayed his fine character and bravery during the Korean conflict. During the fight for the Chosin Reservoir in North Korea, one of the most costly of the war, John Yancey, after suffering three serious wounds, led several platoons against overwhelming odds to retake and hold Hill 1282. It is for this action, and subsequent action on Hill 698 that I request that Mr. Yancey be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. President, the Medal of Honor is given to those servicemen and women who have served "above and beyond the call of duty" in the face of the enemy. Captain Yancey exemplifies the incredible courage, dedication to duty, and professionalism associated with this high honor. Many marines have attested to the fact that Captain Yancey's actions saved Hill 1282 as well as numerous American lives. For these reasons, I strongly support the request of these marines that the Congressional Medal of Honor be bestowed on John Yancey.●

CHASE MANHATTAN CHAIR-
MAN'S REMARKS ON DEFICIT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today, we find ourselves in the midst of one of

the most significant budget debates of recent history. The continued growth of the Federal budget deficit has reached such proportions that the strength and stability of our economy, which we Americans have worked hard to secure, is being threatened by a near unanswerable national debt. If we do not act wisely and decisively to roll back the tide of deficit spending, the future of the economic base upon which much of the greatness of this Nation is founded, will certainly be undetermined.

The seriousness of the deficit warrants careful consideration of all possible means of deficit reductions. I ask my colleagues to seek advice about the various proposals from all perspectives of analysis of the problem. In order to provide an alternative view of how the deficit might be treated, I call to the attention of my colleagues the remarks of Willard C. Butcher, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank, NA. On February 5, 1985, Mr. Butcher gave the following remarks to the American Mining Congress:

THE FEDERAL DEFICIT: THE NEED FOR BIPARTISANSHIP

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

It is a great pleasure for me to take part in this annual meeting of the American Mining Congress. I have had a deep interest in—and even a close emotional attachment to—your industry since my first mine viewing expedition to Bingham Canyon, almost 30 years ago. I thought then and I believe now that mining is a most essential industry to this country. Indeed, while the word "critical" is often overworked, the mining business is in fact "critical" to the vital interest of our nation.

My own industry, like yours, has taken some hard knocks over the last couple of years. Bankers and miners alike have felt the impact of a whole constellation of economic factors.

First, the strong U.S. dollar has on the one hand encouraged overseas export of metals to the United States, thus displacing domestic manufacturers, and on the other hand, helped close off export markets abroad.

Second, high worldwide interest rates, have depressed economic activity in other countries and reduced overseas demand for U.S. products.

Third, foreign competitors have been subsidized in a number of countries.

Fourth, and closely related, we find a different kind of subsidized foreign competitor—namely, sovereign producers whose primary goal is to secure foreign exchange and improve local employment.

Fifth, demand has been reduced for a number of metals due to the increased production of small cars and a shift toward high-tech products and production methods that require less metals.

And sixth, we have experienced sharp commodity price deflation.

These six factors are a formidable list.

But many observers—and I number myself among them—believe that the primary, principal, and most important factor responsible for our uncompetitiveness and the resultant trade deficit is the extraordinary strength of the U.S. dollar.

And the most important cause of the dollar's strength is the relatively high level of U.S. interest rates.

And the most significant underlying cause for that high level of rates is the other great deficit that afflicts our nation—the burgeoning federal budget deficit.

And it is this subject—the budget deficit—that I have chosen for my remarks today.

Now before anybody heads for the door—let me assure you that I am well aware there's been an awful lot of talk lately about the budget deficit. And some of you may think that by addressing this topic yet again, I'm "beating a dead horse." Well ladies and gentlemen, I guarantee you—this deficit "horse" is far from "dead." It's very much alive and galloping out-of-control.

The central facts about the deficit are simple, stark, and terribly serious.

In fiscal 1984, the United States overspent its income by \$175 billion. Our national debt last year soared to more than \$1.5 trillion. That debt required an interest expenditure of more than \$150 billion.

To put these numbers in perspective, compare them with the experience during the Kennedy Administration some 20 years ago, just before the huge buildup of the Vietnam War. In 1964, President Kennedy's entire budget was \$115 billion. That's \$35 billion less than our interest cost to service the national debt last year.

The future is no more inspiring. The government's own deficit projections—without any spending reductions or tax increases—are 218 billion dollars this year . . . 225 billion next year . . . 240 billion in 1987 . . . and 235 billion in 1988.

I realize these numbers differ with those proposed over the weekend by the Reagan Administration. However, I would remind you that the Reagan budget has not yet been adopted.

In any event, the numbers we're talking about numb the mind. And none of us will take heart from an estimate I saw the other day—that if we don't arrest the deficit's growth, total publicly held debt in 2004 would be between 10 and 12 trillion dollars.

Now, how did we come to be immersed in such a fiscal morass?

Some of the deficit's growth is due to our long recession, that accelerated spending and depressed revenues.

But even if we hadn't had a recession, last year we would have had a federal deficit in excess of 100 billion dollars! So, clearly, something other than the recession has been at work.

That "something"—the real culprit—is the fact that growth in government spending continues, in an ever-increasing degree, to outstrip revenue growth.

We are simply living beyond our means. To paraphrase the popular TV commercial, "We're spending money the new-fashioned way—we're not earning it!" And it's our economy, ultimately, that will pay the budget IOU's.

The situation is no different than if you or I, for a protracted period of time, lived beyond our income. Eventually, things would catch up to us. And so it is with our government deficit.

The fact is, government over the years has created spending programs of sweeping promise and lofty intent. At the same time, it has become evident that voters eager to receive benefits have not been as eager to pay for them.

As Illinois' new senator, Paul Simon, said recently: "What the public wants are more services and lower taxes. And we have given them both!"

We are in an intolerable situation that is steadily growing worse. That hasn't prevented some people—including a few prominent economists—from saying "deficits don't count."

Well, ladies and gentlemen, I beg to differ. Deficits do count and furthermore, they're not self-correcting either.

We may not know the precise outcome of our growing mega-deficits—or which of the consequences will exact the highest toll. And, frankly, I don't care to find out.

But the basic conclusion of deficits is incontrovertible. We can't continue to live on borrowed money without living on borrowed time. No individual, no corporation, and no nation can persist in running up debts without sooner or later paying a severe price.

We pay that price because we have no choice but to finance our deficits. And government has only two options in accomplishing this. Neither one is acceptable.

In the first, government prints more and more money to cover the deficit. This would rekindle inflation, and the hard-won ground on that front would be tragically sacrificed for an unworthy cause.

In the second option, the money supply remains in control, reversing the recent course of interest rates and returning them to even higher levels. Government then moves in as a primary borrower, and corporations and individuals are forced to take a back seat in the market. That would return us to square one—again grappling with the consequences of a recessionary economy.

Now, we have been fortunate over the past several years to have been able to keep the money supply in reasonable control without squeezing out the private sector. We've managed this largely because of a huge importation of capital. Foreign investors, in fact, have financed about half of our fiscal deficit.

But ladies and gentlemen, our excessive reliance on overseas capital cannot be assumed to be a permanent solution. Indeed, there is nothing permanent about it. And the more we depend on it, the more vulnerable our own financial base becomes—and the more subject we become to adverse external influences.

And that's the last thing that any of us needs—particularly the mining industry.

The real point is, ladies and gentlemen, we must take the deficit seriously. It is a real, not a paper, tiger. And we continue to ride it at our peril.

As Bob Dole has correctly put it, the budget deficit is far-and-away our number one domestic economic problem—just as the trade deficit is far-and-away our most threatening international economic problem.

So what can we do about it?

Perhaps a look back at how we got to where we are will help point the way to how we get to where we want to be. If one looks at a reasonably broad sweep of history—let's say back to the Kennedy years—we find that the government then took in 19 percent of GNP in taxes and spent about 19 percent. Today, we still take in 19 percent in taxes—even after the so-called Reagan tax cuts. But spending has sped ahead and now accounts for a full 25 percent of GNP.

So clearly, we must attack government spending.

Any meaningful attack on expenses must be aimed at three areas. First, the administrative budget, second social spending, and third defense.

In the first area, some people around this town suggest that we can solve our deficit

problem by cutting the administrative budget. The fact is we can't. Indeed, while there may be additional administrative "fat" that can be cut—we've already done a good job in cutting administrative expenses.

Moreover, according to some projections, even if we had no administrative budget—we'd still end fiscal '85 with a budget deficit. In other words, the three elements of defense, interest, and entitlements alone are expected this year to exceed total government revenues.

Our largest hurdles are defense and entitlements, which together comprise 69 percent of the federal budget—27 percent for defense, 42 percent for entitlements.

As for defense spending, a lot can be done—without compromising our nation's military power—by judiciously determining the weapons systems we really need and how we pay for them, in rational, multi-year procurement programs. We simply must find savings in our defense budget.

As to entitlements, we must control more vigorously our social spending. The principal guideline here should be to spread the penalties of such actions evenly across our society. The pain should be shared by everyone except by the poor, as defined by the various means tests.

I'm convinced the time has never been more ripe for an earnest, bipartisan effort to close the budget gap. That is what is required—bipartisanship—a cooperative effort to forge a workable compromise.

The administration has proposed cutting the budget by about \$50 billion by fiscal 1986. This ought to form the basis of any deficit-cutting program. We have got to wring that \$50 billion and more out of the deficit if we are to reach our targets. And our most critical targets, in my view, are attaining deficit to GNP ratios of 4 percent in 1986, 3 percent in 1987, and 2 percent in 1988.

Now, what about taxes?

Clearly, spending cuts must occupy center stage. Cutting spending must be our primary focus—our first priority. And any tax increases or revenue enhancements must be secondary issues.

However, to attain the kind of bipartisan effort necessary to cut the deficit may well require some give-and-take on the revenue side—to form the basis of a compromise that all sides can accept.

But in any case, we must not yield to the temptation to try to balance the budget principally by imposing higher taxes. We've been there before. And it doesn't work.

If new taxes are necessary, our goal should be to discourage consumption, not investment and savings. Indeed, the personal savings rate in this country is already much too low—about 6-plus percent of Americans' disposable income—compared to 11 percent in West Germany and 18 percent in Japan.

I consider it a positive sign that the level of debate about the budget deficit has intensified recently. Indeed, there is no shortage of specific proposals these days for trimming the deficit. And the last thing you need today is to hear my own personal laundry list of specific cuts. Frankly, there isn't one that I can think of that won't have some pain attached to it. So I'll spare you the Bill Butcher prescription this afternoon.

It isn't ideas that have been wanting. It's been the will to make some unpleasant decisions.

Four years ago when President Reagan took office, he pleaded that he would con-

trol inflation and get the country moving again. He has done both. And what is needed now is similar bold determination to solve the deficit problem.

If we are successful in cutting the fiscal deficit—we will have made a giant step toward redressing the other great imbalance—the trade deficit—that so directly affects the people in this room.

But clearly the place to start is with the budget deficit. And the time to start is now.●

THE IRAN AND IRAQ CONFLICT

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, since the resolution of the hostage crisis, the United States has essentially turned away from Iran. The atrocities that so shocked us several years ago did not vanish simply because we turned our attention to other things. Yesterday thousands of Iranians in the United States, Europe, and, under threat of personal danger, in Iran itself staged demonstrations to draw attention to the terrible human suffering that is the daily lot of Iranian citizens. I issued a statement in support of the continuing effort to set the Iranian people free of the Khomeini regime. I would like to enter that statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to recall to my colleagues the recent suffering which has occurred inside Iran.

I am speaking in an act of solidarity and support for the overwhelming majority of the people of Iran. I want to help bring to the attention of the American people the tragedy of the ongoing war between Iran and Iraq.

This war is most tragic because of the senseless death and destruction being inflicted. So far, only on the part of Iran, 1 million people have been killed or wounded; 3 million have become homeless and refugees, in addition to billions of dollars in war damage. In the last assault by the Iranian armed forces, there were nearly 60,000 casualties. This most recent offensive was launched only to counter the Iranian people's growing desire for peace. At all costs, the Khomeini regime seeks to keep the flames of war ablaze, and to prevent them from being extinguished in the ashes of hundreds of thousands of war dead. Because of the people's hatred for this conflict, the regime finds itself trying to induce the belief in these war stricken peoples that it loves peace—when in reality the culture of the present rulers in Iran can be basically said to be founded on a hysterical battle against all manifestations of liberty, both in nature and in society.

The regime can only survive by promoting death, grief and sorrow, while showing hostility toward all forms of

civil and human rights and international norms.

Both the Iranian and the Iraqi Governments have repeatedly been accused of using chemical warfare in the form of toxic gases. The casualties have by no means been limited to military personnel only. The civilian population: old men, wives, small children, have been killed and wounded by the thousands; their homes, towns, and livelihoods destroyed.

The consequences for the fabric of these societies, among the oldest in our Western civilization, of destruction, mass migration and economic and political chaos are unimaginable to those of us who have not been there. The American public can only have the vaguest image of the suffering of the people of both countries.

Compulsory conscription of adolescents—children by our standards—has become a feature of the Iranian war effort. I ask those of us observing this tragedy, how would you feel if your 15-year-old son were sent to the front in a bloody war, for a religious purpose in which you did not believe?

This war has dragged on for nearly 5 years. The people of Iran support the idea of peace, support the idea of an end to this senseless and bloody conflict which is draining their nation of its lifeblood, and killing off its next generations.

The movement for peace and freedom in Iran under the leadership of the National Council of Resistance is getting stronger. Solidarity demonstrations have taken place in capitals around the world; in addition, demonstrations have taken place repeatedly inside Iran, in the face of brutal repression by the Khomeini regime.

And today, here and in 10 other major cities around the world, we express our solidarity and support for the movement for peace and freedom in Iran.

Solh, solh azadi: Peace, peace freedom.●

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO REPEAL 5-PERCENT FLOOR ON DEDUCTIONS FOR MEDICAL EXPENSES IN THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to make all medical expenses deductible by repealing the 5-percent floor on the medical deduction from section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. I urge my colleagues to join me in this repeal.

The medical component of the current cost of living index is rising faster

than any other section of our economy. Medical expenses are increasing annually at an 8- to 10-percent rate—2½ times that of the entire economy as a whole. This increase in medical costs and services destroys the savings of the elderly, the poor, and even the middle class as many times they are unable to protect their earnings from the 5-percent floor.

Preventive health care is a vital part of keeping medical costs low. I believe that when we raised the floor on deductibility of medical expenses to 5 percent in the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984, we actually have discouraged individuals from seeking the care that they need. It is my firm belief that we should not place any impediments through the Tax Code or through Federal regulations to the receipt of adequate health care.

This legislation would repeal the 5-percent floor and simply allow all of our citizens—rich and poor, young and old alike—to deduct all their legitimate, reasonable and customary medical expenses from their tax basis in each fiscal year.

We all recognize that when an individual is in a catastrophic health situation, where their medical expenses are high, they can deduct those expenses from their income tax to the extent that it exceeds 5 percent of their income.

I am concerned that there are a number of our citizens, particularly the elderly, who are postponing or even avoiding medical care because of this 5-percent floor, thereby, when illness strikes, it is much more severe and ultimately is much more costly to our economy. By removing the 5-percent floor we will actually gain in revenues as we gain in productivity. People will attend to their illnesses in a much more timely manner, and sickness and disease will be arrested in the early stages.

The legislation that put the floor into place and then raised it to its current 5 percent level was done in a mistaken attempt at economy. Now is the time to correct this inequity in our Tax Code.

Thank you for the time, Mr. Speaker. I invite my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.●

SMALL BUSINESS AND THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in expressing my support for the small businesses of America and for the agency designed to assist them, the Small Business Administration [SBA].

Small business is an integral segment of American society. This Nation was transformed from a colony based on agriculture to the world's greatest industrial giant. Undeniably, it was the small entrepreneur with a sharp eye for expansion opportunities that provided the spark for this transformation. In a time of economic recession, shortage of resources, and an ever increasing budget deficit, we, as a nation, cannot afford to hinder in any way the valuable contributions that the small businesses makes to our society.

This Nation is currently enjoying an economic recovery for which small business is the backbone. During the recent recession it was small business that was hit hardest, yet the creation of new small businesses and the expansion of existing ones were the leading source of new jobs or replacement for jobs lost because of plant closures. In 1981 and 1982 alone, small business created some 2.6 million new jobs while big business lost 1.6 million. Clearly, the President's vaunted net employment increase during his first term of office was a result in the growth of small business. Without the contributions of small business, our Nation could not continue down the road toward good economic health. Small firms have proven their vital leadership role in job creation, product innovation, and the development of new technologies. The contributions of small business can be seen in every aspect of our economy.

Minority owned small businesses have played a significant role in this expansion as well. In the 1972 to 1982 period the number of minority owned businesses increased by 43 percent, and account for 5.7 percent of the total small businesses in the United States. California has the greatest concentration of minority owned small businesses; 19 percent of the total number. Almost half of these businesses are located in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, the area which I in part represent.

Undoubtedly, some of these contributions would not have been made without the assistance of the Small Business Administration [SBA]. The SBA has helped foster hundreds of thousands of small businesses who probably would never have gotten passed the planning stages without its assistance. The accomplishments of the SBA are impressive. Since its founding in 1953 the SBA has made or guaranteed more than \$35.7 billion in loans, helped thousands of small firms win Government procurement contracts, created over 33.4 million hours worth of work, contributed over \$468 billion to the gross national product, and \$142 billion of income-tax revenue. When the SBA was created there were approximately 4 million small businesses in the United States. Today

there are more than 13 million, certainly the SBA had some part in that growth.

The SBA has been especially beneficial in assisting minority businesses which, in turn, improves the conditions of economically depressed areas. However, minorities often face economic disadvantages which prevent them from opening their own businesses such as the lower level of family income. According to a study conducted by the National Federation of Independent Business [NFIB], 25 percent of new businesses are founded by personal and family savings. This poses a setback for blacks and Hispanics whose yearly median family income is 58 percent and 69 percent respectively, of the median income of all races.

Of utmost importance to small, disadvantaged businesses is the 8(a) procurement programs. In this program the SBA acts as the prime contractor and subcontracts out to small, economically, and socially disadvantaged firms interested in obtaining Government contracts. In fiscal year 1984 some 4,944 Government contracts were awarded to 1,716 disadvantaged firms, 208 of which were owned by women, for a value of \$2.6 billion.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that small business is in many ways the key to our economic well-being. Without small business our potential for job expansion will be inhibited and our gross national product will shrink. The SBA has been tremendously vital to the growth of small business, and is an agency we cannot afford to lose.●

RETRAINING OUR FARMERS

HON. E. THOMAS COLEMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, all across our country, the clouds of a massive agricultural crisis are taking shape, threatening to throw thousands of farmers out of business and pulling down with them many rural banks and businesses. As a result, an increasing number of individuals are losing their livelihood due to this turn in the economy and the ripple effects that will likely spread through agriculturally dependent communities. Many of the individuals affected by this crisis must now consider new lines of work, they are in fact, "dislocated workers."

In the past, the term "dislocated worker" has conjured up the image of a steelworker in Pittsburgh or an auto worker in Detroit; but in Missouri, a State with relatively low unemployment, the face associated with the phrase is that of one of the hundreds

of farmers who are expected to abandon farming this year because they have gone bankrupt or can no longer borrow enough money to plant a crop and purchase necessary equipment.

Measures must be taken to ease the distress of farmers as they face the reality of having to retrain themselves for a new career. Most farmers have a very specific set of skills, and because most of them will have to seek work unrelated to agriculture, new job skills are essential.

Title III of the Job Training and Partnership Act [JTPA] provides one such measure. Under title III, grants are provided to States on a formula basis for programs and services to dislocated workers. Programs authorized under title III provide training to persons out of work because of any permanent closure of a plant or facility. On February 20, I joined 15 Members of Congress in writing to Acting Secretary of Labor, Ford B. Ford urging him to issue a letter to all Governors informing them of the option available to States of including dislocated farmers as dislocated workers in order to participate in training programs under title III of JTPA. I understand that a copy of this letter has been presented to our new Secretary of Labor, William Brock. I am submitting a copy of the letter for the RECORD.

I urge States to take advantage of the opportunities under title III of JTPA and make their services for dislocated workers widely known to their agricultural communities. Participation in these programs represent one small way the Federal Government can help our struggling farm families begin the difficult task of making new lives for themselves.

The letter follows:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC, February 20, 1985.

Hon. FORD B. FORD,
Acting Secretary of Labor,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. FORD: As you are aware there is growing concern regarding the current economic crisis many farmers are about to face. An increasing number of farmers are losing their livelihood due to the economic downturn and the ripple effects that are likely to spread throughout agriculturally dependent communities across the country.

Title III of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) provides grants to States on a formula basis for programs and services to dislocated workers defined under the Act, Section 302(a), as individuals who:

1. have been terminated or laid-off or who have received a notice of termination or lay-off from employment, are eligible for or have exhausted their entitlement to unemployment compensation, and are unlikely to return to their previous industry or occupation;

2. have been terminated, or who have received a notice of termination of employment, as a result of any permanent closure of a plant or facility; or

3. are long-term unemployed and have limited opportunities for employment or re-employment in the same or a similar occu-

pation in the area in which such individuals reside, including any older individuals who may have substantial barriers to employment by reason of age.

The agricultural industry is undergoing many of the same changes with regard to the numbers of people needed to provide products as are such industries as steel and automobile manufacturing. These changes are permanent and will not be reversed. Since most farmers have very specific sets of skills, and because most of them will have to seek work unrelated to agriculture, job retraining will be of paramount importance.

In our judgment it would not conflict with Congressional intent to include dislocated farmers under this deliberately broad definition. It is not apparent though, that States are utilizing title III programs to serve such farmers. One possible reason why these programs are not widespread is the uncertainty regarding the definition of "dislocated worker." It is critical therefore, that States be made aware of their option to serve dislocated farmers under JTPA. Title III funds could be used to provide training and support services to dislocated farmers and others dependent on the agricultural economy in a coordinated effort with other necessary social services.

We strongly urge that you issue a letter to all the Governors informing them of this option under the law. That is, that dislocated farmers may be defined as dislocated workers in order to participate in training programs under title III of the JTPA. Without a uniform policy, we are concerned that unnecessary hesitancy will weaken the efforts of the States to meet this growing need.

Prompt attention with respect to this issue is crucial. We do not want this unmet need to go unattended for lack of definition. If we can be of any assistance in facilitating action on this issue, please inform us.

Sincerely,

James M. Jeffords, ranking Republican,
Steve Gunderson, Cooper Evans, John R. McKernan, Denny Smith, Jim Lightfoot, Frank Horton, Tom Lewis, E. Thomas Coleman, Olympia Snowe, Doug Bereuter, Michael G. Oxley, Pat Roberts, Virginia Smith, Sid Morrison, Bob Whittaker, Members of Congress.●

THE OUTRAGE AT IBNET

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, May 2, I introduced with the full support of the Republican members of the Select Committee on Hunger (Mr. EMERSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, and Mr. BE-REUTER) a sense of the Congress resolution which expresses outrage at the forced evacuation of over 60,000 famine victims from a feeding camp in northwestern Ethiopia.

I have asked the Foreign Affairs Committee to expedite consideration and bring the following resolution to the floor under a unanimous-consent request:

SUSPEND THE RULES AND PASS THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION, H. CON. RES. 140 WITH AMENDMENTS

In the sixth paragraph of the preamble, strike out "half" and insert in lieu thereof "one-third", and insert "in Ethiopia" before the semicolon.

In subsection (a) of the first section, strike out "civilized".

Material proposed to be deleted appears in [brackets] and material proposed to be inserted appears in *italic*.

H. CON. RES. 140

Mrs. ROUKEMA submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the forced evacuation of the Ibnet feeding camp in Ethiopia.

Whereas from April 28 to April 30, 1985, Ethiopian army troops ousted about 60,000 famine victims from the Ibnet feeding camp in the Gondar Administrative Region and then destroyed the camp;

Whereas many of those in the Ibnet feeding camp were at risk of death from famine;

Whereas several thousand of those at the Ibnet feeding camp were children under 5 years of age;

Whereas approximately 52,000 people who were sent away from the Ibnet feeding camp were forced to travel on foot;

Whereas relief officials of a private and voluntary organization stated that as many as half of those who were forced to walk may die;

Whereas the United States Government has provided about [half] *one-third* of all relief assistance going to famine victims in Ethiopia; and

Whereas Agency for International Development officials reported there were 800 tons of United States-donated food at the Ibnet feeding camp which was meant for famine victims and is now being provided to the local population who are less in need than those who were at the camp; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) the Congress joins with Agency for International Development Administrator McPherson in expressing outrage at the forced evacuation of the Ibnet feeding camp in Ethiopia and urges that [civilized] nations join in condemning the action of the local Administrator of the Gondar Region for allowing this heinous action to occur.

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Ethiopian Government—
(A) should take necessary steps to ensure that the forcible evacuation and destruction of refugee facilities never happens again; and

(B) rectify the situation by assisting those famine victims who were displaced;

(2) the United Nations monitor the migration of the former inhabitants of the Ibnet feeding camp, investigate what humanitarian aid is being provided for them, and report back to the donor community;

(3) the Agency for International Development ensure that none of the United States-donated food is diverted from famine victims;

Sec. 2. The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution to the President with a request that the President transmit a copy to the Government of Ethiopia.

Information from reliable sources confirms that from April 28 to April 30, 1985, Ethiopian Army troops, acting on the orders of local government leaders, forcibly evicted 60,000 famine victims from the Ibnet feeding camp in the Gondar Administrative Region of northwest Ethiopia. As the evacuation was in its final stages, the camp was burned to the ground. Until this heinous act, Ibnet had been the largest feeding center for famine victims of Ethiopia.

Of the 60,000 refugees evicted from Ibnet, approximately 52,500 were forced to travel on foot too. This group includes several thousand children under the age of 5 and several thousand adults who were weak from famine and associated diseases. Yet, this group now finds itself on a forced migration through the rugged highland mountains of Ethiopia. Some private voluntary officials predict as many as half of these people may die before they reach suitable refuge.

Officials of the Agency for International Development have reported that there were 800 tons of U.S.-donated food at Ibnet, which was intended for consumption by these famine victims. Reports indicate that this food is now being distributed to the local population surrounding the former camp who are less in need than the refugees ousted from the camp.

In our best humanitarian tradition, the U.S. Government is providing one-third of all the food aid going to the famine victims in Ethiopia. The American people have responded to the tragedy unfolding in Africa with characteristic generosity. Yet, the Ethiopian Government has callously neglected its own people. Although the local administrator is said to be responsible for this outrageous act, the Ethiopian Government bears ultimate responsibility for allowing this incident to develop.

House Concurrent Resolution 140 calls upon the nations of the world to condemn those responsible for this heinous act. It also calls upon the central government in Ethiopia to rectify the situation and prevent a recurrence. The resolution directs AID to take the steps necessary to ensure that no U.S.-donated food aid is diverted or misused. The measure also asks the United Nations to monitor the migration of the Ibnet refugees to determine what necessary humanitarian aid is being given to them.

As ranking Republican on the Select Committee on Hunger, I recently had the unparalleled opportunity to visit Ethiopia and study the famine situation. It was a soul-searing experience. The suffering of the victims of this terrible combination of the cruel hand of nature and callous political neglect is unimaginable and inhumane. Surely, the U.S. Congress should raise its voice in moral outrage. It should

clearly articulate to the United Nations and the Ethiopian Government that never again should there be such reprehensible action and that all such efforts should be undertaken to prevent any recurrence.●

SOVIET JEWRY

HON. BERNARD J. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with you, and my colleagues the plight of Marina Shenderovich, a 25-year-old refusenik. As you know, Soviet Jews long for the freedom and liberty that we take so readily for granted in this country. I appeal to you in the name of compassion that our commitment on their behalf never be lessened, but rather deepened and strengthened.

A while back, it had come to my attention that a number of student organizations at Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey, were concerned about the treatment of a former biology student at Moscow University. Her name is Marina Shenderovich and today she faces the reign of oppression as do so many of her fellow Jews in the Soviet Union.

Her situation is one of desperation. The daughter of an engineer and an English teacher, she was refused an emigration visa in 1979 for unstated reasons. As a result, she was forced to curtail her studies at the university.

The Rutgers student body hopes that, if Ms. Shenderovich cannot leave the Soviet Union permanently, she will at the very least be able to spend 4 years in the United States to resume her studies. Officials at Rutgers University are willing to evaluate her application prior to her leaving the Soviet Union. However, the Soviet Union has made no effort to release her records.

As Americans, we are committed to a democratic form of government as the best way to protect the rights, well-being, and dignity of all men and women. As elected officials, we believe in justice and equality under the law. Let each one of us speak out with more vigor than ever before. We must demonstrate to the world at large, but most importantly to the refuseniks, that we will work endlessly until the human rights of all are affirmed.●

IN HONOR OF RED TINDOL, GEORGIA SMALL BUSINESS- MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. RICHARD RAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Georgia Small Business Association is presenting their Man of the Year Award. It would be difficult for me to know of a person who is more qualified to be recognized for this honor than my good friend, Red Tindol.

I first became acquainted with Red in 1953, when he was employed by a big business firm, Orkin Exterminators. In fact, I had my own small business at that time, and Red Tindol tried to buy me out.

When Red decided to leave Orkin and start his own small business, he risked all his assets in this venture. During this period of time, he learned firsthand of the frustrations that small business people face—the difficulty of making a payroll, the frustration of fighting the Federal bureaucracy and its cumbersome regulations, and the difficulty of choosing between taking a financial risk to expand or facing possible extinction if he didn't.

So, Red Tindol has known both sides of the business spectrum—the big business side and the small business side. Today, he is an extremely successful businessman who has learned how to handle the pressures and the problems of small business. His career and his life are an inspiration to all struggling small business people.

Mr. Speaker, I was a small businessman for 23 years, and, although I've been out of small business for about 13 years, I've never lost my concern for the problems that face our Nation's small business men and women.

The history of our Nation is an unparalleled success story. America has always been the land of opportunity where hard work pays off.

Open and honest competition in the American marketplace is what makes it possible for people to succeed through hard work. Along with you, I will always work to keep the marketplace competitive.

I am concerned that the free enterprise system be kept healthy in this country and that small business growth is encouraged.

The administration's 1983 report on small business shows that small firms are providing half of all jobs and creating two-thirds of new jobs in the private sector.

According to that report, in 1981 and 1982, small businesses created 2.6 million new jobs, while large businesses lost 1.6 million jobs.

So, it is still true that small business is the backbone of America, and this backbone must be kept strong.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider cuts and changes in the Small Business Administration this year, I urge my colleagues to remember that small business is a major employer and a significant factor in reducing unemployment in this country.

My commitment to small business remains deep. Although cutbacks must come in all areas of our budget this year, we need to make sure that we don't take steps that may hurt employment and growth in this country. Before we pass small business legislation this year, Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to look down the road and see just where our actions will take this country. ●

DON'T BLAME CIVIL SERVANT

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, before this body begins legislative action on budget recommendations for fiscal year 1986, I want to share with my colleagues an editorial by Mr. Tommy C. Ishee, public relations director for the Virginia Federation of the National Association Retired Federal Employees. This essay, entitled "Don't Blame Civil Servant," eloquently highlights the history of the Federal retirement system and the responsibility Congress has to ensure its solvency.

I urge all my colleagues to read with care this important commentary on the Civil Service pension system before casting your vote on measures affecting compensation and benefits for active and retired Federal workers. The article follows:

DON'T BLAME CIVIL SERVANT

(By Tommy C. Ishee)

The U.S. Civil Service is, to many people, an undefinable mass of people who cost taxpayers money and produce little but frustration.

Few people stop to consider that the government policies, which are the root of the frustration, are created not by the civil servants, but by the Congress, the president and the courts, who are the real government of the United States. The civil servant is merely a hired hand, paid to enforce the laws and carry out the will and bidding of these lawmakers. More often than not, public frustration results from the policies, but public anger is directed at the person charged with carrying out the policies.

However, federal employees, from astronaut to zoologist, are the best hired hands that can be obtained from their particular jobs, so far as competitive examinations or comparisons of academic or technical training can determine. Civil Service employees are hired on the basis of what they know, and not who they know.

All too many Americans have forgotten that the U.S. Civil Service was created a

century ago (1883) when—after President James Garfield was assassinated by the disgruntled job-seeker—public indignation boiled over and forced Congress to put an end to the corrupt and scandal-ridden "spoils system" of selling federal jobs to highest bidders, or handing them out as rewards to political cronies of incoming administrations.

Recently a great deal of attention has been directed toward the retirement benefits received by former civil servants. Allegations have been made that these are excessive and that cutting them would go a long way toward balancing the budget.

Civil Service retirement benefits accrue from a retirement investment fund created in 1920, primarily as a convenience for the government so it could get rid of many very aged employees without firing them outright. Federal employees were compelled, as a condition of employment, to pay 2½ percent of their total salary into this fund. The government contributed nothing. Over the years, this individual assessment of salary has grown to 7 percent. In 1957, the government decided to begin contributing a like amount. Federal retirement benefits are one factor used in setting "comparability" standards for federal salaries.

Over time, the government has borrowed all the reserves in the Retirement Trust Fund, at a comparatively low rate of interest, and used the money for various purposes, such as farm loans, VA and FHA mortgage guarantees, and the like. At the end of 1983, the Retirement Trust Fund reserve totaled more than \$109 billion—and 99 percent of this was "on loan" to the U.S. government.

When one compares total contributions to the retirement fund with total disbursements, the following becomes obvious:

For 40 years (from 1920 through 1960), employee payments into the trust fund exceeded disbursements from the fund by \$763 million. Cost of federal retirement to the U.S. government: nothing.

For another 14 years (1961 to 1975), employee payments into the fund, plus interest accumulated on fund investments, exceeded federal retirement expenses by more than \$1 billion. Again, cost of federal retirement to the U.S. government was nothing.

Between 1975 and 1984, employee contributions, plus interest earned on trust-fund investments, plus government-agency "matching" contributions (which are 7 percent of salary and are really part of the employee's salary) exceeded total retirement-system expenses by more than \$7 billion.

So, as a matter of fact, the Civil Service Retirement System is self-sustaining and, in addition, has provided a financial service to the U.S. government.

We should all remember that the civil servant has no voice in the decisions as to what his salary should be; what perquisites (if any) he or she receives, or what interest the government should pay on the money that government borrows from the trust fund. These decisions are made unilaterally by the government. Congress decides what retirement benefits should be, and therefore what percentage of salary an employee must pay into the Retirement Trust Fund to yield such retirement benefits.

A federal employee is sworn to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States. He or she may not strike nor really negotiate for pay, benefits or any condition of employment. Overt political activity is proscribed. If, indeed, the federal employee is a monster, he or she had no part in creating it, and shouldn't be blamed for it. ●

THE PRESIDENT AT THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT: A JOB WELL DONE

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this morning, our President gave a masterful address to the European Parliament. His speech was both inspiring and challenging.

In his moving address, the President was eloquent in talking about America's shared struggle with our European allies during the Second World War. He also talked of America's unflinching commitment to a strong political, economic and military partnership with Europe. He pointed to our common heritage with Europe and our aspirations for a future filled with freedom, prosperity, and peace.

The President also pointed out that history has shown that weakness can lead to instability and conflict and that Western weaknesses in past decades have been exploited by the Soviets. In talking about the challenges of keeping the peace with an aggressive Soviet Union, our President offered a series of practical steps for reducing tensions with that country. These procedures include exchanging observers at military exercises, and holding regular high-level contacts between United States and Soviet military leaders. Also proposed was a plan urging that our two countries agree on confidence-building measures and that we establish a military communications link between our two Nations.

I believe that Europeans today are more confident than ever that America is a tested and true friend who will stand by our allies in time of need.

I am certain that my colleagues will join me in saying well done to our President.

With these thoughts in mind, I recommend the following excerpts from the President's speech to my colleagues in the Congress.

TEXT OF THE ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT TO A SPECIAL SESSION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, STRASBURG, FRANCE, MAY 8, 1985

We mark today the anniversary of the liberation of Europe from tyrants who had seized this continent and plunged it into a terrible war. Forty years ago today, the guns were stilled and peace began—a peace that has become the longest of this century.

On this day 40 years ago, they swarmed onto the boulevards of Paris, rallied under the Arc de Triomphe, and sang the "Marseillaise" in the free and open air. In Rome, the sound of church bells filled St. Peter's square and echoed through the city. On this day 40 years ago, Winston Churchill walked out onto a balcony in Whitehall and said to the people of Britain, "This is your victory"—and the crowd yelled back, in an unforgettable moment of love and gratitude, "No—it is yours." Londoners tore the black-

out curtains from their windows, and put floodlights on the great symbols of English history. And for the first time in nearly 6 years, Big Ben, Buckingham Palace, and St. Paul's Cathedral were illuminated against the sky.

Across the ocean, a half million New Yorkers flooded Times Square and laughed and posed for the cameras. In Washington, our new President, Harry Truman, called reporters into his office and said, "The flags of freedom fly all over Europe."

On that day 40 years ago, I was at my post at an Army Air Corps installation in Culver City, California. Passing a radio I heard the words, "ladies and gentlemen, the war in Europe is over." I felt a chill, as if a gust of cold wind had just swept past, and—even though, for America, there was still a war on the Pacific Front—I realized: I will never forget this moment.

This day can't help but be emotional, for in it we feel the long tug of memory; we are reminded of shared joy and shared pain. A few weeks ago in California an old soldier with tears in his eyes said, "It was such a different world then. It's almost impossible to describe it to someone who wasn't there, but when they finally turned the lights on in the cities again it was like being reborn."

If it is hard to communicate the happiness of those days, it is even harder to communicate, to those who did not share it, the depth of Europe's agony. So much of it lay in ruins. Whole cities had been destroyed. Children played in the rubble and begged for food.

By this day 40 years ago, over 40 million lay dead, and the survivors composed a continent of victims. And to this day, we wonder: how did this happen? How did civilization take such a terrible turn? After all the books and the documentaries, after all the histories, and studies, we still wonder: how?

Hannah Arendt spoke of "the banality of evil"—the banality of the little men who did the terrible deeds. We know they were totalitarians who used the state, which they had elevated to the level of a "God," to inflict war on peaceful nations and genocide on innocent peoples.

We know of the existence of evil in the human heart, and we know that in Nazi Germany that evil was institutionalized—given power and direction by the state and those who did its bidding. And we also know that early attempts to placate the totalitarians did not save us from war. In fact, they guaranteed it. There are lessons to be learned in this and never forgotten.

But there is a lesson too in another thing we saw in those days: perhaps we can call it "the commonness of virtue." The common men and women who somehow dug greatness from within their souls—the people who sang to the children during the blitz, who joined the resistance and said "No" to tyranny, the people who hid the Jews and the dissidents, the people who became, for a moment, the repositories of all the courage of the West—from a child named Anne Frank to a hero named Raoul Wallenberg. These names shine. They give us heart forever. The glow of their memories lit Europe in her darkest days.

Who can forget the hard days after the war? We can't help but look back and think: life was so vivid then. There was the sense of purpose, the joy of shared effort, and, later, the impossible joy of our triumph. Those were the days when the West rolled up its sleeves and repaired the damage that had been done, the days when Europe rose

in glory from the ruins. Old enemies were reconciled with the European family. Together, America and Western Europe created and put into place the Marshall Plan to rebuild from the rubble. Together we created an Atlantic Alliance, which proceeded not from transient interests of state but from shared ideals. Together we created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a partnership aimed at seeing that the kind of tyrants who had tormented Europe would never torment her again.

NATO was a triumph of organization and effort, but it was also something new, very different. For NATO derived its strength directly from the moral values of the people it represented, from their high ideals, their love of liberty, their commitment to peace.

But perhaps the greatest triumph of all was not in the realm of a sound defense or material achievement. No, the greatest triumph after the war is that in spite of all the chaos, poverty, sickness, and misfortune that plagued this continent, the people of Western Europe resisted the call of new tyrants and the lure of their seductive ideologies. Your nations did not become the breeding ground for new extremist philosophies. You resisted the totalitarian temptation. Your people embraced democracy, the dream the fascists could not kill. They chose freedom.

Today we celebrate the leaders who led the way—Churchill and Monnet, Adenauer and Schuman, De Gasperi and Spaak, Truman and Marshall. And we celebrate, too, the free political parties that contributed their share of greatness: the Liberals and the Christian Democrats, the Social Democrats and Labour and the Conservatives. Together they tugged at the same car, and the great and mighty ship of Europe moved on.

If any doubt their success, let them look at you. In this room are those who fought on opposite sides 40 years ago, and their sons and daughters. Now you work together to lead Europe democratically. You buried animosity and hatred in the rubble. There is no greater testament to reconciliation and to the peaceful unity of Europe than the men and women in this chamber.

In the decades after the war, Europe knew great growth and power, amazing vitality in every area of life, from fine arts to fashion, from manufacturing to science to the world of ideas. Europe was robust and alive, and none of this was an accident. It was the natural result of freedom, the natural fruit of the democratic ideal. We in America looked at Europe and called her what she was: an Economic Miracle.

And we could hardly be surprised. When we Americans think about our European heritage, we tend to think of your cultural influences and the rich ethnic heritage you gave us. But the industrial revolution that transformed the American economy came from Europe. The guiding intellectual lights of our democratic system—Icke, Montesquieu, and Adam Smith—came from Europe. And the geniuses who ushered in the modern industrial-technological age came from—well, I think you know, but two examples will suffice. Alexander Graham Bell, whose great invention maddens every American parent whose child insists on phoning his European pen pal rather than writing to him—was a Scotsman. And Guglielmo Marconi, who invented the radio—thereby providing a living for a young man from Dixon, Illinois, who later went into politics—I guess I should explain that's me—so blame Marconi. Marconi, as you know, was born in Italy.

Tomorrow will mark the 35th anniversary of the Schuman Plan, which led to the Eu-

ropean Coal and Steel Community, the first block in the creation of a united Europe. The purpose was to tie French and German—and European—industrial production so tightly together that war between them "becomes not merely unthinkable but materially impossible." Those are the words of Robert Schuman; the Coal and Steel Community was the child of his genius. And if he were here today I believe he would say: We have only just begun!

I am here to tell you America remains, as she was 40 years ago, dedicated to the unity of Europe. We continue to see a strong and unified Europe not as a rival but as an even stronger partner. Indeed, John F. Kennedy, in his ringing "Declaration of Interdependence" in the freedom bell city of Philadelphia 23 years ago, explicitly made this objective a key tenet of postwar American policy; that policy saw the New World and the Old as twin pillars of a larger democratic community. We Americans still see European unity as a vital force in that historic process. We favor the expansion of the European Community; we welcome the entrance of Spain and Portugal into the Community, for their presence makes for a stronger Europe, and a stronger Europe is a stronger West.

Yet despite Europe's Economic Miracle, which brought so much prosperity to so many, despite the visionary ideas of the European leaders, despite the enlargement of democracy's frontiers within the European community itself, I am told that a more doubting mood is upon Europe today. I hear words like "Europessimism" and "Europaralysis." I am told that Europe seems to have lost the sense of confidence that dominated that postwar era. If there is something of a "lost" quality these days, is it connected to the fact that some, in the past few years, have begun to question the ideals and philosophies that have guided the West for centuries? That some have even come to question the social and intellectual worth of the West?

We in the West have much to be thankful for—peace, prosperity, and freedom. If we are to preserve these for our children, and for theirs, today's leaders must demonstrate the same resolve and sense of vision which inspired Churchill, Adenauer, De Gasperi, and Schuman. Their challenge was to rebuild a democratic Europe under the shadow of Soviet power. Our task, in some ways even more daunting, is to keep the peace with an ever more powerful Soviet Union, to introduce greater stability in our relationship with it, and to live together in a world in which our values can prosper.

The leaders and people of postwar Europe had learned the lessons of their history from the failures of their predecessors. They learned that aggression feeds on appeasement and that weakness itself can be provocative. We, for our part, can learn from the success of our predecessors. We know that both conflict and aggression can be deterred, that democratic nations are capable of the resolve, the sacrifices, and the consistency of policy needed to sustain such deterrence.

From the creation of NATO in 1949 through the early 1970's, Soviet aggression was effectively deterred. The strength of Western economies, the vitality of our societies, the wisdom of our diplomacy, all contributed to Soviet restraint; but certainly the decisive factor must have been the countervailing power—ultimately, military, and, above all, nuclear power—which the West

was capable of bringing to bear in the defense of its interests.

It was in the early 1970's that the United States lost that superiority over the Soviet Union in strategic nuclear weapons which had characterized the postwar era. In Europe, the effect of this loss was not quickly perceptible. But seen globally, Soviet conduct changed markedly and dangerously. First in Angola in 1975, then, when the West failed to respond, in Ethiopia, in South Yemen, in Kampuchea, and ultimately in Afghanistan, the Soviet Union began courting more risks, and expanding its influence through the indirect and direct application of military power. Today, we see similar Soviet efforts to profit from and stimulate regional conflicts in Central America.

The ineffectual Western response to Soviet adventurism of the late 1970's had many roots, not least the crisis of self-confidence within the American body politic wrought by the Vietnam experience. But just as Soviet decision-making in the earlier postwar era had taken place against a background of overwhelming American strategic power, so the decisions of the late 1970's were taken in Moscow, as in Washington and throughout Europe, against a background of growing Soviet and stagnating Western nuclear strength.

One might draw the conclusion from these events that the West should reassert that nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union upon which our security and our strategy rested through the postwar era. That is not my view. We cannot and should not seek to build our peace and freedom perpetually upon the basis of expanding nuclear arsenals.

In the short run, we have no alternative but to compete with the Soviet Union in this field, not in the pursuit of superiority, but merely of balance. It is thus essential that the United States maintain a modern and survivable nuclear capability in each leg of the strategic triad—sea, land, and air-based. It is similarly important that France and Britain maintain and modernize their independent strategic capabilities.

One can imagine several possible responses to the continued Soviet build-up of nuclear forces. On the one hand, we can ask the Soviet Union to reduce its offensive systems through equitable, verifiable arms control measures. We are pressing that case in Geneva. Thus far, however, we have heard nothing new from the other side.

A second possibility would be for the West to step up our current modernization effort to keep up with constantly accelerating Soviet deployments, not to regain superiority, but merely to keep up with Soviet deployments. But is this really an acceptable alternative? Even if this course could be sustained by the West, it would produce a less stable strategic balance than the one we have today. Must we accept an endless process of nuclear arms competition? I don't think so. We need a better guarantee of peace than that.

Fortunately, there is a third possibility. It is to offset the continued Soviet offensive build-up in destabilizing weapons by developing defenses against these weapons. In 1982, I launched a new research program—the Strategic Defense Initiative.

The state of modern technology may soon make possible for the first time the ability to use non-nuclear systems to defeat ballistic missiles. The Soviets themselves have long recognized the value of defensive systems and have invested heavily in them. Indeed, they have spent as much on defen-

sive systems as they have on offensive systems for more than 20 years.

This research program will take time. As we proceed with it, we will remain within existing treaty constraints. We will also consult in the closest possible fashion with our Allies. And when the time for decisions on the possible production and deployment of such systems comes, we must and will discuss and negotiate these issues with the Soviet Union.

During the 1970's we went to great lengths to restrain unilaterally our strategic weapons programs out of the conviction that the Soviet Union would adhere to certain rules in its conduct—rules as neither side seeking to gain unilateral advantage at the expense of the other. These efforts of the early 1970's resulted in some improvements in Europe, the Berlin Quadripartite Agreement being the best example. But the hopes for a broader and lasting moderation of the East-West competition foundered in Angola, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, and Nicaragua.

The question before us today is whether we have learned from these mistakes and can undertake a stable and peaceful relationship with the Soviet Union based upon effective deterrence and the reduction of tensions. I believe we can. I believe we have learned that fruitful cooperation with the Soviet Union must be accompanied by successful competition in areas—particularly Third World areas—where the Soviets are not yet prepared to act with restraint.

These are the reflections which have molded our policy toward the Soviet Union. That policy embodies the following basic elements:

While we maintain deterrence to preserve the peace, the United States will make a steady, sustained effort to reduce tensions and solve problems in its relations with the Soviet Union.

The United States is prepared to conclude fair, equitable, verifiable agreements for arms reduction, above all with regard to offensive nuclear weapons.

The United States will insist upon compliance with past agreements both for their own sake and to strengthen confidence in the possibility of future accords.

The United States seeks no unilateral advantages, and, of course, can accept none on the Soviet side.

The United States will proceed in full consultation with its allies, recognizing that our fates are intertwined and we must act in unity.

The United States does not seek to undermine or change the Soviet system nor to impinge upon the security of the Soviet Union. At the same time it will resist attempts by the Soviet Union to use or threaten force against others, or to impose its system on others by force.

I have directed the Secretary of State to engage with the Soviet Union on an extended agenda of problem solving. Yet even as we embark upon new efforts to sustain a productive dialogue with the Soviet Union, we are reminded of the obstacles posed by our so fundamentally different concepts of humanity, of human rights, of the value of a human life. The murder of Major Nicholson by a Soviet soldier in East Germany, and the Soviet Union's refusal to accept responsibility for this act, is only the latest reminder.

If we are to succeed in reducing East-West tensions, we must find means to ensure against the arbitrary use of lethal force in the future—whether against individuals like

Major Nicholson, or against groups, such as the passengers on a jumbo jet.

It is for that reason that I would like to outline for you today what I believe would be a useful way to proceed. I propose that the United States and the Soviet Union take four practical steps.

First, that our two countries make a regular practice of exchanging observers at military exercises and locations. We now follow this practice with many other nations, to the equal benefit of all parties.

Second, as I believe it is desirable for the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union to meet and tackle problems, I am also convinced that the military leaders of our nations could benefit from more contact. I therefore propose that we institute regular, high-level contacts between Soviet and American military leaders, to develop better understanding and to prevent potential tragedies from occurring.

Third, I urge that the Conference on Disarmament in Europe act promptly and agree on the concrete confidence-building measures proposed by the NATO countries. The United States is prepared to discuss the Soviet proposal on non-use of force in the context of Soviet agreement to concrete confidence-building measures.

Fourth, I believe a permanent military-to-military communications link could serve a useful purpose in this important area of our relationship. It could be the channel for exchanging notifications and other information regarding routine military activities, thereby reducing the chances of misunderstanding and misinterpretation. Over time, it might evolve into a "risk-reduction" mechanism for rapid communication and exchange of data in times of crisis.

These proposals are not cure-alls for our current problems, and will not compensate for the deaths which have occurred. But as terrible as past events have been, it would be more tragic if we were to make no attempt to prevent even larger tragedies from occurring through lack of contact and communication.

We do not aspire to impose our system on anyone, nor do we have pat answers for all the world's ills. But our ideals of freedom and democracy and our economic systems have proven their ability to meet the needs of our people. Our adversaries can offer their people only economic stagnation and the corrupt hand of a state and party bureaucracy which ultimately satisfy neither material nor spiritual needs.

I want to reaffirm to the people of Europe the constancy of the American purpose. We were at your side through two great wars; we have been at your side through 40 years of a sometimes painful peace. We are at your side today because, like you, we have not veered from the ideals of the West—the ideals of freedom, liberty, and peace. Let no one—no one—doubt our purpose.

The United States is committed not only to the security of Europe—we are committed to the re-creation of a larger and more genuinely European Europe. The United States is committed not only to a partnership with Europe—the United States is committed to an end to the artificial division of Europe.

We do not deny any nation's legitimate interest in security. We share the basic aspirations of all of the peoples of Europe—freedom, prosperity, and peace. But when families are divided, and people are not allowed to maintain normal human and cultural contacts, this creates international tension. Only in a system in which all feel secure,

and sovereign, can there be a lasting and secure peace.

For this reason we support and will encourage movement toward the social, humanitarian, and democratic ideals shared in Europe. The issue is not one of state boundaries, but of insuring the right of all nations to conduct their affairs as their peoples desire. The problem of a divided Europe, like others, must be solved by peaceful means. Let us rededicate ourselves to the full implementation of the Helsinki Final Act in all its aspects.

As we seek to encourage democracy, we must remember that each country must struggle for democracy within its own culture; emerging democracies have special problems and require special help. Those nations whose democratic institutions are newly emerged and whose confidence in the process is not yet deeply rooted need our help. They should have an established community of their peers, other democratic countries to whom they can turn for support or just advice.

We in our country have launched a major effort to strengthen and promote democratic ideals and institutions. Following a pattern first started in the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States Congress approved the National Endowment for Democracy. This organization subsequently established institutes of labor, business, and political parties dedicated to programs of cooperation with democratic forces around the world. I hope other democracies will join in this effort and contribute their wisdom and talents to this cause.

I do not believe those who say the people of Europe today are paralyzed and pessimistic. And I would say to those who think this: Europe, beloved Europe, you are greater than you know. You are the treasury of centuries of Western thought and Western culture, you are the father of Western ideals and the mother of Western faith.

Europe, you have been the power and the glory of the West, and you are a moral success. In the horrors after World War II, you rejected totalitarianism, you rejected the lure of new "Superman," and a "New Communist Man." You proved that you were—and are—a moral triumph.

You in the West are a Europe without illusions, a Europe firmly grounded in the ideals and traditions that made her greatness, a Europe unbound and unfettered by a bankrupt ideology. You are, today, a New Europe on the brink of a new century—a democratic community with much to be proud of.

We have much to do. The work ahead is not unlike the building of a great cathedral. The work is slow, complicated, and painstaking. It is passed on with pride from generation to generation. It is the work not only of leaders but of ordinary people. The cathedral evolves as it is created, with each generation adding its own vision—but the initial ideal remains constant, and the faith that drives the vision persists. The results may be slow to see, but our children and their children will trace in the air the emerging arches and spires and know the faith and dedication and love that produced them. My friends, Europe is the Cathedral, and it is illuminated still.

And if you doubt your will, and your spirit, and your strength to stand for something, think of those people 40 years ago—who wept in the rubble, who laughed in the streets, who paraded across Europe, who cheered Churchill with love and devotion, and who sang the "Marseillaise" down the

boulevards. Spirit like that does not disappear; it cannot perish; it will not go away. There's too much left unsung within it.●

U.S. SMALL BUSINESS WEEK, 1985

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. ECKART of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize National Small Business Week—May 5 through May 11—and honor the Nation's 13 million small businesses.

We are all very aware of the economic rollercoaster which our Nation has been riding in recent years. Especially disturbing are the continuing high unemployment rates. One county in my district reported just last week an unemployment rate of 15 percent, double the national average.

As we continue to strive to reduce these dismal unemployment figures, there is some light at the end of the tunnel. That light is small business. Over the past 5 years, America's small businesses and entrepreneurs have created almost 3 million new corporations, an astonishing rate of some 600,000 per year. More importantly, they have created an estimated 900,000 self-employed persons and numerous other jobs for American workers.

In a time when employment opportunities seem to be diminishing and plants are closing at an alarming rate, America's pioneer spirit and adversity have been demonstrated by the entrepreneurial ability of its inhabitants. Not only have small businesses created hundreds of thousands of new jobs, but they have also made great technological innovations which have served to increase the diversity of our economy.

It is with great honor that I salute the small business community and their many contributions today.●

WHY REQUIRE SEAT BELTS?

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I had the occasion to visit the rehabilitation center on the ninth floor of Norfolk General Hospital, and I can say without hesitation that it was a moving and enlightening experience. The majority of patients undergoing therapy had been victims of automobile accidents, and in each case their severe injuries resulted from a drunken driver, the absence of a seatbelt, or both.

Those who oppose mandatory seatbelts as too confining should visit a rehabilitation center and see what real confinement is. They should see young people who will be in wheelchairs for life, with brain damage, spinal cord injury, or missing legs. I saw one young man, who had had a promising engineering career ahead of him, who had been widowed and blinded as a result of his accident.

The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot on May 4, 1985, carried an editorial entitled "Save Virginia Lives, Too," and I am pleased to commend it to my colleagues, who can replace "Virginia" with the names of their own States. The editorial effectively demolishes the argument that somehow requiring seatbelts is an unwarranted restriction on freedom.

In addition, I would like to take this opportunity to share an article from the May 1985, issue of Psychology Today, written by E. Scott Geller, who is professor of psychology at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, VA. Professor Geller offers some valuable arguments in support of the use of safety belts, and some excellent suggestions for helping encourage more people to "buckle up." I was struck by his statement that only about 5 percent of the television performers were shown wearing a lap or shoulder belt, and it occurred to me that viewers who feel strongly about the need to encourage this vital safety practice might wish to write to the networks, the producers, and the sponsors of their favorite programs to urge that more shows have the use of seatbelts or shoulder restraints in their scripts.

Mr. Speaker, with graduation time upon us, and the summer tourist season just ahead, it strikes me that these articles are particularly timely and cogent, and I hope that my colleagues will give them consideration and perhaps share them with their constituents.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[From the Virginian-Pilot, May 4, 1985]

SAVE VIRGINIA LIVES, TOO

The Virginia General Assembly, which refuses to mandate the wearing of seat belts in motor vehicles, should ponder the 27 percent drop in traffic deaths of drivers and passengers in New York since a large percentage of New Yorkers began buckling up.

During the first three months of this year, 184 drivers and passengers died in motor-vehicle accidents in New York, compared to 252 during the first three months of 1984. The comparable statistics in Virginia were 199 in 1984, 203 in 1985. A mandatory seat-belt law could save 25-30 lives in Virginia over a three-month period and 100-120 a year—possibly more.

That would be worth doing. But Virginia's lawmakers bought the spurious argument this year that compelling drivers and passengers to wear seat belts constitutes an unwarranted restriction on freedom.

That argument might have merit if society generally were not burdened with the heavy medical, welfare, legal and other expenses imposed by highway carnage. If the families of killed, mangled and maimed individuals who refused to wear seat belts also paid all costs resulting from fatalities and crippling injuries that could have been forestalled by seat-belt usage, society's interest in demanding that drivers and passengers buckle up would be significantly diminished. But the cost is borne generally—as inflated insurance premiums, the proliferation of litigation, rising welfare costs and lost productivity, among other things, eloquently attest.

Besides, everyone licensed to operate a motor vehicle knows that driving is a privilege granted by the state, not a natural right. Retention of that privilege is contingent upon obedience to traffic laws, maintenance of motor-vehicle insurance and periodic demonstrations of competence behind the steering wheel. Buckling up is inconvenient at worst, and Virginia should demand it.

How many Virginians would respond? Compliance in New York state is running about 60 percent, compared to less than 14 percent in the states where wearing seat belts isn't required. As for enforcement, New York police cited 7,000 people for disobeying the law during the first three months; 90 percent of those citations were made when drivers were arrested for other traffic offenses. New York's encouraging experience with buckle-up legislation parallels the experience in foreign lands. Motor vehicle accidents have not decreased in New York; only the deadly consequences of such accidents.

Does buckling up save lives and limbs? Yes. Does the Virginia General Assembly welcome highway carnage? Of course not. So the honorables shouldn't be deterred by half-baked arguments about "freedom" and "choice" from enacting a sensible law to lessen the slaughter.

SEAT BELT PSYCHOLOGY (By E. Scott Geller)

What single action, if done regularly, would be most likely to save your life? Jogging, eating less, kicking an unhealthy habit? No. The one thing that would do more than any other to increase your longevity and quality of life is to use a safety belt every time you travel in a car.

Vehicle accidents are responsible for more than 30,000 deaths and 500,000 injuries each year. More than half of these deaths and injuries could be avoided by the use of safety belts, but only around 15 percent of U.S. drivers and passengers buckle up.

Many European countries have passed mandatory belt use laws, and the rate of safety-belt wearing in these countries is much higher than in the United States, ranging between 70 percent and 92 percent. New York, New Jersey, Missouri, Michigan and Illinois have recently passed seat-belt laws, and will serve as critical test cases for the efficacy of requiring safety-belt use in the United States.

Mandatory seat-belt laws, however, have not been gracefully accepted in the United States. Newspaper editorials proclaim the infringement of individual freedom caused by a seat-belt law. Many people feel it is their personal right to choose whether or not to buckle up, and believe (incorrectly) that no one would suffer except themselves if they were unbuckled in a vehicle crash. And we hear a variety of excuses for not

buckling up: "I'm a safe driver, so I won't be in an accident." "It's safer to be thrown from the vehicle." "I don't want to be trapped if my car is on fire or under water." "Seat belts are too uncomfortable and wrinkle my clothes." "I don't need a safety belt when driving around town." Several educational programs clearly demonstrate that all such excuses for not buckling up are erroneous, but education alone is not sufficient to get people to use safety belts.

From the perspective of behavioral psychology, the low use of safety belts can be explained by examining events that precede or follow the use or nonuse of a safety belt. For example, opportunities to wear a safety belt are rarely preceded by signs or verbal messages that remind us to buckle up. And, since most people who travel without wearing a safety belt usually reach their destination safely, they are, in a sense, rewarded for not buckling up.

Modeling, or behavioral example, is another powerful behavioral tool that could be used to promote safety-belt use but isn't. Current TV heroes, the role models for children and young adults, for instance, do not buckle up when they ride in their cars, trucks and vans. A recent assessment of safety-belt use by TV stars during prime time "action shows" (conducted by my research students) found that fewer than 5 percent of the actors were shown wearing a lap or shoulder belt. Psychological theory and research suggest that such consistent modeling of the nonuse of safety belts contributes significantly to the low safety-belt use in the United States.

After examining the conditions that influence safety-belt use, the behavioral psychologists approach the problem by manipulating conditions that might increase the wearing of safety belts. This involves attempts to remove conditions that discourage use of safety belts and to add conditions that encourage their use. The first approach is seen in the petition my students and I circulated nationwide to get support for the idea that the consistent nonuse of vehicle safety belts by TV stars is irresponsible broadcasting. However, we have been more successful with the second approach—adding conditions that encourage belt use.

In a series of research projects, we have shown that basic principles of positive reinforcement can be used cost-effectively to increase safety-belt wearing. For example, simply rewarding people when they are buckled up can more than double usage rates.

Our safety-belt rewards were inexpensive (hamburger coupons or lottery tickets, for instance), donated by community merchants (for good-will advertising) and administered conveniently (by police officers and cashiers at the drive-in exchange windows of the banks and fast-food restaurants).

In one campaign every bank customer who was buckled up when driving up to the outdoor exchange window received a number for a community bingo game. Such programs are accepted by everyone involved, and promote a positive attitude toward safety belts because they are not seen as a threat to individual freedom.

Some people may only buckle up to get the reward, but even after the rewards are removed, usage rarely drops as low as the previous levels. So some people actually develop and continue the safety-belt use habit after a few rewards. Furthermore, we have found it useful to reinstate the safety-belt incentive program periodically. This intermittent reinforcement helps maintain increases in seat-belt wearing.

For example, because of the tremendous corporate costs resulting from vehicle accidents involving unbelted employees, corporations have found it cost-beneficial to use intermittent reward programs for safety-belt promotion. This can mean large savings for a company, since it has been estimated that a single employee fatality costs industry an average \$120,000 in direct payments (wage compensation, property damage, medical expenses and insurance outlays). And this may be only the tip of the iceberg when you consider the costs of work disruption and decreases in productivity associated with hiring and training replacements.

Two years ago, I wrote an instructional manual that specifies guidelines for rewarding safety-belt wearing in corporations. With actual case examples, the manual illustrates how to apply feedback, group discussions and commitment strategies to increase the long-term impact of a safety-belt reward program. In addition, we have recently produced a 25-minute film that demonstrates the use of psychology in encouraging safety-belt use at various community sites, including churches, banks, schools, fast-food restaurants, corporations and universities.

Our film demonstrates a "flash for life" that can be used by anyone to encourage others to buckle up. This involves holding up a large flash card in the window of your vehicle so that people in other cars can read the message: "Please buckle up—I care." If viewer buckles up, the "flasher" flips over the card to reveal: "Thank you for buckling up." A surprisingly large number of non-users buckle up on the spot (22 percent of 893 people in a recent study).

The simply "flash for life" incorporates several principles derived from psychological research, including behavioral modeling (the flash-card holder is buckled up) and effective "stimulus control" (the flash-card holder gives a specific message in non-demanding language at a time when the person viewing the flash card can act on the request). A beneficial side effect of this procedure is that the flash-card holders (whether child or adult) increase their commitment to safety belts.

Our recent successes in prompting and reward strategies in corporate and community settings suggest that it is possible to increase safety-belt use while maintaining public acceptance and positive attitudes and illustrate the importance of psychological theory and research when designing buckle-up campaigns.●

LIBERTY CITY GROWING FROM ASHES OF RIOTS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion in media lately about reconciliation, dealing with past horrors and rebuilding a society destroyed by conflict. These references were to the victims of World War II and the rebuilding that took place after the war.

There is another story, however, smaller in scope but similar in some ways, right here in Dade County, FL.

Following the civil disturbances in 1980, Liberty City was devastated as a community. However, the resourceful and determined people who live there were not willing to give up, and what they have been able to achieve is remarkable. I would like to share with my colleagues an article written by Neal R. Pierce which details one of these achievements. Perhaps other communities in other parts of the country will learn and be motivated from their example.

LIBERTY CITY GROWING FROM ASHES OF RIOTS

(By Neal R. Pierce)

MIAMI.—On a dazzling late March Saturday morning in Liberty City, a neighborhood devastated by bitter race riots in 1980, families dressed in their Sunday best stood in line for an experience commonplace for most Americans—shopping at a well-stocked supermarket.

Inside the spanking new Winn-Dixie store in Edison Plaza, beaming, courteous teenagers—the boys in white shirts and black ties, girls in blue uniforms—ran cash registers, stocked shelves, and helped customers with their first quality grocery purchases in five years.

The nation's last glimpse of this block was quite different: a national guardsman in riot gear, armed with an automatic rifle, holding four black teenagers at bay. The old grocery store was a gutted shell. Food bins, beer cans and broken bottles floated in a sea of water left by firefighters. Food displays hung eerily from the ceiling, advertising yesterday's specials. For private investment, the site—like most of Liberty City—seemed jinxed, seen as another riot waiting to happen.

Why then has Winn-Dixie, a leading Southern supermarket chain, risked entering Liberty City? The answer: a mix of players and investments no city could have assembled in 1990.

First, the owner-manager of the site is a new-generation local economic development corporation. Its director, a savvy ex-cop and Liberty City native named Otis Pitts, is getting premier business counsel. The Tacoloy Economic Development Corporation's nine directors each has at least five years' business ownership and management experience.

Second, active support came not just from the Ford Foundation, but from the recently organized LISC—the Local Initiatives Support Corporation LISC helped recruit Pitts for the job, exposed him to successful community economic development projects in Boston and the South Bronx, sent a Harvard MBA team in to assist, and then invested \$250,000 of its own funds in the project.

Third, Miami Mayor Maurice Ferre did what few mayors of the city contemplated before the '80s: He invested big chunks of his own time, and \$650,000 of the city's money, to make the project work. Dade County threw in \$260,000. Some big federal bucks were given—\$800,000 from the Economic Development Administration. But the Liberty City revival is not your old-style federal initiative. The Carter administration, in the wake of the '80 riots, pumped \$10 million into Liberty City—most of it frittered away without result. Now the feds are responding to local initiative.

Finally, city business leaders are involved. They loaned \$250,000. But the commitment didn't come without heavy selling by Ferre

and company. The biggest investment of all is Winn-Dixie's own—about \$2 million.

No one can say that Liberty City, even with this massive investment, is on a sure comeback trail. There's still crushing joblessness, an excruciating crime rate, and lingering fear that another chain of racially charged events—the acquittal of four white police officers in the beating death of a black motorcyclist after a high-speed chase—could spark another conflagration.

But hope, not fear, filled the air as Edison Plaza opened in late March. There were political speeches, colorful balloons, all the fanfare usually reserved for a major civic occasion. Despite Miami's sometimes bitter "triethnic" politics (Hispanic, black, white), politicians of every stripe showed up.

Soon a dry-cleaning shop, drugstore and shoe store will join Winn-Dixie in the white stucco and red brick plaza. In offices behind the stores, a law firm is open for business and a dentist is waiting to move in. McDonald's has opened across the way; the "New Beginning" shopping center nearby has 10 small shops. There's a stunning contrast between these neat, ordered new developments and the "old" Liberty City that lingers on around them—Simon's Tailor Shop with so many security bars you'd think it was a prison, the greasy-spoon "Meal a Minute" restaurant, and a pawnshop whose sign screams: We buy gold and silver.

"There is a sense of pride in what has happened here on the part of people," says Otis Pitts. "It's not like people are just coming to shop in a store. It's like they're coming to something that is a vital part of their community."

"We don't only look good, we are good," says Robert Pitts (no relation), owner of People's Barber Shop, around the corner from Edison Plaza, as he cuts a customer's hair while three others wait in turn. "I have no doubt in my mind that this is a start to do other things now. As a race of people in this area we've learned and are looking at things more intelligently. We're going to help ourselves out."

Pitts, whose barber shop has been in Liberty City for 17 years and like many black businesses survived 1980 undamaged, says neither he nor fellow merchants have plans to leave the neighborhood: "Everybody is committed to staying. Why leave now? We sweated out the worst. There ain't nothing to do but look forward now."

The attitude is what Ferre has been hoping for. Neighborhoods, he notes, need some kind of an economic break to pick themselves up—"an inducement based on a perspective that something is going to happen."

The stake for Liberty City people gets a lot farther than the convenience of a supermarket. All ghettos suffer from "expenditure leakages"—money flowing to outside stores and falling to circulate and create jobs locally. "If we're going to be financially independent, then those dollars need to turn over 6, 8, 10 times before they leave the neighborhood," Athalie Range, Miami's first black city commissioner, told by associate Robert Guskind.

Trevino Bostic, a stock boy at the new store, never heard of "expenditure leakages." But he knows what it means for him: "I need a job. I want to save money so I can go to college and get a good education. I want to come back and maybe be a manager." ●

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF REA

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is truly a privilege for me to speak on the 50th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration. Of all the Government programs which have been enacted in the last 50 years, the REA may have done the most to help the rural people of this Nation. The REA truly represents the highest good which Government programs can attain.

Though it is really not long ago that the REA started its work, it is easy to forget how the REA changed the lives of America's farmers. My grandfather, Linus P. Barton, did not receive electricity on his farm in Bosque county, Texas until 1949, the year I was born. Even today, my mother talks about the dramatic impact that electricity and the REA had on their life. My mother's father ran a cotton gin in McLennan County, Texas in the small community of Speegleville, which was made possible by the electricity provided by the REA.

I would like to specifically commend the following REA co-ops in my district, for their vital work in improving the lives of the people in Texas: Hill County Electric, Limestone County Electric, Navarro County Electric, Johnson County Electric, Houston County Electric, Tri-County Electric, Sam Houston Electric, San Bernard Electric, Mid-South Electric, Robertson Electric, Brazos Electric, and Tex-La Electric.

I salute the great accomplishments of the REA on its golden anniversary. As we look to the future, I hope to see the REA continue its great work in rural America. The REA will plan a vital role in the continuing prosperity of America's agricultural sector. If we can achieve the same high level of success in the next half century as we have achieved in the last one, we can look forward to very happy times indeed for those that live in rural America. ●

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF WILLIAM J. BURKHOLDER, SUPERINTENDENT OF FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the accomplishments of Mr. William J. Burkholder, superintendent

of the Fairfax County public schools, on the occasion of his forthcoming retirement on June 30, 1985. His career spans some 34 years in public education in the Commonwealth of Virginia, 29 of which were spent in Fairfax County. During that period, he has served education as a school bus driver, classroom teacher, school principal, instructional supervisor, personnel director, labor negotiator, and deputy superintendent—a broad range of experiences which qualified him for the superintendency of the 10th largest school system in our great Nation, an organization of more than 13,000 employees engaged in educating 124,000 students in 159 schools and 19 special services centers, serving the educational needs of a population close to 650,000 people in an area covering more than 400 square miles.

In this highly complex situation, Mr. Burkholder has displayed the characteristics of a fine educational leader: courage, sensitivity, a strong sense of educational priorities, a keen awareness of community values and dynamics, an ability to move toward the future without sacrificing the strengths of the past and present, and a belief in children as this Nation's most important resource.

Among his many achievements are just three which I will mention here. His comprehensive program to address the problems of substance abuse is a national model, recognized by Mrs. Reagan at a White House ceremony. His determination to improve the academic performance of minority students has resulted in a major effort involving every school and supported by community leaders. Finally, he has guided the opening of a high school for science and technology, and encouraged the active involvement of the business community through his business/industry advisory council. These selected accomplishments are symbolic of his dedication to the resolution of current problems and his recognition of future needs.

The life of a superintendent of schools is not easy. Dealing with 80-hour workweeks, hundreds of public and private meetings, the depth of community emotions surrounding highly controversial issues, the balancing of competing special interests, and, above all, the need to focus the attention of the body politic on the child in the classroom, require skills and characteristics which are almost superhuman. Mr. Burkholder has met all of these challenges with imperturbable calmness and acumen, perceptiveness, and sensitivity.

As the representative of Virginia's 10th Congressional District, I take great pride in Mr. Burkholder's career and I join my colleagues and the citizens of Fairfax County in wishing him much happiness in the years to come.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WALLOP-BREAUX RESOLUTION

HON. JOHN B. BREAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution, for myself and 136 of my colleagues, which would call on the administration to properly implement the Boating Safety and Sport Fish Enhancement Act, commonly known as the Wallop-Breaux Act. Passed in 1984 as part of the Deficit Reduction Act, this legislation was the result of a long effort on the part of the sport fishermen and boaters of this country to raise additional funds to improve their sport and to continue a 50-year tradition of user fee programs to support conservation of natural resources.

The Wallop-Breaux program is an expansion and continuation of the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Program, passed by the Congress in 1950, which was funded by an excise tax on certain articles of sport fishing tackle. The Boating Safety and Sport Fish Restoration Act expanded the number of fishing tackle items subject to this excise tax. In addition, the legislation recognized that recreational boaters pay another user fee for which they previously received only limited benefits—the 9 cents per gallon tax on fuels purchased for recreational boats. Prior to passage of the Wallop-Breaux legislation, the money attributable to the motorboat fuels tax was authorized to be spent on boating safety programs, but very little was ever appropriated. The Wallop-Breaux legislation dedicated the motorboat fuels tax to boating safety and sport fish restoration programs, along with import duties on fishing tackle and pleasure craft. All of these funds were placed in a special Aquatic Resources Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was a bipartisan effort, strongly supported by the fishing and boating public, the Congress, and the administration. Yet, the administration's budget proposal for fiscal year 1986 proposes to repeal the existing automatic appropriation for the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act and to withhold new funds from this program. My colleagues and I believe that the administration's attack on this program threatens to undermine the user fee concept which has served this program and others so well. Sportsmen have willingly supported user fees in the past because they believe in conserving these natural resources and because Congress has never broken faith with them. I strongly urge your support for this resolution that calls on the administration to honor its commitment to the more than 50 million American boaters and fishermen and to imple-

May 8, 1985

ment the provisions of the Boating Safety and Sport Fish Restoration Act as approved by the Congress and the administration less than 1 year ago.●

"DOC" GARCELON ELECTED NRA PRESIDENT

HON. JOHN R. MCKERNAN, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. MCKERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that a distinguished citizen from the First District of Maine has risen to the highest position in The National Rifle Association of America [NRA]. Dr. Alonzo H. Garcelon, DDS, was unanimously elected president of the 3-million-member NRA by its board of directors on April 22 at the association's 14th annual meeting in Seattle.

This prestigious position could not have been entrusted to a more qualified individual. Dr. Garcelon, an outstanding marksman and progun activist from Augusta, ME, has a broad background in professional and civic activities. In addition to serving on the board of directors of the NRA before his election to presidency, he has held positions in many other organizations, including chairman of the advisory council of the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Game, chairman of the Maine Governor's Committee on Hunting Safety, and chairman of the Council for Sensible Game Management, as well as heading other hunting and rifle associations. Dr. Garcelon is honorary president for life of the Sportman's Alliance of Maine, an organization that he founded in 1975. As a public and private health dentist, he is at the top of his profession, having served as president of the State Dental Association. Dr. Garcelon has an abiding interest in education as well. He serves as a trustee of three different educational institutions.

I praise my friend and fellow Mainer, "Doc" Garcelon, for his many achievements and invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating him and wishing him luck as he looks toward this new challenge at the NRA.

I would like to share with my colleagues the text of Dr. Garcelon's acceptance speech at the Seattle NRA Convention:

Ladies and gentleman of the board: Thank you for electing me president of this great organization—The National Rifle Association of America. You know, I'd rather be president of the NRA than Governor of Massachusetts, which doesn't say much, I suppose. But I'd rather be president of NRA than Governor of Maine and that says much!

Where else in America could a small town dentist from Maine be honored by his peers through election as president of the 3 mil-

lion-plus member National Rifle Association.

The fight for leadership of NRA is over. Ray Arnett is our elected executive vice president for the next five years. I want to congratulate Ray, but I also want to congratulate the NRA. We are so fortunate to find another great American to carry on where Harlon Carter left off. In our great American democracy, people argue, contest, and cast their ballots. I want to remind you that an equally important tradition is accepting the outcome of elections hard fought and fairly contested.

As the one common link between the membership as a whole and the board of directors—both of whom share responsibility for governing this great organization—the office of president can and must be one of leadership!

I pledge to this organization that I will vigorously pursue my role of healer, unifier, and catalyst for promoting the goals and objectives as well as the dreams of this organization and all that it stands for.

In addition to this traditional role, permit me to sketch a few other areas which I hope to address as your new president. These include: (1) fair coverage by the media, (2) recruitment of millions of hunters as members, (3) educating new generations to the responsibilities of gun ownership and hunting, and (4) reaching the group which number over 50% of all voters—the women of America!

With regard to the first issue, we want to judiciously use our economic power and clout to bring fairness to the print and electronic media. They, who represent no one but themselves, have for so long distorted the values, activities, and integrity of NRA members and millions of other hunters and gun owners.

By entering the market place, perhaps we could help bring about a climate in which the media covers events and organizations with fairness, objectivity, and honesty. In the near future, I will appoint a special committee which will explore these possibilities.

As an avid hunter and lifelong gun owner, I know that we can enlist many more members to this important group. While many may not yet have heard our message, it seems pretty simple to an old country boy like me that you can't hunt if you can't own or use a gun. Our challenge is to reach and recruit the 20 million hunters who are not yet among us.

We have made a good beginning with our youth programs. The youth of America are our future. We must expand our efforts in this direction. There must be millions of our youth like Jared Goegeline, whom we honored Friday as the 50,000th junior member.

Our young people are the leaders and voters of tomorrow. They are also the hunters and gun owners of the next generations, for without their interest and involvement, there will be no gun ownership or hunting.

Another segment of our population which needs more emphasis is women. We can easily double or triple our ranks by enlisting women who can or will share our interests.

This so-called minority, as well as the real minorities in our society, represent great potential for increasing our ranks.

Thus far, I've not said anything about the NRA's most important responsibility—opposing gun control of all kinds and in all political jurisdictions! Lest there be any misunderstanding by friend and foe alike, these areas I've discussed, and given new priority, will provide the needed and additional

strength, numbers, and resources for the battles that lie ahead. NRA has, and will always be, the "cutting edge" and in the first rank among any who defend the second amendment. Preserving our rights to keep and bear arms is, after all, our primary challenge and greatest obligation. So said our membership by over 95%, according to the recent DMI poll.

You'll be hearing more about these subjects in the President's Column and through other appropriate means.

In the meantime, I respectfully request that when we leave this board meeting, and this annual meeting, that we become a family once again, with all of the traditions that make a family great. If there is any group that can do it, we, the NRA, can!

Thank you and God bless you all.●

VOTING RECORD

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it has become my practice from time to time to list my votes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I strongly believe that the people of the Second Congressional District of Arizona have a right to know where I stand on the issues decided by this body, and I have found that printing my record here is the best way to provide that information.

This is not an all inclusive list. I have omitted noncontroversial votes such as quorum calls, motions to resolve into the Committee of the Whole House, and motions to approve the Journal of the previous day.

The descriptions are necessarily somewhat short, and I am sure that some of my constituents will have additional questions about the issues described here. So I invite them to write me for more specifics.

The votes are described as follows:

KEY

1. Rollcall number;
2. Number of the bill or resolution;
3. Title of the bill or resolution;
4. A description of the vote;
5. The outcome of the vote;
6. The vote total;
7. My vote, in the form Y=yes, N=no, and NV=not voting;
8. The vote totals of the Arizona delegation (yes-no-not voting);
9. The date.

151. H.R. 4170. Deficit Reduction Act. Vander Jagt, R-Mich., motion to instruct House conferees on the deficit-reduction bill not to agree to the Senate amendment to lengthen the depreciation period for real estate and to reduce tax credits available for the rehabilitation of old buildings. Motion agreed to 397-24: Y(5-0-0), May 23, 1984.

152. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Gore, D-Tenn., amendment to the Brown, D-Calif., amendment, to provide that no funds may be used to test the anti-satellite missile (ASAT) against a target in space unless the Soviet Union conducts a test of its ASAT after enactment of the bill. Adopted 238-181: Y(2-3-0), May 23, 1984.

153. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Stratton, D-N.Y., amendment to the Brown, D-Calif., amendment, to provide that the anti-satellite missile (ASAT) may be tested against an object in space as many times as the Soviet ASAT has been tested against an object in space. Rejected 178-236: N(3-2-0), May 23, 1984.

154. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Byron, D-Md., amendment to the McCurdy, D-Okla., substitute to the Brown, D-Calif., amendment, to provide that the anti-satellite missile (ASAT) may be tested against an object in space as many times as the Soviet ASAT has been tested against an object in space. Rejected 181-229: N(3-2-0), May 23, 1984.

155. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. McCurdy, D-Okla., substitute to the Brown, D-Calif., amendment, to bar testing of the anti-satellite missile (ASAT) against an object in space through March 31, 1985, and allowing tests thereafter only if the president certifies that he has invited the Soviet Union to resume negotiations to limit ASATs. Rejected 186-228: N(3-2-0), May 23, 1984. (The Brown amendment, as amended, which provided that no funds may be used to test the anti-satellite missile (ASAT) against a target in space unless the Soviet Union conducts a test of its ASAT after enactment of the bill, subsequently was adopted by voice vote.)

156. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Foley, D-Wash., amendment to bar the use of authorized funds to introduce combat troops into El Salvador and Nicaragua, except in certain circumstances. Adopted 341-64: Y(2-3-0), May 23, 1984.

157. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Hartnett, R-S.C., amendment to bar the use of authorized funds to introduce combat troops into Western Europe, the Middle East or Korea, except in certain circumstances. Rejected 27-379: N(0-5-0), May 23, 1984.

159. H.R. 5692. Debt Limit. Passage of the bill to increase temporarily the debt ceiling by \$30 billion, from \$1.49 trillion to \$1.52 trillion, through June 22, 1984. Passed 211-198: Y(3-2-0), May 24, 1984.

160. H.J. Res. 492. Department of Agriculture, Fiscal 1984 Urgent Supplemental Appropriations. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to appropriate \$1,061,894,000 in fiscal 1984 for the Department of Agriculture and other agencies. Adopted 376-36: Y(4-1-0), May 24, 1984.

161. H.J. Res. 492. Department of Agriculture, Fiscal 1984 Urgent Supplemental Appropriations. Long, D-Md., motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment providing \$61.75 million in military aid to El Salvador. Motion agreed to 267-154: Y(4-1-0), May 24, 1984.

162. H.J. Res. 492. Department of Agriculture, Fiscal 1984 Urgent Supplemental Appropriations. Boland, D-Mass., motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate Amendment providing \$21 million in covert aid to Nicaraguan rebels, with an amendment providing no funds for Nicaraguan rebels. Motion agreed to 241-177: Y(2-3-0), May 24, 1984.

163. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Hunter, R-Calif., amendment to bar the use of authorized funds to introduce combat troops into El Salvador or Nicaragua unless the president determines that a communist threat to the region exists. Rejected 99-288: N(3-2-0), May 24, 1984.

164. H.R. 2174. Bankruptcy Court Extension. Rodino, D-N.J., motion to agree with

the Senate amendments to the bill to extend from May 25, 1984, until June 20, 1984, a period of transition to a new bankruptcy court system established under the 1978 Bankruptcy Reform Act (PL 95-598). Motion agreed to 349-27: Y(4-0-1), May 24, 1984.

166. H.R. 5713. Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 511) providing for House floor consideration of the bill to appropriate funds for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and 17 independent agencies for fiscal 1985. Adopted 296-56: Y(2-1-2), May 30, 1984.

167. H.R. 5713. Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Walker, R-Pa., amendment to authorize the president to cut any item in the bill by up to 10 percent. Rejected 133-258: N(3-2-0), May 30, 1984.

168. H.R. 5713. Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Passage of the bill to appropriate \$58,436,496,500 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and 17 independent agencies in fiscal 1985. Passed 282-110: Y(3-2-0), May 30, 1984.

169. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Bedell, D-Iowa, amendment to the Nichols, D-Ala., amendment to bar the Pentagon from limiting competitive bidding only to persons on a list of qualified bidders. Adopted 324-75: Y(2-3-0), May 30, 1984.

170. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Nichols, D-Ala., amendment to require contractors to identify the manufacturer of parts sold to the Pentagon. Adopted 396-0: Y(5-0-0), May 30, 1984.

171. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Ottinger, D-N.Y., amendment to bar the use of funds for civil defense intended to prepare for or respond to a nuclear war. Rejected 87-301: N(0-5-0), May 30, 1984.

172. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Biaggi, D-N.Y., amendment to allow up to two non-U.S.-built cruise ships to be used in trade between U.S. ports. Adopted 237-159: N(1-4-0), May 30, 1984.

174. H.R. 5112. Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Ottinger, D-N.Y., amendment to delete \$31.3 million for the National Endowment for Democracy, created in 1983 to encourage understanding of U.S.-style democracy in foreign countries through the private sector. Adopted N(4-1-0), May 31, 1984.

175. H.R. 5112. Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Miller, R-Ohio, motion to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to trim 4 percent in discretionary funding for fiscal 1985. Motion agreed to 208-194: N(3-2-0), May 31, 1984.

176. H.R. 5112. Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Passage of the bill to provide \$10,749,649,000 in fiscal 1985 for the Commerce, Justice and State departments, 17 related agencies and the federal judiciary. Passed 303-98: Y(3-2-0), May 31, 1984.

177. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Price, D-Ill., amendment to the Dickinson, R-Ala., Amendment, to authorize the production for 15 MX missiles subject to certain conditions. Adopted 203-182: N(4-1-0), May 31, 1984.

178. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Bennett, D-Fla., amendment to the Dickinson, R-Ala., amendment to prohibit the obligation of funds appropriated

for production of MX missiles unless Congress has given its approval by passing a joint resolution after April 1, 1985. Adopted 199-197: Y(2-3-0), May 31, 1984.

179. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Dickinson, R-Ala., amendment, as amended, to authorize the production of 15 MX missiles but prohibit the obligation of funds appropriated for the purpose unless Congress had given its approval by passing a joint resolution after April 1, 1985. Adopted 198-197: NV(1-3-1), May 31, 1984.

180. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Price, D-Ill., motion that all debate on the bill and the amendments thereto be completed in one hour (by 10:10 p.m.). Motion agreed to 213-174: Y(3-2-0), May 31, 1984.

181. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Hiller, R-Ind., motion that all debate on the Dellums, D-Calif., amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to five minutes. Motion rejected 55-321: N(2-3-0), May 31, 1984.

182. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Dellums, D-Calif., amendment to prohibit, during fiscal 1985, further deployment in Europe of Pershing II or ground-launched cruise missiles unless the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) notified the United States that there was a NATO consensus that further deployments should be made. Rejected 104-291: N(0-5-0), May 31, 1984.

183. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Dickinson, R-Ala., amendment, as amended, to authorize the production of 15 MX missiles but prohibit the obligation of funds appropriated for that purpose unless Congress have given its approval by passing a joint resolution after April 1, 1985. Adopted 199-196: Y(2-3-0), May 31, 1984.

184. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Passage of the bill to authorize \$207 billion for research and development, weapons procurement, and operations and maintenance in the Department of Defense. Passed 298-98: Y(4-1-0), May 31, 1984.

185. H.R. 5743. Agriculture Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Dannemeyer, R-Calif., amendment to reduce certain programs by \$24 million, on the assumption that the Agriculture Department could administratively implement money-saving policy changes recommended by a presidential commission (the Grace commission). Rejected 153-232: N(3-2-0), June 6, 1984.

186. H.R. 5743. Agriculture Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Obey, D-Wis., substitute for the Walker, R-Pa., amendment, to reduce appropriations for non-entitlement farm and food programs in fiscal 1985 by 64 percent. Rejected 6-388: N(0-5-0), June 6, 1984.

187. H.R. 5743. Agriculture Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Walker, R-Pa., amendment to reduce appropriations from farm and food programs in fiscal 1985 by 1 percent. Adopted 232-164: Y(5-0-0), June 6, 1984.

188. H.R. 5753. Legislative Branch Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Frenzel, R-Minn., amendment to reduce funds for House of Representatives operations by approximately \$13 million. Rejected 191-201: N(3-2-0), June 6, 1984.

189. H.R. 5753. Legislative Branch Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Brown, R-Colo., amendment to bar hiring individuals to operate elevators in House office buildings and reduce funds in the bill earmarked for eleva-

tor operators' salaries by \$88,354. Rejected 176-205: N(3-2-0), June 6, 1984.

190. H.R. 5753. Legislative Branch Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Frenzel, R-Minn., amendment to make a 2 percent across-the-board cut in the bill's funding level. Adopted 201-175: N(2-2-1), June 6, 1984.

191. H.R. 5753. Legislative Branch Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Fazio, D-Calif., motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill back to the House. Motion agreed to 234-147: Y(2-3-0), June 6, 1984. (By voting to rise the House refused to consider a pending Lewis, R-Calif., amendment to bar the use of funds for House television coverage unless cameras pan the chamber uniformly from gavel to gavel.)

192. H.R. 5753. Legislative Branch Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Frenzel, R-Minn., amendment to make a 2 percent across-the-board cut in the bill's funding level. Adopted 193-190: N(3-2-0), June 6, 1984. (This amendment previously had been adopted in the Committee of the Whole.)

193. H.R. 5753. Legislative Branch Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Passage of the bill to provide \$1,247,450,820 in fiscal 1985 for House of Representatives operations and legislative branch agencies. Passed 247-138: Y(4-1-0), June 6, 1984.

194. H.R. 1149. Oregon Wilderness. Seiberling, D-Ohio, motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill to designate as federal wilderness and protect from development 945,000 acres in national forests in Oregon. Motion agreed to (thus clearing the bill for the president) 281-99: Y(2-2-1), June 6, 1984.

196. H.R. 5145. Human Services Amendments. Perkins, D-Ky., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to reauthorize Head Start, Community Services Block Grants, and other social services programs through fiscal 1989. Motion rejected 261-156: Y(2-3-0), June 7, 1984.

197. H.R. 5504. Surface Transportation Act. McNulty, D-Ariz., amendment to strike the provision in the bill changing the formula for allocating to the states funds for highway resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation and reconstruction. Rejected 93-315: Y(5-0-0), June 7, 1984.

198. H.R. 5504. Surface Transportation Act. Passage of the bill to approve Interstate highway and Interstate substitute cost estimates, and to provide relocation assistance. Passed 297-73: Y(3-2-0), June 7, 1984.

199. H.R. 5525. Semiconductor Chip Protection. Kastenmeier, D-Wis., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to provide a new form of 10-year copyright protection for semiconductor chips. Motion agreed to 388-0: Y(5-0-0), June 11, 1984.

200. H.R. 4772. Vietnam Veterans of America Charter. Sam B. Hall Jr., D-Texas, motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to grant a federal charter to the Vietnam Veterans of America. Motion agreed to 295-96: Y(3-1-1), June 11, 1984.●

REMOVAL JURISDICTION ACT OF 1985

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation to correct a problem with the Judicial Code of the

United States relating to removal jurisdiction and the ability of Federal district courts to hear certain cases removed by defendants from State courts. This legislation will eliminate unnecessary and unproductive work in the Federal court system and remove another obstacle hindering litigants in their quest for justice.

Conceptually, the problem this legislation addresses is simple. A State court defendant may remove to the Federal court for the district in which the State court sits an action founded on a claim or right arising under the Constitution, treaties or laws of the United States. Congress provided for such removal in 1875 in order to enable a defendant sued on a Federal question to avoid litigating a Federal issue in a State court of the plaintiff's choice, as well as to empower the Federal bench to hear all cases involving Federal questions.

Removal works as Congress intended—provided Federal jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action is concurrent with the State courts. In other words, removal operates effectively if either the State courts or the Federal courts could hear the action and render a valid judgment on the merits. If, however, jurisdiction over the particular subject matter is reserved by law to the Federal courts exclusively, then a problem arises. Upon removal, the Federal court must dismiss the action, even though the Federal court is the only tribunal authorized to hear the action and even though the plaintiff can refile the suit there immediately.

This results from the 1922 Supreme Court decision in *Lambert Run Coal Co v. Baltimore & Ohio R. Co.*, 258 U.S. 377. There, the Supreme Court held that removal jurisdiction is "derivative," and ruled that a Federal court cannot derive subject matter jurisdiction over an action from a State court which had no such jurisdiction. This means a lawsuit filed in State court and removed by the defendant to Federal court for further proceedings must be dismissed because the Federal court does not acquire jurisdiction over the subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes no practical sense whatsoever. The rule requires litigants already in court to start over in Federal court from the point of filing rather than continuing from the point of removal. Because only the defendant can remove a suit from State to Federal court, obviously this rule penalizes a defendant who wants to expedite an action rather than delay it; a defendant not wanting to proceed will seek dismissal in the State court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The rule therefore adds to the expenses of both parties and the court system by creating unnecessary paperwork and delaying actions which could otherwise proceed to

judgment. The rule promotes no cognizable Federal policy in return.

The rule is also illogical. To require the action be dismissed and refiled in the same Federal court defeats the very purpose of removal jurisdiction. The Federal court is where the action should have been filed in the first place, and is indeed the only court which can hear it and render a valid judgment. The rule also penalizes plaintiffs whose attorneys mistakenly file their claims in the wrong courts when the defendant is willing to remove the action to the proper forum.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation would amend section 1441 of title 28, United States Code by adding a new subsection to correct this problem. The intent of my legislation is clear: To overrule the doctrine of *Lambert Run Coal Company* to permit Federal courts to hear cases removed from State courts which lack jurisdiction over the subject matter of the actions. This bill will make our court system more efficient for the courts themselves and for litigants.

This legislation does not expand the substantive rights of litigants. The bill provides only that a Federal court to which an action is removed by defendant is not precluded from hearing the suit and rendering judgment on the merits because the State court from which the action is removed lacked jurisdiction over the subject matter. Under current law, only defendants may remove actions from State to Federal court, and defendants not wishing to remove need only move to dismiss actions below if they prefer, forcing plaintiff to refile in a proper forum. Should defendant, however, choose to remove an action to the proper Federal forum in the interest of expediting the litigation, he or she may do so under this legislation, provided the other requirements for removal are satisfied, and the Federal court may proceed.

Mr. Speaker, one of my former law professors, George Fraser of the University of Oklahoma Law Center, brought this problem to my attention. Professor Fraser is a long-time student of the Federal court system and a recognized authority on issues of Federal jurisdiction and civil procedure. Professor Fraser and other commentators including Wright and Miller, Hart and Wechsler and the American Law Institute have urged the courts and Congress to abandon this unjustified and unproductive rule. I am grateful to Professor Fraser for bringing this matter to my attention, and I thank him for his kind and diligent assistance in drafting this important and long overdue legislation. ●

AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, May 8, 1985 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

As if high interest rates and low prices were not enough, farmers now have a third reason to be concerned over the health of their industry: for the second time in a month, the Department of Agriculture has lowered its estimate of U.S. exports for 1985, dropping it some \$1 billion. According to USDA officials, the U.S. will sell \$34.5 billion worth of farm goods abroad this year. That is down more than 20% from 1981, when agricultural exports peaked at almost \$44 billion. Not only have export earnings dropped, the U.S. share of world agricultural trade has fallen from 46% to 38%.

Exports are of paramount importance to U.S. farmers. 1 out of every 3 acres is producing solely for export. Agricultural exports constitute one-fifth of farm income as well as one-fifth of U.S. total export earnings. It is clear that our farmers' income and the well-being of agriculture have become heavily dependent upon exports. Once a relatively isolated sector, U.S. farming is now heavily "internationalized". Since Indiana ranks eighth in our nation's total agricultural exports (fourth in soybean and feed grains), Hoosiers have a big stake in the world market.

Yet this reliance on world markets can be a two-edged sword. Our farmers are now extremely vulnerable to events which take place thousands of miles from home, such as changes in agricultural and economic policies of foreign countries, the vagaries of weather conditions worldwide, and the international monetary situation and exchange rates.

In the 1970's, farm exports were booming, due largely to increased purchasing power of countries that were good markets for our products, as well as a more competitive U.S. dollar. Overall, the value of U.S. farm exports increased 460 percent, from less than \$8 billion in 1971 to almost \$44 billion in 1981. Yet in recent years, exports have been slumping. There are several reasons for this, including the strong value of the dollar, the lingering world recession, huge third-world debts, increased agricultural production worldwide, aggressive competition, and high U.S. farm support levels pricing us out of some markets.

Productivity gains and increased efficiency in several countries have complicated this export problem and have recently challenged American producers. For example, market incentives introduced in China in 1982 produced a 15 percent expansion in corn production, 20 percent in rice, and 40 percent in wheat. Increased yields with the use of new varieties coupled with government incentives made the United Kingdom a net exporter of wheat and barley in little more than four years. In Latin America, agricultural production had increased by 35 percent over the last decade. Brazilian soybean and corn yields often compete with our own, Argentine wheat prices undercut ours, and both countries have significant land for farm expansion.

Diagnoses of the causes of agriculture's ills are numerous, but most of the proposed remedies rely upon the same old medicine. It is critical that we seek innovative ways to maintain and, if possible, expand our exports, and thereby help assure the American farmer a fair return on his investment. Given the complexity of the problem, there is no single, simple solution.

The increase in the value of the dollar in recent years had been the primary factor in the downturn in farm exports, and the major culprit behind our overvalued dollar is the huge federal deficit. The overvalued dollar makes American products some 40 percent more expensive to overseas customers. The biggest single step we can take to help the farmer is to reduce the federal deficit.

Unfortunately, reducing the deficit will take time, and many farmers need help now. We must take immediate steps to improve our export picture. The newly-formed National Commission on Agricultural Trade and Export Policy, composed of 35 government and farm-sector leaders, recently released a preliminary report to assist Congress in its rewrite of the 4-year Farm Bill this year. The report proposes several steps, which I support, for improving U.S. agricultural exports:

First, because farm exports suffer from the inconsistent actions of the many U.S. government agencies involved in policy formulation, we should designate one government agency to be responsible for coordinating agricultural trade policy. All agencies should be required to report the impact their policies and programs would have on farm exports. Second, we should require the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative to implement an improved system for monitoring and responding to unfair trade practices. We must counter unfair trade practices by every appropriate means. Third, we should continue to negotiate a general reduction of trade barriers, as dictated by our national commitment to fair trade. Variable import restrictions could be used to reward nations cooperating in efforts to lower trade barriers and to punish nations which continue to employ predatory or unfair trade practices. Fourth, we must expand and improve our export credit programs, including direct credits, credit guarantees, and blended-credit programs. I favor the selective and focused use of export subsidies when they are necessary to discourage foreign subsidies and maintain U.S. markets. Fifth, the long-term potential of U.S. agriculture depends upon a strong commitment to foreign market development. That includes credit programs for importing countries to improve their import and marketing facilities, as well as improved use of food aid programs for foreign market development. Sixth, the U.S. must re-establish its reputation as a reliable supplier of agricultural products, by strengthening existing law generally prohibiting the use of embargoes and by ensuring contract sanctity. Seventh, cargo preference laws designed to help the U.S. maritime industry have increased the cost of shipping our farm products overseas. We should exempt agricultural programs from cargo preference requirements. Finally, we must make sure that our domestic farm programs are not hindering the competitiveness of U.S. agricultural products in world markets. ●

SALUTE TO HARRY CRANDELL, A DEFENDER OF WILDLIFE AND WILDERNESS

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, May 1 marked the retirement of Mr. Harry Crandell as chief of staff of the Interior Committee's Subcommittee on Public Lands, after a distinguished 35-year career of service as a defender of our Nation's wildlife and wildlands. As chairman of the subcommittee, I would like to take this occasion to pay tribute to his tireless efforts on behalf of the environment. The late Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas once observed that the trees, animals, plants, fish, and landscapes of our Nation, because they cannot speak in their own defense, are all too often left without a voice in modern society. For over 35 years, Harry Crandell has been, like Justice Douglas himself, an ardent defender of those interests. But more than that, through his tremendous knowledge and wise counsel, he has been an invaluable asset to our subcommittee and, indeed, to the entire conservation movement in the United States.

While I have known Harry only for the past 10 years, in 8 of which he served as staff director of my Subcommittees on Alaska Lands and Public Lands, his formal conservation career extends back to 1951, when he began a 10-year stint as a wildlife refuge manager with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. During that period, Harry was assigned to various wildlife refuges in Arizona, Oklahoma, and Wyoming, and his duties included personnel supervision, public relations, preparation of biological studies and research in public use management and wildlife issues. From conversations with him over the years I am certain that many of his great personal strengths, such as his friendly, self-effacing manner and his ability as a firm but congenial negotiator, were developed or honed during those 10 years in the field.

In 1959, Harry moved to Albuquerque, NM, where he was put in charge of the Fish and Wildlife Service's land acquisition program for an eight State region—Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming. In that capacity he was instrumental in the establishment of 16 new units of the National Wildlife Refuge System and in assisting States and Indian tribes in the development and implementation of fish and wildlife management programs. He also represented the agency at numerous public meetings, hearings, and negotiating sessions—activities which prepared him extraordinarily well for his

legislative responsibilities beginning some 10 years later on Capitol Hill.

In 1964, Harry's career brought him to Washington, DC, where he became the Fish and Wildlife Service's planning officer with responsibility for supervising planning functions for recreation, interpretive wildlife management and wilderness activities. After the passage of the Wilderness Act in 1964, the Fish and Wildlife Service was directed to review roadless areas of the National Wildlife Refuge System, with a view toward recommending suitable areas for wilderness. It was Harry's job to head up that review process. Thus began Harry's formal involvement in the wilderness "movement." However, I am sure that his real involvement began in his boyhood years in the mountains of Colorado, where his parents, Ben and Mildred Crandell, instilled in him a love for the outdoors and respect for nature. Harry's leadership, often in the face of stiff resistance from more "management" oriented colleagues who did not as fully appreciate the values of unmanaged wildlands, resulted in the ultimate recommendation of some 3.5 million acres of wildlife refuge lands in the lower 48 States and tens of millions of acres in Alaska for inclusion in the newly created Wilderness System. Many of those areas have since been designated as wilderness by act of Congress, thanks in no small degree to Harry's diligent efforts in developing the proposals and later working directly with Congress to secure their formal designation.

In that regard, it should be noted that Harry drafted the Interior Department regulations which interpreted the language of Wilderness Act to include a requirement that roadless "ecological islands" of less than 5,000 acres in size be inventoried and studied for their wilderness potential. As a result of that review, several such "ecological islands," including the Great Swamp in New Jersey, Moosehorn in Maine and Chase Lake in North Dakota, were judged by the Fish and Wildlife Service to merit wilderness designation and have since been so designated by act of Congress. These units, though relatively small in size, provide important diversity in the Wilderness System and incorporate therein lands and ecosystems that afford especially valuable opportunities for wildlife protection, scientific study, and education.

During his tenure as the Fish and Wildlife Service's planning officer, Harry also became increasingly involved in the agency's planning efforts in Alaska. Frequent trips to that State convinced him that Alaska represented our Nation's last real chance to set aside parks, refuges and wildernesses on a scale large enough to preserve entire ecosystems, so that present and

future generations of Americans would have the thrill of seeing some of the world's most magnificent wildlands free of the marks and works of man, reflecting only the majestic handwork of the Creator.

After some 20 years with the Fish and Wildlife Service, Harry's deepening commitment to the Nation's wildlands prompted him to leave Federal service for a 5-year stint as director of wilderness reviews for the Wilderness Society. The 5 years—1970-75—of Harry's service with the society not surprisingly coincided with some of that organization's more highly publicized and effective public education and legislative campaigns. These included: enactment of the landmark Eastern Wilderness Act of 1975; the Alaska oil pipeline struggle—in which the Wilderness Society played a major role in ensuring that the pipeline proposal was modified and improved to protect environmental values; the designation of a dozen new national wildlife refuge wildernesses; and the rejection of the U.S. Forest Service's RARE I proposal.

Harry also spearheaded the Wilderness Society's citizen education efforts and did a marvelous job in recruiting, stimulating and educating young environmental activists. Many of his proteges have gone on to become consummate grassroots organizers and leaders of the environmental community today. Harry also often drew the unenviable task of being the society's lobbyist assigned to particular Members of Congress who were not known for their enthusiastic support of the goals and proposals of the Wilderness Society. In that capacity, Harry's friendly nature and expert knowledge of the facts undoubtedly persuaded more than one Member of Congress to go from opposition to neutrality and often to support of wilderness proposals.

With an exceptionally diverse background in wildlife and wildlands management, administration, planning, education, grassroots activism and lobbying, it is perhaps only natural that Harry's career finally led him to Capitol Hill, where in August 1975 he became a consultant to the Subcommittee on Public Lands, then chaired by Congressman—now Senator—JOHN MELCHER of Montana. During the year and a half he served with JOHN MELCHER's subcommittee, Harry played a key role in the working out of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 [FLPMA]. Among other things, he was primary draftsman of section 603, the key section pertaining to the Bureau of Land Management's Wilderness Study Program.

During Harry's years in the field with the Fish and Wildlife Service he had toured numerous BLM lands and had grown to realize that the lands nobody wanted actually contain some

of the most scenic and beautiful areas in the Nation. Only now, nearly 10 years after the enactment of FLPMA, are more and more Americans beginning to learn of the spectacular red rock canyons, badlands, river gorges, native grasslands and desert ecosystems that comprise many BLM roadless lands. That these lands are still enjoyable in their natural, unspoiled state can be attributed to the foresight of Harry and others who initially helped formalize the BLM wilderness study process.

The year 1976 also saw the enactment of legislation designating several new wildernesses in the Refuge System and a statute removing BLM as joint administrator, with Fish and Wildlife Service, of three of the Nation's finest national wildlife refuges, the Charles M. Russell Refuge in Montana, the Charles Sheldon Antelope Range in Nevada and the Kofa Game Range in Arizona. The act gave the Fish and Wildlife Service sole jurisdiction and full management authority for all parts of the refuge system in the lower 48 States. Once again, much of the credit can be traced back to Harry's superb lobbying efforts and grassroots organizing skills immediately prior to his moving to the Hill.

Upon organization of the 95th Congress in 1977, Harry became the staff director of the newly formed Subcommittee on General Oversight and Alaska Lands, on which I served as chairman. Thus began his 8 years of service with me as an administrator, innovator, legislative strategist, confidant, and above all, prime adviser and point man on the monumental Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 [ANILCA]. Together we sat through hundreds of hours of hearings, meetings, drafting sessions, markups, floor debates and strategy discussions that finally culminated in the House passage of a bill in 1978, re-passage in 1979, and ultimate enactment into law in 1980.

Throughout the entire Alaska process, and in the years that have followed, Interior Committee Chairman MO UDALL, and I and others members of the committee were repeatedly amazed by Harry's intimate knowledge of the State of Alaska, his devotion to the land, and his personal attachment to each park, refuge, wilderness and other conservation proposals—almost as if each and every proposal were a spiritual or blood relative. Harry's comprehensive understanding of the nuances and legal intricacies of alternative park, refuge, wilderness, and other proposals, his sense of the appropriateness of a potential designation for each particular tract of land, and is scholarly and professional presentation of the issues and facts involved made him invaluable to all who

worked on this monumental conservation legislation.

Although the final version of ANILCA was not as strong as the House-passed version, many of the tremendous achievements and positive features of the 1980 act are attributable to Harry's superb work on Alaska over his years at the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Wilderness Society and as staff director of the Subcommittees on Alaska Lands, and later, Public Lands.

Of course, Harry's years as staff director were not spent solely working on Alaska Lands. Indeed, perhaps of equal significance in the long term were his efforts to ensure that the National Wilderness Preservation System in the lower 48 States contain quality units in as many States as possible and be truly representative of the broad range of ecosystems and wildlands that originally covered most of the Nation's landscape. From 1979-84, the subcommittee produced legislation designating some 12 million acres of new national forest and BLM wilderness in the lower 48 States. Although the specifics of such designations were sometimes left to others, Harry's expertise as a wilderness historian and institutional memory on wilderness management and philosophy issues were invaluable to a whole host of staff colleagues, conservationists and Members of Congress. Harry's involvement, in one way or another, in practically every wilderness designation battle since the enactment of the Wilderness Act in 1964, helped provide Members and staff with a sense of history by which to evaluate various management options and legislative proposals.

We were often reminded by Harry that the Wilderness System was just that—a system—and that we should resist demands to modify the basic tenets of that system, lest the end product become a mere assortment of specialized management areas, each governed by a different set of rules, regulations and management standards. In short, Harry was a true guardian of the integrity of the Wilderness System and perhaps Congress' prime watchdog against the frequent logical sounding but potentially debilitating proposals to allow special exceptions for certain uses in wilderness areas. I believe hindsight will indicate that these efforts were among Harry's most important contributions as a defender of wilderness.

Given such a long career devoted to wilderness and wildlife issues, Harry's retirement from Federal service will surely not spell the end of his involvement in the conservation arena. Indeed, I am confident that we will continue to benefit from his wisdom and input for many years to come. Harry claims that he is not sure where his interests will lead him and his charming wife, Olga, to locate next,

but I would not be surprised to see him move back to enjoy the wildlands of Colorado, where his life began some 61 years ago. Wherever he goes, he will enrich the lives of those around him and undoubtedly play a forceful role in conservation issues.

We will miss Harry Crandell terribly on Capitol Hill, not only for his profound knowledge and professional demeanor, but for his unassuming and good-natured manner, his friendly disposition and his ability to laugh. His departure leaves a void that cannot be filled, but the inspiration he gave to those succeeding him should help lessen the impact of his leaving. We wish him well in his future endeavors. ●

A TRUE SERVANT OF THE PEOPLE RETIRES

HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I would take just a moment to praise an exceptional public servant in my district who, for health reasons, retired in December of the year just past.

He is Sheriff Manly Lancaster, who served 34 years in the Forsyth County Sheriff's Department, the last 14 of them as the elected head of the department. His is an unusual story about a very special person.

Sheriff Lancaster served as a glider pilot in World War II and participated in the D-day landings in France. After the war, he earned a degree in journalism at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and landed a job as a sportswriter for the Winston-Salem Journal. His career was cut short, however, when he found that he was required to work Sundays. Mr. Lancaster said he didn't believe in doing that, so he quit.

Left at somewhat loose ends, he took a \$30-a-week job making hotdogs and was slinging mustard in 1950 when he was offered a job as a deputy in the sheriff's department. Neither his life nor the sheriff's department were ever the same again, for there he came under the tutelage of Sheriff Ernie Shore, renowned both as a legendary sheriff and, as a New York Yankee pitcher, the roommate of Babe Ruth.

When Sheriff Shore retired in 1970, he pitched his support Lancaster's way, and Lancaster carried every precinct in the populous county. Shore's advice to his successor was that above all else, a sheriff must be honest.

Lancaster was that, but he was much, much more. In succeeding years, his popularity grew. That popularity was not based on personality, or movie star good looks, or wrongheaded but popular approaches to tough prob-

lems. He was popular because he was always fair, always decent, always dedicated to service to the people. This, Mr. Speaker, is in the finest traditions of American public service.

Sheriff Lancaster also was very efficient and innovative. He inherited a horse and buggy department, and during his tenure turned it into one of the best local law enforcement agencies in the Nation.

Long before it was popular—or even acceptable—to do so, he hired minorities and women and paid them the same scale as their white male counterparts. He beefed up the patrol fleet and organized a community crime watch—the first east of the Mississippi River. He hired a training officer, and also sent deputies away to training schools all over the Southeast. He added a juvenile division, and an identification division. He stressed crime prevention, and was so successful with it that he was picked as the first chairman of the State's crime prevention council. He was admired and respected by his peers, who elected him president of the N.C. Sheriffs Association.

During his last year in office, Forsyth County had 1,800 crimes on the FBI index list. Two other North Carolina counties of comparable size—Guilford and Wake—had 2,500 and 2,800, respectively. Forsyth officers solved 35 percent of their cases; Guilford and Wake solved 19 and 11 percent, respectively.

A sheriff or a deputy with a college degree was rare when Lancaster gained that distinction, but it was commonplace in his department when he retired. He left a staff that included two holders of master's degrees, 24 with 4-year college degrees, and 40 with 2 years of college study in police science. Its 24 minority members ranked from captain on down.

But Sheriff Lancaster left much more than that. He left a legacy of professionalism, dedication, and trustworthiness that will tax his successors to equal. Indeed, he may be the yardstick by which Forsyth sheriffs are measured for generations to come.

Although he describes his illness as incurable, Sheriff Lancaster told a reporter that he "did not come home to die, but to live." That living, he said, will include more church work, a little more golf, and perhaps more volunteer work at one of the community's several hospitals.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a glimpse of a quite remarkable man, Manly Lancaster, who dedicated his life to public service, and even now is spending his last days serving people. He has been an inspiration to me, as he well might be to us all. ●

HANDICAPPED DEPENDENT TRUSTS

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, we have a great deal to be proud of in the gains that have been made through Federal laws in ensuring that handicapped children will be provided equal education and employment opportunities. Considering where we were 10 years ago, this progress is remarkable. We have taught handicapped children to function independently and to learn alongside their nonhandicapped peers. We have provided them with the vocational skills necessary to lead fulfilling, productive lives as adults. And we have begun to recognize the importance of transitional services for handicapped young men and women who no longer come under the protections of Public Law 94-142, but who need to maintain the sense of dignity and self-worth that such programs provide.

One of the concerns that continues to plague parents of the handicapped, however, is how to provide for their children's future financial security. There is currently no affordable option for moderate income families who wish to set money aside to ensure that their handicapped children will continue to receive the medical care and other services that will be required as they grow older.

I am introducing today legislation which provides a solution to this problem. My bill will allow for the establishment of privately endowed lifetime assistance to disabled individuals, with little or no expense to the Federal Government. Under this legislation, a taxpayer would be able to establish a life insurance contract the exclusive beneficiary of which would be a trust set up on behalf of a disabled child or other disabled member of the taxpayer's family. Tax deductions would be allowed equaling the aggregate life insurance premiums paid by the taxpayer during each taxable year.

It is time to build on the progress that has already been made in promoting independence for the handicapped. This legislation is a logical and important step in surmounting the obstacles that exist in achieving our goals. ●

A TRIBUTE TO MR. ZBIGNIEW
HLADKI

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, recently, Mr. Zbigniew Hladki of New Britain, CT, was honored as the 2,500th person placed in a job by the New England Association of Business, Industry, and Rehabilitation, through a program sponsored by the New Britain Constructive Workshop. I congratulate Mr. Hladki for successfully completing the intensive preparation which assisted him in overcoming the sometimes overwhelming physical and emotional barriers of being disabled.

Mr. Hladki's achievement also affords the opportunity to give some well-deserved recognition to the good work of the constructive workshop and NEABIR, which is part of the U.S. Department of Education's Projects with Industry Program.

The constructive workshop, located in my hometown of New Britain, CT, is a privately financed organization created to place as many disabled people as possible in industry-related jobs. To do this, the organization has prospective employees participate in a series of NEABIR-sponsored workshops, seminars that are held in rehabilitation facilities throughout Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Maine. This course is designed both to prepare the individual for interviews and, more importantly, to give him or her the confidence needed to succeed in a job. Oftentimes, the anguish caused by a disability proves to be the prime stumbling block for people. By encouraging people like Mr. Hladki to feel comfortable discussing their disabilities in an interview, these seminars attack this problem head on. This approach has clearly helped the program achieve its amazing placement rate, which in turn has been a boon to local industry since the program's inception 6 years ago.

The private sector has been a strong partner in this project: over 3,000 businesses have worked with NEABIR since 1979. It is encouraging to see so many firms recognize that physical limitations do not keep one from being a productive employee. One cannot help but feel optimistic about our future when cooperation, concern, and effective communications create new opportunities for individuals and industry.

In conclusion, I wish Zbigniew Hladki all the best in his work as a data acquisition analyst for Focus Research Systems of West Hartford. His meticulous preparation, the caring atmosphere of the constructive workshop, the work of NEABIR, and the foresight of his new employer have

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

laid the foundation for Mr. Hladki to succeed and for others as well to fulfill their dreams of employment, productivity, and independence.●

TRADE EMBARGO ON
NICARAGUA

HON. JOHN McCAIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a statement by my colleague and friend from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO], who is the ranking Republican member on the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs. On Tuesday, May 7, the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee jointly with the International Economic Policy and Trade Subcommittee held a hearing to review the administration's decision to impose economic sanctions and a trade embargo on Nicaragua. From the opening statements of the two subcommittee chairmen and the press release announcing the hearing, it seemed as though the hearing was intended to serve more as an opportunity to criticize the President and the administration than an occasion to explore more fully the justification for imposing such economic sanctions. My colleague from California took issue with the criticism of the administration, and I urge you to read his statement.

REMARKS OF HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

Mr. Chairman, I must take this opportunity to deplore the unrelenting effort by the majority party in this House to make U.S. policy toward Nicaragua a partisan political issue.

Any objective political scholar who has followed the debate of this issue in the House since the Sandinista takeover in 1979 must feel the same consternation as I do to see the twists of logic used by the majority party in its approach to this issue.

In the first years, aid to the Sandinista regime was debated and approved in spite of the clear indications that Sandinista ties with Cuba and the Soviet Union were direct and strong. A tremendous military buildup—aided and abetted by the Soviet bloc—began almost immediately after the Sandinistas came to power in 1979. Yet, many of my colleagues on the other side, in debate against aid to the Contras, which only began in 1982, claimed this would push the Sandinistas into the Soviet and Cuban camp.

In the early years of the Sandinista regime, many of my colleagues on the other side questioned whether the Sandinistas posed a threat to the security of the United States or even to their immediate neighbors.

Finally, during the debate two weeks ago on aid to the Contras, virtually everyone on the majority side agreed that something had to be done to force the Sandinistas to moderate their behavior, the only question being how to do it. Now, two weeks later, we hear questions raised as to whether the Sandinistas really are a threat to the United

States. I know of nothing that's happened in the last two weeks that has made the Sandinistas any less of a threat than they were during the Contra aid debate.

And now we come to the issue of trade sanctions against Nicaragua. The economic situation in Nicaragua is a disaster, with the Sandinista regime facing a \$4.6 billion external debt and a state-controlled economy incapable of providing for the needs of its citizens. On the eve of the vote on Contra aid, Nicaraguan President Ortega announced his intention to go to Moscow to seek additional economic assistance. Following that, and I emphasize it was after Ortega went to Moscow, the administration announced trade sanctions against Nicaragua. Incredibly, some on the majority side criticize the sanctions because they will drive the Sandinistas into further dependence on the Soviets and give them an excuse for the economic chaos in their country, when in fact, that is the situation before the sanctions.

One of the criticisms of the administration I most often hear from many of the Democrats is that "the White House isn't listening to the Congress." Well, I can assure you, the White House was listening to what the Democrats had to say before the Contra aid vote and during the debate on the Contra aid, and this is some of what they heard:

Congressman OBEY. "Economic pressure is the greatest leverage we have in forcing internal change, in forcing divisions among the leaders of the Sandinistas. Economic pressure is what will cause the population to raise questions about Nicaragua's economic and social policies. Hamilton has it. . . ." referring to the Hamilton-Barnes resolution.

Congressman GEJDENSON. "If we examine the options that are put before us by the committee, they take account of realistic alternatives. They give the Congress and the President an opportunity to attempt to utilize economic pressures, economic pressures that have a far greater opportunity to be successful than the present failed policy."

Congressman LEVIN. "They [opponents of the Hamilton resolution] do not refer to the fact that this Congress would consider the imposition of trade sanctions. Are we serious about considering such actions? The answer is yes." And finally:

Chairman BARNES. "Why is it that the United States is Nicaragua's leading trading partner if the Sandinistas are so bad?"

The Barnes-Hamilton resolution states that if Nicaragua does not address the concerns described earlier, "the United States—(c) should consider the imposition of trade sanctions." The resolution is worded in such a way that does not make trade sanctions contingent either on multilateral support for these measures or on other measures to be implemented in concert with trade sanctions despite arguments to the contrary.

Not only did Nicaragua not address the concerns described in the Hamilton-Barnes resolution, the Sandinistas publicly flaunted their disdain for that conciliatory effort. The most obvious slap in the face was President Ortega's visit to Moscow where new ties between Nicaragua and the Soviet Union were announced by Tass. Other developments revealed in the past week are equally disturbing:

Capture of seven agents of the Nicaraguan State Security Service in Honduras who admitted they were there to help Honduran guerrillas;

A Costa Rican combat group, organized by an extreme left-wing group with close ties to

Nicaragua, preparing for possible military operations in Costa Rica;

Delivery two weeks ago by the Soviet Union of additional MI-8/17 helicopters;

Delivery two weeks ago by East Germany of a large shipment of military transportation equipment;

Rejection by Nicaraguan leaders of any possible church-mediated dialogue with the democratic opposition of Nicaragua; and

Break-up of the May Day march by independent labor unions in Nicaragua.

Whatever questions you may raise about the process of imposing sanctions, and whether there was adequate consultation, there can be no mistaking the fact that the message sent from Congress to the administration was that trade sanctions should be considered. Well, the administration considered them, and agreed to impose them. Calling these hearings to bash the President once more on his policy toward Nicaragua must be seen as a purely political exercise. ●

A TRIBUTE TO VICTORIA SOKOLOFF

HON. JOSEPH J. DiOGUARDI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. DiOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise before the House today to present tribute to Victoria Sokoloff, for many years a resident of the city of Mount Vernon, NY, in my congressional district.

Victoria, who recently left us, had a life epitomizing the spirit of volunteerism so much a part of the American tradition.

Even in death, Victoria has the ability to humble those of us who knew her personally, or knew her through years of dedication as a veteran's hospital volunteer.

Her life was spotlighted on the occasion of her 80th birthday, just prior to her death. She was asked how, at her age, she could manage an active career as a veteran's hospital volunteer. In response, she said, "My dear, that has been my life."

Victoria's involvement in veteran's affairs started at age 17. At that tender age, she watched her brother, as well as other young men, march off to war in Europe, to risk, and often, to give, their lives in defense of the cause of freedom that we all share.

The need to give of herself to help those who gave so much of themselves for the cause, led her to start a career of more than 60 years of service to those who served America so admirably.

Victoria was assertive, without being aggressive; powerful, without being overpowering; small in stature, but bigger than life. Her need to become involved, to give something back to the veteran who had given so much to America, became the cause that dominated her life.

In the absence of the salute that we give our departed veterans, let us hail

her memory. Victoria's record of service to hospitalized veterans is truly magnificent. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. ●

LESSONS FROM VIETNAM

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, journalist and Vietnam veteran Al Santoli, author of "Everything We Had" and "To Bear Any Burden" shared some of his insights on the Vietnam experience and lessons that the United States should learn from our involvement there in a May 1, 1985, interview in the Washington Times and in a recent guest column in USA Today, I have found value in them and would like to share them with you.

CONG STRATEGY SET UP KILLINGS OF
CIVILIANS

(Journalist Al Santoli discussed his book, "To Bear Any Burden," with Lou Marano of The Washington Times. The book is an oral history of the Vietnam War and its aftermath in the words of Americans and Southeast Asians.)

Q: You were sergeant in an Army infantry unit, and then you worked in a very special kind of unit. Tell us about both?

A: I think my experience in the regular infantry before and after [the 1968] Tet [Offensive] probably wasn't very different from that of many other infantrymen. We were involved in a fair amount of fighting. Some of it was in the jungle along the Cambodian border, some was in the rice paddies and some of it was in towns.

Q: What unit were you in?

A: The 25th Division, just northwest of Saigon. The thing that was the most upsetting, and upset me even more after I got home is that when we did have to fight in town and around civilians, it was because the North Vietnamese or the Viet Cong—there weren't a whole lot of Viet Cong left at that time, because we had pretty much wiped them out during Tet—had chosen to use villages as battlegrounds.

They used civilians as shields in a very brutal and cowardly way, which created chaos and confusion. They also did it for propaganda reasons. By forcing Americans to hurt civilians or do damage, we then looked like the bad guys internationally. They could also tell the people, "Look, the Americans have come here to hurt you, and destroy your homes."

It was a very smart move on their part, and unfortunately our people fell for it—our people being the media, the politicians and international opinion in the Western democracies. Instead of condemning the people who chose to create chaos in civilian populations, we were the ones who were condemned.

If you look at what's happened after 1975, not only the ultimate tragedy in Cambodia but also the quiet strangulation of Vietnamese society and culture, they're still operating in the same kind of brutal and tyrannical way.

Q: Some former Viet Cong in your book attest to this, don't they?

A: Yes, two or three, and one former ARVN [Army of the Republic of Vietnam].

They talk of the communist plan to hide among the people like trees in the forest. They were training children. One of the people in "To Bear Any Burden," Troung Mealy, was recruited and trained to be a Viet Cong agent when he was 10 years old.

Kids were trained to be terrorists to throw hand grenades or to become human bombs. The communists were very explicit about the fact that they did this because they know what effect it would have on the GIs who would have to kill the kids. They knew the psychology of Americans. They could see how GIs liked to make a fuss over the Vietnamese children and give them candy, etc.

[Gen.] Lu Mong Lan, another person in the book, has been in the Viet Minh against the French and then later fought for South Vietnam against the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong. He says that this was a tactic used to disorient visiting soldiers and to create negative propaganda, both for internal and international reasons.

During the '68 Tet Offensive, there never was an uprising. As one of the Vietnamese in the book says, when the communists attacked, the people got angry. It was during their holiday, and a two-week truce had been called. What a brutal and cowardly act that was. Why didn't our media report that?

When Eddie Adams took the picture of the police chief shooting the Viet Cong, Eddie didn't know that the Viet Cong had just killed the police chief's best friend, his wife and their six children.

A: That particular individual man. Instead that terrorist murderer became a martyr and a saint according to the anti-war opposition. And that picture changed the minds of many people who had supported the war, causing them to think, "What a horrible thing we're involved in." It was completely the opposite. Those were the kind of frustrations those of us who served in Vietnam and really knew what was going on had to face.

Q: I remember when Gen. Westmoreland criticized the Viet Cong for attacking during Tet, he was mocked by some Americans who called attention to the fact that Gen. Washington attacked the Hessians at Trenton at Christmas of 1776.

A: Gen. Washington attacked an army. The North Vietnamese and Viet Cong attacked civilian populations. They massacred more than 3,000 people at Hue—buried people alive. This is something Hitler would have done and they became viewed as agrarian-reform liberators.

The ultimate mockery was that so many people here in the anti-war movement believed the Viet Cong were going to give people private ownership of land that there was going to be all these great reforms. One, of the people in the book, Mrs. Le Thi Anh, who was in the anti-war movement here in the United States returned to Vietnam and saw that the country was much better off in 1971-72 than she ever remembered it. What the communists did [after 1975] was to appropriate the peasants' land our Land-to-the-Tiller program had underwritten. Our program had promoted decentralization and local autonomy.

Vietnam was much better off in the early '70s than it's ever been since. Instead of giving the people land and helping them to develop themselves, the economy and their way of life, the communists have collectivized the land. Some of the problems they've had with agriculture and industry in Vietnam has come from passive resistance.

I've talked to hundreds and hundreds of boat people, and the one thing that's unanimous is that they said: "We had no hope. We fled knowing that we might die at sea. * * * But we had to try, because there was no future in our country."

And then people say we shouldn't take any more refugees because they're economic migrants. In a Marxist-Leninist system you cannot separate the economics from the politics. If anybody goes against the political economy of Leninism, they're persecuted. So they are political refugees, and people using this argument are trying to make us forget that an average of 2,000 people a month per country are still escaping from Vietnam, from Laos and from Cambodia. Ten years later the situation is still getting worse.

When I lived out in the villages with a small unit—half American, half Vietnamese—we knew the people didn't want to be communists. They didn't want war, but they also didn't want to be communists.

And it was very apparent that they didn't want to be overseen by the Northerners. Of course, they would get angry at the Americans if we did something stupid or insensitive. But, by the same token, they did not turn against us at Tet, when they had a good chance to strike out at us. And people ran from the communists in 1975, they didn't greet them.

"To Bear Any Burden" points out that there were many American mistakes made on all levels. But between the years 1965—when the Americans first landed—until 1972, we had basically won the war, and now the Viet Cong admit it.

Then, when the Americans pulled out, and there was a possibility of success, Henry Kissinger negotiated an agreement that allowed 145,000 North Vietnamese troops to remain on the Vietnam Cambodia border. The communists had the ability to proselytize in South Vietnamese government areas, but the South Vietnamese did not have the right to give their point of view in the communist areas or in North Vietnam.

We tried to play by the Marquis of Queensbury rules, but for the communists, it was a total war. It was a war of terrorism. * * * As Mr. Troung Nhu Tang, the former Viet Cong justice minister confirms, they had a specific department whose job was to work with international opinion to drive it against the Americans.

Q. Do you think the war could have been won?

A. The war could have ended successfully in '68-'69 after Tet. Our South Vietnamese allies were successful in '72-'73. After the Easter offensive, the North Vietnamese were beaten.

There's a new book out called "The Tunnels of Cu Chi," in which former Viet Cong admit they could not stay in South Vietnam after 1970 because they were beaten. They could not go into the villages because of the Cords program [Civil Operations and Revolutionary Development, a pacification program stressing self-help and local autonomy]. So the combination of American military efforts which was, in fact, effective, with the land reform programs and the economic development we were doing, which did give people a better life, we basically had achieved a very great success.

But there was one great problem, the myth that Laos and Cambodia were neutral countries. After Tet, Westmoreland asked for 206,000 more troops to cut the Ho Chi Minh trail. That would have won the war. Westmoreland was condemned as a warmon-

ger, but it was the people who opposed him who prolonged it.

Q: What did you mean when you wrote, "the ill-conceived military tactics and callous irresponsibility in some of our senior officers cause needless American and Vietnamese casualties"?

A: Tactics such as certain search and destroy operations. We should have worked with small units going into an area to locate the enemy, having good reconnaissance people, good special operatives that knew how to pinpoint the enemy. Then bring in your air strikes or artillery or whatever, use the infantry to clean up. Chuck Allen [a Special Forces adviser] talks about this in the book.

The enemy could choose to fight or not to fight according to their estimation of how U.S. casualty levels would affect American domestic politics. Because they could jump back and forth across the Cambodian or Laotian borders, they could pick and choose the time they wanted to fight. It was callous and irresponsible for the American command to follow this unmilitary pattern year after year.

It also turned the American people against the war. At Hamburger Hill and elsewhere, Americans had to fight more than one battle at the same spot, taking heavy casualties each time. Hamburger Hill became kind of a metaphor for the "futility" of the war, but if Westmoreland had been allowed to cut the Ho Chi Minh trail, it would have been a completely different picture.

Q: Your first book, "Everything We Had," was an oral history of servicemen who had served in Vietnam. What made you decide to write "To Bear Any Burden"?

A: I felt that too much attention was being given what to I feel is oversentimentality about the American soldier. Let's all feel sorry for the American veterans. They were foolish people who didn't know they were being used for an unjust cause.

Although the war ended in a way that makes me very sad. I very much believe in why I was there. I lived and bled with those people, and for a very short time, I shared their aspirations for peace and freedom, which they don't have now. I felt the best way of getting that across was by letting some of them speak as well as Americans.

I don't like it when people say, "Separate the warrior from the war. Feel sorry for the veterans but detest the cause." My feeling is, don't separate me from the war; I was very much a part of it.

VETS KNOW WHAT FREEDOM MEANS

(By Al Santoli, guest columnist)

NEW YORK.—I returned from Vietnam in March 1969.

As a 19-year-old infantry sergeant, I had seen substantial combat in jungles and rice paddies on the Cambodian border.

I had witnessed the terror that North Vietnamese and Viet Cong forces had imposed on innocent villagers.

By living and working with South Vietnamese farmers and soldiers, I understood their desire to be free of war and tyranny of any political color.

I had lost friends, both U.S. and Vietnamese, whose courage will always live within me.

I was committed to give my life to help bring freedom to the Vietnamese. But, like many soldiers, I became confused and angered by the political decisions not to let us end the war by driving the North Vietnamese army, that we had defeated during Tet,

out of its sanctuaries in Cambodia. We were stunned when President Johnson stopped the bombing of their supply lines, which created more U.S. casualties.

The feeling of betrayal by our leaders numbed me. But to come home to a popular antiwar movement that, in part, advocated victory by Ho Chi Minh's communist forces, nearly destroyed me.

My whole world was turned upside down. For 10 years I tried carrying on with my life, trying not to think about Vietnam. But it was always there, in dreams, in sounds I would hear on the street, and in the faces of lost friends who I could not help but remember.

In 1978, I began interviewing hundreds of fellow veterans and Southeast Asian refugees for what have become two oral histories of the war. I have found that Vietnam was many different wars, depending where one was stationed and the time of one's involvement.

But there is a shared sense of strength: We survived both the war and the difficult homecoming. And we have become more caring people because of our survival.

Rather than a liability, most Vietnam veterans and Southeast Asia refugees are proving to be valuable contributors to our communities. We have paid a high price to partake in the freedom and opportunities that our country has to offer. And we appreciate the blessing of liberty that many people take for granted.

The legacy of the Vietnam war—the Soviet warships now based in Cam Rahn Bay, the reeducation camps and boat people of Vietnam, the slaughter of Pmpong and other hill tribes in Laos, the ongoing war and holocaust in Cambodia—remind us of the reasons for our veterans' sacrifices as today the struggle for freedom continues in Southeast Asia and other parts of the world. ●

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN DEFENSE PROCUREMENT

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Congressman NICHOLS and I have introduced H.R. 2356, which follows these brief remarks. This legislation addresses the "revolving door" situation in which Federal employees and some military have handled contract matters across the table from contractors, by whom they are shortly thereafter employed. The cosponsorship of all Members of the House will be welcomed.

H.R. 2356

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Conflict of Interest Act of 1985".

SEC. 2. CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST IN DEFENSE PROCUREMENT.

(a) LIMITATIONS ON FORMER ACQUISITION OFFICERS.—(1) An individual who is a former officer or employee of the Department of Defense or former retired member of the

uniformed services who, during the two years preceding the individual's separation from Government service, had significant responsibilities for a procurement function with respect to a Government contractor may not accept compensation from that contractor for a period of two years following the individual's separation from Government service.

(2) Whoever knowingly violates paragraph (1) shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

(3) Whoever knowingly offers, tenders, or grants any compensation to any individual in violation of paragraph (1) shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON CONTRACTORS.—(1) Each contract for procurement of goods or services entered into by the Department of Defense shall include a provision under which the contractor agrees not to provide compensation, during the period described in paragraph (2), to an individual who is a former officer or employee of the Department of Defense or a former or retired member of the uniformed services who, during the two-year period preceding the individual's separation from Government service, had significant responsibilities for a procurement function with respect to that contractor.

(2) The period referred to in paragraph (1) is the two-year period beginning on the last day of the individual's employment with the Department of Defense or two years following the individual's retirement from the uniformed services.

(3) A contractor who knowingly violates a contract provision required by paragraph (1) shall forfeit to the United States, as liquidated damages under the contract, an amount equal to the greater of \$100,000 or three times the compensation paid by the contractor to the individual in violation of such contract provision.

(c) REPORTS.—(1)(A) Each contractor subject to a contract term described in subsection (b) shall issue an annual report listing the name of each individual (together with other information adequate for the Government to identify the individual) who is a former Government officer or employee, or a former or retired member of the uniformed services who—

- (i) had significant responsibilities for a procurement function;
- (ii) left Government service within the previous two years; and
- (iii) was compensated by that contractor after leaving Government service.

(B) Each such listing shall—

- (i) show the agency by which the individual was last employed or on active duty;
- (ii) show the individual's job titles; and
- (iii) contain a full and complete description of the duties of the individual during the last two years of his employment and a description of the duties that the individual is performing on behalf of the contractor.

(C) A copy of each such report shall be sent to the Inspector General of the Department of Defense.

(2) The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall review each report under paragraph (1) to assess the report for accuracy and completeness and for the purpose of identifying possible violations of subsection (a) or (b) or paragraph (1). The Inspector General shall report any such possible violations to the Attorney General for prosecution.

(3) Whoever fails to file a report required by paragraph (1) shall be liable to the United States in the amount of \$10,000.

(d) REVIEW BY DIRECTOR OF OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS.—The Director of the Office of Government Ethics shall have access to the reports submitted under subsection (c)(1) and shall conduct an annual random survey of the reports to check for violations of subsections (a), (b), and (c)(1). The Director shall submit an annual report to Congress on the operation of this section, including the findings of the Director under such reports.

(e) EXCLUSION.—This section does not apply to a contract for an amount less than \$100,000.

(f) COVERED PROCUREMENT FUNCTIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense—

(1) shall delineate the procurement functions covered by this section consistent with the definition provided; and

(2) shall provide a list of such functions to Congress.

(g) ADVISORY OPINIONS FROM OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS.—(1) An individual who is offered compensation that might place the individual in violation of subsection (a) may, before acceptance of such compensation, apply to the Director of the Office of Government Ethics for advice on the applicability of this section to such compensation. Any such application shall be made jointly by the individual and the contractor who proposes to provide the compensation.

(2) An application under paragraph (1) shall contain—

(A) a full and complete description of the duties of the applicant during the last two years of his service in the Government;

(B) any official responsibility the applicant exercised with regard to any procurement contract in which an interest is or was retained by the contractor who proposes to provide such compensation; and

(C) a description by contractor of any prospective services that the applicant will perform on behalf of the contractor.

(3) Promptly upon receipt of an application under paragraph (1), the Director of the Office of Government Ethics shall publish notice of the application in the Federal Register.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "compensation" includes any payment, gift, benefit, reward, favor, gratuity, or employment valued in excess of \$100 at prevailing market price, provided directly, indirectly, or through a third party.

(2) The term "contractor" means any person, partnership, corporation, or agency thereof (other than the Federal Government, the independent agencies thereof, or the District of Columbia) that offers, negotiates, agrees, or otherwise contracts to supply the Federal Government with goods, services, or supplies. Such term includes any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate thereof.

(3) The term "procurement function", with respect to a contract, means any acquisition action relating to the contract, including negotiating, awarding, administering, approving contract changes, costs analysis, quality assurance, operation and developmental testing, technical advice or recommendation, approval of payment, contractor selection, budgeting, auditing under the contract, or management of the procurement program.

(i) SEPARATION OF MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES.—A member of former member of

the uniformed services shall be considered to have been separated from Government service upon such member's discharge or release from active duty.

(j) TRANSITION.—This section does not—

(1) preclude the continuation of employment that began before the effective date of this section or the receipt of compensation for such employment; or

(2) apply to any officer or employee whose service with the Department of Defense terminated before the effective date of this section.

(k) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on January 1, 1986.●

THE TRUE NATURE OF THE "FREEDOM FIGHTERS"

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post carries on its front page today a devastating article, based on an interview with a Contra field commander who has just returned to Nicaragua under its offer of amnesty without reprisals to the Contras.

I urge my colleagues to read the words of the former National Guard sergeant, who rose in the Contras to the rank of task force commander, but left in disgust over the refusal of the former Guard officers at the top of the military command to halt the murder, kidnaping, and rape of civilians as a routine Contra strategy.

I urge my colleagues to reexamine the FDN's claim that the military command is not dominated by former Guards. The FDN provided its own list of military commanders and their background to some Members of Congress during the recent debate: This Contra leader was described on that list as a former peasant, with no prior Guard service, yet he admits to having been a sergeant. In addition, that list conspicuously excluded the General Staff of the FDN, which even the State Department now admits is 90 percent former National Guards.

As we move toward consideration of foreign aid for El Salvador and Honduras, read what this former Contra leader says about the massive diversion of military equipment from those Governments to the Contras. Congress has banned aid to the Contras, but they're getting it anyway.

This article shows that more than ever the Contras are the wrong horse to ride in Central America. Let's stay off that horse, for good.

[From the Washington Post, May 8, 1985]

A DEFECTING NICARAGUAN CONTRA'S TALE
FORMER FIELD COMMANDER CHARGES
WIDESPREAD ABUSES

(By Robert J. McCartney)

MEXICO CITY, May 7.—Ever since 1980, when he was among the first Nicaraguans to

join the anti-Sandinista resistance, Jose Efren Martinez Mondragon had appeared to follow the typical career of the dedicated contra, or counterrevolutionary, guerrilla leader.

Formerly a sergeant in the National Guard of deposed dictator Anastasio Somoza, Martinez Mondragon worked his way up in the resistance movement from commander of a guerrilla training unit in Honduras to become a task force commander who regularly led missions inside Nicaragua. Just six months ago, he was commanding 180 contras on a patrol in Esteli province, deep inside territory normally controlled by the Sandinistas.

Today, however, Martinez Mondragon did something that no contra commander ever had done before: he flew home to Managua to be welcomed by his former foes as a defector. He will take advantage of a Nicaraguan amnesty law approved earlier this year that provides for a pardon for rebels who lay down their arms. Eight weeks ago, Martinez Mondragon and nine other persons, including two other guerrillas, sought political asylum in the Mexican Embassy in Tegucigalpa, Honduras. Initially the Honduran government refused to let him leave the country, although the others were permitted to depart for Nicaragua almost immediately, and his fate was uncertain until a week ago when the Honduran authorities finally let him fly to Mexico City.

The defection ended what Martinez Mondragon described as a prolonged personal ordeal of several years as he grappled with his own doubts about the guerrillas' cause and, even more, about their behavior in the field. In a four-hour interview here last night, he said he left the contras in disgust with what he said were their routine practices of murder, kidnaping and rape of Nicaraguan civilians.

"They are kidnaping and killing people who just want to work," the 26-year-old defector said. "This wasn't a struggle. It was banditry."

While there have been news reports of individual incidents of alleged killings and abductions by the contras of Nicaraguan civilians who were, or were believed to be, Sandinista sympathizers, Reagan administration officials in the past have denied the validity of claims that such practices were routine and characterized the claims as propaganda.

In another assertion that was likely to be controversial, Martinez Mondragon said that the Honduran, Salvadoran and Guatemalan armies have supplied the contras with the bulk of their ammunition and other military supplies since the CIA stopped funding them a year ago.

Spokesman in Miami and Honduras for the rebel group Martinez Mondragon belonged to were unavailable today for comment on his specific allegations.

Because of the severity of his charges and the unprecedented nature of his defection, Martinez Mondragon's change of heart could contribute to the political debate that extends from Managua to the U.S. Congress. The guerrillas previously have drawn criticism for human rights abuses from some unofficial U.S. monitoring groups. This has become a factor in the U.S. debate over whether Washington should resume financial backing for them.

Several former Sandinista leaders, such as Arturo Cruz and Eden Pastora, and many sympathizers of the Sandinistas have broken with Managua's government and are allied with the rebels. Martinez Mondragon, a middle-level contra field commander, is the first to go the other way.

The defection already has triggered a flurry of activity by several of the players involved, either to control the damage or maximize it.

The Nicaraguan Democratic Force, the largest of the rebel groups and the one to which Martinez Mondragon belonged, already has suggested that the defector had lost some of his mental faculties because of a motor vehicle accident. The force, known by its Spanish initials FDN, also has charged that Martinez Mondragon's lover was a Sandinista spy who may have encouraged the defection.

For its part, the Nicaraguan government wasted no time making the defector available to the media, presenting him both at the interview last night and at a news conference upon his arrival in Managua this morning.

In the interview, Martinez Mondragon alleged that the contras have regularly killed Nicaraguans who refused to join the rebel cause after crossing the border into Honduras or after being abducted and brought there by the guerrillas. He said that there were several clandestine cemeteries for such victims along the Nicaraguan-Honduran border, including one near a hamlet called San Judas in Honduras' Choluteca province, and another at La Lodoza in El Paraiso province.

"If you won't fight, then they think you are a [Sandinista] infiltrator and kill you," he said.

He said the armed forces of Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala currently are providing the FDN with the bulk of its ammunition, uniforms and boots. He said he had seen Honduran military trucks and helicopters deliver ammunition and other supplies to contra camps, and that he had learned from friends who handled the rebels' supplies that these three countries' armies were the principal source of materiel.

The FDN's base camps are inside Honduras just across the border from Nicaragua, and the defector said that Honduran Army officers control all deliveries of military supplies to the contras.

Since Congress stopped the CIA from funding the guerrillas a year ago, the source of the rebels' military supplies has been something of a mystery. The rebels say they have continued their fight with the aid of private donations, but several reports have surfaced that the Honduran, Salvadoran and Guatemalan governments were playing an important role.

Martinez Mondragon said that other contra commanders had told him that "the CIA advisers arranged for the Salvadoran, Guatemalan and Honduran armies to provide materiel" to the FDN. He did not say when the CIA supposedly had done this, however.

He said guerrillas frequently had raped civilian women in Nicaragua and abducted them for sexual use.

During a patrol in Nicaragua's Jinotega province last August, the defector said, he came across a group of 40 families near Wina who said that they had been abducted by another patrol from the San Jacinto regional command. This patrol had abducted and raped eight young women from the group, and had killed eight young men who refused to join the rebels, he said.

At that time, Martinez Mondragon said, he radioed FDN military leader Enrique Bermudez to complain about the treatment of the civilians. Bermudez told him "to stop interfering in business that doesn't affect you," the defector said. This was only one of

several times that Martinez Mondragon complained to FDN leaders about abuses by the rebels and received unsatisfactory responses, he said.

The interview was conducted in a sitting room at the Nicaraguan ambassador's residence in Mexico City, but the defector said that he had not been pressured to grant the interview and had not been briefed beforehand by Sandinista officials, Nicaraguan Embassy officers wandered through the room from time to time during the talk, but their presence did not seem to affect Martinez Mondragon.

The defector acknowledged that he was seriously hurt in the vehicle accident, when he struck his head hard and was unconscious for a week. He spoke slowly, occasionally lost his train of thought and said that his head still hurt "deep inside" from time to time.

While the FDN has suggested that he cannot be trusted because of brain damage, the FDN did entrust him to command several missions inside Nicaragua after the accident had taken place.

Martinez Mondragon expressed fears that the FDN would take reprisals against his friends or family. He said he believed the FDN's leadership was responsible for the deaths of his brother and two of his cousins. ●

CUBA, NICARAGUA ARE THE REAL DANGERS

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent commentary by John Norton Moore, professor of international law at the University of Virginia. Professor Moore puts into proper perspective what is at stake in Central America in terms of the rule of law. As Professor Moore correctly states:

The real threat is the serious and sustained armed attack directed by Cuba and Nicaragua against El Salvador and neighboring states, in violation of the United Nations and the Organization of American States Charters.

Critics of U.S. policy in Central America have turned the issue on its head by falling into the Sandinista trap of claiming U.S. policy is aggression. We must not confuse defense with aggression. Moreover, it is essential that we carry out our commitments to "take effective action against aggressive use of force intended to deprive nations in this hemisphere of their right to self-determination," as Professor Moore states.

I urge my colleagues to give serious thought to Professor Moore's analysis, which originally appeared in the April 22 edition of the Los Angeles Times.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 22, 1985]

CUBA, NICARAGUA ARE THE REAL DANGERS

(By John Norton Moore)

A principal argument of those opposed to U.S. funding of the counterrevolutionaries in Nicaragua is that it would be illegal under accepted norms of international law. The rule of law is at stake in Central America. But the real threat is the serious and sustained armed attack directed by Cuba and Nicaragua against El Salvador and neighboring states, in violation of the United Nations and Organization of American States charters.

To focus on the issue of funding, rather than on the Cuban-Nicaraguan attack, is to accept the childhood plea, "It all started when he hit me back." More dangerously, it is to confuse the defense with aggression, and thus to undermine the single most important normative restraint against the use of force. Moreover, the goals of deterrence and stability are at risk if we ignore the commitment made repeatedly by our country; that we will take effective action against aggressive use of force intended to deprive nations in this hemisphere of their right to self-determination. This commitment is found in the Monroe Doctrine and the hemispheric Rio Defense Treaty, and in the congressional Cuban resolution of 1962 and the 1965 House resolution on communist subversion in the hemisphere.

Since seizing power in 1959, Fidel Castro has directed insurgencies against 17 Latin American nations. Until the attack against El Salvador, the most serious of these was a sustained insurgency against Venezuela, condemned in 1964 by the OAS. The success of the Sandinistas—with substantial Cuban support—two decades after Castro's takeover in Cuba provided new ideological fervor and opportunity for what is now a joint Cuban-Nicaraguan policy of "revolution without frontiers."

Both the bipartisan Kissinger Commission and the House Select Committee on Intelligence have concluded that Cuba and Nicaragua are engaged in efforts to overthrow the governments of neighboring states, particularly El Salvador. These efforts include meetings held in Cuba in December, 1979, and May, 1980, to forge a united Salvadoran insurgency under Cuban and Nicaraguan influence and assistance, including arms supply, training, financing, command and control, and political and technical support.

The resulting insurgency now fields well-trained armed forces one-fifth the size of the Salvadoran army, and operates 67 offices in 35 countries in political support of the continuing attack. As defectors' reports and weapon serial numbers demonstrate, the preponderance of the insurgents' weapons continues to be supplied externally. In fact, they had American M-16 rifles and M-60 machine guns (from stocks in Vietnam and Ethiopia) even before the Salvadoran army had those weapons.

Congress itself found, in the Intelligence Authorization Act of 1983, that the "actions of the government of Cuba and Nicaragua threaten the independence of El Salvador and threaten to destabilize the entire Central America region, and the governments of Cuba and Nicaragua refuse to cease those activities."

These Cuban-Nicaraguan activities violate the United Nations Charter, the Charter of the Organization of American States, the Rio Defense Treaty, the United Nations definition of aggression, the 1965 U.N. General Assembly declaration on intervention, the 1970 General Assembly "friendly relations"

declaration, the 1972 basic principles agreement, the 1975 Helsinki principles and even the Soviet draft definition of aggression.

This pattern of ongoing aggression constitutes an armed attack justifying the use of force in collective defense under Article 51 of the U.N. Charter and Article 3 of the Rio Treaty. Indeed, Article 27 of the OAS Charter declares that such an attack is "an act of aggression against . . . (all) the American states," and Article 3 of the Rio Treaty creates a legal obligation on the United States to assist in meeting the armed attack. This obligation is parallel to that owed by the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (under Article 5 of the NATO Treaty) in the event of an attack on a NATO member.

A response in defense may lawfully be overt, covert or both, as has been the case in virtually every conflict in which America has fought in this century. In World War II no one suggested that Allied support for partisan forces or covert operations in Germany were illegal in responding to Axis aggression.

Certainly responses in defense must be proportional. But how is it disproportionate for the United States to respond against a covert Cuban-Nicaraguan armed attack aimed at overthrowing the democratically elected government of El Salvador by not ruling out that same objective against a totalitarian Sandinista military junta?

One of the most serious contemporary threats to world order is the aggressive covert political-military attack by an externally instigated and supported guerrilla insurgency. Such an attack from Cuba and Nicaragua is the world threat in Central America. Congress must decide whether it meant what it said in the 1962 Cuban resolution, when it pledged "that the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere."

(John Norton Moore is chairman of the American Bar Assn. Standing Committee on Law and National Security and a professor of international law at the University of Virginia. He has served as counsel to the United States in the Nicaragua case before the International Court of Justice. The views expressed are his own.) ●

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE CAPITAL PUNISHMENT FOR FEDERAL PRISONERS WHO COMMIT MURDER WHILE ALREADY SERVING A LIFE SENTENCE

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, the people of Wisconsin were shocked last year by the brutal and senseless murder of a prison guard at the Oxford, WI, Federal correctional facility. Sadly, the question we must ask about the killing is not "Why did it happen?" but rather "How is it that it hasn't happened more often?"

Prison guards are vulnerable victims in a jail. They must walk unarmed

among the prisoners in our overcrowded correctional facilities for fear that a pistol or a shotgun could be taken from them in the course of an escape attempt or prison protest. For the same reason, guards are often locked in the cellblocks without a key while performing their duties.

Unlike the guards, however, some of the prisoners are armed, having secretly fashioned homemade knives which they keep hidden, and sometimes even having access to firearms surreptitiously brought into the prison.

What deterrence is there for prisoners already in jail for life not to kill prison guards, or for that matter, other prisoners? I have always opposed the death penalty except in the most extreme of cases. Unfortunately, this has to be of one of those cases. This is why yesterday I reintroduced legislation providing capital punishment for Federal prisoners serving life sentences who commit first-degree murder.

My bill, H.R. 2398, addresses the deterrence need while providing careful safeguards to ensure its fair application. It sets out specific guidelines for courts and juries to follow, outlining what particular factors should be considered in determining the appropriateness of the penalty to the given case and spelling out procedural rules designed to protect the defendant's constitutional rights. In substance and form, the bill addresses the concerns for fairness and clarity which the courts have expressed in reviewing death penalty laws.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill can help protect our prison guards and the whole Federal prison population and submit it here in its totality for the record.

H.R. 2398

A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide capital punishment for first degree murders committed by prisoners serving a life sentence

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CHAPTER 51 AMENDMENT.

Chapter 51 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 1118. Murder by Federal prisoners

"(a) OFFENSE.—Whoever, while confined in a Federal correctional institution under sentence for a term of life imprisonment, commits first degree murder (as defined in section 1111 of this title) shall be punished by death or by life imprisonment without the possibility of parole.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) the term 'Federal correctional institution' means any Federal prison, Federal correctional facility, Federal community program center, or Federal halfway house; and

"(2) the term 'term of life imprisonment' means a sentence for the term of natural life, a sentence commuted to natural life, an indeterminate term of a minimum of at

least fifteen years and a maximum of life, or an unexecuted sentence of death.

"(c) HEARING REQUIRED.—A person shall be subjected to the penalty of death under this section only if a hearing is held in accordance with this section.

"(d) NOTICE BY GOVERNMENT.—(1) Whenever the Government intends to seek the death penalty under this section, the attorney for the Government, a reasonable time before trial or acceptance by the court of a plea of guilty, shall sign and file with the court, and serve upon the defendant, a notice—

"(A) indicating that the Government in the event of conviction will seek the sentence of death; and

"(B) setting forth the aggravating factors which the Government will seek to prove as the basis for the death penalty.

"(2) The court may permit the attorney for the Government to amend such notice for good cause shown.

"(e) SENTENCING HEARING.—(1) When the attorney for the Government has filed a notice under subsection (d) of this section and the defendant is found guilty of or pleads guilty to an offense under this section, the judge who presided at the trial or before whom the guilty plea was entered, or any other judge if the judge who presided at the trial or before whom the guilty plea was entered is unavailable, shall conduct a separate sentencing hearing to determine the punishment to be imposed.

"(2) The hearing shall be conducted—

"(A) before the jury which determined the defendant's guilt;

"(B) before a jury impaneled for the purpose of the hearing if—

"(i) the defendant was convicted upon a plea of guilty;

"(ii) the defendant was convicted after a trial before the court sitting without a jury;

"(iii) the jury which determined the defendant's guilt has been discharged for good cause; or

"(iv) after initial imposition of a sentence under this section, redetermination of the sentence under this section is necessary; or

"(C) before the court alone, upon the motion of the defendant and with the consent of the Government.

"(3) A jury impaneled pursuant to paragraph (2)(B) shall consist of 12 members, unless, at any time before the conclusion of the hearing, the parties stipulate with the approval of the court that it shall consist of any number less than 12.

"(f) INFORMATION WHICH MAY BE PRESENTED.—(1) Notwithstanding the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure or any other provision of law, if a defendant is found guilty of or pleads guilty to an offense under this section, no presentence report shall be prepared.

"(2) In the sentencing hearing, information may be presented as to any matter relevant to the sentence and shall include matters relating to any of the mitigating or aggravating factors set forth in subsection (i) or (j) or any other mitigating factor.

"(3) In such hearing, information presented may include the trial transcript and exhibits if the hearing is held before a jury or judge not present during the trial.

"(4) Any other information relevant to such mitigating or aggravating factors may be presented in such hearing by either the Government or the defendant, regardless of its admissibility under the rules governing admission of evidence at criminal trials, except that information may be excluded if its probative value is substantially out-

weighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury.

"(5) The Government and the defendant shall be permitted to rebut any information received at the hearing and shall be given fair opportunity to present argument as to the adequacy of the information to establish the existence of any of the aggravating or mitigating factors, and as to the appropriateness in that case of imposing a sentence of death. The Government shall open the argument. The defendant shall be permitted to reply. The Government shall then be permitted to reply in rebuttal.

"(6) The burden of establishing the existence of any aggravating factor is on the Government, and is not satisfied unless such existence is established beyond a reasonable doubt. The burden of establishing the existence of any mitigating factor is on the defendant, and is not satisfied unless such existence is established by a preponderance of the information.

"(g) SPECIAL FINDINGS.—(1) The jury, or if there is no jury, the court, shall consider all the information received during the hearing. It shall return special findings identifying any mitigating factors, whether or not set forth in subsection (i), and any aggravating factors set forth in subsection (j) of this section found to exist.

"(2) If—

"(A) an aggravating factor set forth in subsection (j)(1) is not found to exist; or

"(B) an aggravating factor set forth in subsection (j)(1) is found to exist but no other aggravating factor set forth in subsection (j) is found to exist;

the court shall impose a sentence, other than death, authorized by law.

"(3)(A) If an aggravating factor set forth in subsection (j)(1) and one or more of the other aggravating factors set forth in subsection (j) are found to exist, the jury, or if there is no jury, the court, shall then consider whether the aggravating factors found to exist sufficiently outweigh any mitigating factor or factors found to exist, or in the absence of mitigating factors, whether the aggravating factors are themselves sufficient to justify a sentence of death.

"(B) Based upon this consideration, the jury by unanimous vote, or if there is no jury, the court, shall return a finding as to whether a sentence of death is justified.

"(h) IMPOSITION OF SENTENCE.—Upon such a finding that a sentence of death is justified, the court shall sentence the defendant to death. Otherwise the court shall impose a sentence, other than death, authorized by law.

"(i) MITIGATING FACTORS.—In determining whether a sentence of death is to be imposed on a defendant, the following mitigating factors shall be considered but are not exclusive:

"(1) The defendant was less than 18 years of age at the time of the crime.

"(2) The defendant's capacity to appreciate the wrongfulness of the defendant's conduct or to conform the defendant's conduct to the requirements of law was significantly impaired, but not so impaired as to constitute a defense to the charge.

"(3) The defendant was under unusual and substantial duress, although not such duress as constitutes a defense to the charge.

"(4) The defendant is punishable as a principal (as defined in section 2(a) of this title) in the offense, which was committed by another, but the defendant's participation was relatively minor, although not so

minor as to constitute a defense to the charge.

"(5) The defendant could not reasonably have foreseen that the defendant's conduct in the course of the commission of murder, or other offense resulting in death for which the defendant was convicted, would cause, or would create a grave risk of causing, death to any person.

"(j) AGGRAVATING FACTORS.—The following aggravating factors shall be considered:

"(1) The defendant—

"(A) intentionally killed the victim;

"(B) intentionally inflicted serious bodily injury which resulted in the death of the victim; or

"(C) intentionally participated in an act which he knew or reasonably should have known would create a grave risk of death to a person, other than one of the participants in the offense, and the victim did die as a direct result of the act.

"(2) The defendant committed the offense during the course of seizing, confining, inveigling, deceiving, kidnaping, abducting, carrying away, holding hostage, or holding for ransom or otherwise, any person.

"(3) The defendant committed the offense during the course of perpetrating or attempting to perpetrate a sexual assault on any person.

"(4) The defendant committed the offense during the course of, on account of, or as a result of, any transaction concerning or distribution of any controlled substance as set forth in schedule I, II, III, IV, or V in the Controlled Substances Act.

"(5) The defendant committed the offense while armed with, or having readily available, a firearm, as defined in section 921 of this title.

"(6) The death or injury resulting in death occurred during the commission or attempted commission of, or during the immediate flight from the commission or attempted commission of, an offense under section 751 (prisoners in custody of institution or officer), section 844(f) (destruction of Government property by explosives), or section 1201 (kidnaping).

"(7) The defendant has been convicted of another Federal offense, or a State offense resulting in the death of a person, for which a sentence of life imprisonment or a sentence of death was authorized by law.

"(8) The defendant has previously been convicted of two or more State or Federal offenses punishable by a term of imprisonment of more than one year, committed on different occasions, involving the infliction of, or attempted infliction of, serious bodily injury upon another person.

"(9) In the commission of the offense the defendant knowingly created a grave risk of death to one or more persons in addition to the victim of the offense.

"(10) The defendant committed the offense in an especially heinous, cruel, or depraved manner.

"(11) The defendant procured the commission of the offense by payment, or promise of payment, of anything of pecuniary value.

"(12) The defendant committed the offense as consideration for the receipt, or in the expectation of the receipt, of anything of pecuniary value.

"(13) The defendant committed the offense after substantial planning and premeditation to cause the death of a person.

"(14)(A) The defendant committed the offense against a Federal law-enforcement officer or an employee of a United States penal or correctional institution while such officer or employee was performing that of-

ficer's or employee's official duties or because of that officer's or employee's status as a public servant.

"(B) For the purpose of this paragraph, the term 'law-enforcement officer' means a public servant authorized by law or by a Government agency or Congress to conduct or engage in the prevention, investigation, or prosecution of an offense.

"(k) **ANTIDISCRIMINATION INSTRUCTIONS.**—In any hearing held before a jury under this section, the court shall instruct the jury that in its consideration of whether the sentence of death is justified it shall not consider the race, color, national origin, creed, sexual preference, or sex of defendant or of the victim or victims. The jury shall return to the court a certificate signed by each juror that consideration of race, color, national origin, creed, sexual preference, or sex of the defendant or of the victim or victims was not involved in reaching such juror's individual decision.

"(1) **REVIEW.**—(1) In any case in which the sentence of death is imposed under this section, the sentence of death shall be subject to review by the court of appeals upon appeal by the defendant, if the defendant files notice of such appeal within the time limits prescribed for notice of appeal of judgment in section 2107 of title 28.

"(2) On review of the sentence, the court of appeals shall consider the record, the evidence submitted during the trial, the information submitted during the sentencing hearing, the procedures employed in the sentencing hearing, and the special findings returned under this section.

"(3) The court shall affirm the sentence if it determines that—

"(A) the sentence of death was not imposed under the influence of passion, prejudice, or any other arbitrary factor; and

"(B) the information supports the special finding of the existence of any aggravating factors, or the failure to find any mitigating factors as set forth or allowed in this section.

"(4) In all other cases the court shall remand the case for reconsideration under this section.

"(5) The court of appeals shall state in writing the reasons for its disposition of the review of the sentence.

"(m) **IMPLEMENTATION OF SENTENCE.**—(1) A person who has been sentenced to death pursuant to this section shall be committed to the custody of the Attorney General until exhaustion of the procedures for appeal of the judgment of conviction and for review of the sentence. When the sentence is to be implemented, the Attorney General shall release the person sentenced to death to the custody of a United States marshal, who shall supervise implementation of the sentence in the manner prescribed by the law of the State in which the sentence is imposed. If the law of such State does not provide for implementation of a sentence of death, the court shall designate another State, the law of which does so provide, and the sentence shall be implemented in the latter State in the manner prescribed by such law.

"(2) A sentence of death shall not be carried out upon a woman while she is pregnant.

"(3) A United States marshal charged with supervising the implementation of a sentence of death may use appropriate State or local facilities for the purpose, may use the services of an appropriate State or local official or of a person such as an official employs for the purpose, and shall pay the

costs thereof in an approved by the Attorney General."

SEC. 2. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.

The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 51 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

"1118. Murder by Federal prisoners." ●

TRIBUTE TO MILTON EISENHOWER

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a wonderful and talented educator, author, and adviser to eight Presidents: Milton Stover Eisenhower. Dr. Eisenhower died in Baltimore on May 2, 1985. He will be missed immensely. I believe that Mike Bowler of the Baltimore Sun best summarized the enormous accomplishments and contributions of Dr. Eisenhower:

MILTON EISENHOWER, ADVISER TO EIGHT PRESIDENTS, DIES
(By Mike Bowler)

Born in Abilene, KS, the last of six brothers, Dr. Eisenhower left an indelible mark as public servant and educator. He was an adviser to presidents from Calvin Coolidge to Richard M. Nixon and a trouble-shooter in labor disputes, foreign crises and other matters, foreign and domestic.

He was instrumental in shaping U.S. policy in Latin America in the 1950s and later helped lay the foundation for the Alliance for Progress, the vast Latin American economic and social development program of the Kennedy administration.

As the only man to lead the Johns Hopkins University twice, he tripled income and doubled endowment, raising faculty salaries to fourth-highest in the nation. He was known as a thoughtful, reasoned administrator who did not interfere in faculty affairs, and he became an expert on the U.S. presidency and the nomination process for presidential candidates.

In an active retirement, Dr. Eisenhower raised money to fight violence in America, led a drive for a six-year U.S. presidential term and continued a love affair with the Baltimore Orioles. At a Memorial Stadium party on his 75th birthday, the Orioles presented Dr. Eisenhower with a \$1-a-year "contract" as a right-handed reliever and asked him to throw out the first ball.

He wrote two books, including "The President is Calling" in 1974. The book was a close-range assessment of the eight presidents he had come to know intimately and an evaluation of the Constitution and laws and traditions affecting the presidency.

A man of medium height, clear blue eyes, trim build, erect carriage and crisp, direct but amiable manner, he kept up an enormous range of activities in his professional and private life.

Close friends and admirers mourned the loss of Dr. Eisenhower. "He was a man of great good sense and great good humor who did great good in the world," said Stephen E. Ambrose, historian at the University of New Orleans and biographer of both Milton and Dwight D. Eisenhower. "He was one of

the most intelligent men I ever met, and the kindest.

George S. Wills, a Baltimore public relations man who had known Dr. Eisenhower for 30 years, said, "One of his greatest contributions was providing a wonderful example of how to grow old. He displayed courage and grace under very difficult circumstances, particularly the last three years.

Steven Muller, president of Johns Hopkins, had served as provost under Dr. Eisenhower and then had succeeded him as head of the university. "Working with him and for him was one of the really great experiences in my life," Dr. Muller said. "He was a totally admirable person. He had a lively, very practical mind. He possessed a wealth of information... There wasn't a mean bone in his body.

"Whenever I felt I needed to talk, he was always ready to tell me what he thought, what he knew," said Dr. Muller. "Long before I came to this university, he had restored it to solvency, and he knew everything about it. But he never interfered, never tried to impose his will."

Maryland Senator Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., one of a close group of friends who met regularly with Dr. Eisenhower to discuss world affairs, said, "He represented the epitome of citizenship. He knew a citizen's duty: be informed, be involved. As a result, his advice was always current and important."

Senator Paul S. Sarbanes of Maryland said Dr. Eisenhower's counsel "was especially sought by those of us who valued his wisdom."

Born in Abilene September 15, 1899, Milton Eisenhower was the youngest of six brothers: Arthur, banker in Kansas City, Mo.; Edgar, corporation lawyer in Tacoma, Wash.; Dwight, commander of Allied Forces in World War II and president from 1952 to 1960; Roy, pharmacist in Junction City, Kans., and Earl, electrical engineer and newspaper owner.

Majoring in journalism at Kansas State Agricultural College (now Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science), he interrupted his studies for two years to earn expenses as city editor of the Abilene Daily Reflector. After having received his bachelor of science degree from the college, he joined its faculty as assistant professor of journalism, leaving in 1924 when appointed to the diplomatic service.

The next two years were spent as vice consul in Edinburgh, Scotland, and as a part-time graduate student at the University of Edinburgh.

Then Dr. Eisenhower moved from diplomacy to the Department of Agriculture, where he held a number of posts during the next 16 years, starting as assistant to the secretary and becoming director of information and coordinator of the land-use program.

The outbreak of World War II brought new responsibilities.

Appointed director of the War Relocation Authority by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Dr. Eisenhower supervised the Japanese evacuation camps in California but later criticized the authority for its work. "He ran [the camps] with as much fairness as was humanly possible," said Dr. Ambrose, his biographer.

Dr. Eisenhower's specialty on the international scene was Latin America, but he had missions in other nations during World War II, and he played a prominent role in the beginnings of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

In June, 1942, President Roosevelt named him associate director of war information, and in December, after the Allied invasion of North Africa led by his brother, he was sent to Algeria and Morocco. His mission was to resolve problems of refugee relief and relocation and to establish an organization for psychological warfare in Europe.

Next he began a new career, and for a quarter-century he was to serve three universities as president, beginning with Kansas State, in 1943. Seven years later he assumed the top position at Pennsylvania State University, and in 1956 he arrived in Baltimore to head Johns Hopkins.

In 1953—he was then president of Penn State—he made the first of several fact-finding tours to South America as President Eisenhower's special ambassador. During the period from 1953 to 1961, Dr. Eisenhower helped reshape U.S. policy in Latin America. In 1963, he wrote a book about U.S.-Latin American relations, "The Wine is Bitter."

In the book, Dr. Eisenhower wrote in italics that "revolution in Latin America is inevitable. Only the form it takes is uncertain."

Dr. Ambrose said Dr. Eisenhower was "the real father of the Alliance for Progress, although Kennedy got the credit."

President Eisenhower used to say that Milton "was always the bright one in the family."

When a congressman expressed regret that Milton did not have an official post in the administration, the president replied, "If it weren't for his name, he would have a very high governmental position."

In fact, as noted by Neil A. Grauer, a Baltimore author and a friend of Dr. Eisenhower who interviewed him last fall, Dwight's brother "was a savvy veteran of the capital's bureaucracy long before his brother came to Washington."

"He had deep affection for his brother," said Mr. Wills. "He probably had more quiet influence on Dwight than any of the more publicly known figures we know through the history books. Milton wasn't on the government payroll, but during the Eisenhower years he was usually at the White House on weekends."

Dr. Ambrose said Dr. Eisenhower strongly influenced his brother's presidency. "Ike trusted him completely and leaned on him heavily," he said. "Indeed, Ike could not have carried the terrible burden of eight years in the White House without Milton's support."

In 1967, believing that he was bringing his formal academic responsibilities to a close, Dr. Eisenhower retired from the Hopkins presidency—in his final commencement, the trustees announced they had named the new library on the Homewood campus in his honor—and promptly began another career, becoming a director of 13 corporations.

These included the Chessie System, insurance System, insurance companies, financial institutions in California and others in this country and in England. He also became a governor of the New York Stock Board of Trade.

Dr. Eisenhower served President Lyndon B. Johnson almost as extensively as he had his brother. He advised the president of the Dominican crisis and, after the assassinations of Martin Luther King, Jr., and Robert F. Kennedy, chaired the Presidential Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

"The commission may not have brought about sweeping changes," said Dr. Ambrose, "but all of its practical recommendations got done—things like updating police departments."

Dr. Eisenhower returned to Hopkins a second time as president in 1971 following the forced resignation of Lincoln Gordon. The resumption of his university duties did not leave him time to keep up with his directorships, and he resigned many of them.

As for his way of life in retirement the second time in 1972, Dr. Eisenhower described many interests.

"I like to swim. I paint watercolors, mostly landscapes. I read everything, all the way from novels to the most serious books. I keep up constantly with the monthly reports by economists like Walter Heller and Milton Friedman."

Dr. Eisenhower became cochairman of the National Committee for a Six-Year Presidential Term, a group of about 250 business and civil leaders and former government officials.

Thirty-three American and six foreign universities conferred honorary degrees on Dr. Eisenhower.

Dr. Eisenhower was married in 1927 to Helen Eakin, of Washington. Mrs. Eisenhower died at Penn State in 1954, and Dr. Eisenhower never remarried.

The Eisenhowers had a son, Milton, Jr., now director of a division of International Business Machines, and a daughter, Ruth Eisenhower Snider, a voluntary worker in numerous community activities and the wife of a Baltimore radiologist. She died last year. There are three grandsons and one granddaughter.●

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to pay tribute to the men and women who are the economic stability of our Nation. The efforts of the small business men and women are to be commended. There are many small businesses within my district. These small businesses provide consumers with reasonable prices and availability. Small businesses also improve the community's economic situation by providing job and investing back into the community.

In order to keep our communities stable, we must support small businesses. Low interest loans and Government aid programs should be maintained to encourage the growth of small businesses. By encouraging the growth of small businesses communities are improved, unemployment is reduced, and the Nation's economic situation is improved. To support the small business men and women of our Nation is to support the Nation.

Chairman PARREN MITCHELL is to be commended for designating the week of May 5 through May 11, 1985, as "Small Business Week." In his role as chairman of the Committee on Small Business, Chairman MITCHELL's efforts have provided thousands of otherwise unavailable business opportunities for small minority businesses throughout the United States.

Finally, I would like to commend the small and minority business entrepreneurs who are being honored here this week.●

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS PROTESTS PRESIDENT'S BITBURG VISIT

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in recent days about the President's trip to the German military cemetery in Bitburg, West Germany. His decision to honor German war dead, in a spirit of "reconciliation" was sharply criticized by people of all faiths and political backgrounds.

This action, coming no more than 100 feet from the graves of some of Hitler's elite killing soldiers, the Waffen SS, caused enormous pain and suffering to survivors of the Nazi death camps, who have seen firsthand the brutal murders perpetrated by these troops.

In addition to the 6 million Jews who were murdered in death camps, other populations also suffered horrible losses, all of which can be blamed on the brutal Nazi war machine.

I would like to include in the record a telegram sent by the Polish American Congress to President Reagan concerning the anguish that Polish Americans felt because of the President's decision to honor German war dead.

Polish Americans regret your plans to honor the Nazi dead.

Nowhere else did the Hitlerites unleash the insane fury of their bestial rage and hatred as in Poland. They drenched Polish soil with the blood of innocent people.

We mourn the death of 6 million Polish citizens, most of whom were mercilessly butchered by the type of primitive barbarians who lie in the graves of the German cemetery you will visit. Their goal was to forever destroy everything Polish, be it Christian or Jewish. In the genocide of Europe's Jews, at least half were Poles.

Measured by numbers who died, Polish Jews and Polish Christians perished almost equally. Measured by percentage, Poland lost more of Her population to the Nazis than any other country.

As Christians, we feel compelled to forgive them. As their victims, we find it inconceivable to honor them.

MICHAEL PREISLER,
President, Polish American Congress,
Downstate New York Division.●

SENATOR SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1985

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr. I would like to thank the dean of the North Carolina delegation, Mr. BROYHILL, for arranging this special order and allowing us this opportunity to reflect on "Senator Sam" and his lifetime of public service.

Clearly the one single undertaking that most of my colleagues associate with Sam Ervin, was his work as chairman of the Senate Select Committee to Investigate Campaign Practices—or the "Watergate Committee." As a newly elected Member of Congress during that difficult and troubling time, I found Sam Ervin's unwavering dedication, to both the Constitution and the people it was written to serve, a pillar of reason upon which the foundation of trust in our political institutions and our leaders was reinforced. Indeed if Sam Ervin leaves us with a legacy, it was when he demonstrated, for the world to see, the strength and integrity of the democratic process as practiced through the Constitution of the United States.

Sam Ervin was born in Morganton, NC which he called home for his entire life. He completed his undergraduate work at the University of North Carolina. After serving in France during World War I and being decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, and two Purple Hearts, Sam Ervin attended Harvard Law School. Upon graduation in 1922, Ervin returned home to Morganton to begin a law practice. Sam Ervin began his political career in the North Carolina State Assembly where he served three terms. However, his first trip to Washington as an elected official, was when he filled the vacancy in the House of Representatives created when his brother died. Ervin served one term in the House before returning to North Carolina where he served on the State supreme court from 1948 to 1954. In 1954 Senator Ervin was elected to the U.S. Senate where he served ably and diligently for 20 years. Following his retirement in 1975 Senator Ervin returned to his hometown of Morganton, N.C. where he continued practicing "a little law" until his death on April 23.

I join my colleagues in extending our sympathies to Sam Ervin's wife of 61 years, Margaret Bruce Bell, his son, Sam J. Ervin III, and his two daughters, Leslie and Laura. May they find comfort from their loss in the fact that Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., will be remembered as one of the greatest

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

statesman to have walked the Halls of Congress.●

SMALL BUSINESS FUELS
ECONOMY**HON. JOHN R. MCKERNAN, JR.**

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. MCKERNAN. Mr. Speaker, Small Business Week gives us an opportunity to reflect on the important contributions of small businesses to our country. Ninety-seven percent of all businesses in the United States are small, according to the definition of the Small Business Administration.

Small firms are the major driving force in job creation. A study by the SBA shows that the very smallest businesses—those employing up to 19 persons—led the way in generating new jobs during the 1976-82 period. They generated a higher percentage of jobs not only on a national basis, but also in every region of the country. In the New England Bureau of Census region, which includes my State of Maine, firms with up to 19 workers increased job totals 25.5 percent during those 6 years. In Maine, 89 percent of all businesses employ less than 20 persons.

According to the most recent annual report of the President, small businesses employ nearly 48 percent of the private nonfarm work force, contribute 42 percent of sales, and generate about 38 percent of the gross national product.

This week, I am proud to take part in honoring the creative and dedicated individuals who run our Nation's small businesses. America's entrepreneurial spirit is exemplified in the State small business persons of the year who are gathered in Washington to be recognized for their achievements.

The first boatbuilder to be named an SBA small business person of the year is 1985 Maine winner Roger D. Hewson, president of Sabre Yachts in South Casco. He started his company in 1971 with three employees and one model of a sailboat. Today, the company has 150 employees and six models marketed by dealers across the country.

Mr. Hewson and the other State winners give evidence of the many ways in which small businesses have fueled our economy. We, as a Congress, have a responsibility to help provide the best possible economic climate so that small businesses will have the opportunity to grow and keep "America at Work."●

*May 8, 1985*NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS
WEEK

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM LEWIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as the week of May 5-11, 1985, has been designated "National Small Business Week," I would like to take this opportunity to talk about the importance of small business to our economy.

It is the enterprising determination to work and prosper, embodied in more than 14 million small businesses, that provides the technology to keep our economy growing, the manufacturing and marketing skills to keep our Nation competitive, and the innovation to guide us into a better future. It is this enterprising genius that has helped small business create most of our new jobs and provide economic opportunities unsurpassed by any nation in the world.

Ninety-nine point seven percent of the 14.3 million nonfarm businesses in the United States are considered small businesses. Together, these firms provide 55 percent of all private sector jobs, furnish two out of three workers with their first job, create over half of all industrial innovations and inventions, and account for approximately 38 percent of the Gross National Product.

The President's March 1984 report to Congress on the "State of Small Business" drew attention to the role small business continues to play in creating jobs. According to the report, between 1980 and 1982, small businesses generated all of the 984,000 net new jobs in the United States. Small business produced 2,650,000 new jobs, more than offsetting the 1,664,000 jobs lost by larger businesses.

It is not an exaggeration to say that small business must prosper if the rest of the Nation is to succeed economically. We all benefit from the contribution of small businesses and those who create them.

I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting the small business men and women of our Nation during "National Small Business Week."●

THE FAIR SHARE MINIMUM TAX

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard stories about profitable corporations and wealthy individuals who avoid paying their fair share of

taxes. Because the Tax Code is riddled with so many loopholes, many wealthy individuals as well as corporations earning billions of dollars in profits pay no taxes and, to add insult to injury, receive rebates for taxes they paid in earlier years.

Is it unfair to insist that profitable corporations like General Dynamics and General Electric pay some taxes? And is it unfair to insist that millionaires pay the same tax rate as someone earning \$18,200? We don't think so and we are proposing a bill to do something about it.

Because the rich are abusing the Tax Code, the burden on the middle class has been getting heavier and heavier. Consider these statistics: In 1960, income tax payments from corporations and the wealthiest 1.8 percent of individuals accounted for 43 percent of all Federal revenues. By 1983, taxes from these same sources were providing only 17 percent of Federal revenues.

Without decisive action, the United States faces deficits in excess of \$200 billion for the rest of this decade. The President explains that we can no longer afford programs like student aid, family farm assistance, the Small Business Administration, and revenue sharing. But he fails to point out that what we really cannot afford is the billions of dollars of welfare funneled through the Tax Code to profitable businesses and wealthy individuals.

This corporate welfare and aid to the wealthy increases the deficit just like spending on defense or domestic programs, even though it never appears as a line item on the budget. At a time when we are told that we can no longer afford assistance for people who need it, we certainly should not spend billions of dollars on welfare for corporations and people who are much better off.

With this in mind, the Honorable MARTY RUSSO and I, along with 53 of our colleagues, are introducing a far tighter minimum tax on wealthy individuals and profitable corporations. The fair share minimum tax is based on a very simple proposition: Every individual and corporation earning at least \$150,000 per year ought to pay taxes equal to at least 25 percent of their income. Since the middle class pays this much in taxes, it certainly is not asking too much to insist that corporations and the rich also pay the same amount.

Under the terms of this bill, taxpayers would pay either their current tax liability computed with all existing deductions, exclusions, credits, and adjustments or the alternative minimum tax, whichever is greater. This will ensure that wealthy taxpayers cannot use loopholes to avoid paying any taxes. With this proposal, they will not be able to pay less than the middle class.

The fair share minimum tax has at least four advantages:

It represents genuine tax reform. If Democrats are going to regain the political initiative, we need an approach to tax policy that strengthens the middle class. The fair share minimum tax fits this description.

It will be supported by the middle class. Most Democrats believe that the Mondale candidacy proves that even talking about tax increases is political suicide. But Mondale's plan would have raised taxes on families earning as little as \$25,000. The fair share minimum tax is different. It totally exempts the middle class from paying more than it does now.

It doesn't lock in the regressive tax policies of the Reagan administration. Under the President's tax proposals, the corporate income tax has shrunk dramatically as a source of Federal revenues. In addition, with the rapid increase in Social Security taxes, the poor and the average income taxpayer have been bearing a heavier and heavier tax burden. This proposal won't undo all the damage that has been done to our progressive tax structure, but it is a dramatic step in the right direction.

It is a significant step toward tax reform, but it doesn't destroy any socially desirable tax preferences. This tax proposal will not repeal any pro-growth tax incentives. Investors will still be able to use these tax incentives, they simply won't be able to avoid paying their fair share of taxes.

If this tax proposal were enacted, wealthy taxpayers, both individuals and corporations, would be able to use tax preferences to reduce their effective tax rate to 25 percent, but no lower. This is a lower effective tax rate than the Treasury proposal and the same rate proposed in Kemp-Kasten. It offers significant incentives for investment and growth. It cuts tax rates virtually in half, from 50 percent for individuals and 46 percent for corporations, to 25 percent for all wealthy taxpayers. But at the same time, it guarantees that profitable corporations and wealthy individuals will pay their fair share of taxes.

For several reasons, the fair share minimum tax is different from all the other minimum tax proposals now being discussed.

The fair share minimum tax sets a 25 percent rate on alternative taxable income above \$150,000. Most of the other minimum tax proposals establish a much lower rate, generally only 15 percent. This makes a tremendous difference in the amount of revenues that would be generated. According to very preliminary estimates, the fair share minimum tax will raise at least \$22 billion immediately and significantly greater amounts in later years. Some of the other proposals raise no

more than \$6 billion in 1 year, and most raise less.

A 25 percent rate is fairer than a 15 percent rate. Why shouldn't wealthy individuals and profitable corporations pay 25 percent, which is the same marginal rate as a single individual earning only \$18,200 per year?

The fair share minimum tax covers both individuals and corporations. Most of the other proposals are only calling for a corporate minimum tax. If it is wrong for profitable corporations to avoid paying their fair share of taxes, isn't it equally wrong for wealthy individuals to avoid paying their fair share? Estimates are that only between 300,000 and 700,000 wealthy individuals would be affected by the individual minimum tax. Our constituents get just as upset when they hear about millionaires who don't pay taxes as they do when they hear about profitable corporations that escape paying their fair share.

The fair share minimum tax is much more comprehensive than alternative proposals, and virtually loophole free. Right now, for example, there are corporate and personal minimum taxes, and yet we are all familiar with stories about profitable corporations and wealthy individuals who still manage to avoid paying taxes. Clearly, the current minimum taxes aren't doing the job, and there is no guarantee that several of the other minimum tax proposals will be significantly better. The fair share minimum tax, however, will ensure that no profitable corporation or wealthy individuals earning more than \$150,000 will escape their fair share of taxes.

By injecting two overriding principles into the Democratic Party's discussion of tax reform, we believe that the fair share minimum tax can serve as the basis for comprehensive, progressive tax reform.

The first principle is that no wealthy individual or profitable corporation should be able to use the Tax Code to avoid paying their fair share of taxes. This principle should apply to any Tax Code—the current system, Bradley-Gephardt, Treasury, or Kemp-Kasten.

Unfortunately, the current Tax Code and Kemp-Kasten are sieves. They allow large numbers of profitable corporations and wealthy individuals to avoid paying their fair share of taxes. In fact, under Kemp-Kasten, the ranks of large corporations paying no taxes is destined to grow, primarily because of that bill's generous depreciation schedule.

Tax reform that allows tax avoidance is a sham and Democrats should not be reluctant to oppose this type of reform.

The second point is that for 25 years, the Tax Code has been getting more regressive. In 1960, income tax

payments from corporations and the wealthiest 1.8 percent of individuals accounted for 43 percent of all Federal revenues. By 1983, taxes from these same sources were providing only 17 percent of Federal revenues. In other words, because wealthy individuals and profitable corporations have been paying less, the middle class has been paying more.

Each of the other major tax reform proposals locks in this regressivity. None moves the system's progressivity back to where it was at the beginning of the Kennedy administration.

Tax reform that makes no effort to lift the burden on the middle class is not in keeping with the Democratic Party's traditional concern for social justice and equity—precisely the concerns that earned the party the loyalty of the middle class for the past half century and precisely the concerns we need to reaffirm if we are to regain the allegiance of the middle class.

With these principles in mind, we believe that a comprehensive, airtight, minimum tax is an integral feature of, and a worthy basis for, comprehensive tax reform. The fair share minimum tax should be viewed as a safety net, or a backstop in the event that certain tax preferences are not eliminated by tax reform.

Simply put, it may be unrealistic to assume that the final version of tax reform will completely eliminate every tax preference. Some will be retained for good reasons, and others might be retained for less good reasons. But no matter how many are retained, and no matter why they are retained, the fair share minimum tax is designed to ensure that nobody will be able to use these preferences to avoid paying their fair share of taxes. In this respect, the fair share minimum tax will help tax reformers accomplish their goal—ensuring that no taxpayer can use the complexity of the tax system to escape paying their fair share of taxes.

The following is a section by section analysis of the major provisions of the fair share minimum tax bill:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF FAIR SHARE MINIMUM TAX BILL

Section 2(a): This section declares that the personal minimum tax will be fully phased in at \$100,000. It establishes lower tax rates for the \$70,000 to \$100,000 phase in period. For the corporate minimum tax, it establishes a phase in period starting at \$70,000 and rising to \$150,000, at which point the full 25 percent minimum tax rate will apply.

Section 2(b): This section states that the five allowable personal deductions—state and local taxes, medical deductions, interest on the mortgage for a principal residence, casualty losses, and charitable contributions—will be phased out between incomes of \$100,000 and \$150,000.

Section 2(c): States that interest deductions will only pertain to new loans for purchasing and rehabilitating a principal residence. Also provides a deduction for state

and local income and property taxes. Sales taxes are not an allowable state and local deduction.

Charitable contributions, casualty losses, interest to the extent of investment income, and medical expenses are already in the minimum tax code as allowable deductions, so they are not explicitly enumerated in this bill.

PREFERENCES THAT PERTAIN TO ALL TAXPAYERS

Section 3(a)(1)(A): States that all depreciable property will be considered a preference item, irrespective of whether or not it is leased. Current law says that only leased property is a preference item.

Section 3(a)(1)(B): States that for minimum tax purposes, depreciation cannot be calculated using ACRS recovery periods. Instead, the taxpayer must use the actual or useful life, known as the "present class life." These are depreciation schedules published by the Treasury for various classes of assets. Where there is no proposed class life, such as for buildings, the depreciation schedule is set at 40 years.

These are the same recovery periods as the ones used in the 1984 tax bill for property leased to tax exempt entities.

This section only pertains to property placed in service after the date of enactment.

Section 3(a)(2): Under present law, intangible drilling costs are a preference if they exceed one half of net income and are expensed, rather than amortized over 10 years. The FSMT defines the intangible drilling cost preference as the difference between 10 year amortization and expensing, with no net income offset. This section would only pertain to intangible drilling costs incurred after the date of enactment.

Section 3(a)(3): Adds the following new preferences—

Interest from newly issued tax exempt securities. This interest will now be considered to be a preference item. Under present minimum tax law, it is not a preference item.

Installment sales method of accounting. Under present law, a taxpayer using the installment sales method of accounting can defer capital gains taxes due on the sale of property. Under this method, a seller who also provides the financing only has to declare the gains from the sale as the purchaser makes installment payments. Since in many cases, the seller discounts the note or sells it on the secondary market soon after the sale of the property is consummated, the seller actually realizes the total gain immediately, even though for tax purposes, the gain does not have to be declared immediately.

Therefore, this section also states that the gain from a sale has to be declared immediately, rather than declared as installment payments are received.

Inside buildup on life insurance policies. This section states that the inside buildup, or the increase in the cash value, of whole life insurance, annuity, or endowment contracts is now considered to be a preference item for minimum tax purposes. It is not a preference under current minimum tax law.

PREFERENCES THAT PERTAIN ONLY TO CORPORATIONS

Section 3(b)(1): Under current law, there are several tax preferences that apply only to personal holding companies. The FSMT declares that these preferences shall apply to the minimum tax levied on all corporations, not just personal holding companies.

The list of preferences that now pertain to all corporations are:

a. accelerated depreciation on leased property

b. the difference between expensing of mining exploration and development costs and 10 year amortization.

c. the difference between expensing magazine circulation costs and 3 year amortization of those costs.

d. the difference between expensing intangible drilling costs and 10 year amortization with no net income offset.

e. for research and experimentation costs, the difference between expensing and 5 year amortization.

Section 3(b)(2): Declares that the following preferences shall apply only to corporations—

Bad debt reserves. For all banks, the FSMT declares that a preference exists if the bank's addition to its loan loss reserves exceeds the reserve that would be computed using the experience method. This provision is already in current law.

Cost of carrying tax exempt securities. For all banks, the FSMT declares that a preference exists if a bank deducts its interest expenses for carrying newly-acquired tax exempt obligations. In other words, a bank cannot claim a business deduction for its interest costs when it borrows money in order to purchase tax exempt obligations.

Foreign Sales Corporations: Under current law, export earnings are exempt from taxation if a corporation sets up a foreign sales corporation and funnels its exports through this dummy corporation. The FSMT states that exempt earnings from Foreign Sales Corporations will be declared to be a preference item for purposes of the corporate minimum tax.

Deferred Shipping Income. Under current law, shipping income can be deferred from taxation if that income is deposited in a capital construction fund. If the money is withdrawn to build a new ship, the withdrawals are also exempt from taxation, although if they are withdrawn for other purposes, the withdrawn amount is taxable.

The FSMT says that all new deposits, and all withdrawals of old deposits shall be considered to be a preference item for purposes of the corporate minimum tax.

Completed Contract Accounting. Under current law, a corporation might receive periodic progress payments over the life of a multiyear contract, but the corporation doesn't have to declare the income until the contract is completed. This technique is used by defense contractors who receive periodic payments but who don't include those payments as part of each year's taxable income. As a result of this technique, contractors defer taxes for several years, and they minimize their total taxes by determining the timing of their claims for deductions and taxable income.

The FSMT declares that contractors must declare income as periodic payments are received.

PREFERENCES RELATING ONLY TO TAXPAYERS OTHER THAN CORPORATIONS

Section 3(c): Declares that the following preferences shall apply only to taxpayers other than corporations.

Untaxed portion of social security benefits. This section defines as a preference the difference between social security benefits and all payroll tax contributions plus interest earned in that taxpayer's account. The preference only includes that portion of social security benefits currently exempt from taxation.

Earned income of citizens and residents living abroad. Under current law, an individual living abroad can deduct up to \$80,000 of his overseas income from U.S. taxable income. The FSMT says that this \$80,000 exclusion will be considered to be a preference item for purposes of the individual minimum tax.

Increase in nonforfeitable pension benefits. If you have a nonforfeitable right to a pension, the increase in the account during the tax year will be considered to be a preference item for purposes of the individual minimum tax. This section only pertains to vested pension benefits.

Deduction for two earner married couples. This section repeals the deduction for 2-earner married couples. Because the minimum tax is levied at a flat 25 percent rate, there is no bracket creep associated with adding two incomes together. Consequently, there is no marriage penalty, so the deduction designed to reduce the marriage penalty should not pertain to the minimum tax.

Health related benefits excluded from gross income. Under current law, an employer's payments for medical insurance and for medical care are not included in the employee's gross income. This section makes these payments subject to the individual minimum tax.

Group-term life insurance. Under current law, an employer's premium payments for the first \$50,000 of group term life insurance are not included in the employee's gross income. This section says that all employer contributions for group term life insurance must be included in gross income for purposes of the individual minimum tax. ●

THE ONLY FAIR DECISION

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, regarding the question of how the majority leadership handled the seating of the Representative for the Eighth District of Indiana, I would like to submit for the information of my colleagues an editorial entitled "Democrats Make a Mistake," from the May 3, 1985, St. Petersburg Times. The editorial follows:

DEMOCRATS MAKE A MISTAKE

The strongest reason for sending the decision on who should represent them in the U.S. House back to the voters of Indiana's 8th District is the impossibility of reaching a fair decision on the results of the Nov. 6 vote. That is why House Democrats erred Wednesday when they seated Democrat Frank McCloskey.

Two days after the polls closed last November McCloskey was the apparent winner by 72 votes. But when it was discovered that the votes in two precincts had been counted twice, Republican Richard D. McIntyre appeared to win by 34 votes. On that tally, the Indiana secretary of state, a Republican, certified McIntyre as the winner.

When the state completed its recount, McIntyre's lead was increased to 418 votes, but 4,808 ballots were thrown out for technical reasons. Under the traditional rule that the House is the final judge of its own members, the House Administration Com-

mittee was asked to recount the ballots and settle the issue. It created a three-member task force of two Democrats and one Republican to do that job. They hired auditors from the General Accounting Office actually to count the ballots. The controversy centered on absentee ballots and late-arriving military absentee ballots, according to Congressional Quarterly.

Indiana law requires that absentee ballots be notarized and signed. The task force decided to count the absentee ballots that earlier had been thrown out by the state, provided the voter's intent was clear. There were 62 such ballots that had not been properly notarized or signed, but that county clerks mistakenly had sent to precincts for counting. The task force counted those ballots on grounds that they were inseparable from other ballots. But there were 32 other such ballots, which county clerks had not sent to the precincts, that were not counted. The Republican member of the task force also lost a bid to count 11 absentee military ballots that had been postmarked before the election but had arrived as late as a week after the election.

After those decisions, the task force declared McCloskey the winner by a count of 116,645 to 116,641.

We defy anyone to reach a just and acceptable judgment in those circumstances. The only fair decision would be to return the decision to the voters of the district, which House Democrats refused to do.

The House and the nation will pay a price for that error. It appeared Wednesday when House Republicans demonstrated their partisan animosity in words and deeds by dramatically walking out of the chamber. Lack of civility has been a problem in the House all this year, and this decision by the Democrats can only make it worse.

CONCORD MINUTEMEN BAND VISITS NATION'S CAPITOL

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last week students from the Concord High School Minutemen Band visited Washington, DC. These students are from Concord, CA, which is included in the Seventh Congressional District, which I represent.

The Minutemen were visiting Washington while participating in the Apple Blossom Festival in Winchester, VA. I was delighted to meet them and the band's director, Eric Hammer, at the U.S. Capitol.

This is an outstanding band of 87 students who have spent many hours practicing their music and their marching. Their performance in the Apple Blossom Festival was a great credit to their skill and their hard work.

I know that all Members of the House of Representatives will want to join me in congratulating the Minutemen Band on their performance at the festival.

The members of the band are:

CONCORD MARCHING BAND

Jeanie Abraham, Kathy Alcorn, Cathy Allred, Eric Anderson, Kim Blackburn, Brian Blackburn, Terri Botto, Wendy Brown, Christie Bureckner, Jeff Brueckner, David Busing, Chris Cabral, Denise Cabral, Debbie Case, Jeff Chan, Mike Chavez, and Debbie Cherbonnier.

Cyndie Clark, Dina Cotter, Danielle Cutler, Amy Cutt, Jon Davenport, D'arcy Dornan, Brent Coryell, Lorraine Converse, Merrie Converse, Jennifer Dutton, Diana Edamura, Mike Emanuel, Kelly Emerton, Carol Fabian, Karie Freeman, Kristie Freeman, and Matt Goodshaw.

John Griffin, Ken Griffiths, Gina Guadagnini, Marianne Hoeft, Anissa Hudson, Eric Humphrey, Darnelle Huus, Asha Jirge, Dayton Johnson, Holly Jones, Paula Kapfenstein, Keiko Kobayashi, Kevin Leveroni, Sunny Love, Robin Mangum, and Lisa Manzon.

Paul Manzon, Danny McAninch, Janet Morones, Jenni Nedrow, Jeff Nedrow, Janet Neumann, Debbie Nichols, Shari None-maker, Marian Mikares, Lainie Odegaard, Lynette Odegaard, Karla Oliver, Kristen Oliver, Stephanie O'Steen, Jennifer Pickrell, Barbara Pollard, Brian Rewerts, and Jill Robinson.

Michelle Sanchez, Marcial Santolaya, David Scharper, Sandra Schlink, Scott Shern, Neil Straghalis, Allan Tangaan, Rich Thall, Denise Vedovelli, Judy Venturino, Joanne Viscia, Marya Walford, Kim Watkins, Val Webb, Julie Weimar, Melissa Wright, Rikki Wyman, and Shannon Yonge. ●

AFFIRMATIVE RETREAT

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan's Justice Department continues its assaults on the Nation's civil rights laws. The latest attack is its asking 50 cities and counties to modify voluntarily previous consent decrees relating to affirmative action agreements in public jobs.

The following New York Times editorial calls is a design to dismantle Federal civil rights enforcement long before the Nation has overcome past discrimination.

[From the New York Times, May 5, 1985]

AFFIRMATIVE RETREAT

Not content with agitating against affirmative action, the Reagan Administration has sued Indianapolis for honoring commitments to desegregate its police and fire departments. The action fits a design to dismantle Federal civil rights enforcement long before the nation has overcome past discrimination.

The Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, William Bradford Reynolds, contends that the Constitution and Federal law prohibit using numerical goals in employment. He says there can be no such remedy, no matter how blatant the past bias and no matter how mild the impact on white male job seekers favored in the past.

Mr. Reynolds is once again misreading the law. He is diverting precious resources from

unfinished civil rights business and threatening to burden the courts with retrial of settled cases.

Fortunately, every court that has heard his theories has ruled against them. Indianapolis and other cities that have long since made their peace with fair hiring requirements want no more interference with orderly desegregation. Congress should call off this new assault on the law.

When the Justice Department, under different management, sued Indianapolis in 1978, only 11 percent of its police officers and 8 percent of its firefighters were black. Under a consent decree the city agreed to enroll blacks in a quarter of its training classes and to appoint one woman police officer for every four new hires. Blacks now hold 14 and 13 percent of the police and fire positions—gains that city officials hope to enlarge if left alone.

Mr. Reynolds has now sent intimidating letters to 56 governmental employers, warning that the Supreme Court's decision in a Memphis case last year outlaws numerical targets, whether voluntary, court ordered, or negotiated in consent decrees. He refers to a ruling that Memphis, in making budget-induced layoffs, could not ignore the seniority rights of white firefighters in order to retain more recently hired blacks.

But that case involved layoffs, not hiring and promotions, and it ran afoul of an explicit protection of seniority systems that organized labor demanded for supporting the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Mr. Reynolds may want the affirmative action ruled unlawful, but the Court has not done so.

For these and similar attacks on civil rights, Mr. Reynolds is slated for promotion to Associate Attorney General. The Senate need not acquiesce. Congress can also withhold appropriations for Mr. Reynolds' brand of litigation. The path to a colorblind society is forward through accommodation, not back through the turmoil of the past. ●

VIETNAM VETS WELCOMED HOME

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in New York City a long overdue "welcome home" was finally given to the Vietnam veterans of this Nation. Nearly 25,000 veterans of that longest war in our history were received in a historical, emotional, ticker-tape parade through Lower Manhattan.

Mr. Speaker, many of those who marched yesterday in New York were New Jersey residents. As a member of the House Veterans Affairs Committee I have had the chance to meet and talk with these men and women throughout our State at various veteran events and meetings. I can tell you that what happened yesterday in New York will accomplish much in the way of healing the wounds which we unfortunately may have allowed to develop in the past 10 years. I am grateful to Mayor Edward Koch of New York for all of his efforts in making yesterday a reality. I am sure that we will all look back at May 7, 1985, as one of the

landmark events in the long and emotional road of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article from today's Philadelphia Inquirer newspaper which more fully describes the events of yesterday. I would like to include this piece in the RECORD.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

N.Y. HONORS VIETNAM VETS WITH A PARADE (By Andrew Maykuth)

NEW YORK.—Thousands of Vietnam veterans marched across the Brooklyn Bridge—under a banner that said "Welcome Home"—and through the concrete chasm of lower Manhattan yesterday, showered by shredded paper and adulation. It was the ticker-tape parade they had never had.

"It's way overdue," said David Hewitt, a Marine veteran who lives in Tuckerton, N.J. "This makes things better. We're not hiding it anymore."

Nor were the people who lined the sidewalks. They cheered. They waved flags. They yelled, "You're No. 1—we love you."

The spectacle, a decade after the fall of Saigon, was an outpouring of patriotic fervor that equaled New York's last ticker-tape parade honoring the 1984 Olympic champions.

"USA! USA!" a crowd on Broadway chanted, led by a group of marchers who stopped to bask in the cascade of paper. Then the veterans resumed their march, singing the "Marine's Hymn."

"Here we are," shouted one of the marchers, raising his face and arms to office workers in windows high above Broadway. Like many marchers, he was dressed informally in remnants of his uniform. He wore jeans and a Marine fatigue hat. A brown T-shirt covered his paunch.

"We love youse," he shouted, as his group of friends laughed. "We're home."

"Thank you," read the signs. "We are so proud," read a banner near the City Hall reviewing stand, which was dominated by military officers, most in proper uniform.

One who wore civilian clothes was Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the commander during the height of the Vietnam War. To cheers from the crowd, he climbed down from the stand to march with his soldiers.

The marchers were led by Mayor Edward I. Koch, who pushed John Behan in a wheelchair. Behan, 40, a Republican state assemblyman from Long Island who lost both legs in Vietnam, was one of a score of Medal of Honor winners in the parade.

The New York Veterans Memorial Commission organized the parade to cap a three-day celebration, which included a display of fireworks Monday night over the East River. Koch dedicated a memorial to those who fought in the war.

Organizers of the parade estimated that 25,000 veterans marched—less than half the number of Americans who died in the war. Police estimated the crowd at a million, although some sites along the 2.5-mile route were nearly empty.

It was a ticker-tape parade that probably would not have been possible 10 years ago, when the remaining U.S. contingent in South Vietnam was evacuated from Saigon's rooftops and returned to the scorn of a nation weary of war.

Amid the cheers yesterday—the loudest came from the limping and the legless—there were bittersweet feelings.

"I do kind of feel it's too little, too late" said Bob Sullivan, a Marine veteran from Bricktown, N.J. "I almost didn't come. I'm looking around for familiar faces."

Sullivan, along with Hewitt, came to reveal and, to an extent, to protest. Their group, Agent Orange Victims of New Jersey, has been trying to force the government to compensate veterans suffering ill effects from the defoliant used in Southeast Asia. Some of the group wore orange T-shirts that read, "Sprayed and betrayed."

Jim Kennedy, a former Army Airborne member who lives near Williamsport, Pa., represented a group that also suffers the lingering effects of the war—the post-traumatic stress unit of the Veterans Administration Medical Center in Lyon, N.J.

The veterans' cold reception when they returned from Vietnam, Kennedy said, compounded the psychological battle scars they already had. "It would be nice if everything—everybody's feelings—could be erased from today on," he said. "It could be changed, but not erased."

"There was a lot of bad feeling between the vets and the general populace," he said. "When I came home, I came home on a stretcher to Valley Forge. That was in '68. I was wounded in Khe Sanh. We were driving along the turnpike in this Army ambulance and somebody pulled up alongside us and gave us the finger. You know, the fickle finger of fate. That was my welcome home."

William Starkey, a member of the United Vietnam Veterans Organization in Cherry Hill, said he received a similar reception when he returned from Vietnam in 1968.

"Like an idiot, I spent a couple of days on the West Coast," he said. "I walked around on the Berkeley campus with a damn uniform on and felt as threatened as I was during the Tet offensive."

"Among other things, this parade is the right thing to do," said Starkey. "It's long overdue. Frankly, a lot of us don't like the image that we lost the war."

It was a diverse group flowing along Broadway to Battery Park—a score of Medal of Honor winners, hundreds of New York city employees and thousands of veterans, who wore fatigues or their unofficial campaign jackets, bearing such words as "When I die I'll go to heaven because I've spent my time in hell."

Earlier, as several units waited to push off, there came the distant sound of rotor blades. The mass of veterans looked up.

Swinging into view from behind a stack of skyscrapers was a covey of helicopter gunships flying in tight formation. They were led by a C-130 Hercules transport, the huge military plane that was used to transport troops and bring home the bodies.

The mass of veterans in the streets began applauding wildly, cheering and pumping raised fists into the air, shouting "Go Baby!" and "Glad to see you."

Among the camouflage jackets in the crowd was Bob Danis, formerly of the Air Force, now an accounts manager for Citibank. He took a couple of hours off work, pinned the medals he won in 1969 to his gray suit, and joined the crowd.

"It's kind of weird," he said, standing aside at the end of the parade route near Battery Park. "I don't know—after 15 years, it's probably going to be good, in that it will heal the wounds. I think there is a lot of bitterness."

He paused to look at a lot of men in jungle fatigues, who seemed intoxicated on the confetti, cheers and beers. They were shouting, "USA! All the way!"

"In a lot of ways," said Danis, "It brings back bad memories. A lot of these guys have had a hard time adapting."

(Knight-Ridder News Service reporter Joe Starita also contributed to this article.)

J. FRANK WARMATH HONORED

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. J. Frank Warmath of Humboldt, TN, a strong civic leader, lawyer, newspaper publisher, businessman, and my friend. Mr. Warmath has worked diligently for many years on behalf of his home community. He served the community as a member of Tennessee's General Assembly. He has worked hard on a number of projects that improved the community.

This Friday, May 10, Mr. Warmath will be honored for the many years of service he has rendered to another local civic project, the West Tennessee Strawberry Festival which is an annual festival. The strawberry festival will honor Mr. Warmath for the many services he has rendered it throughout the years. He has served actively in the festival beginning in 1937 and has held many of its leadership posts.

Frank Warmath has meant much to his community and has worked hard on its behalf. I am proud to count him among my friends and join with Humboldt, TN in paying him tribute. I would request that an article recently carried by the Humboldt Courier Chronicle regarding Mr. Warmath's service be included in the RECORD.

FESTIVAL DEDICATED TO CHRONICLE PUBLISHER

(By Genie Alsbrook)

Saying "It was a lot of fun," J. Frank Warmath summarized his years of work for the West Tennessee Strawberry Festival.

He will be honored on J. Frank Warmath Day Friday, May 10, at both the parade and Governor's Luncheon.

Warmath, is a native of Humboldt, son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Clint Warmath. He attended school here until the 10th grade when he left to attend Barnhan and Hughes Military Academy. Upon graduation, he attended Vanderbilt University and received his AB degree in 1932. At Vanderbilt Mr. Warmath was president of his Senior class. In June of 1934 he received his Doctorate of Jurisprudence from Cumberland University.

Between his graduation from Vanderbilt and his attending Cumberland University, Mr. Warmath returned to Humboldt to work. During this period he ran a service station which was located downtown on the site of the old police station. After this enterprise, he traveled for a local shoe company as a salesman. Neither of these lasted very long.

After Mr. Warmath's graduation from Cumberland in 1934, he started a law practice here. His career as an attorney did not last many years due to a 46% loss of hearing which was caused by a mastoiditis operation. The strain of not being able to hear was physically exhausting, and Mr. War-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

math did not feel he could give full justice to his clients if he could not hear witnesses in a trial situation.

Once Mr. Warmath was unable to practice law, he began to branch out." His first "branch" was WIRJ, the local radio station. He then acquired the Courier Chronicle newspaper. Mr. Warmath's "branches" went out in many directions in Humboldt and in the surrounding area.

J. Frank Warmath's association with the West Tennessee Strawberry Festival began in 1937 and continued throughout the 1960's. His first role with the festival was Chairman of the Queen's Ball. In those days, this was a lavish affair complete with big name bands, which he arranged for.

From that role, Warmath has held many, many positions in the Festival, including General Chairman in 1941 and 1945, and President in 1949. He worked with the budget and finance committee for many years and Chairman of the Governor's Luncheon for many years. Mr. Warmath recalls that during the 1940's, when he was general chairman, the local chamber of commerce was not involved in the festival organization as they are now. The responsibility for all the planning and organizing of the festival lay with the General Chairman.

In 1941, he actually closed his law office and with the help of a few others, ran the entire festival from there. They wrote all the letters, attended the area beauty revues and made bus trips, devoting two and a half months to making sure the festival was a success.

Mr. Warmath became involved in politics in 1945 when he was elected to the Tennessee Legislature. He later served on the staffs of Governors Ellington and Clement and also on the Aeronautics Commission.

Warmath was instrumental in having the four-lane built on Hwy. 45 which leads from Humboldt toward Trenton. As a member of the Aeronautics Commission, he was involved in bringing an airport to Humboldt.

Humboldt's Cedar Crest Hospital was "born on a golf course in Florida" as he talked with Dr. Tom Frist, the founder of the Hospital Corporation of America. Three weeks later the doctor was in town, looking for a location.

Along with his many "branches" and his political involvement Mr. Warmath has served on many civic organizations including one of the founders of the Lions Club and President of that organization, President of the Humboldt Golf and Country Club, President of the Chamber of Commerce and on the Chamber of Commerce Industrial Board. While Chairman of the Industrial Board of the Chamber of Commerce, he was instrumental in bringing many industries to Humboldt. Included in this group was Century Electric, now Copeland Electric, Wayne Gossard, Alton Box Co., General Metals Products and South-eastern Motor Truck Lines, now McLean Trucking.

There have not been many areas of social, civic, political or business life in which Mr. Warmath has not been involved and been successful. He attributes his involvement and success to those people whom he has met over his life time. "It is who you know," Mr. Warmath says.

Festival officials lauded Mr. Warmath's work saying, "The Strawberry Festival, Humboldt, the County and West Tennessee have all benefited greatly from his efforts through the years."

COMMUNISM—NAZISM'S INSPIRATION

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Senator WILLIAM ARMSTRONG has performed a public service by writing an article describing the role the Soviet Union played in World War II and afterward. His detailed, historically accurate article shows that the Nazi-Communist alliance between 1939 and 1941 was one based on mutual respect and mutual need. He also shows that Communists, whenever they have taken power, have demonstrated the same ruthlessness as the Nazis. He quite correctly reminds us that communism was Nazism's inspiration.

At this point I want to place in the RECORD "How Soviets Mark V-E Day" by WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG, Senator from Colorado, as published in the Washington Times, May 8, 1985.

HOW SOVIETS MARK V-E DAY—WHAT ISN'T BEING REMEMBERED THERE

(By William L. Armstrong)

For the Soviet Union, the rightful heir of National Socialism, today's anniversary of the defeat of Nazi Germany holds great significance. Victory in what the Soviets call the "Great Patriotic War" is perhaps the only real accomplishment in 67 years of misrule, and the regime is trying to make the most of it.

Props for the celebration were readied in advance. The once discredited Joseph Stalin has been largely rehabilitated to celebrate his wartime role as supreme commander. One of Stalin's favorite flunkies, former Commissar for Foreign Affairs Vyacheslav Molotov, now in his mid-90s, was last year readmitted to the Communist Party. He had been expelled by Nikita Khrushchev in his "de-Stalinization" campaign, and comedians had suggested Mr. Molotov was being groomed as a successor to former Communist Party boss Konstantin Chernenko. Even American veterans' groups have contributed to making the anniversary a success, participating in Soviet-sponsored celebrations of the link-up of U.S. and Soviet forces on the Elbe in 1945.

Soviet World War II commemorations are most notable, however, for what is not being remembered. For example, you do not hear that millions of Soviet citizens of all nationalities, far from rushing to "defend their gains under socialism," initially greeted the Germans as liberators from Communist oppression. Nor do the Soviets mention that hundreds of thousands of Soviet fighting men eagerly surrendered to the first Germans they met and volunteered to fight the Soviet Army. Nor do you hear about the several million Russians and Ukrainians who sought asylum, only to be turned over to Stalin by the Western allies in the infamous "Operation Keelhaul" at the end of the war.

Finally, you certainly are not apt to hear about what touched off the war in the first place: the Non-Aggression Pact between Hitler and Stalin. It was concluded by Mr. Molotov and Nazi Foreign Minister Joachim

von Ribbentrop on Aug. 23, 1939. The pact divided the countries of Central Europe between the two totalitarian powers, set the stage for the invasion of Poland, and lit the fuse to begin the new world war.

Nowadays, when forced to explain the pact, the Soviets claim it was only a measure designed to gain time against the inevitable Nazi onslaught. But this claim just does not hold up. British author Nikolai Tolstoy asserts that for Stalin "the pact was not a stern necessity but a highly congenial alliance." Indeed, notes Mr. Tolstoy, the only restraining force on the Soviets' pro-Nazi policy seems to have been that they did not want to make it too obvious, for fear of provoking Germany's western enemies.

Exiled Ukrainian Gen. Petro Grigorenko wrote that the Soviets felt confident enough about their new relationship to demolish a massive string of fortifications in the Western U.S.S.R.

Soviet intelligence officers were warned not to report any German war preparations against Russia, because this would undermine their new friendship. One high official, Gen. Grigorenko says, was shot only a week before Hitler's attack for giving Stalin proof of German intentions.

If the U.S.S.R. was only buying time, what were they buying it for? Why did they seem totally unprepared for the attack when it finally came? Moscow's famous spy in Tokyo, Richard Sorge, had told the Soviets the exact date of the attack. Still, the Blitzkrieg shocked its former ally and ripped through the Soviet-occupied portions of Poland in less than three days.

For almost two years, until June 1941, Hitler and Stalin were allied in all but name and worked hand-in-glove to erase the last vestiges of democratic government and civilized values from a continent still not recovered from the cataclysmic years of 1914-18. It is generally overlooked how much Hitler's conquests in Europe owed to this cooperation. Poland, Greece, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, France—all fell to Nazi forces fed with Soviet grain and powered by Soviet petroleum.

Today we tend to forget how the pact shocked the world when it was concluded. Everywhere Communists, who only the day before had vilified the Nazis as the most vicious thugs of all time, praised them for standing up to the British and French bankers. In country after country threatened by the Blitzkrieg, Communists worked diligently to undermine defense efforts, spreading defeatist propaganda and sabotaging war production; only after the U.S.S.R. was under attack did the Communists of Nazi-occupied Europe flip-flop again, become "patriots," and join the resistance.

The conventional view was—and still is—that there was something unnatural about the Nazi-Communist alliance. But a closer examination shows that the affinity between the two movements was more than just a matter of convenience. As Adolf Hitler himself once observed:

"There is more that binds us to Bolshevism than separates us from it. There is, above all, genuine revolutionary feeling, which is alive everywhere in Russia except where there are Jewish Marxists. I have always made allowance for this circumstance, and have given orders that former Communists are to be admitted to the Party at once. The petit bourgeois Social Democrat and the trade union boss will never make a National Socialist, but the Communist always will."

Both movements, loathed everything that smacked of "conservatism" or traditional

social values: religion, property, the family, old-fashioned patriotism. Each vied with the other in its attacks on our system of "bourgeois democracy." One ecstatic Nazi hailed the pact as "the confluence of two streams which run toward the same sea, the sea of world revolution."

But these totalitarian twins had not entered the world together. Nazism (national socialism) clearly and deliberately imitated the example of Communism (international socialism), which preceded it by several years. Hitler consciously borrowed many features of his movement from the Communists, even taking the Communist color red for his party flag. In its early years, the Nazi movement recruited much of its personnel from the Communists, and Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's propaganda minister, had long been torn between the two camps. The Gestapo was a copy of the Soviet Cheka. The Storm Troopers were Red Guards in brown shirts. Nazi propagandists studied the masterful techniques of Soviet propagandists.

Hitler's concentration camps were patterned on those begun under Lenin, who in fact invented the term "concentration camp." The Communists were the teachers, the Nazis their pupils.

Both aim to reduce individuals to a uniform, collectivized mass, devoid of God or any higher spiritual aspiration, regimented in an all-encompassing totalitarian order. Nazism organizes society based on race, communism according to class; bad genetics and bad economics. But everything else—the use of lies and propaganda, the secret police, the concentration camps, the infallible leader, the party, the obsession with death and violence—is remarkably similar.

But for all the similarities and relationships between Nazism and communism, there is a striking difference in how the two are perceived. There is never a shortage of those individuals whom Lenin called "useful idiots" supplying every possible excuse for Soviet aggressiveness. The only real explanation for the behavior of the Soviet leaders—that they act like Communists because they really are Communists—is carefully avoided.

Nazism was laid in its grave 40 years ago; but communism, Nazism's inspiration and successor, still lives and thrives. During its brief and terrible life, Nazism killed 12 million people. But this number pales beside the more than 100 million victims (estimates run to 150 million) of international communism since it first seized power in Russia. More than 60 million have been killed in that country alone, according to Alexander Solzhenitsyn, and the toll in China is of similar magnitude. And every day, in prisons, camps, and "psychiatric hospitals" from Castro's Caribbean Gulag to Vietnam's "re-education centers," the staggering total grows.

The Soviet regime's eagerness to tout the superiority of its social system in light of its victory in World War II should give us pause to ask precisely what kind of system it is and with what kind of system it was allied. The fact that Hitler turned on his Communist allies and ended a marriage that the Soviets wanted to preserve is hardly something of which the Soviets should be proud. The ensuing struggle has been aptly described by noted Russian dissident Vladimir Bukovsky as "the great war to determine whether the concentration camps of the future would be Brown or Red."

Today, there are still concentration camps operating in the heart of Europe. And they are Red. ●

IN HONOR OF SMALL BUSINESS WEEK, 1985

HON. CATHY (MRS. GILLIS) LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mrs. LONG. Mr. Speaker, it is a particular pleasure for me to address the House today during our observance of National Small Business Week, as just last week I became a member of the Small Business Committee. I look forward to my work on small business issues through my service on the committee, and am eager to do my part to help nurture a strong economic climate in which our Nation's small businesses can grow.

Over the years, it has been America's small businesses which have continued to provide new jobs through technological innovation. Small businesses employ one-half of the private sector American work force. In my own District in Louisiana, there are countless small businesses providing essential products and services. With small businesses responsible for approximately 40 percent of our gross national product, we simply cannot afford to idly stand by and watch this critical sector of our economy continue to suffer. Nor will I accept unemployment rates in some parishes in my district which are running at three times the national average.

As we praise the hardworking entrepreneurs across the Nation this week, the Small Business Committee is concluding a long series of hearings on the legislation to reauthorize the Small Business Administration for another 3 years. I am in full support of continuing the fine work that the SBA has performed since its establishment in 1953. While the adjustment of some programs is certainly warranted, I believe that it would be a mistake to eliminate the SBA.

The critical issue is to make certain that the programs which the SBA does continue to operate, work as effectively as possible. At a time when so many people are still searching for work, particularly minorities, veterans, women, the handicapped, and others who have historically been less able to find work, we must continue to help worthy enterprises grow.

But the SBA cannot do the job alone. Budget deficits must be trimmed and taxes made more equitable so that the private sector will be able to provide the necessary capital for economic growth. There can be no question that we must make the tough choices which are necessary to help keep our small businesses in operation and allow new businesses to begin.

Mr. Speaker, I commend all the small businessmen and woman who have struggled to make their dreams

of running a successful business to become a reality, and will do my part provide the incentive for another generation of American entrepreneurs. ●

GRADY COLUMNS ON
NICARAGUA

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, as the situation in Nicaragua continues to dominate the headlines, I would like to share with my colleagues further reflections of Sandy Grady, reporter for the Philadelphia Daily News. Sandy was part of the delegation I led to El Salvador and Nicaragua from April 8-15, 1985. Upon his return, Sandy published a series of five articles on our trip.

Yesterday, I submitted the first of these articles for my colleagues' review. Today, I would like to place the second and third in the series into the RECORD, as I believe they can be helpful in our understanding of the current situation in Nicaragua. These articles include a particularly insightful and descriptive picture of life in areas subject to Contra attacks; they also cover the views of a number of Nicaraguan leaders. I recommend Sandy Grady's words to my colleagues as we further consider our Central American policy.

[From the Philadelphia Daily News, Apr. 23, 1985]

SURVIVING IN CONTRA COUNTRY

ESTELI, NICARAGUA.—If you want to know how Ronald Reagan's rebels are doing, this is the place to come.

All it needs is a roadside billboard: "This is Contra Country—Your (U.S.) Tax Dollars At Work."

This farming area, with its green valleys and dry brown hills, is 35 miles south down the main highway chute from the Honduran border. Marauding bands of the 15,000 U.S.-funded guerrillas always have the area in their gun sights.

You don't move around these roads after sundown. It's like Indian territory in 19th-century Kentucky.

Hot, dusty teen-age boys trudge the roadside, coming home from patrol. Instead of fishing rods or ball bats, they carry Soviet-made AD-47 rifles.

"It's safe here because we've got guards out," says Juan Cruz Rodriguez, the sheriff of the mountain village of El Regardio. "But after dark . . ."

His shrug and toothless grin say: Forget it.

Our van has raced 80 miles up the highway from the capital of Managua, then groaned up a winding dirt road 10 miles deep into the hills. Not a house in sight. Suddenly, in an explosion of chickens and children, we're in the farming village of El Regardio.

Neat time-roofed huts, fat hogs in the streets, plenty of giggling kids. Looks like a happy hamlet. But there's a sour edge of fear here.

I've been in Nicaragua three days, bird-dogging a U.S. delegation that includes Rep. Bob Edgar, D-Pa., Rep. Ted Weiss, D-N.Y., and professors and ministers from the Philadelphia area. We've talked to the Sandinista leadership, including President Daniel Ortega.

But they're politicians. Like their Washington counterparts, wrangling over the week's votes on \$14 million for the U.S.-backed counter-revolutionaries—Contras—they're full of rhetoric. But here in the Esteli hills, the war isn't an abstract debate over who's a Marxist and who's a "freedom fighter."

It's about 15-year-olds carrying rifles and others being kidnapped, and about teachers being shot and trucks full of campesinos being shot into flames.

"Go up that road two kilometers [slightly more than a mile] and they'd nail you," said Juan Cruz Rodriguez, popping his palm with his fist. "The contras move in small bands at night. But they're bold. One hot afternoon in that field you see, they cut up one of our farmers with machetes. We found him hung from a tree."

You don't believe everything you hear in Central America. But you believe Juan Rodriguez, who is a ramrod 6-foot-4, has a countryboy directness, and looks like Matt Dillon in a straw hat.

"I have a 100-man militia [for a village of 550], but when the contras are close by, I can call in 800 [Army] troops," said the sheriff through an interpreter. "We've had about 40 casualties here. 'We're a nice target. The contras ambush vehicles. They kidnap young men and take them over the border. Tell me, will President REE-gan get more money for the contras?'"

The village had no TV set and only a few radios. Yet there was intense interest in the U.S. Congress debate 1,500 miles north. I sensed that to the *campesinos* Reagan is a powerful but irrational figure, like an intoxicated man in a bar with a gun. What will he do next?

I was also struck by the high morale. There may be grumbling in Managua over shortages and the draft, but the rural areas seem solidly pro-Sandinista. Granted, this was a co-op farm, where life is vastly improved since the Somoza regime. But if the CIA imagined the contras could divide the country, they've flopped. My impression in the Esteli hills is of country folk knitted together by the U.S.-backed invaders.

Peer into the crudest, dirt-floored hut and you spot posters on the wall: "After 50 Years Sandino [the legendary Nicaraguan general] Still Lives!" and "Yanquis Will Never Defeat Our Homeland!" Paradoxically, there is no open hostility toward Americans—and it seems half the Nicaraguan men proudly wear caps of the Baltimore Orioles, for whom countryman Tippy Martinez pitches.

The suffering, though, is real. A dozen women in dark dresses give visitors to El Regardio the names of sons and husbands lost to contra attacks. There was a similar sad litany of victims at a Christian-based hamlet where we ate tortillas and rice in the village huts.

"The contras ambushed a pickup truck and took away my 16-year-old son at gunpoint," said Santos Centeno Hudiel, a farmer with a stoical, mestizo face. "Please tell President REE-gan I want my son back."

If the local lamentations about contra brutalities are overwrought, U.S. religious workers who have spent years in the Nicaraguan boondocks sound trustworthy.

"In my community about 30 miles east of Esteli we had 33 civilian deaths last year," said Sister Susan Deliee, a Maryknoll nun. "If the contras get more money, I fear we'll see stepped-up harassment and kidnappings after the rainy season ends. Do Americans really want that?"

A young American priest named Bob Starke, who spent a day interpreting for us in Esteli, knows the contras first-hand. He was kidnapped by them.

"They stuck a gun to my head. They were taking me away, probably to be executed," said Starke, a lean, hard-worn young priest with a Robert Redford profile. "The contras had surrounded a church during our services. They let me go only because I was an American."

"But the lay priest—a 'Delegate of the Word'—wasn't as lucky. When we found him, he'd had his arms broken and been shot seven times. He was the most popular guy in the village, a real leader."

"That's the sort of person the contras go after. Of the 33 schools in my district, 30 are closed. The Cuban teachers, who were really good, heard they were on a contra death list."

A controversial CIA manual, exposed in October 1984, advised the contras to "neutralize selected government officials," a phrase that means assassination.

On the other hand, the Nicaraguan army has also played rough in Contra Country. It has chased thousands of peasants from the countryside into refugee camps, sometimes burning homes and killing animals. "It's like the U.S. Army free-fire zones in Vietnam," Lino Hernandez, head of the Human Rights Commission, told us. "Now the Army can attack anything that moves."

What about Soviet military in Contra Country? We saw no Soviet personnel, but a Soviet T-28 helicopter, wearing camouflage paint and the red Nicaraguan ball on its fuselage, was making low observation runs over a valley near Esteli.

So far the Sandinistas haven't used their most potent weapons, six MI-24 "Hind" helicopters considered the best gunships in the world. "Our technicians in Managua are testing them now," said Commandante Guerrillo Salvatierra.

You want to know about fighting contras, Salvatierra's your man. He's 29, bespectacled, a former revolutionary fighter, a U.S. baseball buff, and the No. 2 in command of this mountainous area where the contras concentrate.

At his rather casually guarded headquarters, Salvatierra pulled out maps and graphs and body counts. He says he's facing 4,800 contras plus 1,800 logistical troops. Judged by his casualty lists, the war's a standoff. Why?

"The contras move through isolated areas, attacking co-op farms, peasant villages, road crews," said the Nicaraguan commandante. "They're mobile. Their U.S. equipment, especially mortars and grenade launchers, are light. They move faster than we do."

"They recruit by kidnapping and propaganda. They tell young peasant men that we're against religion, that we're Communists, that we'll take away their land. Now, though, we're seeing a lot of contra deserters."

"If the U.S. really cuts off aid, they can't continue. They don't have the will to fight without the U.S. Most of their leaders are old Somoza officers. But if the CIA gets money and equipment to them, they can hide up in the hills and kill us forever."

That's the Army line. In the villages where we wandered, you didn't hear much talk of body counts, logistics, geopolitics, or Karl Marx. "Tell Reagan," said a black-garbed woman who'd lost a son, "we need peace."

As the moon come up, we were barreling down the highway to Managua.

At the U.S.-built Hotel Intercontinental, a Mexican band tooted by the swimming pool. The bar, as usual, was full of drifters, adventurers, con men and journalists drinking \$1.70 Tona beer and \$11-a-shot—yep, \$11—imported Scotch.

The dirty little war of Contra Country was far away.

[From the Philadelphia Daily News, Apr. 24, 1985]

AT TIMES, THE WAR IS WORDS

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA.—You're a long way from the Third World when you have dinner at the U.S. ambassador's house.

No tin-roofed huts, no dusty streets full of skinny kids, no patrols toting Soviet rifles here.

Instead, tropical stars glint down on the ambassador's pool.

About 50 guests, including four U.S. congressmen and several European diplomats, are dining on the ambassador's terrace. There is the scent of perfume, gin, cigars and bougainvillea. Red-and-purple jungle birds squawk in cages by the outdoor bar.

Do not envy Harry E. Bergold Jr. for all this splendor. It's not often a U.S. ambassador does business in a country his president is trying to overthrow. You can detect the strains at the dinner party. This is a few days before Congress votes on \$14 million in aid to the Contras—the counter revolutionaries. Arguments burst out across the linen tablecloths like firefights.

Now it's after midnight in Harry Bergold's living room. The ambassador eases his ample girth into a chair, sips a whiskey and soda, and analyzes The Situation.

"I don't know much about Central America," Bergold, a career diplomat who's come here from Eastern Europe, says dryly. "The economy's bad here, but I guess it will bump along. People can go outside and pick fruit off trees."

Maybe Bergold's making a cynical joke. He throws in a few kind words for the Sandinistas: They have some exciting young leaders, and they're trying to improve health and literacy. But he says the United States can't tolerate even a mildly Marxist government here.

"Why? Propinquity to the U.S.," say Bergold. "And the domino theory."

The Rev. William Sloane Coffin has been listening with building tension to his fellow Yale—Coffin was Yale '48, Bergold '53. A prominent figure in the anti-Vietnam War movement the burly Coffin finally bursts.

"Mister Ambassador, your analysis leaves out one question," Says Coffin in Wurlitzer-like tones. "Why does United States policy always wind up f..... the poor people of the world?"

Bergold blinks. "Well," he says smoothly, "I certainly feel for poor people up on the Nicaraguan border. They're simple folks who only care for their animals and their land. And they're caught between two armies."

"But Mister Ambassador," Coffin leans forward, shouting, "one . . . of . . . those . . . armies . . . is . . . ours!"

Bergold sighs, puts down his whiskey and spreads his hands.

"Look, I'm paid to sell President Reagan's policies," he says. "I can give you other sce-

narios. I don't know how realistic they are. An all-out military solution would be tragic. Negotiations would be ideal. But you can't trust the Sandinistas and you can't trust the U.S. Congress [to be consistent].

"So things will probably continue the way they are. The \$14 million [for the rebels] doesn't mean anything. In the bars and grills of Washington, a low-intensity conflict looks good. It's cheap. It keeps up pressure. And you play for time."

The ambassador stretches. It's 1 a.m. "Wander around Nicaragua," he says "People talk freely. Figuring out the truth is hard."

Guests leave, some baffled, some resentful. Bergold and Coffin shake hands coolly.

He's right. Ronald Reagan calls it a "totalitarian state," but Nicaraguans talk endlessly—pro- and anti-Sandinista. Here are some voices of Nicaragua:

THE ANGRY TEACHER

Fernando Cardenal looks like a small-town, U.S. school principal. He's ramrod tall, mid-50s, an ex-Jesuit priest who is the minister of education. He grew irate when I asked when Sandinistas would allow freedom of the press:

"We're proud of raising our literacy rate from 12 to 51 percent. We're proud of our brilliant elections. How long did it take your American Revolution to do such things?"

"Freedom of the press? To allow it in a war would be weak and stupid. I hate press censorship. I think it hurts us. But we have to censor the enemy paper [La Prensas]. Even the U.S. censors its press in wartime."

"Look, you can go back to your safe home. But I may be on the front, fighting U.S. Marines. When Reagan ends the war, we end censorship."

THE DISSIDENT BUSINESSMAN

Dr. Jaime Benjoechea is head of the Chamber of Commerce. He's typical of a surprisingly feisty anti-Sandinista business community that openly rails against the government:

"We can recognize a dictatorship a mile away. And this is a dictatorship. We were part of the rebellion against the Somoza regime. Now, the Sandinistas have broken every gentleman's agreement."

"We want them to stop confiscating businesses and give freedom to the newspapers. Oh, they don't use firing squads or torture. But they isolate people, muzzle the opposition. Ration cards, shortages . . . I think they're running out of political capital."

THE HUMAN RIGHTS MAVERICK

Lino Hernandez, a stocky man in his 30s, runs the Permanent Commission on Human Rights out of a walk-up office in downtown Managua. He spoke intensely of Sandinista abuses, but I had no way to verify his charges:

"The Sandinistas try to intimidate us. They have occupied our offices, put some of us in jail. We continue to work, tracking their abuses. They have 3,000 or 3,500 political prisoners. We've counted 127 political killings. They put people in prison for a year without charges. They put them in dark isolation cells for months. It ruins a man's nerve. The most feared prison is El Chipote, near the hotel. Freedom of expression is this country is an illusion."

THE WOMAN COMMANDER

Dora Maria Tellez looks like a vibrant, brunette U.S. college student. But she wears a Sandinista Army uniform and packs a .38 on her thigh. She says she's the granddaughter of a rebel general who fought the

U.S. Marines in 1933. She dropped out of medical school to fight the Somoza regime. Now 29, she's commandante of Managua:

"I cannot accept that we torture anyone in prison. We know too well under Somoza what torture is. But the war destroys normal living. We have over 7,000 dead. Our boys 17 to 20 who should be in college must fight the contras."

"We need negotiation with the U.S., not the contras. As [Daniel] Ortega says, we want to talk to the circus owners, not the monkeys. If Reagan gets his \$14 million, the war goes on for years. Or Reagan invades our country."

"We think he [Reagan] is a serious man, not a joke. We are well aware of Grenada. We are aware of the 10,000 U.S. troops, the tanks and planes, on our border. If Reagan finds the right excuse, anything will happen."

THE INTELLECTUAL

Kabier Gorostiaga, a goateed, energetic man, is an economist and ex-Jesuit priest who runs the Nicaraguan Institute for Social and Economic Research. He talked about what might happen next:

"This country is in serious trouble. We're using 40 percent of the budget to fight the war. When you mobilize 100,000 people, you have a manpower problem. Coffee, cotton and sugar are all down. We have loans of \$4.7 billion and no way to make payments."

"Yes we have terrific potential. This isn't the Sahara. It's a country rich in minerals, crops, perhaps oil. And the Sandinistas are trying something new in the Third World, a mix of Marxism, Christianity and nationalism. It's not a little Soviet. People don't read 'Das Kapital.' This is a country of poets, not philosophers."

"But Reagan is the best friend the Soviets have, because he's driving Nicaragua to the Marxist model. It could end two ways. We could have a Vietnam-type invasion and a new banana republic. Or we'll have a new relationship with the U.S. The future is quite scary."

The cynical ambassador was right. Every-one talks. The truth is hard to find—but the voices of Nicaragua are hard to ignore.●

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

HON. THOMAS A. LUKEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for giving me this opportunity to recognize the millions of small business men and women of this country. They are responsible for creating new jobs and helping spur economic growth. Five out of seven new jobs in the last 2 years were generated in small firms. Truly, small businesses are the foundation of our Nation's economy.

This week, May 5 to 11, has been designated as National Small Business Week. It is appropriate that we salute our hard-working entrepreneurs in this fashion. This week the 50 State small business persons of the year are here in Washington to celebrate their

success and their awards. I am pleased to congratulate these winners.

As chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee on Tax, access to equity capital and business opportunities, I am quite concerned that these businesses be given a fair shot to grow and expand in our economy. The essence of the American economic system of private enterprise is free competition. It is appropriate that we consider the small business community as we examine the proposed tax reform and tax simplification packages in the near future.

I am particularly pleased to recognize the Ohio Small Business Person of the Year, Mrs. Janet Makrauer from my home district of Cincinnati. She has made an outstanding contribution to our local business community through her business, Amko Plastics, Inc.

Small business men and women have always been known for their spirit of independence. This entrepreneurial streak in their nature has made possible many of our Nation's important research and innovations. It is important that this Congress continue to protect the climate necessary for this innovative spirit to grow and expand.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman. For allowing me a chance to congratulate these winners and support our Nation's vital small business community. ●

RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS RESEARCH DESERVES CAREFUL REVIEW BY NIH

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday two very important people, Mrs. Barbara Matia of Arizona and Mr. Douglas Reddan of California, testified before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, on which I serve. They came to speak about arthritis research and the work of Dr. Thomas Brown of the Arthritis Institute of the National Hospital in Arlington, VA. They are not scientists nor arthritis specialists. They came all the way to Washington to speak on behalf of the work of Dr. Brown because they believe Dr. Brown has found a treatment for arthritis that works. Both can attest to personal experiences that support Dr. Brown's work. Their testimony was fascinating and I urge my colleagues to review it. The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF E. DOUGLAS REDDAN, TRUSTEE OF THE ARTHRITIS INSTITUTE OF THE NATIONAL HOSPITAL, ARLINGTON, VA.

Mr. Chairman and Distinguished Members of this Committee:

I am E. Douglas Reddan of Santa Barbara, a Trustee of the Arthritis Institute of the National Hospital for Orthopedics & Rehabilitation, Arlington, VA. Because two members of my family are arthritics, and unhappy with all available approved treatment methods, I have commuted monthly to Washington over the past 6 years studying the arthritis problem. I would like to tell you what I have found and I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you again for this purpose.

A half billion dollars of Federal funds over the past 4 decades have failed to produce any safe approved therapy offering even remotely comparable results to those achieved by Dr. Thomas McPherson Brown's unapproved antibiotic therapy. The approved drug of first choice, gold, has a 5-year success rate of only 10%. It has been reported in the literature as having the highest mortality rate of all prescribed drugs. This compares with Dr. Brown's 80% success rate over the same 5 year period with no toxicity problem.

The obvious question is why no approval. Fifteen years ago promising clinical research in Dr. Brown's antibiotic approach to the disease was cut off from further NIH funding when a highly questionable short-term treatment program on only 13 patients, at Boston University, was interpreted by the rheumatology profession as disproving the efficacy of the antibiotic approach.

From that point on Dr. Brown went it alone financed by patient support. Today he is treating arthritics from all over the country, from all age groups, and all walks of life—including Congress, the White House, the Cabinet, the Supreme Court and the Embassies. With very few exceptions all are referrals from other physicians.

By now Dr. Brown has in all probability treated more arthritics than any other physician in the history of rheumatology—over 10,000. His practice is so crowded it takes up to a year for new patients to get an appointment. And, Dr. Brown is not alone; other physicians, under his guidance, in various parts of the country, are having similar success with his antibiotic therapy.

After spending several thousand hours with Dr. Brown, his colleagues at his Arthritis Institute and his patients, I've learned a great deal about the plight of arthritics and the hopeless, pain-racked future facing most of them. I've come to know he's closer to the truth about arthritis than anyone in the field.

The purpose of my testimony today is to suggest to this committee that a government sponsored clinical trial of Dr. Brown's antibiotic therapy is long overdue and that a reasonable course of action for this committee, in light of the markedly unimpressive record of existing approved therapies, and Dr. Brown's record of success, now clearly recorded in both retrospective and prospective clinical trials, is to see that such a clinical trial is underwritten by NIH.

The present annual cost of arthritis to the U.S. economy is \$40 billion. That is due to grow to \$100 billion by the year 2000, if such action is not taken now.

It is my hope that this Committee will lend its full support to a grant application for a trial of Dr. Brown's antibiotic approach now currently under review by NIH. The cost is only 2 cents per patient!

The rewards can be tremendous for all of us.

NIADDK's present position is that they will proceed only on a research basis of looking for the causative agent in the joint

fluid of arthritics. When they find it they will find the means of attacking it. Idealistically, this sounds great; practically it makes no sense. None of the existing approved therapies were approved on this basis. If they were accidentally found to have positive effects on the disease, they were approved for use. In all cases long term usage brought out their severe toxicity problems—often worse than the disease itself.

The research approach proposed by NIADDK will take years. That means the benefit to today's patients is a long way off. I'm here representing millions of those patients. They want relief and control of their disease now. Dr. Brown's antibiotic treatment provides that. There is no justifiable reason for depriving these millions of its benefits now, short of the proposed clinical trial which can be conducted for pennies per patient.

Available independent data on a large group of patients clearly shows its long time disease control superiority over other therapies. To hold it back for years more from today's arthritics is, in my personal view, criminal.

When the proposed clinical trial is completed I have no doubt but that the results will change the direction of emphasis of most of today's arthritis researchers greatly enhancing the likelihood of a cure in the near future.

I'm sure you have noticed that a great deal of the support money provided and to be provided for arthritis programs is for the purpose of improving surgical techniques for joint replacement, etc. and teaching patients how to live with their arthritis. This is all surely needed but it is also a clear admission that approved therapies are not working.

I'm not a zealot—I'm simply a person able to recognize the difference between programs that are not working and one that is. Fifteen years ago a wrong turn was taken. The time has come to admit it. I'll be happy to answer any questions you may have.

TESTIMONY OF BARBARA A. MATIA

Mr. Chairman, Members of Congress and Staff:

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you again.

It is hard for me to believe that the program that brought me from being bedridden as a result of rheumatoid arthritis to being fully functional in 6 years is still not widely available to the 36 million arthritics in our country today!

As you may remember from my testimony last year, the program I am talking about is a treatment program for arthritis developed by Dr. Thomas Brown of the Arthritis Institute of the National Hospital which uses antibiotics in conjunction with anti-inflammatories. As you may also remember, I told you that Dr. Brown told me the first time I met with him that I would be getting worse for a period of time and would then begin to improve each year thereafter as long as I remained on the program. It was because I worsened, as predicted, that I sensed this doctor was actually tinkering with the disease process that had made me feel so ill. The fact that this doctor had the confidence to tell me that I would be getting worse before I got better and the fact that that actually occurred showed that there was real significance to this program.

This is a program that arthritics travel from all over the United States and the world to receive; that patients are willing to wait more than 6 months to a year to re-

ceive for the first time; that the International Congress of Rheumatology selected for presentation at their annual meeting in Sydney, Australia later this month; that is safer and more effective over a long term, without toxicity, than any other treatment currently available; and that could lead us to a breakthrough to the cure for arthritis.

Three significant developments have occurred since I was here last year. First, Dr. John T. Hicks, a noted rheumatologist, has joined the Arthritis Institute because of the promise he feels Dr. Brown's work holds for relieving the suffering of arthritics. Immediately prior to joining the Arthritis Institute, Dr. Hicks served in the Rheumatology/Immunology Division of the Smith Kline Beckman Corporation where he was responsible for large-scale, controlled trials of oral gold therapy. Thus, he is experienced in developing, organizing and directing clinical trials of long acting drugs in double-blind studies.

The second significant event is the completion of an evaluation of the Arthritis Institute's patient records by an independent biostatistical firm of national reputation. Using 98 patients as the control group, this retrospective study indicated that after five years of treatment, over 70% of the control group were still benefitting from antibiotic therapy, a percentage far higher than with other treatment programs. The study concludes that in spite of the results noted in the 1971 Boston study, among others, a properly designed and managed clinical trial of the antibiotic treatment program is in order at this time.

The third significant development is that a grant application has been filed and is now pending at the National Institutes of Health requesting a clinical trial which will compare the antibiotic treatment program to gold therapy as a treatment for rheumatoid arthritis. Based upon my experience over the last three years discussing the antibiotic treatment program with the medical establishment, I believe that it will take the involvement of this subcommittee to make sure that the opportunity before us does not die in the peer review committees. The grant application calls for a political decision, not a medical decision. The political decision is whether this subcommittee thinks the 36 million arthritics are worth 2 cents per year over the next 3 years which could potentially lead to the availability of the best treatment program for arthritis yet known. It is the clinical trial which will provide the medical decision! If the peer review committees turn down the grant on the basis of earlier trials improperly conducted, or if this grant is not made for whatever reason, we may have missed one of those rare opportunities in the history of mankind to positively affect the human condition. When you consider that the amount being requested is only six cents per arthritic, can we afford not to permit the trial to be conducted?

To the arthritics in this country, this grant could mean the difference between just coping and a full life, pain and no pain, crippling and no crippling, and despair and hope.

Let us all stay involved in the processing of this application so we can put this program to the test! This could be the best 6 cents the Federal Government has or ever will spend on me! ●

AN AMERICAN RESURGENCE IS UNDERWAY—HAVE YOU NOTICED?

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Robert V. Krikorian, chairman and chief executive officer of Rexnord, Inc., gave a very interesting and valuable speech on the subject of America's resurgence. So that Mr. Krikorian's remarks may be available to a wider audience, I ask that this speech be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

AN AMERICAN RESURGENCE IS UNDERWAY—HAVE YOU NOTICED?

I want to address you today as a representative of the capital goods industry, which a couple of years ago was regarded as increasingly non-competitive, saddled with obsolete plants, without much hope for the future. Some of the more imaginative journalist called us the "rust belt."

Earlier this year, the Center for the Study of American Business at Washington University in St. Louis, issued a paper examining the problem. The study suggested that those predicting the "rust belt" phenomenon were drawing long-term pessimistic conclusions by merely extending short-term data over a longer period of time. This rather simplistic approach is being proven wrong.

Conventional wisdom in the early days of this decade was that the "post industrial" era was upon us and that manufacturing would decline, transferred to other parts of the world, most notably to the Far East. There is indeed a trend to the Far East for capital goods manufacturing, but if we in this nation stay ahead of competition—which we are doing with increasing success—we can retain our lead. I think our American economic system works best when challenged to be creative. That's the condition I see right now—through cooperative effort, we're meeting the challenge and are becoming stronger.

Management of American industrial companies have awakened to the fact that we are operating in a global market requiring a global outlook. We're still going to manufacture products that American and world industry needs, but our factories are becoming more flexible, efficient, smarter and better. The microchip is finding a place on the factory floor. What we're increasingly seeing is fewer people making more and more products for more and more people. And let me emphasize that we're accomplishing this without a national industrial policy and without central economic planning.

American industry is going with—and in many cases is leading—what I believe is a national resurgence. I can see it all around us. The economy is on the move, inflation is down, interest rates are falling, there's a new emphasis on product quality, plant utilization is up and there's a feeling of shared commitment between labor and management.

But I think it would be fair to ask an obvious question, how can there be a national resurgence when:

The national deficit is still sky-high
Our negative balance of payments is growing rapidly

Many of our cities still aren't safe
Unemployment is still at 7.2 percent
We still have the hard-core poor
Is this what resurgence looks like?
Yes, I think it probably is. That's the way our system works . . . in fits and starts. Nobody ever claimed that our free society is neat, well-ordered or predictable. While this is the system that offers each individual American the best chance for opportunity and personal growth, it takes time to change negative attitudes built up over recent years, attitudes such as:

No growth
Reduced personal expectations
Attacks on traditional values
A national "malaise"
And an onslaught of national self-criticism—it seems that for a long time, some of the most spiteful criticism of the United States came from our fellow Americans!

I would liken our current condition to an outstanding athlete starting to train and compete after a long layoff. Muscles are sore and some parts of the body aren't working too well yet, but our performance is getting better and with determination we can continue our world leadership position.

Four things strike me about our national resurgence and I want to discuss each briefly:

First, and possibly most important, is the awesome force inherent in our American economic system. This was almost totally unexpected by most pundits and economists here and abroad. We had apparently lost sight of the fact—or we forgot—that our system works best when left relatively unattended by the government. That's the very nature of our system. It's built in.

To put the thoughts of the late Harvard teacher and economist, Joseph Shumpeter, into a present day context, the American economic system, not by coincidence, Shumpeter would say, but by virtue of its mechanism, progressively raises the living standard and quality of life of the American people.

The second thing that strikes me is the natural optimism, the national pride, the buoyant outlook that is native to our people.

What some people call our "gross national spirit" seems to be on the rise. Five years ago, in 1979, Public Opinion magazine reported that the average American said that he was worse off than five years before, and that he would be even worse off five years later. Last year, the poll was taken again and our average American felt that he was better off than five years ago, and was confident that he would be even better off five years from now. Other polls show a similar spirit.

There are plenty of other optimistic signs that are clearly visible: Inflation is way down and I believe that it is going to stay down. Employment is up and unemployment has been coming down. The index of leading economic indicators over the last two years or so have been good, with recent months leveling off—which I think is healthy. Industry Week magazine recently released its annual CEO survey which showed that 78 percent of surveyed companies planned increased capital spending in 1985 and about 40 percent have plans to expand production capacity—and this last figure has been typically in the 20 percent range. This survey, however, was taken before the proposed changes in the treatment of depreciation for tax purposes were announced.

My perception is that today more Americans feel that we're in charge of our own future. We have a growing confidence in ourselves and in our country—we know that we can solve many of our own problems—that our problems are solvable if we let our system work.

Nonetheless, we do have problems that are serious. We still have hard-core unemployed and single-parent families that are second and sometimes third generation. We continue to live in an unsettled world and we are still struggling with opposing views of what role government should play in our lives.

But as we are solving our other problems by letting the American system work, we will make progress in solving some of these problems as well.

The third thing that strikes me about our national resurgence is that we're recapturing some strongly held feelings that have been traditional to the American people.

For example, the feeling of self reliance as individuals. This becomes very apparent when we look at how many Americans volunteered to work on worthwhile projects—usually in the neighborhoods and local communities. In 1983, 92 million people contributed time that was worth \$70 billion—that's an increase of 8 million people over 1981.

Voluntary giving is up, too. In 1983, \$65 billion was contributed, a ten and a half percent increase over the previous year.

On a more sobering note, many of us as individuals—especially more fortunate, affluent individuals—should be giving more. Beginning with the 1982 tax year, the maximum tax rate on personal income was lowered from 70 percent to 50 percent. But while one survey showed that personal giving by those in the \$15-30,000 earnings range increased their giving by 6.8 percent, those making \$50,000 and more decreased their giving. I know that much of this money which isn't contributed is being invested, which creates more jobs and makes for a better society. But I do believe that those of us who benefit most from our system must shoulder our share of the load.

I'm personally pleased to see a commitment to corporate giving spontaneously springing up throughout the nation. Five percent and two percent organizations started in the Twin Cities in Minnesota and have spread to such places as Seattle, San Francisco, Phoenix and other cities, most recently including Milwaukee. In just one year, 107 businesses in Milwaukee reported that they are contributing at least two percent of their domestic pre-tax earnings to worthwhile community and national organizations. Just think what could happen if such a movement was promoted by Rotary or other groups in this city!

And the fourth thing that strikes me about our national resurgence is the increasing awareness that there are values in our free society that we live by, that they are valid and important to a free society after all, and are worth passing along to our children. A free society is dependent on such values as honesty and ethical behavior, morality and religion, family values, the rule of law, the sovereignty of the individual and the simple virtue of helping our neighbors.

It seems to me that one of the striking features of this year's presidential election was the issue of religion.

The important thing about this issue is that it became an issue at all. And I think that was healthy. Because religion is so closely tied to societal values, the issue got people thinking about the place those

values play in our lives—in our political and personal lives and in our schools and other institutions.

I hope that during the next few years we will see more dialogue and serious discussion. This is too important to conceal behind clichés or slogans. Religion has always had a major role in our national life and we short-change ourselves and especially our children if we deny or ignore it.

To try to teach American history without explaining the influence of religion on our founding fathers is an incomplete reading of the subject. To try to illuminate the teaching of the law while forced to ignore the great laws of religion—including the Ten Commandments—is to cripple the teacher's ability to teach. To reduce the teaching of values to what is called "values clarification"—where all values are equally valid—only produces confusion. I hope that the dialogue about religion will heed the words of historian Will Durant: he said, "There is no significant example in history, before our time, of a society successfully maintaining moral life without the aid of religion."

One of the prophets of our national resurgence has been Adam Smith. Critics of the ideas of Adam Smith complain that he extolled the benefits of self interest rather than a commitment to the common good. Yet Smith saw clearly that while self interest would lead to the common good, it would do so only if most people in society accepted shared ethical and moral values as a guide to their behavior. The United States is a nation with shared values and the success of the American system has certainly proved Adam Smith right.

I recently completed a three-year term as chairman of the board of the Ethics Resource Center, a national organization devoted to extending personal, political and economic freedom by strengthening the ethical values that make them possible. This experience gave me a sharpened sense that:

First, ethical values are what hold our diverse society together. From our earliest history, the United States has been a heterogeneous, pluralistic society. We are a nation of immigrants whose roots extend to every other nation and culture on earth. We've seen other nations torn apart because their cultural, ethnic or racial pluralism acted as a centrifugal force, hopelessly dividing their people. What was it that enabled our pluralistic society to so far avoid this calamity? Only one thing: a shared system of ethical values. Because we shared common values and a common hope, we could trust each other. However, it seems to me that we in America are also in danger of becoming caught in the centrifuge of pluralism. We seem to be loosening our hold on the nation's greatest dream—E pluribus unum, out of many, one. The metaphor of the "melting pot" may no longer be operative. We seem to perceive more readily our differences, our special interests, than we do our common interests and the deeply shared values that make freedom and pluralism possible. This is a trend that we must work to halt.

Second, I've found that people in and out of business are increasingly concerned with ethical conduct. I'm always distressed to hear fellow business people concede that we should operate honestly and ethically, even though this makes it harder to be successful. This is nonsense. Ethical conduct makes it easier to do business—in the short and the long run.

And third, I believe that each of us as individuals has an ethical responsibility for

our families and neighbors. In the same way, each of us as a corporate citizen has a similar responsibility for our community, state and nation. So I see a direct link between ethical values and discharging our responsibilities through voluntary action.

I recently joined the Board of Directors of an organization called VOLUNTEER: The National Center for Citizen Involvement. VOLUNTEER is doing some exceptional work through its national network of Voluntary Action Centers. This organization is headed by former Michigan Governor George Romney, who is deeply committed to voluntary citizen involvement in our society. "Volunteerism," says Gov. Romney, "is the price of freedom."

Anthropologist Margaret Mead once observed, "If you look closely, you will see that almost anything that really matters to us, anything that embodies our deepest commitment to the way human life should be lived and cared for, depends on some form—often many forms—of volunteerism."

So we have a national resurgence. But what can American business people do to make sure it keeps going? Just one thing, it seems to me. And that is to recognize the inherent strength in our American system and help make it work. I would like to suggest five ways to make this happen:

First, don't panic when some part doesn't work as well as we would like. Let our system work, but even more important, preserve our system so we are able to pass it along to succeeding generations.

Second, resist the powerful impulse to run to the government when we think we need help—and here I would mention subsidies, tariffs, special legislation or other preferential treatment.

Third, give support to individuals, companies, public servants, educators and others in their efforts to strengthen our system.

Fourth, make a major effort to assure that ethical conduct is expected in all levels and functions of our companies and businesses.

And fifth, encourage and reward those people in our organizations who voluntarily engage in worthwhile outside activities. This not only makes for better communities, but it sharpens the leadership abilities of our people and makes them better employees.

I believe that the American system of laws and limited government is the best governmental system ever devised. If the ultimate test of a national system is how well it can and does serve people, then ours is superior to any other.

It's up to us to support it and to make it even stronger. ●

CONSUMER MONEY SHOULD FUND CONSUMER REPRESENTATION

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce a bill with my colleagues Messrs. LELAND and WAXMAN that would guarantee consumer representation at future telephone rate proceedings at the State and Federal level.

The last decade of change in the telecommunications industry has been

nothing short of epochal. During this momentous period, the consumer has seen many changes and proposals being discussed without a consumer representative sitting at the table. As frequently happens at such discussions, those who are represented look after their interests very well, and those who are not represented suffer. Consumers have suffered at rate proceedings throughout the country because they have not enjoyed adequate representation. This proposal will help us achieve that goal.

In November 1984, the Federal Communications Commission ruled that AT&T had overcharged consumers by approximately \$101 million through 1978 overcharges on interstate and overseas phone rates. The rate of return set by the Commission was set at 10 percent, but in fact AT&T had earned 10.22 percent. With interest, the sum now due consumers is at least \$178 million.

This bill would set aside \$35 million of that total for consumer representation in State and Federal rate proceedings. A board consisting of representatives from consumer groups, small business, National Association of Regulated Utility Commissioners, National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, and the National Association of State Attorneys General would administer the trust fund. Proceedings from the trust fund would be distributed each year to groups seeking to represent residential and small business consumers in rate proceedings.

The rest of the refund money would be returned to consumers under the proposed FCC plan. Consequently, this proposal creates a solid funding for consumer interests and still gives some money back to consumers.

I urge my colleagues to support this proposal as a sound method of financing adequate consumer representation. This proposal would provide limited and controlled funds to groups representing constituents not adequately represented. ●

A TRIBUTE TO JACK DAUM

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute today to Mr. Jack Daum, a long-time employee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who retired on April 1, 1985.

Jack was the very first Republican staff member of the Interior Committee, having been hired for that position when minority staff positions were authorized in 1974.

There are a lot of things I could say about Jack, who has distinguished

himself in many ways, but I would like to include in the RECORD an article written by some of his friends and fellow staffers.

I think the following article captures the measure of the man in a unique and colorful way:

HOW DO WE REMEMBER JACK DAUM?

(By His Fellow Staffers)

Jack Daum officially retired from his congressional staff position on April 1, 1985; even though here it is mid-May and he hasn't yet cleaned out his desk and departed the premises.

Those of us who have been his friends, and worked with him professionally over the years, will not soon forget him.

You see, Jack was truly a remarkable individual. He was a man of strong personal convictions, fierce pride, and one who was a dedicated professional. When he believed in something, he could be strongly partisan, and he never backed off from a fight.

At the same time, he worked well with staff professionals from the other party, and tried to be accommodating in every way possible. He was one who did his homework and wanted to be fully informed on any issue or legislative matter in which he was personally involved.

If this made him opinionated in the eyes of some, and unwavering in the minds of others, it just may have been that he knew more about a given subject than many of those around him.

Jack was an incessant reader, on a wide range of subjects. That might help explain why he was a successful newspaper reporter and editor, political activist, public relations expert, and congressional staffer.

His newspaper experience included several years with the old Washington Times-Herald, where his investigative reporting received him a Pulitzer nomination; and service with the Daily News-Miner in Fairbanks, AK, and the Daily Alaska Empire in Juneau.

While in Alaska in the early 1950's, prior to statehood, Jack became somewhat of a legend, not only because of his skills as a reporter, but as a radio personality, and as one who didn't hesitate to make the news on several momentous occasions.

Two of his more notable activities included single handedly capturing a wild bear cub, for a local zoo, and helping engineer the removal of a whale carcass that had washed ashore. Media cameras were rolling on each of these occasions.

While working in Alaska, Jack met and married a young coed at the University of Alaska, the former Alice Plunkett. This union produced eight children, five daughters and three sons.

On leaving Alaska in 1956, Jack made his way to southern California, where he was an early activist in the conservative political movement that was later to produce several prominent political figures, including the President of the United States.

Jack remained active politically, after moving to Santa Fe, NM, in 1963, and his work on behalf of Congressman Manuel Lujan, Jr., landed him a congressional staff job in Washington in 1969.

During his 11 years on the staff of the Interior Committee, he was best known for his expertise on Indian issues and water legislation affecting Western States.

An avid fisherman, Jack found his way to Deale, MD, where he bought a home on the Chesapeake Bay; and always seemed to be the owner of one or more boats, even if they

weren't all seaworthy. Widely known on the bay, as either "High Pockets" or "Cap'n Jack," he was the man many people turned to for information on where the fish were biting.

His latest boat was appropriately dubbed "The Office," and when anyone inquired as to Jack's whereabouts, the obvious answer took on special meaning to those who knew him.

Besides his family and job, Jack had many other interests, including a leadership role in various American Legions posts, and work with underprivileged youth.

It always went without saying that Jack had an understanding wife, who never knew when he was coming home; and when he did, she many times would welcome one of his new friends, usually someone temporarily down on his luck, who would take up residence in the family guest room.

While not everyone who knew him recognized Jack as a man of impeccable character, without exception everyone knew him as a genuine "character." He was quite capable of perpetrating the "master con," if in his mind circumstances warranted it. And, quite often the circumstances did.

Jack never spent a lot of money on new suits. Had he done so, in his mind this would have smacked of pretentiousness, and, more importantly, would have been a downright waste of good money.

In early June, Jack will be departing his home on the Chesapeake Bay, and returning to his adopted State of New Mexico. He will be exchanging life on the bay, for the more tranquil, but equally enjoyable, trout fishing in New Mexico's northern mountains.

Those who knew and worked with Jack wish him well in retirement. His friends and acquaintances on the Hill include Members, who knew they could depend on Jack for that "quick in-depth speech"; fellow staffers who could turn to him for that needed information on almost any subject; and a multitude of others who Jack befriended at one time or another, or invited for a memorable day on the bay.

With his departure, will Jack soon become the forgotten man? Not on your life. To a lot of people on Capitol Hill, from all walks of life, Jack Daum is the man who won't soon be forgotten. ●

THE 1984 CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the worldwide epidemic of drug trafficking and drug abuse continues to intensify at an alarming rate, and the associated problems of crime, corruption, and terrorism have reached epidemic proportions. Reports released earlier this year by the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB), the Department of State, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, on which I serve as the ranking minority member, all attest to this situation. It is clear that the produc-

tion and trafficking of drugs, financed by organized crime, is undermining the political, economic, and social institutions of the entire international community. Despite the efforts of this Nation to assist drug producing countries to reduce an eliminate the illicit production of drugs, we expected more drugs than ever before to be produced this year and to be available throughout every city, town, and school district in our Nation.

The international drug trafficking syndicates use their vast profits to develop sophisticated techniques to cultivate, process, and market illicit narcotics. These profits allow them to assemble the most modern boats, aircraft, radar, and other equipment to conduct their clandestine operations. Many nations are beginning to take positive steps against drug trafficking and drug production within their own borders. For example, under the leadership of President Belesario Betancur of Colombia, since mid-1984, that government has begun an intensive campaign against drug traffickers. It has destroyed numerous cocaine processing laboratories and seized more than 37 tons of coca/cocaine and thousands of tons of marijuana. In addition, it has extradited several drug traffickers wanted in the United States, which to date has already resulted in one conviction.

Actions such as those taken in Colombia have led to increased frustration by the drug traffickers, including increased acts of terrorism. The Minister of Justice of Colombia has been murdered, coca eradication and crop substitution specialists in Peru have been gunned down, our embassies have been bombed, hit squads have been sent to our shores, and a price tag has been placed on the head of our drug law enforcement officials by the drug traffickers.

It is also significant that drug producing nations are beginning to feel the impact of drug abuse and the corruptive influence of the drug traffickers in their own countries. In Burma, Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, Mexico, Pakistan, and Thailand, drug abuse has become a serious problem, and this in abuse is leading drug producing nations to the unavoidable conclusion that drug production must be brought under control.

In order to overcome the global menace of drug abuse and narcotics trafficking, it is essential that all nations of the world join together in a coordinated and cooperative effort to combat illicit drug production and drug trafficking. A key element in any such worldwide effort is the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control [UNFDAC]. Since its establishment in 1971, UNFDAC has been instrumental in calling attention to the needs of the world community in fighting the deadly scourge of drug trafficking and

drug abuse. Under the very capable leadership of executive Director, Dr. Giuseppe di Gennaro, the Fund is currently developing projects to control the illicit production of coca in the sub-Andean region of South America. These special projects are the direct result of a 5-year, \$41 million pledge from the Government of Italy, which is to be commended for its most generous contribution to UNFDAC. Both the Government of Italy and Dr. di Gennaro are also to be commended for their dedicated efforts to combat drug trafficking and drug abuse.

Despite these worthy actions, contributions to UNFDAC by many nations are nominal, and in some cases nonexistent. In 1981, only 35 of the 157 member nations of the United Nations contributed a total of \$4.9 billion to the Fund, which when combined with private contributions of \$754,150, equaled a total of \$5.6 million. In 1982, 42 nations contributed a meager \$6.7 million to the Fund; private donations amounted to \$581,929 for a grand total of only \$7.3 million. In 1983, the number of nations contributing to the U.N. Drug Fund dropped to 28, and collectively they pledged a paltry \$3.7 million. When combined with private contributions of \$255,953, the total for 1983 amounted to a mere \$3.9 million.

In 1984, the number of nations declined to a record low of 17 or less than 11 percent of the 159 member nations of the United Nations. Although the amount contributed increased to slightly more than \$8 million—\$8,028,926—when combined with private donations and interest of \$561,654, the global "war" on drugs amounted to only \$8,590,580. The bulk of the increase, however, can be attributed to two nations: Italy and the United States, which contributed \$7.3 million or 91 percent.

At the November 1984 United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities, the number of nations that pledged to contribute to UNFDAC increased to 25 or less than 16 percent of the United Nations membership, with contributions amounting to a meager \$2,357,950—hardly enough to purchase a sophisticated high-speed coastal patrol boat.

At a time when international drug syndicates are reaping huge profits from their illicit activities and continue to undermine the social, economic, and political institutions of the international community, anything less than total support of UNFDAC by nations of the international community raises serious questions about our resolve in fighting this global drug menace. Annually scrapping together between \$4 million and \$8 million by the entire world community is not the way to effectively conduct a "global war" on drug trafficking and drug abuse. In this regard, nations of the world must intensify their commit-

ment to waging "war" on drugs by developing a global drug strategy and by providing the funds, personnel, equipment, and resources to implement that strategy.

Finally, it is important that other U.N. agencies intensify their drug-related efforts and devote greater resources to the issues of drug abuse. The World Health Organization [WHO], the International Labor Organization [ILO], the Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO], and the United National Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO] must elevate drug-related activities to a top priority on their agency programs. In addition, we must change the current practice in which UNFDAC underwrites significant portions of the drug-related activities of the WHO, the ILO, the FAO, and UNESCO. It is time for these organizations to fund their drug-related activities out of their own regular budgets rather than relying on UNFDAC's scarce dollars derived by the voluntary contributions of member nations to support their activities.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to inform my colleagues on the level of contributions to the U.N. Fund for Drug Abuse Control and to urge them to continue to support the vital work of this organization, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD four documents: A status report of cash contributions or pledges received during the years 1971-83; a status report of cash contributions pledged or received during 1984, as of October 31, 1984; a report on pledges announced for 1985 at the United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities, November 7-8, 1984; and a report of UNFDAC funding and expenditures for other U.N. drug-related agencies.

Annex I.—United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control—Status of cash contributions pledged or received during the years 1971-83 as of October 31, 1984¹

[1971-83 contributions in US dollars]

Algeria.....	7,995
Argentina.....	86,000
Australia.....	2,127,877
Austria.....	516,937
Bahamas.....	5,000
Barbados.....	1,750
Belgium.....	167,503
Benin.....	1,667
Bolivia.....	6,000
Brazil.....	48,000
Canada.....	2,104,541
Chile.....	27,500
Cyprus.....	6,582
Denmark.....	433,026
Egypt.....	4,000
Finland.....	156,053
France.....	1,388,646
Germany, Federal Republic of.....	9,361,257
Greece.....	23,799
Guyana.....	487
Holy See.....	1,000
Hong Kong.....	172,907
Iceland.....	23,900
India.....	42,000
Indonesia.....	8,000

Iran.....	43,715
Iraq.....	20,032
Ireland.....	20,000
Israel.....	4,500
Italy.....	953,161
Ivory Coast.....	1,211
Jamaica.....	7,505
Japan.....	2,705,682
Jordan.....	2,000
Kenya.....	24,386
Kuwait.....	26,000
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.....	16,460
Liechtenstein.....	6,000
Luxembourg.....	1,000
Madagascar.....	6,400
Malawi.....	1,014
Malaysia.....	21,500
Malta.....	2,580
Mauritius.....	3,338
Mexico.....	10,000
Morocco.....	29,275
New Zealand.....	311,223
Nigeria.....	14,778
Norway.....	8,014,740
Oman.....	997
Pakistan.....	5,546
Panama.....	2,470
Philippines.....	17,979
Portugal.....	19,000
Qatar.....	62,000
Republic of Korea.....	13,500
Rwanda.....	1,066
San Marino.....	1,500
Saudi Arabia.....	657,000
Senegal.....	6,204
Singapore.....	3,000
South Africa.....	52,474
Spain.....	20,000
Sri Lanka.....	500
Sudan.....	1,000
Suriname.....	2,000
Sweden.....	3,776,873
Switzerland.....	340,379
Thailand.....	9,000
Togo.....	652
Trinidad and Tobago.....	1,000
Tunisia.....	17,342
Turkey.....	39,773
United Arab Republic.....	12,000
United Kingdom.....	936,347
United Republic of Cameroon.....	4,504
United States of America.....	35,270,000
Uruguay.....	1,000
Venezuela.....	16,000
Viet Nam.....	1,000
Yugoslavia.....	69,288
Zaire.....	500
Total.....	70,330,821
Public donations.....	2,543,449
Interest income (31.12.83).....	4,156,683
Grand total.....	77,030,953

¹ This cumulative list shows all contributions pledged or received during the period 1971-83 irrespective of the year of application.

Annex II.—United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control.—Status of cash contributions pledged or received during 1984 as at October 31, 1984¹

¹ List showing contributions pledged or, in the absence of a pledge, received during the first 9 months of 1984.

[1984 contributions in US dollars]

Barbados.....	250
Canada.....	241,723
Greece.....	2,000
Hong Kong.....	12,791
Ireland.....	5,000
Israel.....	4,764
Italy.....	4,802,000
Malta.....	215
Mexico.....	706
New Zealand.....	23,652

Norway.....	51,367
Saudi Arabia.....	50,000
Sweden.....	37,229
Switzerland.....	34,523
United Kingdom.....	260,370
United Republic of Cameroon.....	2,336
United States of America.....	2,500,000

Total.....	8,028,926
Public donations.....	175,476
Known interest income in 1984.....	386,178
Grand total.....	8,590,580

ANNEX IV.—UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR DRUG ABUSE CONTROL—1983 FUNDING AND EXPENDITURE BY EXECUTING AGENCIES

[In thousands of U.S. dollars]

Agencies	Program ¹		Expenditure	
	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of program
DND.....	\$3,170	34.5	\$3,027	95.5
ILO.....	150	1.6	33	21.8
FAO.....	513	5.6	290	56.5
WHO.....	743	8.0	502	67.5
UNSDRI.....	74	0.8	55	74.3
UNESCO.....	208	2.3	173	83.2
UN/DTCD.....	62	0.7	27	43.6
ILANUD.....	23	0.3	22	95.7
UNDP/OPE.....	2,703	29.4	1,347	49.9
Subtotal.....	7,646	83.2	5,476	71.6
Grants to non-UN organizations.....	45	0.5	44	97.8
UNDP/UNFAC working arrangement.....	735	8.0	631	85.9
UNFAC ²	764	8.3	645	84.4
Total.....	9,190	100.0	6,796	73.9

¹ Figures based on approved allocations of funds.

² Includes UNFAC Administration and evaluation of projects.

Annex V.—United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control—Pledges Announced for 1985 at the U.N. Pledging Conference for Development Activities (November 7-8, 1984)

Country or area	
Australia.....	\$126,050
Austria.....	69,767
Cameroon, Republic of.....	2,128
Chile.....	5,000
Denmark.....	13,455
Ecuador.....	2,500
Egypt.....	1,000
France.....	159,575
Germany, Fed. Republic of.....	728,477
Iceland.....	2,000
India.....	10,000
Indonesia.....	2,000
Italy.....	263,158
Jamaica.....	235
Kenya.....	3,660
Madagascar.....	2,000
Malaysia.....	8,500
Norway.....	677,966
Pakistan.....	1,754
Panama.....	2,470
Saudi Arabia.....	50,000
Spain.....	36,235
Switzerland.....	36,000
Turkey.....	15,570
Yugoslavia.....	6,000
Total.....	2,225,500

SBA OK'D LOANS TO COMPANIES LINKED TO ALLEGED MOB FIGURES

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I submitted for the RECORD part 1 of a five-part investigative series by Newsday on improper loan practices involving Long Island businesses which were financed by the Small Business Administration. Today, I would like to submit part 2 of that series, published in the May 6 issue of Newsday, while reiterating that I do not believe the questionable activities outlined in these articles are widespread. However, at a time when we can no longer afford to overlook wasteful Federal programs, it is important that we examine the deficiencies in the SBA to make certain that the agency's programs are serving a public need, rather than creating more inefficiency in the Federal bureaucracy.

[From Newsday, May 6, 1985]

SBA OK'D LOANS TO COMPANIES LINKED TO ALLEGED MOB FIGURES

(This is the second in a five-part series on publicly financed small business loans, the result of a 13-month investigation by reporters Brian Donovan and Bob Porterfield of the Newsday investigative team. More than 5,000 documents were examined and 120 persons interviewed. The series was written by Donovan.)

While various federal agencies fight organized-crime figures on Long Island, another one sometimes helps finance them: the Small Business Administration.

A Newsday investigation has found loans totaling \$1,635,000 from the SBA to at least six Long Island companies that have been linked to reputed organized-crime figures and their business associates.

All of these loans have become problems for the SBA—and the taxpayers—and the agency's handling of the loans illustrates some of the shortcomings that congressional investigators have found in SBA procedures around the country.

For example:

The SBA loaned \$500,000 to an East Islip car dealership without asking questions that might have disclosed the financial interest of Michael Franzese, named by federal prosecutors as one of Long Island's major organized-crime figures. After a few payments, the SBA loan went into default.

The SBA granted a series of loans on a Smithtown restaurant despite its well-publicized history of mob involvement and defaulting on debts. SBA officials say that a \$350,000 loan on the restaurant is now delinquent, but the agency has negotiated away its first claim on the collateral.

The SBA loaned \$150,000 to a Huntington car lot run by a Franzese associate, Donald Pumalo, without checking to see if he had the required state car-dealer's license, which he didn't. The loan helped keep Pumalo's corporation in business while he used the company to defraud a bank. He then defaulted on the SBA loan, leaving the agency no collateral.

The SBA loaned \$150,000 to a St. James car lot, Auto Omni Inc., without discovering that its owner had a criminal record. When Auto Omni defaulted on the loan, another firm in which the owner was involved got a second \$150,000 SBA loan for a car lot at the same address. That company defaulted as well, leaving the SBA with no collateral for either loan.

The SBA loaned \$250,000 to a Dix Hills country club run by Salvatore Avellino, since accused of being a mob soldier. Half of the money was supposed to have been used to put up a building. But when Avellino defaulted, the SBA found it couldn't foreclose because its collateral didn't include the land under the building.

In some of these cases, deeper background checks could have established the criminal records or associations of the loan applicants. In other instances, closer attention to such basic procedures as verifying required business licenses and securing loan collateral could have prevented losses to applicants whose criminal activities or associations did not become apparent until long after the loans were granted.

Such cases, to be sure, represent only a small fraction of the hundreds of loans the SBA makes on Long Island, and SBA officials say they do not knowingly make loans to mob-connected businesses. Fraud against lending institutions is one of the specialties of organized crime, and SBA officials say it is not surprising that their agency sometimes gets stung.

But the extent of this sting on Long Island remains in question. SBA officials have refused to release key records on these loans and others suspected of similar links to the underworld. Walter Leavitt, who heads the SBA's Long Island office in Melville, repeatedly said he was under orders not to discuss details of how these loans and others were granted.

The SBA has denied Newsday access to its records on failed loans, despite a federal court ruling that such files are public. Some records were obtained by Newsday under the Freedom of Information Act. But key passages were censored. Information for this article has been assembled from public documents, interviews, and fragmentary SBA records obtained through other channels.

Leavitt said mob-related loans discovered by Newsday do not indicate that SBA operations here are more lax than elsewhere. Ever since the SBA went into business in 1953, periodic scandals have erupted around the country over loans to mobsters and their companies.

"I think it's happened all over the SBA, nationwide," Leavitt said. "Any organization that deals in money has problems, whether it's a bank, the SBA, a finance company, anybody. There are guys sitting up nights trying to figure out ways to get something for nothing. Things, do go through the cracks, and we make mistakes."

Nevertheless, practices leading to such mistakes have been documented repeatedly in reports by congressional committees and the SBA's own inspector general. They include granting loans not backed by adequate collateral, relying too heavily on investigations of applicants by banks granting SBA-guaranteed loans, and failing to monitor collateral so it doesn't disappear when loans go bad.

For instance, the General Accounting Office, the investigative arm of Congress, reported in 1981 that "SBA routinely honors the guarantee agreement with par-

ticipating banks without knowing the existence, condition and location of collateral pledged to secure the loan." Only 4.6 percent of the collateral's stated value was recovered in the loan sample cited by the GAO.

In 1983, the SBA inspector-general's office, which investigates mismanagement and corruption in the agency, criticized the New York district office, which includes Long Island: "The major causes attributable to the New York District Office of troubled loans were inadequate loan processing and, to a limited extent, closing and servicing practices, making possible loan actions based on incomplete and inadequate documentation and analysis, contrary to agency policies and procedures."

The inspector general's office, however, is not without its own problems. Until last year, when Newsday began looking into the SBA, the agency had only one investigator from the inspector general's office assigned to the New York metropolitan area. Now, the New York office has three investigators to monitor one of the nation's major centers of business—and organized crime.

SBA officials say they have no system of liaison with local or state law enforcement agencies. The agency's only method for screening loan applicants for criminal connections is to send principals' names to Washington for an FBI computer check. "It's not foolproof," Leavitt said. He also said that added checks with local law enforcement and regulatory agencies would strengthen the loan procedure. But, he added, such a policy would have to be implemented on a national basis.

A problem in the past, said Leavitt, has been pressure under previous administrations to make as many loans as possible. "... We had quotas. You didn't make your loans, you'd get calls from Washington saying: 'What are you guys doing up there?'"

When a mob-connected company defaults on its SBA financing and goes out of business, the damage often goes beyond the loss to the taxpayers. Typically, the company also fails to pay its suppliers, which may be other small businesses unable to survive the loss, and runs up delinquent balances with utilities, insurance, workers compensation and state and local taxes—all losses that ultimately are passed on to the public.

RUMPLIK CHEVROLET

As business associates, Walter Doner and Michael Franzese seemed a mismatch. A casting director might choose Doner to play an "Our Town" sort of character: the affable, folksy, small-town car dealer, active in Rotary, Chamber of Commerce, Little League, a trustee of his church.

For Franzese, the role would likely be cast to type: the streetwise son of a prominent gangster, handsome, articulate, his manner alternately charming and steely, outspokenly bitter toward the government, veteran of several brushes with the law, target of an extensive federal investigation into his business dealings.

Franzese, identified by federal prosecutors as a soldier in the Colombo crime family, denies any connection with organized crime. He was recently acquitted on loan-sharking charges and says he is the victim of the federal government's enmity toward his father: John Franzese; known as Sonny, a reputed Colombo family captain.

Mismatched or not, Doner and Franzese were the main players in a chain of events that included a defaulted \$500,000 SBA loan and the financial collapse of one of East

Islip's older businesses, a 58-year old Chevrolet dealership, Rumpalik Chevrolet, of which Doner was president. The collapse also cost about 25 people their jobs and left behind at least \$300,000 in unpaid debts.

Now Doner, who already is under indictment for tax evasion, says prosecutors have told him that he and Franzese will be named in another indictment. "Part of it is SBA fraud," Doner said, adding he believed neither he or nor Franzese did anything wrong. Franzese invested \$100,000 in the business, borrowing the money from a bank and never repaying the loan.

Walter Leavitt, who heads the SBA's Long Island office in Melville, said the agency had no idea of Franzese's involvement. His name is not on the 1982 loan application. "If I had seen that any place, it would have jumped off the page," Leavitt said. Federal sources said that Michael Franzese has been considered an organized-crime figure by the FBI for the past six years.

Although the SBA has refused to release the Rumpalik file, records obtained by Newsday show that the agency did not ask a key question that could have revealed Franzese's interest. Part of the loan was to start a car-leasing business at the agency. For tax purposes, car dealers generally form separate corporations to handle leasing. Nowhere in the voluminous SBA paperwork was Doner asked whether he would actually own the leasing corporation. That corporation was owned by Franzese.

The Rumpalik loan was a government-guaranteed loan made by the Money Store of New York, an SBA-certified lending institution then headed by Steven Gurian. Yesterday Newsday reported that Gurian, who also heads the Long Island Development Corp., has been involved in business dealings considered improper by senior SBA officials. But the SBA has refused to give Newsday a list of SBA-guaranteed loans made by the Money Store or any other SBA lending institution, calling the information proprietary.

Gurian told Newsday he had no direct role in recommending approval of the loan. "I can't tell you any of the details," he said. SBA records, however, show that Gurian attended a meeting to work out problems with the loan and wrote the SBA a letter urging approval.

Gurian also said that he had never heard of Michael Franzese. But Franzese told Newsday he had met Gurian socially at Raneri's Restaurant in Smithtown. When Franzese decided to get involved with Rumpalik, he said, he arranged for Doner to meet with Gurian. "I worked out a deal with Wally where I would get all the leasing business out of Rumpalik Chevrolet," Franzese said. He said he had Doner meet with the restaurant's proprietor, Peter Raneri, whom he knew was friendly with Gurian. At the time, Raneri was deeply involved with organized-crime figures who helped financed his restaurant. Gurian acknowledged that Raneri brought Doner to him.

As the Money Store and SBA processed the application, some irregularities emerged. Doner told officials his previous partner in the car agency, Thomas O'Donnell, had embezzled \$165,000 from the business, then paid it back in return for an agreement he wouldn't be prosecuted. (O'Donnell is in prison on an unrelated conviction and could not be reached for comment.) The business had tax liens against it, and the first loan closing had to be cancelled when the tax debts turned out to be greater than the application stated.

Nevertheless, Leavitt said, the SBA approved the loan because officials considered the real estate to be excellent collateral and because of Rumpalik's long reputation in the community. After only four payments, however, the loan went into default.

Franzese and Doner acknowledged in interviews that some money from Rumpalik went to other corporations owned by Franzese. Both said they could not recall exact sums, although Doner said one such transfer was \$40,000. But they described these transfers as repayments of loans from Franzese, and they blamed the business' collapse on corporate debts previously run up by O'Donnell. Doner said Franzese was not responsible for Rumpalik's collapse. "I like Michael," he said. "He did nothing to hurt me."

The Town of Islip has bought the foreclosed Rumpalik building for \$615,000, more than enough to satisfy the SBA loan. Gurian and Leavitt cite this as evidence that the taxpayers' interests were adequately protected. But the SBA procedures that allowed Franzese's interest to go undetected remain unchanged.

RANERI'S RESTAURANT

SBA critics in Congress question the agency's practices of making repeated loans to the same financially shaky business. The new SBA loan is used, completely or in part, to pay off an older, delinquent SBA loan. That makes the SBA's lending record look better—clearing its portfolio, at least temporarily, of a bad loan. The practice, however, often puts the business into even worse straits, since the company assumes a bigger debt and, often, a higher interest rate.

The SBA's loans to Raneri's Restaurant and its successor corporation, Chateau Rose, offer an example. Although the SBA barred reporters from the loan files, Newsday found that the agency continued lending to the restaurant even after Peter Raneri's involvement with mob figures—and his debts to loan sharks—were extensively publicized. Then, when Raneri's delinquent SBA debt was assumed by new owners operating as Chateau Rose, the SBA relinquished its first claim on the best collateral: the land and restaurant building on a choice corner of busy Jericho Turnpike in Smithtown.

When Raneri got his first SBA loan in 1977 for a new restaurant building, he was a well-known, popular restaurateur. He had received considerable publicity for resisting threats and vandalism from mob figures. His tires were slashed, his windshield broken, and he told friends that he and his children had been threatened.

Raneri attributed the problems to his choice of a building contractor. The contractor was Ronald Parr, who had cooperated with Newsday and police to thwart mob infiltration of a horse racing track, now defunct, that Parr had built in Yaphank. Raneri got his first SBA loan for \$350,000 through Gurian's Long Island Economic Development Corp., an SBA-certified development corporation.

Raneri later testified that he started borrowing from loan sharks in 1976, a year before he got the SBA loan. The loan sharks were Leopold Ladenhauf and Michael Crimi. Police, however, said the money came from Pasquale Macchiarole, a Genovese crime-family captain. Macchiarole installed his own manager at the restaurant. Later, Crimi was convicted of usury and sentenced to five years' probation for the Raneri loans. Raneri testified that the loans totaled

\$91,000 and that he had to repay \$140,000 with weekly \$2,200 payments.

The year 1978 brought a blizzard of fresh publicity for Raneri's Restaurant. Macchiarole and Ladenhauf were found murdered. With Ladenhauf's body, police found a document signed by Raneri in which he agreed to turn over the restaurant to Ladenhauf and Crimi if he failed to make his payments. Crimi was indicted for Ladenhauf's murder (he was eventually acquitted), and Newsday published stories detailing Raneri's involvement with loan sharks.

Nevertheless, the SBA approved a second loan, for \$85,000, to Raneri in May, 1979. Walter Leavitt, head of the SBA's Long Island office, said he did not know why the loan was granted despite the restaurant's known mob connections. By late 1981, according to an SBA memo, Raneri was bouncing checks, both on suppliers and the SBA. He was so far behind in payments on his 1977 SBA loan of \$350,000 that he owed \$152,413.81 in delinquent interest alone.

At this point, the SBA held a first mortgage on the property, valued at about \$800,000, and could have foreclosed. But SBA documents obtained by Newsday show that the agency instead accepted a proposal by Raneri that new owners, Chateau Rose Inc., take over the restaurant with new SBA financing.

The SBA approved a new \$350,000 loan. Leavitt refused to release records or answer questions on exactly how the money was disbursed, but Newsday learned that \$52,432 went to repay Raneri's 1979 SBA loan and that the interest payments on his 1977 SBA loan were brought up to date.

The SBA's assistant branch manager, David Offenber, wrote that by allowing the deal, "we will bring our loan current plus keep a business in existence, which is our purpose." But the SBA also relinquished its status as first-mortgage holder on the building and property to a Fort Lee, N.J., funding company that was loaning Chateau Rose an extra \$350,000. Now, SBA officials say that the Chateau Rose loan is delinquent, and they are not certain how much the government will recover from its secondary lien on the collateral.

Chateau Rose's owner, Victor Prague, blamed his financial troubles partly on the 22 percent interest he said he had to pay the Fort Lee company.

CARS GALORE

When Donald Pumalo opened his used-car lot, Cars Galore, in Huntington, he didn't bother getting the required state license for used-car dealers. And when the SBA granted Cars Galore a \$150,000 loan, the agency never bothered checking with the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Although the SBA regularly finances automobile-related businesses on Long Island, the agency has no system for checking their status with DMV, which licenses all dealers and repair shops and keeps records of disciplinary proceedings. "It never occurred to me," Leavitt said.

Pumalo, who law enforcement officials say is an associate of Michael Franzese, has worked in Franzese's various automobile businesses. But Franzese said he had no financial interest in Cars Galore and no involvement with the SBA loan. "You wouldn't want an interest in anything he does because you're going to wind up in trouble," Franzese said. "Not because he's a criminal, but because he's just a typical used-car salesman, and he's a schemer." Pumalo has moved to Florida and could not be located for comment.

While Pumalo was getting the SBA loan in 1978, he was using the corporation to defraud Chemical Bank of \$53,000 through phony installment-loan contracts for non-existent people and cars, according to a 25-count indictment filed against him in 1981. He pleaded guilty to third-degree grand larceny and was sentenced to a year in jail. The same year, the SBA wrote off its loan as uncollectable, with \$148,988 still owed. The agency refuses to release records showing why the loss was not offset by collateral. When Pumalo got out of jail, he became the used-car manager for Rumpalik Chevrolet.

THE AVENI BROTHERS

Joseph S. Aveni used to deal in stolen auto parts, but that was before he and his brother discovered the SBA.

In 1971, Suffolk police arrested Aveni as a partner in a Medford chop shop: a wrecking yard where stolen late-model cars were stripped for their parts. Although police estimated the sales at \$10,000 a week, Aveni was fined \$100 for possession of stolen property.

From 1975 to 1977, Joseph Aveni ran a Mazda dealership in Hempstead, then sold it to Michael Franzese and opened a car lot in St. James, Auto Omni Inc.

Auto Omni promptly got a \$150,000 SBA loan. In 1978, a used-car business at the same address, ARJ Motors Inc., applied for another \$150,000 SBA loan. This time the principal was listed on the SBA application as Ross Aveni, although DMV records show that Joseph Aveni was an authorized agent for the company. The second loan also was approved. Both went into default, with \$277,524 still owed. A federal source said that no collateral was ever collected; Leavitt has refused to comment. Since then, the Avenis have been convicted and fined \$1,000 each for altering odometers at Auto Omni. Ross Aveni also was arrested on charges of possessing gambling equipment when police raided what they said was a mob-connected casino, but the charges were dismissed.

Why would the SBA loan this kind of money to a man with a criminal record? The Avenis did not return calls, and Leavitt said he did not know. But a law enforcement source said that any screening system that relies solely on the FBI's Washington computer is bound to miss some local convictions.

HALF HOLLOW HILLS COUNTRY CLUB

It was also in 1981 that Salvatore Avellino Jr. defaulted on a \$250,000 SBA loan, leaving \$205,067 in principal and \$116,431 in interest unpaid. Avellino, owner of Salem Sanitary Carting Corp., has long been prominent in carting-industry trade groups. According to law enforcement, he also is prominent in organized crime.

Avellino, identified by federal officials as a Luchese crime family soldier, is close to the family's current boss, Antonio Corallo, better known as Tony Ducks. A government bug in Avellino's Jaguar recorded conversations with Corallo that led to what authorities call the most significant mob case in years: the recent indictment of members of the Cosa Nostra "commission" that allegedly controls the New York area's five mob families.

The SBA loan was for the Half Hollow Hills Country Club in Dix Hills. Leavitt would not discuss the loan in detail but said \$125,000 of the loan was for a new building and the rest "to acquire land and equipment to become a fully operational public golf course, nine hole, and tennis court facility." But investigators who have examined the

building—an unheated storage shed about the size of a three-car garage—say it probably cost no more than \$10,000 to build. And deed records show that Avellino never bought the land. He ran the club for a few years as a tenant, then went out of business. That left the SBA with the right to foreclose on the shed, but only by removing it from the property. The golf course is now being operated under different management.

Avellino, currently under a bribery indictment, has not replied to several requests for an interview. Leavitt said the SBA is still trying to negotiate a settlement. "Now, with his other problems, I don't know where we're going to come out," Leavitt said. "But I wouldn't hold my breath." ●

A TRIBUTE TO THE CALIFORNIA VETERANS COALITION

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity now to commend the work of the California Veterans Coalition, a Statewide community based veterans services organization headquartered in San Francisco that is working on behalf of veterans of the Vietnam War. The coalition's efforts especially stand out for their work of providing educational and health services for those veterans who have been exposed to the chemically laced dioxin, agent orange.

The agent orange problem is one more sad story in the Vietnam affair. Today, 10 years after all U.S. troops have been pulled out of Saigon, there is still a legacy of hurt and pain. Many of our soldiers, marines, sailors, and airmen have been exposed to potentially life-threatening chemicals emitted from our own weapons—yet the U.S. Government still moves at a snail-like pace in acknowledging the wrong and responding properly to this public health crisis. Agent orange is a real health danger in San Francisco, the State of California, and the entire Nation for that matter. Finally, during the 98th congressional session, Congress did at last pass the "Veterans Dioxin and Radiation Exposure Compensation Standards Act." This piece of legislation was signed into law on October 24, 1984. Its purpose is to assure compensation to veterans and their survivors for disabilities on death related situations based on sound scientific and medical evidence.

The California Veterans Coalition has been very active here in San Francisco in helping to locate former military service personnel along with civilians who also served in Vietnam for the interest of the U.S. Government. The coalition is also working to establish prototype procedures for the Veteran's Administration to work cooperatively with local groups to help

place appropriate veterans on the agent orange registry. If our former service personnel have been exposed to dioxin herbicide, they must be provided with proper health education and medical services to best offset any related health problems.

The California Veterans Coalition will be performing vital information and referral services in low- to moderate-income areas; six major ones located in the city and county of San Francisco. It is in such income areas that adequate health services are frequently unavailable or especially lacking. The group will advise veterans in the detection and prevention of agent orange associated with health problems. Ex-Vietnam soldiers, marines, sailors, and airmen will be informed by specialized tests and screenings conducted by both private and public agencies. This is part of the group's effort to put together a veterans health care network linked to the local city and county health care system.

More than 200,000 veterans nationwide have independently received physical examinations and filed with the Veteran's Administration. This number is a mere pittance in terms of the 2.5-3 million exposure level. In helping to monitor this sad story, the California Veterans Coalition is performing a vital service for some of the most recent generation of armed forces personnel to serve in or support U.S. combat involvement. Like other sad stories from the Vietnam affair, this one will not go away. But we need to recognize the problem, and provide the best possible services to those and their families who are suffering as a result of that conflict. ●

EDUCATION AND HOUSING SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

HON. DAN COATS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, each stage of our life is marked by very distinct goals. In our youth, we anticipate furthering our education to develop necessary intellectual skills for future job employment. As young adults, we look forward to buying our first home. And in later years, we hope to enjoy a secure and comfortable retirement.

We have already seen the positive response of the country to individual retirement accounts [IRA's]. Unfortunately, ever-increasing education and housing costs, high interest rates, and a low rate of savings has made it increasingly difficult for potential college students and prospective first time homebuyers.

For this reason, I am introducing legislation which would create an education savings account and a housing

saving account, based on the IRA principle. Under this legislation, tax deductible contributions to a trust account will accumulate interest tax free for a period of time and then must be used to finance education of the purchase of a first home.

The Education Savings Account would permit potential college students and their families to deposit up to \$1,000 per year in a trust account to cover the educational expenses of higher education. Funds in the account would have to be spent on education before the student's 27th birthday, or the money would be returned to the contributors, placed in another education account, or donated to an educational institution.

The housing savings account would allow a prospective first time homebuyer, or parents and friends, to contribute up to \$1,500 per year or \$3,000 per year in the case of a married couple, over a 10-year period toward a tax-free account. Funds would be used as a downpayment on a first home by the 10th year. One-tenth of the amount would be added to the user's gross income for each of the following 10 years after purchase, thus providing tax repayment to the Treasury.

I urge my colleagues to assist prospective college students and first time homebuyers by cosponsoring my legislation. Help restore the American dream of a college education and homeownership. ●

SOVIET PROPAGANDA

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union is continuing its unjust and immoral war in Afghanistan to this day. Yet, instead of telling the Soviet people the truth about their overt campaign of military aggression against the people of that once peaceful land, Soviet propagandists tell them lies; they attempt, albeit unsuccessfully, to blame their cold-blooded and ruthless policies on the United States and its support for Afghan mujahiddeen "bandits." Recently in *Izvestiya*, in an article entitled "Aggressors and Hypocrites," one author wrote about "American imperialism's dirty war against Afghanistan* * *", and about "The cries being committed in Afghanistan by the guns of bandit rebels armed and trained by Pentagon and CIA 'instructors'* * *."

Mr. Speaker, instead of putting out lies such as this—we all know the Afghan mujahiddeen, are fighting a just and moral war of national liberation—Soviet leaders and propagandists would better serve their citizens by giving them a dose of what is really

going on in that country. This is easily accomplished; all they have to do is to reprint quotes from young Soviet soldiers who, after coming to Afghanistan to fight alleged CIA and Chinese mercenaries, found only Afghan nationals struggling for freedom, and decided to defect. Take, for example, the case of Vladislav Naumov, who defected in 1983:

People (in the Soviet Union) learn virtually nothing about the unjust war from newspapers and magazines* * * the war is only known to those people who have been directly affected by the Afghan problem—the soldiers themselves and the mothers who are the recipients of the white zinc coffins.

This young soldier also said:

Of course, the (Soviet) soldiers are unhappy with the war and with Afghanistan on the whole. I believe that if this continues much longer, the results will be very costly for those who have cooked up this mess* * * It is now time to pay attention to Afghanistan. What is needed is only a beginning and then, I think, the soldiers themselves will start joining the insurgents.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, contrary to the absurd claims in the Soviet press about U.S. responsibility for the Afghan tragedy, it is the Soviet Union's own policies of unjust and ruthless aggression which are responsible for the bloodletting in that South Asian land. As Aleksander Solzhenitsyn said, "Terror is inextricably linked to the lie."

FROM USIA: SOVIET PROPAGANDA ALERT No. 25—APRIL 15, 1985

"America's Dirty War Against Afghanistan." Moscow sought to lay the blame for the continuing struggle in Afghanistan squarely on U.S. support for Afghan "bandits." In an article entitled "Aggressors and Hypocrites" published in *Izvestiya* (March 1), for example, Melor Sturua wrote:

"American imperialism's dirty war against Afghanistan is already in its seventh year. It started immediately after the historic April Revolution, which opened a new chapter in the history of an ancient people. But that is the custom: As soon as the people of some country or other—it does not matter in what part of the world—become the masters of their own destiny, they rapidly become a target for Washington* * *"

"The Crimes being committed in Afghanistan by the guns of bandit rebels armed and trained by Pentagon and CIA 'instructors' are monstrous. But the label 'Made in USA' is not only attached to the instruments of death. It is printed on the whole Afghan tragedy, on the whole destabilizing U.S. policy in the region, on what is being done in Pakistan* * *"

The Soviet media repeatedly warned Pakistan of the dangers of abetting Afghan resistance forces and of serving U.S. interests.●

HISTORY IN THE HOUSE

HON. LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite everyone to visit the

crypt area on the first floor of the Capitol to see the beautifully restored Indian and Hunter Clock. This marvelous piece graced this Chamber prior to the 1948 remodeling. It provides a bit of a feel for the former beauty of this room.

The April edition of "History in the House" contains an article on the clock as well as a very interesting article on the history of the House Chamber itself. "History in the House" is published by the Office for the Bicentennial which serves as a clearing house for historical information on the House of Representatives.

I would like to include the April edition at this point.

[From the History in the House, April 1985]

THE CHAMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Chamber of the House of Representatives has been the scene of dramatic events in United States history, and the Chamber itself is an important symbol of this nation's heritage. Many visitors are unaware of the rich and colorful history of the Chamber, so this issue of *History in the House* will feature the story of the room itself.

Kings, queens, presidents, prime ministers, astronauts, poets, military leaders, and historians have all addressed the Congress from this spot. U.S. Presidents since Woodrow Wilson have delivered their annual State of the Union addresses in the present House Chamber. Here, on April 17, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson asked Congress to declare war on Germany. Here President Franklin D. Roosevelt delivered his war message on December 8, 1941, the day after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Eleven days later Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain, made the first of his two addresses before a Joint Meeting. Here in 1951 General Douglas MacArthur delivered his famous line, "Old soldiers never die, they just fade away." On December 6, 1973, Vice President Gerald R. Ford took the oath of office in the House Chamber in which he had served as a Member of Congress for twenty-four years.

The House of Representatives has been meeting in its present hall for 128 years, outgrowing its previous chamber, now known as the Old Hall of the House or Statuary Hall. As the nation grew, so did the size of the House. In the 50 years it had met in the original south wing, the House had increased from 142 Members in 1807 to 237 Members after the 1850 census.

On July 4, 1851—the 75th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence—President Millard Fillmore laid the cornerstone for a new House wing in a Masonic ceremony using the same gavel and apron that George Washington had used in 1793 to lay the original cornerstone of the Capitol. Secretary of State Daniel Webster delivered a two-hour oration in which he reflected on the growth of the new nation, evoked the spirit of George Washington, and quoted Cicero (in Latin) to the throng of thousands.

The plans for the extension of the Capitol and its new cast iron dome were drawn up by Thomas U. Walter, a Philadelphia architect. Most of the construction work was completed under the jurisdiction of the Department of War, supervised by Captain Montgomery C. Meigs, an army engineer and one of the ablest graduates of the

United States Military Academy at West Point. Meigs modified the Walter design and relocated the House Chamber in the center of the wing to achieve better heating and ventilation.

The House of Representatives first convened in the present Chamber on December 16, 1857. The Chamber's appearance gradually changed with the times. Electricity was added to the Chamber in the 1890s and air conditioning followed in the 1930s. Members used to sit at individual desks in the Chamber. But with the completion of the House Office Building in 1909 (now called the Cannon Building), Members had their own offices for the first time. Desks took up too much space, so they were replaced with benches in 1913. Two of the original desks and a chair, designed by Thomas U. Walter, are now located in the Speaker's Lobby. Since 1901 the flag behind the Speaker's chair has been furnished by the Daughters of the American Revolution; the present flag was hung in 1979.

The bronze fasces (from the Latin "bundle") on the wall behind the Speaker's chair represent authority. In ancient Rome, the fasces consisted of bound rods with an axe projecting from the center. They were carried by attendants, called lictors, who accompanied the consuls of the Roman Republic. The fasces were used to restore order in the court and the rods and axe were used to carry out the sentences of the court. The Romans introduced the fasces to England, where they evolved into the mace of the House of Commons.

The mace in the House of Representatives Chamber is the symbol of House authority. The one in use today was made by silversmith William Adams of New York City in 1841 to replace the original mace which was destroyed when British soldiers burned the Capitol in 1814. The mace consists of 13 thin ebony rods, representing the 13 original States of the Union, bound together to and bottom with engraved silver rings. The uppermost ring supports a silver globe with a detailed engraving of all seven continents and showing the degrees of longitude and latitude. A silver eagle with outspread wings surmounts the globe.

Each day when the House is called to order the Sergeant at Arms places the mace on a cylindrical pedestal of polished green marble at the right of the Speaker's chair. When the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union the mace is moved to a lower pedestal by the desk of the Sergeant at Arms. Members coming on the floor can glance at the mace and tell by its position whether the House is in session or in committee.

Since 1789, there have been few recorded instances of the mace being used to restore order on the floor of the Chamber. If an individual Member becomes unruly and beyond the Speaker's control, the Sergeant at Arms, on order of the Speaker, lifts the mace from its pedestal and "presents" it before the offender. Order has always been promptly restored because of the respect for the mace as a symbol of legislative authority. The last time the mace was used to restore order in the Chamber was in the 65th Congress, during World War I.

The appearance of the Chamber today reflects extensive alterations that were made between 1949 and 1951. Newly added features include the seals of the states and territories that border the ceiling and the marble relief portraits of famous lawgivers above the gallery doors. The clock above the

Speaker's rostrum was added in 1950. It was made by the sculptor Leo Friedlander, probably best known for the equestrian group Valor and Sacrifice on the Washington side of the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

Technological advances in the Chamber include electronic voting and television. In 1972 the House installed an electronic voting system, which was first used in the 93rd Congress beginning in 1973. Prior to that time Members voted with paper ballots, or by roll call; both were cumbersome and time consuming processes. In 1977 the House added a closed circuit television broadcast system that eventually made it possible for millions of Americans to view the proceedings on the House floor without coming to Washington to sit in the gallery.

The four oldest objects in the present Chamber that were moved from the Old House Chamber are the mace (which we have already mentioned), the inkwell on the Speaker's desk, and portraits of the Marquis de Lafayette and George Washington.

The coin silver inkwell, in use on the Speaker's desk whenever the House is in session, is a superb neo-classic piece. It was made by a silversmith named J. Leonard, possibly of Georgetown, about whom little is known. Exactly when it was made and when the House acquired it are also unknown, but the inkwell is depicted in a portrait of Speaker Henry Clay painted by Charles Bird King in 1821 and in the painting "The Old Hall of the House" by Samuel F. B. Morse. The tray holds three crystal inkwells whose original silver tops have been lost. It is adorned on either side by an eagle in a medallion. Its feet are fasces entwined by a snake, which is a classic symbol of wisdom surrounding authority.

The full length portrait of the Marquis de Lafayette by the French painter Ary Scheffer was presented by the artist to the House of Representatives at the time of Lafayette's visit in 1824. The House then commissioned the eminent American artist John Vanderlyn to paint a companion portrait of George Washington. The commission specified that the head should be copied from the famous portrait of Washington by Gilbert Stuart. Vanderlyn's Washington portrait was delivered to the House in 1834, and since then both portraits have hung in the same relative positions in the Old Chamber of the House and in the present Chamber.

In 1788 when New York was debating what role the House of Representatives would play under the new U.S. Constitution, Alexander Hamilton remarked, "Here, Sir, the people govern." It can also be said that here, in this Chamber, is where the American people make history through the actions of their elected Representatives.

RINEHART CLOCK RESTORED

The monumental Rinehart Clock, which kept time in the Chamber of the House of Representatives from 1858 until the Chamber was remodeled from 1949 to 1951, has been meticulously restored and is now on display in the crypt of the U.S. Capitol. It is sometimes called the "Indian and Hunter" clock because of the two bronze figures standing on either side of an elaborately carved clock case made of oak and covered with gold leaf. The clock face is encircled with a garland of fruit and leaves beneath a bronze eagle resting on the United States shield.

The clock was part of the original decorative plan of Architect Thomas U. Walter and Captain of Engineers Montgomery C. Meigs. Its case was made in 1858 by Bembe

and Kimbel of New York; the works, replaced in the 1930's, were by E. Howard and Co. of Boston. The three feet high figures of the Indian and Hunter were executed by William Henry Rinehart (1825-1874), a highly regarded Maryland sculptor who worked primarily in Rome.

Originally the Indian and Hunter were to be used as decorative supports for the fireplace in the Members' Retiring Room, but after casting they were incorporated into the clock design.

For over thirty years the clock has been in storage. It has not been on public view since 1948 when it was loaned to an exhibit of Rinehart's work at the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore.

William Henry Rinehart made another major contribution to the art of the Capitol when, after the death of the brilliant young sculptor Thomas Crawford in 1857, he completed the models for the bronze doors Crawford had designed for the east portico entrances to the House and Senate wings. Using Crawford's drawings, Rinehart completed the models for the House doors in 1867, but they were not cast in bronze for another 36 years, long after Rinehart himself had died. ●

EVEN A SWEETER COLA

HON. JOSEPH D. EARLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, back in 1981, then Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker described the 1981 tax bill as a "river boat gamble." I thought that was an apt description then and with hindsight, it has been borne out by the current deficits facing this Nation. Mr. Reagan's 1981 tax bill, his enormous defense buildup, and the net interest payments on the national debt have brought this Nation to the brink of financial chaos and the status of a debtor nation. Mr. Reagan's Presidency has nearly doubled the national debt in his first term of office, now nearly \$2 trillion.

The administration and some of its allies would have us believe that some 20 years of reckless spending has reduced the Nation to this desperate plight. Well, such thinking ignores the facts of life. You cannot continue to spend what you don't have. Where we have failed is in ordering our spending and revenue priorities. Defense cannot have a blank check; corporations must pay a fair share. If we do not act now, our children and their children will inherit this debt; this is not the type of legacy that any of us wish to leave to future generations.

Many plans have been offered that would reduce future deficits. In particular there is one plan that would attempt to balance the budget on the backs of those least able to fend for themselves—to use the President's words, the "truly needy."

The President's so-called deficit reduction plan would place most of the burden on lower- and middle-income

households while doing very little to hold the defense budget in check. There is little mention by this administration that some of the wealthiest corporations in this Nation have paid few if any taxes in recent years. In fact, corporate taxes as a percent of all Treasury receipts has fallen to a mere 6 percent from an average of 24 percent in the 1950's and early 1960's.

So, rather than attempting to revamp the Nation's tax code so that everyone bears a fair share of the tax burden and rather than attempting to do something about the ever growing defense budget, we are offered another opportunity by the President to further impair the ability of the middle class to meet its current needs and its future expectations. We are asked by this administration to rip the "safety net" even more than it has been over the past 4 years.

Specifically, it has been proposed that we freeze the cost-of-living adjustment [COLA]. Yet, deleting the COLA will have no effect whatsoever on the deficit. The trust funds are now running a surplus and even under the most pessimistic assumptions, the Social Security Administration projects a solvent system well into the 21st century. This happy occurrence is the result of both the 1977 amendments and the 1983 Social Security amendments based on the bipartisan Commission's recommendations.

Suggestions that the COLA is a luxury that retirees can do without until the deficit is reduced and the budget balanced is ludicrous. A cost-of-living adjustment is not an increase in benefits, but an attempt to maintain an individual's purchasing power. If we act on the President's recommendation, we would probably push an additional 500,000 elderly below the official poverty level. We are not talking about making retirees rich by any means. The median monthly Social Security benefit for those 65 or older is \$450. I do not know of many, if any at all, who could pay for shelter, food, and medical expenses on such a pittance. Yet, many of our aged are doing just that.

The COLA has done more than anything else to reduce the incidence of poverty among the Nation's elderly. Nine to 10 million people 65 or older are kept above the poverty level by and annual COLA. Fully two-thirds of beneficiaries 65 or older receive 50 percent of their income from their Social Security check. Forty-three percent of beneficiaries have annual incomes below \$10,000. A full 74 percent have total incomes below \$20,000 annually. These folks are hardly rich by any stretch of the imagination.

In his April 30 television address to the Nation, the President would have us believe that the past 20 years of spending and tax policies have

brought us to our present dire straits. I won't go into that matter now except to say that in the 4 short years of Mr. Reagan's first term the national debt has been doubled—it took nearly 200 years and 39 Presidents to bring it to the \$1 trillion mark and only 4 years under the Reagan administration to double it. Now the President would have us all share the burden equally so that we can continue the course of economic recovery. I hardly think his plans for altering the Social Security COLA is fair and certainly not something that will be shared equally by all of our citizens.

Under the President's plan—the so-called Rose Garden II agreement with Senate Republicans—the average Social Security beneficiary would lose \$1,667 over the next 5 years. The losses would come from reductions in Social Security COLA's and increases in the monthly premiums charged to Medicare beneficiaries. The President's plan would reduce benefits by \$12.1 billion in 1988. The Senate Budget Committee plan calls for reduced benefits of about 4 percent by canceling the 1986 COLA. The President's plan by contrast would cut benefits about 6 percent for 1988 and future years. This is what the President referred to in his speech as a guarantee that all beneficiaries would receive a 2-percent COLA in 1986, 1987, and 1988. It is a ploy to cut in half what retirees would ordinarily receive under current law. It is, in other words, a Consumer Price Index minus 2 type of formula. Our senior citizens are better provided for under current law.

The President said he would not touch Social Security in any way, shape, or form during the 1984 Presidential campaign. It seems that he has changed his mind. Thousands of my constituents have written me urging me to safeguard their Social Security benefits. I also know that these same voters want the deficits reduced and the budget at long last balanced. As such, I think all Americans need to re-examine our national priorities.

Congress will have to act now to meet the Nation's most urgent domestic needs without impoverishing future generations. Some programs will be curtailed, others possibly eliminated, and some adjusted for inflation. Defense spending will have to be cutback to reasonable amounts. And, some tax laws will have to be altered and a few "sacred cows" sacrificed so that we as a nation remain on the road to economic recovery and sustained, future economic prosperity.

Balancing the budget on the backs of our senior citizens, though, is unfair; it is shortsighted, petty minded and mean in spirit to presume that our elderly are an undue burden and drain on the Nation's economic well-being. It

can be said that no one has gotten rich on their cost-of-living adjustment.

The ill-advised "river boat gamble" that Congress took in 1981 has finally come back to haunt us. This administration would have Congress balance the budget on the backs of the elderly, middle-income families, and the poor. It is time that the military also share comparably in deficit reduction efforts. It is also time to examine our tax code and consider steps to make the system more equitable, simpler, and spread the tax burden fairly on individuals and corporations alike.

The Nation won't simply grow out of our deficits. Budget cuts and new revenues will be needed. Hopefully, the Nation's elderly and middle-income groups will survive to see a more promising tomorrow.●

EDUCATION: AN INVESTMENT WE CAN COUNT ON

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to all the students who have been accepted to our Nation's colleges and universities this spring. They should be commended for this achievement. We must realize, however, that if we approve drastic cuts in Federal aid to higher education, these students may never be able to complete their collegiate studies. A high proportion of students hoping to matriculate in September are currently arranging financial aid packages in order to pay the rising costs of a postsecondary degree. If we pass legislation which includes drastic restrictions and cuts of Federal student assistance, we may force many of these students to drop out of school, and in so doing create a society in which middle class and poor Americans will be unable to attend our institutions of higher education.

In an increasingly competitive world our ability to assure future prosperity depends above all on education. We must invest in people. Long range studies indicate that every dollar that we invested in the GI bill brought us back \$3-\$4 in increased tax revenues alone. Recent data indicates that a dollar spent on Head Start \$7 to the taxpayer.

Furthermore, in 1983, statistics showed that of all individuals who desired work, 87 percent of college educated folk were employed while only 74.5 percent of high school graduates held jobs. By cutting programs and threatening the education of so many young people, we are pushing untrained young people out into an already overburdened job market. What

we should be doing is improving existing programs.

We have crossed the threshold into an era of confusing economic and technological change. In entering the era of high technology, we need people that are better-trained and better-educated, not less so. A rapidly changing economy creates a greater need for people who are adaptable to change. In the face of these new challenges we cannot back down on our historic commitment to education. At the core of American society is our ability to create and be innovative, and now more than ever this ability is a function of education and training. If we mortgage our future by gutting such programs as financial aid, we will simply create a deficit of a different sort.

Federal aid to postsecondary students is a proven investment in the future. It is a proven investment in jobs for the American people. Education is an investment we can count on.●

TRIBUTE TO HECTOR HOLGUIN

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor Mr. Hector Holguin of El Paso, TX, who is the recipient this year of the Small Business Administration's Small Business Innovator of the Year Award for his pioneering efforts in the field of computer-aided design for engineering and architectural projects.

In the fast-moving world of computers, the growth of technology has often outpaced the ability of manufacturers to meet the users' training and service needs. Hector Holguin is among those in the world of high technology who have forged a blend, matching a high-quality, innovative product with a commitment to user training and superior service.

Computer-aided design and drafting [CADD] systems are becoming the right arm of the American engineer and architect, but it was not always so. The early CADD systems developed and used in the mid-1960's by the automotive and space industries were large, expensive mainframe computers inaccessible to most engineers, designers, and drafters, especially in small firms. Hector Holguin recognized the problem while working as an engineer at an aerospace company and decided engineers needed more direct control over the tools of their profession.

In 1971, he founded Holguin & Associates with the goal of making people more productive through advanced computer technology. The company

became a pioneer in CADD technology, installing its first system in 1972.

Holguin believes that the success of a CADD system only begins with a quality product. Most of the investment has to do with how the users are prepared for the system, how it is implemented, and how it is managed. Installation begins with an analysis of the user's needs, which are then matched with the appropriate hardware and carefully designed software.

In surveys of Holguin users, the CADD systems have consistently earned high ratings for increasing a company's productivity in solving real-world problems. One user said installing the system was like tripling his staff. CADD systems are also used to upgrade existing personnel. Junior draftsmen can learn quickly how to do much more than follow someone else's numbers or push lines on paper. A Houston engineer said that the system cut mapping errors by 90 percent and reduced mapmaking drafting subdivision time from 2.5 man-years to 1 man-week.

Holguin's approach of listening and responding to the needs of CADD users works. Thousands of CADD operators are using Holguin systems in at least 22 countries, and Holguin has become the second-largest installer of CADD systems in the United States and fifth in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that Hector Holguin of El Paso has received the Small Business Innovator of the Year Award for these efforts, and on behalf of the people of the 16th Congressional District of Texas, I would like to commend him to my colleagues and to this House. ●

**WE ARE GUARDIANS, NOT
GUARDS OF MICRONESIA**

HON. BEN GARRIDO BLAZ

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. BLAZ. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago our Nation assumed a sacred trust for a war-ravaged people in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. We pledged to the world to be the guardians of Micronesia. We vowed to protect, nurture, and guide the 50,000 people of those far-flung islands into the community of nations.

Today there are 150,000 Micronesians. Their islands have been rebuilt, their lives replenished and their constitutional governments established. They are ready and eager to assume their place in the world.

Their declaration of self-government lies before the U.S. Congress. Yet, there it waits as a chorus of voices assail it as a flawed document that gives the islands too much. I hear disgruntled cries that Micronesia is but a

prize of war—a captured territory that is ours by right of conquest; and we are its guard and master.

As our Nation marks Asian-Pacific American Heritage Week this May, celebrating the contributions of our region to the United States, it is an appropriate time to ask: Is America ready to fulfill the commitment it made to our Pacific wards? Is Congress prepared in 1985 to end its trusteeship and make good its pledge to the international community?

I can recall 40 years ago when America assumed its responsibility for Micronesia. I remember as I sat amid the rubble of war-torn Guam with Micronesian friends, how we wondered and pondered what the future and the United States held in store for us. Fortunately for me, Guam became a U.S. territory and I became a U.S. citizen in 1950.

As an American, the future held much for me. I had the opportunity to become an officer in the Armed Forces, a college professor, and now a Member of Congress. For my Micronesian friends, the opportunities were limited and their future was clouded with uncertainty.

The reunions I have had in the past few years with these same Micronesian friends have been increasingly difficult as they still ponder what the future will be for their communities and themselves. Many have had to learn German and Japanese over the years and now, in the twilight of their lives, are struggling with English.

After years of waiting, the Micronesians feel that they have come of age. They now have four constitutional governments: The Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshalls, and the Republic of Palau. All of these groups have written and adopted their constitutions and set up their governments in anticipation of taking their rightful place on the world scene.

Over the past 16 years, Micronesian leaders have negotiated the terms of their new relationship with America. Though the forms of their relationships differ, all have chosen close political, economic, and social ties with us. They have all chosen to remain securely under the U.S. defense umbrella.

In recent congressional hearings on the Compact of Free Association I have heard the agreement described by both conservative Republicans and liberal Democrats as a flawed document that commits a multitude of sins. Some say it gives the Micronesians too much money, others say it doesn't provide enough. Some say that by approving the Compact, the Federal Government would be selling the farm on local autonomy issues for overreaching military rights. Others say the military rights under the agreement are

not clearly defined or adequately assured. I sometimes wonder if we are talking about the same document.

I am becoming increasingly suspicious that there must be something very right about the Compact for it to be the target of linkage with so many other issues and for it to be viewed by individuals of such diverse political persuasions as an effective vehicle for gaining leverage on other issues. I have heard no concern expressed by anyone which would justify undue delay in approving and implementing the Compact. This is not to say that some of the valid concerns that have been raised cannot be addressed in the legislation approving the Compact.

But I will not support any effort to link Compact approval to matters that are not directly related to the agreement. Because of the numerous complex issues in the agreement—from nuclear claims and international trade to immigration—it is absolutely necessary for Congress to scrutinize the pact. But it would be a violation of our Nation's commitment to Micronesian self-determination to use the agreement as a vehicle for addressing other partisan issues.

I do not believe that the Compact will adversely affect the U.S. flag territories. I believe the Compact's incentives for development in Micronesia will produce regional political and economic development which will directly benefit the United States and its Pacific territories.

The Compact presents the United States with a historic opportunity to show the Pacific community that we will enter the next century in a strong strategic posture, but also as a nation able to build good will in the region through creative and democratic arrangements oriented toward economic development through private enterprise.

Those who argue that Micronesia is a prize of war are ignoring the fact that the keystone of American foreign policy in the 20th century has been that we seek no expansion of territory through war and will not seek to claim conquered territory as our own. This policy began with President Woodrow Wilson's emphasis on self-determination and nonannexation at the Versailles Conference following World War I. That principle was reaffirmed by U.S. leaders in the Atlantic Charter in 1941, and the United Nations Charter. It has been a major theme of American policy as leader of the Free World in the post-war era.

If my opinions sound biased on this subject, it is because they are. I am a Micronesian. I am from Micronesia. One of the major reasons I ran for Congress was to add a new and different dimension to that august body in light of the generally recognized view that the Pacific Basin offers enormous

potential for the United States and the world.

The Micronesians have come of age and are ready to fulfill their own destiny. We have an obligation to facilitate their desire to do so. Forty years after we assumed trusteeship of their islands, we must remind ourselves that we are the guardians, not the guards of Micronesia.●

A PARTISAN FOREIGN LEGION

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a longstanding U.S. diplomatic tradition keeps our Ambassadors, noncareer and career alike, out of partisan domestic politics. But that sound policy and practice went up in smoke last year.

The 1984 congressional elections sparked some fire campaigns—perhaps none more heated than the contest for the U.S. Senate in North Carolina.

During the campaign, the incumbent Senator from North Carolina enlisted the support of 22 U.S. Ambassadors, whose normal role is representing our Nation overseas. But in this case, they bent their energy toward representing one senatorial candidate at home. I find such a break with established policy to be a meddlesome, maddening, and misguided precedent.

The issue here is not which political party may have reaped partisan benefits from the endorsements. The action would have been out-of-bounds no matter which party or candidate was involved.

Neither is the issue simply whether the Ambassadors in question serve as political appointees or as career Foreign Service officers. As 36 former Ambassadors pointed out in a protest of the partisan endorsement:

This action violates a well-established tradition followed by administrations of both political parties which has barred American Ambassadors, noncareer as well as career, from active participation in partisan politics while on active duty as official representatives of their country.

The list of former Envoys who objected to this break with tradition is a distinguished roster of diplomats who served both Republican and Democratic administrations. They include Jacob Beam (Soviet Union, 1969-73), Gardner Ackley (Italy, 1968-69), Harlan Cleveland (NATO, 1965-69), W. Averell Harriman (Soviet Union, 1943-46), and David H. Popper (Cyprus and Chile, 1969-77).

Nor, finally, does the question turn on the narrow grounds of whether the Ambassadors broke any laws or regulations. Since they were all noncareer officials they did neither. What they

broke was a wise and well-established policy of our Government which has been observed since our Nation's founding. That policy is that partisan political activity ends at the waters edge.

More than ever before, U.S. Ambassadors must serve as full-time employees of the U.S. Government. They have a full and complex duty to advance the foreign policy goals of our Nation, to represent U.S. citizens abroad, to promote our economic interests, and to safeguard our own diplomatic staff and missions.

Encumbered with such critical issues as nuclear arms control, U.S. trade deficits, and international terrorism I submit that our diplomats have their hands full without meddling in partisan domestic politics. They have neither the time nor the reason to do so.

They have, on the contrary, every reason to steer clear of partisan activity. For example, the Senator in question has done precious little to build bridges to Third World nations in his role on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. How then will these nations respond to Ambassadors who also want to carry his political water?

What made matters worse in this case is that the State Department took scant attention to this grave departure from sensible policy. Secretary Shultz issued through a spokesman an anonymous wrist slap. The candidates even boasted that Secretary of State Shultz would "not make the same statement made by the underbelly of the State Department."

Before this precedent becomes standard practice, Congress needs to put diplomacy back on course, since the State Department seems unwilling to do so. I want to urge the Foreign Affairs Committee to hold early hearings on this matter and to send a strong message to the President and Secretary of State that our Ambassadors should be serving the American people—not a Senate Campaign Committee.

Understanding that hearings will soon take place, I withhold any amendments to the State Department authorization bill. But I want to state forcefully today that the State Department has no room for a partisan foreign legion.●

DAVID K. BOGGINI

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to ask my colleagues in the House to join with me in saying thanks to David K. Boggini, who this month is retiring from 28 years of dedicated service to the city of San Jose, CA.

Dave's service to the city of San Jose has included a number of jobs and assignments in many of San Jose's essential administrative areas, including occupations such as city property manager, director of private development, assistant director of redevelopment, and his latest position—deputy city manager for community development.

As a former mayor of San Jose, I know very well that Dave's solid performance and administrative talents contributed greatly to the well-being of the citizens of San Jose. He has worked on a variety of issues including hazardous wastes, housing, health, and the physically handicapped. Throughout his tenure, he has shown tremendous competence and a true compassion in his work.

Dave's long service to the city of San Jose is exceeded only by his time as a lifelong resident of the city. He has attended its schools and lived in its neighborhoods. He knows this city well.

Mr. Speaker, he has also served this city well. I know that Dave has remarked more than once that he always wanted to give something back to the city that has been so good to him for so long. I can assure him he has indeed given back much to the city of San Jose.

Finally, let me say this. In the city of San Jose there is a park named after Dave's father, Peter J. Boggini, another honorable public servant of our city. I am sure that Dave and his wife, Sally, have brought their four children to that park. I want to assure Pamela, Peter, Paul, and Patrick as well as anyone else who uses Peter J. Boggini Park, that they can be equally proud of David K. Boggini. He has been a trusted public servant to the city of San Jose, and I ask my fellow Members of Congress to join me in expressing our thanks to him.●

BAY AREA WELCOMES BISHOP TUTU

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 40th anniversary of an end to infamy in Europe—a war begun by a racist, totalitarian regime—a war unparalleled in its savagery and inhuman brutality—a war that spawned the Holocaust and the murder of equal numbers of non-Jews in the infamous concentration camps.

Last Sunday, at the U.S. Air Force base in Bitburg, West Germany, the President persisted in his wrong-headed decision to visit the German military cemetery at Bitburg that contains the graves of at least 49 Waffen SS members, the epitome of evil in the

criminal madness that was the Third Reich. The President compounded this moral lapse in attempting to draw a historical analogy with evil in the contemporary world when he said:

Today, freedom-loving people around the world must say: I am a Berliner, I am a Jew in a world still threatened by antisemitism, I am an Afghan, and I am a prisoner of the Gulag, I am a refugee in a crowded boat foundering off the coast of Vietnam, I am a Laotian, a Cambodian, a Cuban, and a Misquito Indian in Nicaragua. I, too, am a potential victim of totalitarianism.

That litany of lament contained a conspicuous and morally indefensible omission—all the more obscene because apartheid is the lineal descendant of the perverse racism that was a hallmark of the Nazi regime. World War II, as proclaimed in the Atlantic charter, was a struggle to destroy fascism, to terminate the remnants of colonialism, and to establish human dignity and social justice for all people throughout the world. The President's conscious decision to exclude any mention of the ongoing obscenity of apartheid on that day of commemoration and renewal to freedom is a deliberate affront to the world community of conscience, and further evidence of the moral bankruptcy of his policy of "constructive engagement" in dealing with the racist regime in South Africa.

This weekend the citizens of the Bay Area in California will have an opportunity to challenge that moral dereliction when we honor a person who fully comprehends the historical lessons and failures of the Second World War in denying human dignity and social justice to everyone, especially people of color in the Third World. This weekend we will have the privilege of welcoming into our midst the Anglican Bishop of Johannesburg, South Africa.

Desmond Tutu is much more than a black South African. Desmond Tutu is much more than the winner of the 1984 Nobel Peace Prize. Desmond Tutu—as committed cleric, ardent advocate of racial equality and social justice, and passionate patriot for peace and freedom for all in South Africa is the living embodiment of John F. Kennedy's inaugural challenge that "here on Earth God's work must truly be our own."

In January of this year at a White House meeting Bishop Desmond Tutu, a native-born South African and Nobel peace laureate, had to confess to our President, the proclaimer and perpetrator of "constructive engagement" that, at age 53, he doesn't have a South African passport: "only a document that describes my nationality as undeterminable at present." But at the same time Desmond Tutu had the moral courage to denounce the hypocrisy of "constructive engagement" for what it truly is: "evil, immoral, and un-Christian".

In his Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech at Oslo, Norway, last December, Bishop Desmond Tutu proclaimed his love for the land of his birth, and the pain and sorrow inflicted on its black inhabitants by the cruel, cancerous curse of apartheid, saying:

I come from a beautiful land, richly endowed by God with wonderful natural resources, wide expanses, rolling mountains, singing birds, bright shining stars, with radiant sunshine, golden sunshine. There is enough of the good things that come from God's bounty, there is enough for everyone, but apartheid has confirmed some in their selfishness, causing them to grasp greedily a disproportionate share, the lion's share, because of their power. They have taken 87 percent of the land, though being only about 20 percent of our population. The rest have had to make do with the remaining 13 percent. Apartheid has decreed the politics of exclusion. 73 percent of the population is excluded from any meaningful participation in the political decision-making processes of the land of their birth.

He went on to say:

We see before us a land bereft of much justice, and therefore without peace and security. Unrest is endemic, and will remain an unchanging feature of the South African scene until apartheid, the root cause of it all, is finally dismantled. . . . There is no peace because there is no justice. There can be no real peace and security until there be first justice enjoyed by all the inhabitants of that beautiful land.

. . . . When will we learn that human beings are of infinite value because they have been created in the image of God, and that it is a blasphemy to treat them as if they were less than this and to do so ultimately recoils on those who do this? In dehumanizing others, they are themselves dehumanized. . . .

His peroration was both plea and summons:

Let us work to be peacemakers, those given a wonderful share in Our Lord's ministry of reconciliation. If we want peace, so we have been told, let us work for justice. Let us beat our swords into plowshares.

In his installation address as the Anglican Bishop of Johannesburg in February, he also reached out to whites in a very special way, saying:

There are very many splendid white people. That is a trite truism. I have said that if I was white I would have needed accesses of grace to oppose a system providing me with such substantial benefits and privileges. And consequently, those white South Africans who oppose apartheid should be saluted more vociferously than their Black counterparts.

But he also pleaded with those same whites, saying:

Please dear white fellow South Africans hear the *cri de coeur* we utter. It is that we too are just ordinary human beings. We too love to be with our wives every day, we too want our children to rush out to meet us as we come back from work, we too would like to live where we can afford it. We too want to be able to move freely everywhere in the land of our birth, we too want to have security of tenure. We too want to participate in the decisions that affect our lives. These are not extravagant demands. They are the expectation of any human being. We want to

have a new kind of South Africa where we all, Black and White, can walk tall together, Black and White, into the glorious future which God is opening up before us—Black and White together.

"Black and White together," the words are also those of the civil rights anthem in our own country. So in the spirit of what Martin Luther King, Jr. lived for, struggled for, and ultimately, died for, people of all colors will welcome Bishop Desmond Tutu to our Bay Area community. There we will reaffirm our common commitment to live out the reality, that "We shall overcome, someday"—in America and in South Africa—because we know that none can be free unless all are free. ●

POPULATION POLICIES SHOULD RESPECT HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in the very near future we are expected to begin consideration of H.R. 1555, the foreign aid authorization bill for fiscal year 1986. At that time, I anticipate that we will debate some very important issues relating to U.S. supported foreign population control programs.

Earlier this week, Representatives ALAN MOLLOHAN, HENRY HYDE, HAROLD VOLKMER, BARBARA VUCANOVICH, and TOM BLILEY joined me in sending a "Dear Colleague" letter detailing our concerns about major human rights abuses that have occurred in the implementation of some of these programs—particularly those carried out in a coercive manner in the People's Republic of China. I hope that my colleagues will take a few moments to review this information before we begin consideration of this important legislation. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enclose a copy of the text of this letter for my colleagues' review.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 6, 1985.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Despite the overwhelming evidence which is now in the public domain about the brutal and coercive nature of the People's Republic of China's (PRC) population control program, some Members of Congress insist that the United States should continue to provide substantial indirect support for this brutal program by contributing over \$50 million in FY '86 to the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA).

The U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) provides over 30% of the total budget of the UNFPA. Over the past four years, UNFPA has contributed \$50 million to the PRC's "one-child" campaign and another \$50 million grant has just begun. This UNFPA funding has played a substan-

tial role in establishing the infrastructure of the Chinese population control program. UNFPA documents note that they currently provide "assistance to strengthen the State [Family] Planning Commission," the central headquarters which issues the rigid "birth quotas" that are enforced in a draconian fashion nationwide.

In his February 26, 1985 testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, AID Administrator, M. Peter McPherson, acknowledged that UNFPA monies are "fungible". Therefore, it is disingenuous to suggest that the United States—which provides more than 30% of UNFPA's budget—is not supporting the brutal Chinese population control program. Would members who make this argument, accept 30% of U.S. funding of an organization that in turn was supporting a program that sanctioned and enforced racism or sex discrimination? Wouldn't they insist that the U.S. government use its leverage as a major donor to insist that the organization we were supporting disengage itself from the offensive program? Forced abortion was declared to be a "crime against humanity" at the Nuremberg Tribunal. Do we in any way want our government to be associated with such atrocities?

It is of virtually no consequence that language in H.R. 1555, the Foreign Aid Authorization bill calls for the U.S. representative to the UNFPA to oppose UNFPA funding of the Chinese population program. Despite the fact that we provide more than 30% of UNFPA's funding, we only have one vote on the 48 member Governing Council. Since the UNFPA has just recently initiated a new five year, \$50 million grant to the Chinese population control program, we would not get to cast our one vote until 1989.

The May/June 1983 issue of *Intercom*, the newsletter of the Population Reference Bureau, reported that a Chinese "central-government circular" issued in February, 1983 said:

"Permanent birth control measures [i.e., sterilization] are to be carried out among those who already have two children. Remedial measures [i.e., abortion] are to be taken as quickly as possible among those who are pregnant without quota [permission]."

The Population Reference Bureau's newsletter then went on to report the following information which is very relevant to the current debate in Congress:

"UN officials contacted about the policy expressed grave misgivings about any forced sterilization policy to a Washington Post reporter, adding that the international organization could not assist a family planning program with an official coercive policy (emphasis added)."

The UNFPA's policy position, therefore, is quite clear. If the Chinese population control program is coercive, the UNFPA—according to their own established policy—cannot fund the Chinese program. The United States, as the largest donor to UNFPA, should seek to ensure that the UNFPA abides by its established policies.

The U.S. Census Bureau's China division has provided transcripts of Chinese radio broadcasts and press accounts which coincide with the Population Reference Bureau's report of a "central government circular." In a May 14, 1983 radio interview recorded by the Foreign Broadcast Information Service, Guangdong Province Vice-Governor Wang Pingshan explained the State Family Planning Commission's decree in these terms: "The basic purpose of this measure is to absolutely prohibit married couples from bearing a second child."

Anyone who missed the Vice-Governor's May 14 radio interview, had an opportunity to read his explanation of the policy in the May 15, 1983 edition of *Nanfany ribao* (*Southern Daily*): "The technical policy of birth control is formulated by the State Family Planning Commission with the approval of the leadership of the Party Central." That policy, he explained, is that "women with unplanned pregnancies must adopt remedial measures as soon as possible."

Nick Eberstadt, a visiting fellow at Harvard University's Center for Population Studies, described the Chinese population program in the April 22, 1984 edition of *The New York Times*:

"So, increasingly, the population program turned to coercion . . . In some areas, women with 'unauthorized' pregnancies were rounded up and ordered to submit to injections of abortifacients. Official edicts warned that those 'who attempt to defeat the fertility plan' would be considered 'enemies of the people'—a threat that any adult who lived through the Cultural Revolution understood only too well. Families that defied the 'one child norm' were faced with monthly fines that often meant semistarvation."

The *Washington Post*, in their January 10, 1985 editorial follow-up to Michael Weisskopf's three-part series on China's population control program, clearly describes the Chinese system as coercive. In the *Post's* analysis, the Weisskopf series "illuminates the scope and type of measures the authorities there employ to limit their country's population . . . while some of the means are what you could call extremely rigorous—education, propaganda, economic leverage, social pressure—other methods fall into the realm of the openly coercive and brutal: mandatory abortion, inducted stillbirth, the strangling of the newborn." The *Post* goes on to point out that "the state actively sanctions and sponsors these means".

On March 29, 1985, the Agency for International Development (AID), released a memorandum on the UNFPA Funding Issue. AID's Assistant Administrator, Richard Derham, the author of the memo, reported on a study by Judith Banister, Chief of the China Branch, Center for International Research, at the U.S. Bureau of the Census "She recounts the evidence on coercion, demonstrates that it is not an isolated activity, nor limited to remote provinces. In fact, it is an intrinsic part of the enforcement mechanism of the policy." Derham further reported on the Banister study by saying: "Referring to the 1981 UN Symposium on Population and Human Rights conclusion that compulsory abortion is a violation of human rights and other UN declarations in favor of voluntarism, she concludes 'China's family planning program is in violation of these oft-stated principles.'"

Derham, himself, went on to say: "I believe the China program debases human values by its emphasis on physical and psychological coercion and violates internationally recognized standards of the human right to determine the family size . . . I further conclude that the UNFPA program cannot be disentangled from the pervasive coercion of the [Chinese] system . . ."

Pranay Gupte, a former foreign correspondent for *The New York Times* in Africa, wrote "The Crowded Earth" under a grant from UNFPA. He described the application of the one-child program in this way:

"So minutely is Chinese socialist society organized that no aspect of an individual's life goes unobserved, especially in rural bri-

gades and communes. Pressure is applied on couples to restrict themselves to only one child not only through family planning cadres in neighborhoods but also through the work units of both husband and wife. . . . If Chiang [a thirty-year old woman in Shandong Province] were to get pregnant, peer pressures on her to get an abortion would be instant, enormous, and irresistible. . . . In the final analysis, it does not matter how many children Chinese like Chiang and Chien [her husband] want—they will be allowed no more than one child."

Clearly, the evidence is overwhelming that the Chinese population control program is rooted in state-sanctioned coercion. The UNFPA's failure to disengage from the Chinese program contradicts their own stated policy. Unfortunately, there is strong evidence that the UNFPA has actually encouraged the Chinese in their application of the brutal one child policy.

In 1983 the Chinese population control minister, Qian Xinzong, received a special U.N. award for "the most outstanding contribution to the awareness of population questions." The award, which was strongly defended by UNFPA director Rafael Salas, was "denounced as a travesty by a United States economist whom the agency [UNFPA] enlisted as an advisor. The economist, Theodore W. Shultz of Chicago [a recipient of the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Science], said that the United Nations Fund for Population Activities had ignored the recommendations of private consultants and rewarded two nations [China and India] that have used brutal methods to curb population growth." (*The New York Times*, July 24, 1983)

In "The Crowded Earth", Pranay Gupte recounts the following experience: "I met Minister Qian in his office in Beijing [Peking], and he immediately launched into an appreciation of what the United Nations meant to him and the Chinese. The award had, Qian said, put the imprimatur of the world body on China's family planning efforts . . ."

If Rafael Salas and his colleagues at the UNFPA are willing to let the Chinese government suggest that their barbaric program has the approval of a world body—a position that is in direct conflict with the UNFPA's own stated policy—we should let them know in no uncertain terms that we will not let the good name of the United States be associated with a brutally coercive program that refuses to comply with "internationally recognized standards of the human right to determine the family size."

During consideration of H.R. 1555, the Foreign Aid Authorization bill, Representative Christopher Smith intends to offer an amendment to curtail U.S. population assistance to "any organization which provides funds, directly or indirectly, for population planning programs or abortions" in "any country which permits, officially or in practice, infanticide or coerced abortion." The Smith amendment will not affect the overall level of population funding. It's intent is to persuade the Chinese government to respect the dignity of its own people. If the Chinese are unwilling to recognize a fundamental human right—the internationally recognized right to determine the family size—the UNFPA should redirect their resources to those countries that are willing to comply with the UNFPA's officially stated policies.

We urge your support for the Smith amendment described above and for an-

other amendment which is designed to preserve the current U.S. policy of denying funds to organizations which "perform or actively promote abortion as a method of family planning."

Current U.S. policy is consistent with the U.N. World Plan of Action agreed upon in Mexico City last August. Participants in Mexico City resolved to "forge ahead with effective implementation of the World Population Plan of Action aimed at improving standards of living and quality of life for all people of this planet in promotion of their common destiny in peace and security."

However, the conferees were also very clear in precluding certain means to the mutually desired end. Specifically, they stated that all population programs and policies must be voluntary and non-coercive, and abortion was rejected as a method of family planning. Recommendation #18 of the U.N. World Population Plan of Action emphatically states that abortion "in no case should be promoted as a method of family planning."

It is not surprising that the Mexico City Conference so firmly rejected abortion as a method of family planning. According to a 1984 U.N. report, only 8 of 126 less developed nations authorize abortion for socioeconomic reasons.

In January of this year, the Agency for International Development (AID)—in keeping with the policy agreed to in Mexico City—began asking family planning providers to sign an amendment that they would not "perform or actively promote abortion as a method of family planning." So far, only one of AID's family planning providers—the London-based International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF)—has refused to even negotiate with AID about specific terms of the agreement.

IPPF's staunch advocacy of legalized abortion has been well documented. Professor Donald P. Warwick of the Harvard Institute for International Development, writing in the April 1980 Hastings Center Report, stated: "The International Planned Parenthood Federation of London (IPPF) has been the most outspoken advocate of legal abortion services in the developing countries . . ." The extent to which they encourage local affiliates to go in seeking changes in national laws was revealed quite starkly in a document entitled Report of the Working Group on the Promotion of Family Planning As A Basic Human Right. This report, which was disseminated to IPPF affiliates in November, 1983 states in Section 106:

"Family Planning Associations [IPPF affiliates] and other non-governmental organizations should not use the absence of law or the existence of an unfavorable law as an excuse for inaction. Action outside the law, and even in violation of it, is part of the process of stimulating change."

Lest anyone suggest that this report is not an "official" IPPF document, one need only cite a statement in the Introduction of the report which says: "We hope that both the Federation and individual FPAs will accept these recommendations and promote them as widely as possible." It goes on to say: "The Chairman and members of the Working Group wish to acknowledge the support of the IPPF in facilitating their work, in particular, the participation of the Secretary-General, Carl Wahren, his special adviser, Fred T. Sai, and the Secretary and Rapporteur, Nuray Pincancoglu . . ."

IPPF does not need any help from Congress to get their AID funding restored. All

they have to do is sign the same agreement that every one of AID's other family planning providers will be asked to sign. If, as they claim, abortion is a very small part of their overall program, they should be willing to make a minor adjustment in order to bring their policies into compliance with U.S. law and the U.N. World Plan of Action. If, on the other hand, IPPF is determined to promote abortion as a method of family planning and engage in pro-abortion political campaigns, AID will be free to channel its funds to other family planning providers.

In summary, we urge your support for an international family planning policy that respects the values and laws of foreign countries. The U.N. World Population Plan of Action agreed upon in Mexico City last August states that all population programs must be voluntary and that abortion "in no case should be promoted as a method of family planning." We believe such a policy deserves our support and that the Smith amendments will help ensure that it becomes a reality.

Sincerely,

ALAN B. MOLLOHAN,
HENRY J. HYDE,
BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH,
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH,
HAROLD L. VOLKMER,
THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.,
Members of Congress.●

COORDINATION IN NUTRITION RESEARCH AND MONITORING IS LONG OVERDUE.

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1985, today introduced by Congressman MACKAY for himself and others. This bill establishes a coordinated National Nutrition and Related Research Program, providing for the creation and implementation of a comprehensive plan to assess, and work to improve, both the nutritional quality of our country's food supply and the nutritional and dietary status of the population of the United States.

This legislation is not new. A similar bill was introduced in the second session of the 98th Congress, reported favorably by the Committee on Science and Technology and brought to the floor of the House last October under suspension of the rules. It received 265 votes in favor, but fell 17 votes short of the two-thirds majority needed for passage.

Mr. Speaker, the issue the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1985 addresses is not a new one either. For years, our country has lacked timely, objective national data on the dietary and nutritional status of Americans, as well as related information that could alert policymakers to a "hunger crisis" in our Nation. In the absence of accurate, comprehensive nutrition-related

knowledge, concerned groups and individuals have repeatedly sounded the alarm about the existence of a hunger crisis, but have lacked the hard facts needed to document the extent and severity of the problem.

Past responses by Congress and the executive branch to this need have generally been to initiate urgent studies and surveys. These efforts have largely been short term and piecemeal. Often, they have been anecdotal recollections of testimony and clinical evidence, or one-time efforts to assess the nutritional and dietary status or high-risk groups or limited geographical areas. Less frequently, surveys have been undertaken to periodically obtain information on a representative sample of the population. In 1935, the USDA began food consumption surveys, repeated at 10-year intervals and currently known as the Nationwide Food Consumption Survey. In 1967, a congressional mandate led to the 10-State Nutrition Survey. In 1971, a Presidential directive transformed the National Nutrition Surveillance Survey into a periodic study now known as the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey [NHANES]. These studies have provided a series of valuable snapshots of nutritional and dietary status, but they have lacked timeliness, continuity, and comparability across studies.

Complex survey designs or this type require considerable time for planning and implementation. Their findings, unfortunately, usually become available long after the urgency that provoked the questions has passed; inevitably, as a result, perceived immediate public needs have been addressed by policies dictated by expediency and a sense of crisis, measures put into place before the information has been made available that would permit understanding of the extent and severity of the problem and thus of the best way to solve it.

To address this problem, in 1977, Congress passed the Food and Agriculture Act, which mandated a comprehensive National Nutrition Monitoring System; and later passed the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981, which provided a mandate for a human nutrition research and information management system. One would think that, since these laws are in place and we have been assured that operational plans are being carried out, there is no need for further legislative effort.

Mr. Speaker, this is unfortunately not the case. The infrastructure and commitment of resources to carry out research and provide the results to policymakers in a timely fashion have so far been inadequate. Problems of conceptualization, sampling design and standardization have been insufficiently addressed; reductions in funding levels requested by executive agen-

cies have been accompanied by decreases in levels of effort proposed, so that it is now clear that current plans to collect information in 1987 will not be responsive to the original goals proposed for the program. In summary, despite repeated congressional efforts to date, the executive branch has remained unwilling to commit sufficient resources and effort to put a national nutrition monitoring and research program in place. Congress must provide more direction.

As a former chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, and as former chairman of the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Research and Foreign Agriculture, I have studied this problem for many years. During the past 7 years, these two subcommittees have conducted oversight hearings on nutrition research and monitoring as well as hearings on the original version of this bill. The testimony during these hearings by specialists in the field prompted me and my colleagues Congressmen WALGREN and MACKAY to conclude last year that we needed to authorize a comprehensive, coordinated program for nutrition monitoring and related research.

The bill introduced today calls for a comprehensive plan; it includes the continuous collection of information, as well as a system for organizing and standardizing methods across the many individual studies and surveys of nutritional and dietary status and nutritional quality in our country. The proposed solution will benefit all sectors of society that seek to use these vital data—public and private sectors, the scientific community and policymakers at local, State and national levels.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a revolution in science and information technology. It is past time that we focus our resources and newly developed skills on nutrition monitoring and nutrition research. Our deficiency of information in this area must be faced now, before the next round of urgent calls regarding hunger in America surface and are insufficiently addressed—because, once again, our country lacks the timely information it needs. I invite my colleagues to join with us once again and finally pass this much needed legislation.●

WELCOME TO BILL LUCAS

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, It is a pleasure with my Republican colleagues from Michigan to welcome Wayne County Executive William Lucas as the newest member of the Republican Party.

Bill Lucas has said that it is time for his philosophy to be voiced and told a gathering of over 500 in Detroit this morning about the American Dream and how he is making it come true.

Elected on the Democratic ticket as Wayne County's first chief executive 30 months ago after 14 years as Sheriff, Lucas told those gathered, that while he is changing parties, he will not change his style of leadership.

In 2 short years, the administration of Wayne County Executive Bill Lucas has made great progress in fulfilling the will of the people. Through aggressive management, consolidation of services, and more realistic labor contracts, the Lucas administration has reduced Wayne County's outstanding deficit by \$82 million.

Bill Lucas will be a tremendous gain to the Republican Party. Our gain is the Democrats' loss.●

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

HON. ALBERT G. BUSTAMANTE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

● Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, this is National Small Business Week. I wish to make a few observations on the importance of small firms and independent entrepreneurs to my district and to the Nation's economy.

The 13 million small businesses in this country are the seedbeds of innovation and the sources of future employment for those just entering the work force. Small entrepreneurs are risk takers by definition. They do not enjoy recourse to bond issues or stock offerings when considering the introduction of new product lines or the expansion of production. Their boldness in going to the public with a new product line is not generally a reflection of sophisticated market research. It reflects a keen appreciation of what people want and what they're going to be willing to pay for it.

I realize that the Congress is far from deciding how, through whom, and even if the Federal Government should be offering large-scale assistance to small businesses. That debate may be joined at a later date. In the meantime, I only wish to salute the thousands in my district and the million across the Nation whose daily receipts are the determining factor in figuring inventory size and payroll lists. For every economist with detailed studies on marginal labor productivity or vertical integration, there is a shopkeeper or a mechanic trying to save his employee's jobs. For every firm listed in the Fortune 500, there are dozens which can't even be found in the yellow pages. For every Anhauser-Busch, there is a Shiner Brew-

ery—for every Motorola a Barrera Television Service.

I do not mean to imply only that small is beautiful or that the giant firms of today have forgotten their public responsibilities. In general, the marketplace will not forgive corporate arrogance. I do wish to suggest that executives in boardrooms—and we in Congress—would do well to remember the value of trying and failing, and then trying again, as small businessmen and women do time after time. It is not just an idyllic memory of the kindness we encountered at a mom and pop store which makes small business so vital to our communities and to our position in the world economy. It is the prospect for growth inherent in small firms—and the chances they offer to disadvantaged workers—which make them so indispensable and so often overlooked.●

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE CROCKER ART MUSEUM CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, the Crocker Art Museum, the oldest public art museum west of the Mississippi, is celebrating its 100th birthday this year, and Congressman VIC FAZIO and I would like you and our colleagues to join all of us in Sacramento in commemorating this historic occasion.

The Crocker Art Museum holds a special place in the hearts of a great many people. A beautiful museum with splendid artwork, the Crocker is quite simply one of the finest institutions in Sacramento and the State of California.

It is also renowned for its rich history. Mrs. Margaret Rhodes Crocker gave the museum to the city 100 years ago in honor of her husband, Edwin Bryant Crocker, former associate justice of the State supreme court and brother of railroad tycoon, Charles Crocker. Much of the museum's original collection was purchased by Judge Crocker and his wife on a special trip to Europe with their four daughters. In appreciation of Margaret Crocker's tremendous generosity, the "Festival of Flowers" was held on May 6, 1885. This event was one of the most colorful social events and gala celebrations in the history of Sacramento and captivated the entire city.

Mr. Speaker, a centennial celebration will be held May 18-25, 1985, in Sacramento that features a reenactment of the original "Festival of Flowers." Numerous schools, civic and cultural organizations, and groups will participate in the week-long celebration, which include a grand parade, art

contests, cultural performances, and other activities.

Congressman FAZIO and I want to express our sincere appreciation to all of those involved with the Crocker Art Museum for the cultural enrichment they have provided through a long and fulfilling relationship with the Sacramento community. We are confident that centennial celebration will help sustain and enhance that relationship. ●

MERCHANTVILLE SCHOOL'S
STATUE OF LIBERTY CAMPAIGN

HON. H. JAMES SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, this Friday I will have the honor of seeing off a busload of fourth and fifth grade students from Merchantville, NJ, who will be bound for the Statue of Liberty in New York City.

But this is not simply a sightseeing tour, Mr. Speaker. These young ladies and gentleman are planning to deliver a check in the amount of \$2,000, which will go toward the restoration of the Statue of Liberty.

I am truly proud of the fundraising efforts of these students from Merchantville School. Their work on behalf of the Lady of Liberty began back in January, and they put their ingenuity to work to attract attention to the campaign.

To drum up local interest in their fundraising, they sponsored a T-shirt logo contest which centered on the statue restoration, and then sold T-shirts to raise contributions for the project.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the work of the fourth and fifth grade students from Merchantville School illustrates further the important independent role that young people can play in projects important to our society, and our heritage.

Awesome responsibilities and challenges face our next generation of Americans. The students from Merchantville School show that they have the drive and determination to meet those challenges. And I appreciate the opportunity to share their success today with my fellow colleagues in the House. ●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO
REV. PAUL EDWIN SPIECKER
OF NEW JERSEY: DISTINGUISHED
THEOLOGIAN, ESTEEMED PASTOR AND OUTSTANDING
COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 13 the residents of the city of Clifton, my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join the congregation of the Belle Vista-Simpson United Methodist Church at a testimonial dinner honoring their pastor, Rev. Paul E. Spiecker, who has announced his retirement from his ministry of the United Methodist Church on June 15, 1985. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations to Pastor Spiecker and share great pride with his good wife, Ruth Monica Spiecker; their sons, Paul Sheldon Spiecker and wife Carolyn, Ray Glenn Spiecker and wife Dianne; grandsons Matthew and Christopher; and granddaughters, Karen and Robyn on this milestone of achievement in their family endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. Paul E. Spiecker graduated from Ocean City, NJ, High School in 1926 with commercial training. Upon his graduation from high school he worked as a carpenter and real estate salesman before he decided that the Christian ministry was his calling. To complete scholarship requirements for college admission, he enrolled in Pennington School, Pennington, NJ, and in June 1929 graduated as valedictorian of his class.

He received his bachelor of science degree from Boston University, College of Liberal Arts in 1933. During his college years, which were the depression years, he worked as an elevator operator, a theater usher, and a bus boy in a restaurant on successive years in the evenings.

Paul Spiecker entered Union Theological Seminary, New York City in September 1933 and as a part of his course of study worked in the Church of All Nations as advisor to the Filipino Club of New York for 1 year and as a student assistant at Christ Methodist Church, NY, under Rev. Dr. Ralph Sockman, pastor. He transferred to the Theological Seminary School of Drew University, Madison, NJ, in September 1935 and graduated with a master of divinity degree—"Cum Laude" on June 9, 1936.

Reverend Spiecker has served as spiritual advisor and revered pastor dedicated to the well being and happiness of each and every member of the many congregations he has served. On

October 1, 1936, he was appointed supply pastor of the Carleton Hill Methodist Church, East Rutherford, NJ. He was ordained deacon on April 11, 1937, and elder—corresponds to priest—on April 23, 1939. Upon his ordination as deacon he was appointed pastor of Trinity Methodist Church, Stony Point, NY, where he served as pastor for 3 years. He was appointed pastor of Hawthorne Methodist Church, Hawthorne, NJ, on April 31, 1940, where he served as pastor for 39 years. He retired as a full time pastor on June 30, 1979, and was appointed to his current ministry—part time—as pastor of the Belle Vista-Simpson United Methodist Church on July 1, 1979.

Mr. Speaker, the quality of his leadership, the richness of his wisdom and the abundance of his caring and dedication to our young people and adults alike have been warmly captured in his outstanding service as a pastor of the Methodist Church for 49 consecutive years.

Reverend Spiecker has been a staunch supporter and active participant in many civic and community improvement programs. His standards of excellence throughout his lifetime have earned him the most highly coveted honor of being chosen the 1984 "Paul Harris Fellow" of the Rotary Club of Hawthorne. He was a member of the Hawthorne Rotary Club for 42 years—serving as president of the club 1959-60 and editor of the club bulletin for 25 years.

He has attained the greatest respect and deepest appreciation from a grateful community for his compassion, dedication and untiring efforts in service to his fellowman. He was a member of the Hawthorne Masonic Lodge, F & AM 212 for 40 years. While his sons were in high school, he served as president of the Elementary and High School Parents-Teachers Group and was responsible for the establishment of the American Field Service Program during his tenure.

Among some of his affiliations, he was member and president for 3 years, Greater Paterson Council of Churches; member and president, Paterson Ministerial Associations; member, board of trustees, Clinic for Mental Health Services, Passaic County; member and president for 3 years, board of trustees, Greater Paterson Mental Health Center; civil defense sector warden during World War II; volunteer night ambulance driver, Paterson General Hospital on Wednesday nights during World War II for 3 years. He was appointed chaplain of the police and fire departments of Hawthorne, NJ, and chaplain of the Passaic County Chiefs of Police Association for almost 20 years. Served as counsellor and staff member, Summer Youth Conferences. Served on the

Local Protestant Committee for "God and Country" award of the Boy Scouts of America. Served and serving as merit badge adviser, local Boy Scout Council. He is a member, Northern New Jersey Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church. Served on board of education, Social Action Committee, Nominating Committee and Commission on Archives and History during these years. Member, Historical Society for 40 years and president for 15 years; member, New Jersey Council of Churches. In his Christian ministry he has been cited by many for his outstanding service to our people and was entered in the prestigious publication, "Who's Who in the Methodist Church."

Reverend Spiecker's greatest source of pride is the satisfaction of being able to help people with problems when they become depressed, lonesome or terminally ill. In reflection he states that this opportunity of helping and giving is the most rewarding part of a pastor's ministry.

Mr. Speaker, all of us who have the good fortune to know Reverend Spiecker are especially proud of his many accomplishments. As we reflect upon the history of our great country and the good deeds of our people who have made our representative democracy second to none among all nations throughout the world, I appreciate the opportunity to call your attention to this distinguished gentleman and seek this national recognition of all of his good deeds. We want to share with him, his wife and his children the great pride we have in his distinguished and dedicated lifetime of outstanding service and contribution to the religious, cultural and spiritual enrichment of our community, State and Nation. We do indeed salute a distinguished theologian, esteemed pastor, outstanding community leader and good friend—Rev. Paul Edwin Spiecker of New Jersey. ●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 9, 1985, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 10

9:30 a.m.
Special on Aging
To hold oversight hearings on the establishment and implementation of the National Pacemaker Registry. SD-628

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 366 and S. 534, bills to authorize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and related proposals. SD-406

MAY 13

9:00 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on the Judiciary on international terrorism and narcotic trafficking. SD-226

Judiciary
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Foreign Relations on international terrorism and narcotic trafficking. SD-226

10:00 a.m.
*Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of Management and Budget. SD-192

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on proposed budget requests for fiscal year 1986 for programs of the Department of Energy, focusing on nuclear energy programs and nuclear waste activities. SD-366

MAY 14

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies. SD-116

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To resume oversight hearings on recent changes in the financial services industry. SD-538

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation and Conservation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on automobile fuel economy standards. SD-366

Rules and Administration

To hold hearings on S. 43, to grant line item veto authority to the President on appropriation bills. SR-301

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Business meeting, to mark up S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for United States agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, and related measures. SR-328A

Appropriations

Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Legislative Branch of the Federal Government, focusing on the Office of the Secretary of the Senate and the Office of the Senate Sergeant-at-Arms. S-128, Capitol

Foreign Relations

To continue joint hearings with the Committee on the Judiciary on international terrorism and narcotic trafficking. SD-419

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To hold oversight hearings on weight reduction products and plans, focusing on the safety and efficacy of diet products. SD-342

Judiciary

To continue joint hearings with the Committee on Foreign Relations on international terrorism and narcotic trafficking. SD-419

10:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 483, to ensure that the Federal Government assume the full cost of legislating and regulating Federal purposes and mandates. SD-215

12:00 a.m.

Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the overall impact of drug use in the District of Columbia. SD-138

2:00 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on proposed budget requests for fiscal year 1986 for programs of the Department of Energy, focusing on conservation and renewable programs. SD-366

MAY 15

9:00 a.m.
 Judiciary
 Constitution Subcommittee
 Business meeting, to mark up S.J. Res. 13, to propose an amendment to the Constitution relating to a Federal balanced budget and tax limitation, S. 40, to set forth procedures for holding constitutional conventions for proposing amendments to the Constitution, S. 37, to provide for civil rights in public schools, and S. 150, to revise certain provisions of the Freedom of Information Act with respect to request procedures, time limits, fees, and exemptions.
 SD-226

9:30 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Defense Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for certain defense programs, focusing on Army modernization.
 SD-192

Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
 SD-116

10:00 a.m.
 Foreign Relations
 To continue joint hearings with the Committee on the Judiciary on international terrorism and narcotic trafficking.
 SD-419

Governmental Affairs
 Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
 To continue oversight hearings on weight reduction products, focusing on the safety and efficacy of diet products.
 SD-342

Judiciary
 To continue joint hearings with the Committee on Foreign Relations on international terrorism and narcotic trafficking.
 SD-419

10:30 a.m.
 Judiciary
 To hold hearings on pending nominations.
 SD-226

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 *Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Energy Information Administration, and the Economic Regulatory Administration, Department of Energy.
 SD-138

Foreign Relations
 To hold joint closed hearings with the Committee on the Judiciary on international terrorism and narcotic trafficking.
 S-116, Capitol

Judiciary
 To hold joint closed hearings with the Committee on Foreign Relations on international terrorism and narcotic trafficking.
 S-116, Capitol

MAY 16

9:30 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
 SR-253

Judiciary
 Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to examine whether the United States should participate in the Berne Convention, an international union for the protection of literary and artistic works.
 SR-385

Labor and Human Resources
 Handicapped Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. 415, the Handicapped Children's Protection Act.
 SD-430

Veterans' Affairs
 To hold hearings on the nomination of Donald E. Shasteen, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment.
 SR-418

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for fossil energy.
 SD-138

Appropriations
 Legislative Branch Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Legislative Branch of the Federal Government, focusing on the Library of Congress and the Architect of the Capitol.
 S-128, Capitol

Environment and Public Works
 Water Resources Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on S. 366 and S. 534, bills to authorize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and related proposals.
 SD-406

Judiciary
 Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
 SD-226

2:00 p.m.
 Energy and Natural Resources
 Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
 To hold hearings to discuss the Department of Energy's prospective report to Congress on emerging clean-coal technologies.
 SD-366

MAY 17

9:30 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Surface Transportation Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on the deregulation of surface freight forwarders.
 SR-253

MAY 21

9:30 a.m.
 Environment and Public Works
 Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
 To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of section 404 of the Clean Water Act, relating to the wetlands dredge and fill permit program.
 SD-406

2:00 p.m.
 *Appropriations
 Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Holocaust Memorial Council, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior.
 SD-138

Appropriations
 Legislative Branch Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Legislative Branch of the Federal Government, focusing on the Congressional Budget Office, Office of Technology Assessment, General Accounting Office, and the Government Printing Office.
 S-128, Capitol

MAY 22

10:00 a.m.
 Governmental Affairs
 Civil Service, Post Office, and General Services Subcommittee
 To hold oversight hearings on General Accounting Office report on Federal pay equity and classification system.
 SD-342

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for Naval Petroleum Reserves, and fossil energy.
 SD-138

MAY 23

9:30 a.m.
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation
 Aviation Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. 586, to provide for the review of certain authority in awarding international airline route certificates issued under the Federal Aviation Act.
 SR-253

10:00 a.m.
 Governmental Affairs
 Civil Service, Post Office, and General Services Subcommittee
 To continue oversight hearings on a General Accounting Office report on Federal pay equity and classification system.
 SD-138

Labor and Human Resources
 Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on efforts to locate missing children.
 SD-430

JUNE 3

9:30 a.m.
 Finance
 Health Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed legislation to modify the Medicare direct medical education pass-through.
 SD-215

JUNE 4

9:30 a.m.
 Energy and Natural Resources
 Energy Regulation and Conservation Subcommittee
 To hold oversight hearings on the impact of imported petroleum prod-

11236

ucts on the domestic petroleum industry.
SD-366

JUNE 5

9:30 a.m.
Finance
To hold hearings on S. 814, to make technical corrections to certain provisions of the Tax Reform Act of 1984.
SD-215

JUNE 6

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Natural Resources Development and Production Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the impact of coal imports on the domestic coal industry.
SD-366

JUNE 10

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on proposed budget requests for fiscal year 1986 for programs of the Department of Energy, focusing on fossil energy programs.
SD-366

JUNE 11

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Orphan Drug Act

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

(P.L. 97-414), focusing on section 7(b) relating to radiation-cancer liability.
SD-430

Labor and Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on administrative activities of Gallaudet College and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf.
SR-428

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 403, to revise requirements with respect to the issuance of licenses for existing hydroelectric facilities, and S. 426, to provide for more protection to electric consumers.
SD-366

JUNE 12

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To continue oversight hearings on the implementation of the Orphan Drug Act (P.L. 97-414), focusing on section 7(b) relating to radiation-cancer liability
SD-430

JUNE 18

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation and Conservation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the current status of and factors affecting the natural gas market.
SD-366

May 8, 1985

JUNE 20

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the problem of drugs in the military.
SD-430

OCTOBER 1

11:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to review the legislative priorities of the American Legion.
SD-106

CANCELLATIONS

MAY 9

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up S. 6, bills to clarify and improve certain health care programs and services provided and administered by the VA, and related proposals, and S. 367, Veterans' Administration Adjudication Procedure and Judicial Review Act.
SR-418

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-406

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to discuss the proposed transfer of ownership of the Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail) to the private sector.
SD-226