

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WASHINGTON HOTEL KICKS
OFF I LOVE NEW YORK FESTI-
VAL

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday it was a special honor for me to participate in the official launching of the "I Love New York Festival" sponsored by the Omni Shoreham Hotel in Washington. The highlight of the day was the unveiling of a 36-foot, 50-ton ice carving of the Statue of Liberty which adorns the front of the Omni-Shoreham and weather permitting will for the duration of the festival which is to end at the end of March.

As an individual who has had the benefit of living in both Washington and New York, I commend the management and staff of the Omni Shoreham for this festival. It will certainly serve to foster a sense of improved fraternity between these two powerful and important cities. As Paul Sacco, vice president and managing director of the hotel said:

It is my hope that events such as these will establish a bond between our two great cities and eliminate the rivalry that has somehow existed in the past. Because of its function as the Federal City, Washington is the "pulse of the Nation." New York with its tremendous population, farms, rivers, lakes, streams, historical landmarks, culture and entertainment is the "pulse of the people."

At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a news release from the Omni Shoreham about Tuesday's kickoff and the entire I Love New York Festival; in addition, my remarks at the luncheon:

"I LOVE NEW YORK" FESTIVAL AT OMNI
SHOREHAM

The unveiling of a 36-foot, 50-ton ice carving of the Statue of Liberty, with the release of 1,000 balloons by Congressmen Mario Biaggi and Benjamin A. Gilman; New York 1986 Cherry Blossom Princess Kimberly Sullivan and a host of other celebrities launched the Omni Shoreham Hotel's "I Love New York" Festival at noon today. A Nathan's Famous Hot Dog Stand next to the huge carving provided free franks to on-lookers. The cast of the musical revue, "Forbidden Broadway," colorfully dressed as Carol Channing, Anthony Quinn, Liza Minnelli, Mary Martin, Ethel Merman and Kevin Kline added to the carnival atmosphere. Omni Shoreham Hotel Executive Chef Rupert Froehloch, assisted by Chefs Daniel O'Neill, Greg Scott and Dan Schroeder, sculpted the massive statue.

Following the opening ceremonies, the guests attended a luncheon in the hotel's Minique Café et Brasserie Restaurant with such other New Yorkers as St. Lawrence Seaway Administrator James L. Emery; New York State Society President Gerry Shefflet; Chief Counsel House Public Works

Committee Richard Sullivan; WRC T.V.'s Mac McGarry; and WGMS' Paul Anthony.

The Festival, which continues through March 31, features exhibits, displays and other materials which capture the spirit of the cultural, historical, recreational and entertainment heritage of the Empire State. A photo exhibit will depict the creation and placement of the Statue of Liberty and immigrants arriving at Ellis Island. The Tiffany glass panel from the original Nathan's Coney Island Hot Dog Stand dramatizes the popular Nathan's hot dogs being served.

Omni Shoreham Vice President and Managing Director Paul J. Sacco is presenting the "I Love New York" Festival in response to the growing interest in what is taking place in the State and New York City. People are attracted by New York's historical cities, and the beauty of its countryside and seashore. New York City, of course, has its famed skyline, popular restaurants, sightseeing, shopping, theater, culture and architecture. The Festival in Washington, he hopes, will establish a bond and end the rivalry now existing between the two great cities. Washington, he feels, is the "pulse of the nation." He depicted New York as the "pulse of the people."

The Omni Shoreham will make available to any resident of New York during the Festival a one night package, including a deluxe room, dinner with a bottle of champagne in Monique and a full American breakfast and a discount for "Forbidden Broadway", the hit musical revue in the Marquee Lounge, for \$34.95 per person, per night, double occupancy.

An additional link with New York State will be a contest with a grand prize of a seven-day roundtrip New York Air flight with accommodations for two for three days at Berkshire Place in New York and three days at the Sagamore Resort Hotel in Lake George, plus use of a Hertz car. During the Festival, hundreds of balloons with complimentary dinner coupons will be sent skyward from the front of the hotel entitling finders to have a New York food experience at the Omni Shoreham.

Typical of the New York food to be served during the Festival is the menu for the luncheon which launched the event:

Hors d'oeuvres—Nathan's Famous Hot Dogs; Brochette of Buffalo Beef; Broiled Bay Scallop Skewered with Bacon; Clams on the Half Shell.

Menu—New York Oyster Stew, Waldorf Salad, Roast Long Island Duckling, Apricot-Rice Stuffing, Cauliflower with Buttered Crumbs, Croquette of Chestnut, Poached Apple in New York Port Wine.

Wine—Taylor County Chablis, Bully Hill Chelois Noir.

The Omni Shoreham, which adjoins Rock Creek Park amidst one of Washington's finest residential areas, is within easy reach of every federal building, the business district, Kennedy Center and the Capitol. The hotel is operated by Omni International Hotels, a rapidly expanding group of distinctive hotels located in major metropolitan areas and resort destinations. Omni International is a division of Dunfey Hotels Corporation.

"I LOVE NEW YORK FESTIVAL" LAUNCHING
LUNCHEON

(By Representative Mario Biaggi)

I am delighted to be here today to help officially kick off the "I Love New York Festival," sponsored by the Omni Shoreham Hotel. I wish to pay a special tribute to Paul J. Sacco, vice-president and managing director of this hotel. His outstanding efforts on behalf of this festival guarantee this will be a special occasion between now and the end of March.

It is a pleasure to be among such distinguished guests as: the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Samuel Pierce—a transplanted New Yorker; also my two distinguished colleagues from New York—Charlie Rangel and Ben Gilman; also Chairman Jim Emery of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Commission; and last but not least, another transplanted New Yorker, from my area in the Bronx—Dick Sullivan, chief counsel of the House Public Works Committee.

We are all here for one central reason—we all love New York. I always enjoy participating in those occasions which allow New York to be showcased for the marvelous place it is. I am proud to say that I am a lifelong native son of New York City. I have lived in the worst of times in New York and I have lived in the best of times as well.

For most of my adult life, I have been proud to serve the people of the city of New York. First as a letter carrier—then for 23 years as a police officer—and for the past 17 years in the House of Representatives. I have always maintained that the greatness of New York lies in its people. They have a spirit like nowhere else in this Nation, because they live in a place which is like no other place in the Nation, or in the world, for that matter.

What makes today's event even more important is that it is being held here in Washington. It may serve to dispel the oft held notion that there is some kind of bitter rivalry between the cities of Washington and New York. In my mind, there needs to be no such rivalry. I solved the problem many years ago. I live in both cities.

It is also nice to be associated with an event where Washington is doing something for New York—instead of doing something to it.

I commend the Omni Shoreham for their sponsorship of this unique festival. I also compliment the management and staff for the outstanding and complete restoration they have accomplished. The Shoreham was always a fine, even grand, hotel. The Omni Shoreham does the impossible—it makes this hotel even better. May I also note that Monique's Restaurant is rapidly becoming the rage among diners in this fickle town.

Again I appreciate the opportunity to be here today to promote my home—the city and State of New York. The "I Love New York Festival" will certainly enhance the spirit of fraternity between Washington and New York, which can only benefit both places.

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

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

[From The New York Times, Jan. 28, 1986]

Hot Dog!

New York and Washington have always enjoyed a special relationship, albeit tinged with an edge of rivalry, tending, as they do, to see themselves as the nation's two most important cities (sorry, L.A.). So it is perhaps no surprise that Washington's Omni Shoreham hotel is laying on a two-month "I Love New York" Festival beginning next Tuesday with exhibits and displays evoking the cultural, historic, recreational and entertainment heritage of the Empire State, with special emphasis on New York City. A photo exhibit, for example, will depict the creation and placement of the Statue of Liberty and immigrants arriving at Ellis Island.

The hotel will launch hundreds of balloons over the course of the festival entitling finders to a "New York food experience" in its dining room. Included will be such things as Long Island duckling, Finger Lakes wines and pie à la mode, said to have originated at the Cambridge Hotel in Washington County, N.Y.

What, no Coney Island hot dogs?

Arnold Fine, the promoter for the event, said the hotel had "something more gourmet" in mind but would consider the noble Gotham wurst.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 1, 1986]

CALLING ALL HOT DOGS

Galvanized by the disclosure that Washington's Omni Shoreham Hotel had neglected to include hot dogs on its opening menu for a monthlong salute to the Empire State called "I Love New York," the big Apple's best-known purveyor of the quintessential New York knosh promptly shipped down to the capital a supply of franks, along with a cookbook with 150 (!) recipes for preparing them.

Yes, thanks to Nathan's Famous, hot dogs are now on the kickoff menu: hot dogs au vin blanc, hot dogs amandine and hot dogs au gratin casserole as well as hot dogs swaddled in a bun.

SDI: A STRATEGY FOR THE FUTURE—AND TODAY

HON. RICHARD ARMEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, in the past we relied upon the doctrine of mutually assured destruction [MAD] to assure the defense of our Nation and our allies. Unfortunately, this doctrine implies that the security of America is most certain when its people are held hostage to final destruction by a totalitarian state whose total existence is defined by the denial of freedom.

MAD is an inflexible strategy. All it requires—and all it allows—is that after sustaining an attack on ourselves, we be able to devastate Soviet cities in retaliation. It is a reflexive strategy with no options for action.

Past reliance on MAD can be defended because it was the best strategy we had due to technological limitations. Today, however, those limitations no longer exist.

It is the primary responsibility of the government to defend its citizens. President Reagan's strategic defense initiative [SDI] gives

us the ability to put the evil side of the nuclear genie back in the bottle.

To do that will require research and more expenditures than we appropriated last year. Even in these trying budgetary times, the search for a defense against nuclear attack must be given top priority and freed from the threat of crippling budget cuts.

The proposal for SDI is not some far off dream, but can be partially deployed in the near future as new technologies become available. That's why SDI should not be seen as an isolated strategy. Its most promising features can be blended, as they come along, into broader strategies. While we are implementing this truly defensive system we must maintain a strong nuclear and conventional defense.

As it stands today, Soviet planners can target America's land-based nuclear deterrent and guarantee that almost all of it would be wiped out.

If the Soviet planner must consider the effects of even a partial United States strategic defense which destroys a portion of attacking missiles, he is faced with a problem full of uncertainties. He does not know how many warheads will arrive, and which ones will arrive over which targets.

This changes the simple arithmetic problem into a complex calculus full of uncertainties. Such uncertainties are the essence of effective deterrence.

With the rapid development of missile technology and space exploration, we can start blending SDI into our current defense strategy right away. A missile defense that would stop incoming Soviet missiles before they reach American soil is not only possible, but mandatory. But pursuing such a program requires us to make a commitment to give SDI top budgetary priority.

I am willing to make that commitment to fulfill the original purpose and highest priority of government: to defend its citizens.

COHA HUMAN RIGHTS REPORT ON COLOMBIA

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, Louise Sibling of the Council on Hemispheric Affairs reports on human rights in Colombia. Certainly, that nation has had its share of problems over the past year both political and environmental. I wish President Betancur well. His is not an easy task. Nonetheless, it is important in any democracy to examine problems—economic, social, and political. I am, therefore, submitting Ms. Sibling's report for the RECORD. But I hasten to add that I hope that what she declares to be "civil war" in Colombia will be eliminated and that nation will return to a state of calm.

COLOMBIA: ABUSES WIDESPREAD AS NATION SLIDES TOWARD CIVIL WAR

1985 saw Colombia's human rights picture turn from hopeful to bleak, as the country experienced some of the hemisphere's most serious human rights violations. The previous year, President Belisario Betancur's

peace initiatives had raised the hope that the nation's public order situation might finally be calmed after nearly 40 years of often rampant civil strife. These hopes were brutally dashed in 1985, as the peace process collapsed, and violence again engulfed the nation.

In mid-1984 three of Colombia's major guerrilla groups, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the April 19 Movement (M-19), and Popular Liberation Army (EPL) inked cease-fire pacts with the government. The peace process, which sought to integrate the armed leftist elements into legal political life, was internationally hailed as a model for Latin America. COHA named President Betancur its 1984 regional leader of the year, and even nominated him for a Nobel peace prize.

Under the weight of a bellicose and increasingly autonomous military that has always been antagonistic to the civilian leadership's peace overtures, and a potpourri of fractious insurgent groups—both of which violated the truce accords repeatedly—the peace process fell apart in 1985. As all but one of the nation's major guerrilla factions repudiated the treaties—only the FARC continues to uphold the cease-fire—ever-intensifying fighting has wracked the countryside. This violence culminated in the bloody battle at the Palace of Justice that cost over 100 lives Nov. 7, and was gruesomely underlined in mid-December when mass graves containing as many as 100 bodies that showed signs of torture were unearthed near Toribio southwestern Colombia.

The government's reckless decision to spurn the pleas of Supreme Court Justices and the M-19 for negotiations over the Palace of Justice takeover and instead storm the compound, signalled President Betancur's final capitulation to the military's eagerness to meet the insurgency with force—rather than the concessions and peace talks he had earlier so bravely advocated. The results were disastrous: 100 or more people killed, including 12 Supreme Court magistrates, and the final nail in the peace process' coffin.

The Defense Ministry announced in August that between July 1984 and July 1985, 605 guerrillas, 272 peasants, and 243 military and police died in violence related to guerrilla activities. Since that time, as violence has intensified, the casualty rate has quickened; fighting claimed many hundreds of lives in the last five months of the year.

Spurning the M-19's calls for renewed peace talks, the army declared "all-out war" on the insurgents, launching a bloody "final offensive" in southwestern Colombia in October. More than 2,000 peasants fled from the assault, reporting that the army's indiscriminate bombings (reminiscent of El Salvador), had destroyed most of the farms in the area. The Committee in solidarity with Political Prisoners concluded that from August through October there were twenty murders, six disappearances, and 105 arrests in Cali. The army's November-December "Clean Cali for Christmas" offensive took a heavy toll on the area's civilians as well.

Nor has political violence been confined to such battlefield clashes between the guerrillas and the military. Internecine battles among the armed left have been frequent, with the FARC repeatedly coming under attack by M-19, Quintin Lame, and the Ricardo Franco Front, a dissident wing of its own organization, for foreswearing the armed struggle. Kidnappings have been on the rise, with the abduction of Samuel Schneider, top engineer of the Colombia Pe-

troleum Enterprise the year's most prominent case.

Rightist death squads, most notably "Death to Kidnappers," and military elements have perpetrated scores of assassinations and attacks on leftist figures, exacting a heavy toll on the left's leadership. M-19 commander Antonio Navarro Wolf lost a leg to an army attack on a then-legal M-19 encampment in May; the attack was in violation of the cease fire, which the M-19 did not repudiate until June 21. On April 13 the body of Guillermo Quiroz, leader of ANUC, the national peasant association, was found along the road between Medellín and Cartagena; two days earlier he had been arrested by men claiming to be from military intelligence after an army patrol had searched the ANUC headquarters demanding to know his whereabouts. Legendary M-19 leader Ivan Marino Ospina died in a clash with soldiers Aug. 28, as did Luis Alberto Monroy, a founder of the Quintin Lame Indian insurgent group in November. The EPL's main political leader, Oscar William Calvo, was shot to death by two unidentified men on a motorcycle as he left an optical clinic in northern Bogota Nov. 20; this killing prompted the EPL to decisively renounce its cease-fire with the Betancur regime after months of vacillation. The Army of National Liberation (ELN) took responsibility for the Dec. 1 murder of former ELN leader Ricardo Lara Parada, warning that it "will execute" other former combatants who turn against the military struggle. Bombs damaged the Colombian Communist Party's headquarters in Bogota in June and again on Nov. 20.

Other assassination victims include Narciso Norena, mayor of Corinto, slain on his way to work in August, Judge Julio Manuel Castro Gil, gunned down in Bogota during July, and magistrate Alvaro Medina Ochoa killed in Medellín in April.

FARC personnel have been particular victims of such violence, despite the organization's singular adherence to the cease-fire and efforts to become a part of the legal political process. Fourteen members of its new legal political wing, the Patriotic Union (UP) were assassinated in 1985, along with more than 100 inactive guerrillas murdered during what the organization calls the military's "constant harassment" of its legal camps. On Nov. 30, the army slew 23 FARC members in an attack on an inactive guerrilla column in southwest Colombia. UP political candidates trying to contest next year's elections have found their efforts disrupted by violence and intimidation.

Labor unrest also met with repression. When the Communist Party-linked CSTC labor federation held a 24-hour general strike June 20, police arrested 500 people, and the military broke up demonstrations in numerous cities and towns. Betancur's government then froze the assets and suspended the juridical rights of all the participating unions for six months, underlining Bogota's failure to accept the right to strike. The government argued that its actions were legal under its special state of siege powers.

These decree powers have been in effect since May 1, 1984, when Betancur issued three edicts pursuant to Article 121 of Colombia's constitution, which provides the government special powers when public order has been disturbed. Decree 1039 gave departmental governors the power to restrict and supervise the movement of persons in the street and in public places. Decree 1040 prohibited all political gather-

ings, demonstrations, rallies, and meetings that could disrupt public order unless approved seven days in advance. Decree 1041 forbade the wearing of masks or otherwise concealing one's identity. Although the emergency powers—still in effect—do not abrogate the right of habeas corpus, they do give the military extensive detention privileges in militarized zones.

After the assault on the Palace of Justice, Betancur emphasized that "the peace process will continue." But Evereth Bustamante, the M-19's international secretary replied, in a Nov. 13 letter to the United Nations, that "The peace of Betancur and his political model is the peace of the grave." In Colombia it is no longer peace, but civil war, that is carrying the day.

LET'S KEEP OUR PROMISE TO THE USERS OF DeSOTO BEND

HON. JIM ROSS LIGHTFOOT

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to open DeSoto National Wildlife Refuge near Missouri Valley, IA, for recreational purposes which, after 28 years, have been denied to the users of the lake which is located there.

When plans for the proposed DeSoto Bend National Wildlife Refuge and Recreational Area were made public by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife Service in the late 1950's, a great deal of opposition from the public in the immediate vicinity made necessary public hearings to air grievances.

On September 4, 1957, at Blair, NE and on September 5, 1957, at Missouri Valley, IA, public hearings on the proposed project were held. By far the most significant objection to the proposed refuge was the need for 7,800 acres of valuable real estate to be designated as refuge land. In order to overcome this objection and to gain the necessary support of influential groups, Government officials exhibited numerous slides of similar refuge areas along with exciting commentary, most of which dealt with recreational scenes, water skiing, camping, controlled shooting areas within specially constructed buffer zones, and so forth.

During the hearing, Mr. Robert Burwell, an official of the Department of Interior's regional office in Minneapolis, MN stated:

We are here this evening to describe for you a proposed plan for this refuge as we have developed it, how we would like to operate and administer it, and what we would want to accomplish.

He went on to say:

It is our opinion that the area should generally be open to public enjoyment at all times of the year, except during the period approximately September 15 until the end of the waterfowl season. I believe that with the exception of the period from September 15 to about the first of January, it can be opened to boating, fishing, swimming, picnicking, etc. If the ice is thick enough and the folks want to do so, we know of no reason why there can't be ice fishing.

The bulk of the supporting statements from well-meaning participants in these discus-

sions, were for the most part, stressing desirable fringe benefits to the public from a recreational point of view, and not primarily for the creation of a game refuge alone. The minutes from these meetings are a matter of public record and many of the participants in these hearings were prominent in the field of conservation and local affairs.

It was based on documented remarks such as these that the public gave the DeSoto project its approval, and the proposal became a reality. Initially, as the Government salesmen promised, the project accommodated a wide range of recreational uses.

Unfortunately, however, several key recreational activities used as attractive fringe benefits to win public support never were developed and some were gradually deemphasized after the first few years of implementation. Among the most valuable of these were swimming and water-skiing, both of which have been banned. Water-skiing was banned as recently as last spring, after having been enjoyed by thousands as wholesome family fun for the previous 27 years.

The Iowa Conservation Commission has stated:

The issue, as viewed by the commission, is that the U.S. Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife has gone back on its promise to the people of Iowa and Nebraska as to how the vast resources of DeSoto Bend would be used.

In 1957 public acceptance of Federal control of DeSoto Bend was given only after Federal officials assured the public that in addition to giving refuge to migration waterfowl, Desoto Bend would provide public recreation. This was to include fishing, boating, water-skiing, swimming, picnicking, hiking, hunting, camping, etc.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing today would only restore swimming and water-skiing to the refuge. These activities would be restricted to the summertime months, and would not interfere with the migratory birds which pass through in the fall.

I also want to point out that water recreation opportunities are very limited in this area, but the demand is tremendous. The only two major alternatives for the thousands of water-skiers in the area are Lake Manawa, which is barely large enough to accommodate water-skiing, and certainly not a large volume of traffic; or the Missouri River, which is a terribly unsafe and unhealthy place for family recreation. Desoto Bend, on the other hand, is a clean, 7-mile long body of water which can be used safely by many. Indeed, only one death during the lake's 27-year history was boat-related.

In addition, in order to accommodate the interests of fishermen and others, this legislation would open only one-half of the lake to water-skiing. The other half would remain a no-wake zone for fishing and under-water vegetation.

Mr. Speaker, we, as elected representatives of the people, have an obligation to use their tax dollars in a way which accommodates the widest range of interests possible. That is not what is happening at Desoto National Wildlife Refuge. The citizens in my district are tired of fighting the bureaucrats who are going back on their promises. The bureaucrats have

come and gone over the years, but the people are still there holding a broken promise. The bill I'm introducing today would settle this long-standing disagreement once and for all, and I urge that my colleagues give it their support.

**SMITHSONIAN SELLS
INTERNATIONAL MUTUAL FUND**

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, the Smithsonian Institution has taken important action to sell its shares in an international mutual fund which indirectly has investments in firms doing business in South Africa.

As one who believes the Smithsonian should not invest, however, indirectly, in firms doing business in South Africa, I was pleased by this decision.

As a member of the Smithsonian Institution's Board of Regents, I am submitting the full explanation of this latest step as published by the Smithsonian for my colleagues' attention.

The statement follows:

SMITHSONIAN SELLS HOLDINGS IN INTERNATIONAL PORTFOLIO AS INCONSISTENT WITH INVESTMENT POLICY

The Smithsonian Institution today (Tuesday, Jan. 28) announced that it is selling its holdings in an international equity portfolio because that investment "can be perceived as inconsistent" with Smithsonian policy barring investment in companies involved in South Africa that do not subscribe to the Sullivan Principles.

Carlisle H. Humelsine, acting chairman of the Investment Policy Committee of the Smithsonian's Board of Regents, instructed the Office of the Treasurer to order the sale of holdings in the Trustees Commingled Fund-International Equity Portfolio.

At the winter meeting of the full Board of Regents held yesterday, Humelsine was asked to determine whether there was an inconsistency between the Smithsonian's investment in the International Equity Portfolio and Smithsonian policy on investments in companies doing business in South Africa.

The policy referred to was established on June 17, 1985 when the Executive Committee of the Board of Regents, acting on behalf of the entire Board, instructed the Institution's investment managers to sell the Institution's holdings in American companies that had operations in South Africa but had not subscribed to the Sullivan Principles specifying non-discrimination in hiring, employment, benefits and other areas. The Executive Committee also instructed the investment managers not to purchase any stocks of American companies operating in South Africa that do not subscribe to those principles. These actions were ratified by the entire Board in September 1985.

Humelsine, after reviewing the question of the investment in the Commingled Fund at the Regents' request, "confirmed that the Institution's holdings" in that fund "can be perceived as inconsistent" with the June action of the Executive Committee, as ratified by the full Board.

An investment of \$11.5 million in the Commingled Fund's International Equity Portfolio was made by the Smithsonian at the end of 1984 on the recommendation of its investment advisors and the Regents' investment committee. A portion of this investment was sold during the fourth quarter of 1985, reducing the investment to \$8.6 million with a market value of \$10.6 million. The Trustees Commingled Fund accounted for 6 percent of the market value of the Institution's total endowment as of Dec. 31, 1985.

The Trustees Commingled Fund, part of the Vanguard Group of Funds, is an open-end diversified investment company or mutual fund. Its International Equity Portfolio, according to a prospectus, "follows a flexible investment policy emphasizing primarily non-U.S. equity securities." The Commingled Fund has not had and does not now have any direct investments in South Africa. Its holdings are concentrated in Australia, Canada, Japan and the United Kingdom. A complete list of its holdings was provided to the Smithsonian on a monthly basis.

The Smithsonian Institution, an independent establishment of the United States, had an investment portfolio of approximately \$165 million at the end of December 1985. Of this total portfolio, approximately \$35 million was invested in stocks of 31 companies that have operations in South Africa and are signatories of the Sullivan Principles.

Humelsine, chairman emeritus of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, has been chairman of the Regents' Executive Committee since 1982 and acting chairman of the Investment Policy Committee since 1984.

**ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS
SETTLEMENT ACT**

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to provide for necessary amendments to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act which will clarify future land and stock ownership rights under the act. I am pleased that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has joined as cosponsor of this legislation.

Under the terms of ANCSA, corporate shares in Alaska Native corporations become fully alienable at the conclusion of a 20-year period following enactment. As this deadline draws near, there has been a great deal of concern in Alaska Native communities that the unfettered sale of stock could well result in the loss of lands used by Native people of Alaska for hundreds if not thousands of years.

To address this concern, this legislation would provide for the continuation of restrictions contained in ANCSA, as amended, unless an individual Native corporation takes certain specified actions to eliminate or modify the sale restrictions. Dissenter's rights are provided where the corporation elects to continue stock restrictions. In addition to clarification of corporate share ownership rights, the bill provides for land ownership protections.

Mr. Speaker, many individuals and groups in Alaska have spent a great deal of time and effort over the past 2 years in developing the basis for this legislation. Through a series of village meetings, workshops, and special conventions, Alaska Natives have deliberated long and hard and made many difficult decisions which resulted in proposals to Congress. The Alaska Federation of Natives is to be commended for their efforts to develop a consensus among many individuals, villages, and groups in a difficult and complex area of the law.

I believe the consensus in the Alaska Native community provides us with a good starting point and will serve as a focus of attention on necessary changes in ANCSA. There will be hearings in Alaska and Washington, DC on this legislation. It is my hope that we will be able to enact needed amendments to ANCSA during the current session of Congress.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

**THE MILK MARKETING
CONTROL ACT OF 1986**

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Milk Marketing Control Act of 1986. This legislation would allow dairy farmers to vote in a referendum for a program which would lower dairy program costs by controlling the amount of milk produced and would guarantee dairy farmers a minimum support price of 70 percent of parity—approximately \$15.15 per hundredweight at today's prices.

This legislation was introduced last year as an amendment to the Food Security Act of 1985 by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative OBEY and myself. While it was defeated on the floor of the House, I believe that the farm bill which was ultimately passed by the Congress does little to provide income to our dairy industry, hastens the exodus of family farmers from dairying by actually paying them to give it up, and ignores the devastating, impending impacts of Gramm-Rudman cuts on farmers' milk checks and on the industry as a whole. Ultimately, it forces dairy producers to rely on a diminishing and vanishing support program.

Legislation such as I am introducing today would virtually end Government program costs by eliminating rather than purchasing surplus production. Farmers, who are suffering the ravages of low commodity prices and declining farm equity, would be guaranteed a profitable price for their milk while production costs would decline as herd sizes drop.

Although this bill has a fairly immediate effective date for implementation upon enactment, I am not under any illusion that this bill is likely to be passed in the short term. President Reagan effectively persuaded the Congress in the first session that he will veto any production control legislation.

No, it is more likely that a production control mechanism will be enacted in the longer term. I, like many others, believe that this may be an inevitable route for our farm policy. But, if such legislation is likely to be passed in the future, it is important that farmers and farm organizations begin now to give such a policy change their full attention and discussion. Already, cooperatives such as AMPI and a variety of new farm groups have begun to look at the question of supply management. This is a process which must go forward if the potential of such programs is to be thoroughly understood when farm legislation is next considered in the Congress. It is in that spirit that I introduce this bill today.

My legislation would require the Secretary of Agriculture to estimate the amount of milk production required to meet predictable consumption and to establish limits on production for each dairy farmer based upon historical production patterns over a 5-year period. Allowances are made both for farmers with less than 5 years of production history and for farmers who participated in the Dairy Diversion Program so that their base will reflect what they would have produced had they participated in the diversion program. Since the Secretary would be required to support the price of milk at 70 percent of parity, he would be required to make production cuts large enough to ensure that Government purchases would be minimal.

Individual farmers would be able to transfer their bases to other farmers through sales or leases only if the transfer was accompanied by a transfer of the milk production facility. In other words, a farmer could not realize financial gain from selling or leasing the base unless he sold or rented his milking facilities along with the base.

Since the implementation of the whole-herd buyout program has already begun, it would not be realistic to suspend that program in favor of this program. Nonetheless, there is no reason why the programs cannot operate at the same time since the Secretary will still have the ability to anticipate production and consumption needs. Therefore, all contracts entered into under the buyout program would have to be met.

Our current price support program has proven to be a burden on the national treasury and a burden on the backs of farmers who have had to assume the major share of program costs and who, at the same time, have been forced to operate under ever lower incomes. It is time that we give our dairy farmers the opportunity to choose to match supply with demand and allow market forces to give them the prices they need. Rural America cannot survive without returning to farmers the ability to produce at a profit and to enjoy the luxury of a decent level of income.

**COACH KARAM RECEIVES THE
HONOR HE DESERVES**

HON. BARNEY FRANK
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, at a particularly poignant tribute last month, 700 citizens of

Fall River, MA, joined together to say thanks to "Skip" Karam, the coach of Fall River's B.M.C. Durfee High School. For 25 years, Skip Karam has been the effective head coach of Durfee High's popular and successful basketball team. At a testimonial dinner organized by the Fall River Boosters Club, Skip was appropriately commended for his outstanding record of 467 wins and 102 losses. His contribution to the Fall River community has been a shining example for generations of students and their parents as he has led Durfee High School's team year after year. In fact, under Skip Karam's stewardship, the Durfee team won division championships in 1965, 1977, and in 1984.

Claire Plante and Jackie Rego who have worked tirelessly as leaders of the Durfee Sports Booster Club took the occasion to thoughtfully announce the establishment of a scholarship fund in memory of Skip's father Thomas Karam, Sr., a lifelong booster of athletics in Fall River.

An article from the Fall River Herald News and the Providence Journal describe the events of that evening. Mr. Speaker, I include articles at this point in the RECORD:

**FRIENDS TOAST KARAM; ESTABLISH
SCHOLARSHIP IN MEMORY OF DAD**

(By George Darmody)

Durfee High athletic director/basketball coach Tom "Skip" Karam was honored for 25 years of dedicated service during a testimonial/roast Sunday night at the Venus deMilo in Swansea. It was an impressive affair, highlighted by several prominent speakers including Providence College coach Rick Pitero, Dartmouth athletic director Carlin Lynch and Lexington High coach Bob Farias.

The speaking program was filled and all of the speakers poked a little fun at Skip in traditional roast style, then offered their congratulations on his accomplishments. For Karam, this affair had a different touch.

At the end of the program, Skip who had agreed to be the victim of what started out as a roast in a fund raising campaign sponsored by the Durfee Sports Boosters Club to raise scholarship monies for the Durfee athletes, was overwhelmed.

Claire Plante and Jackie Rego, members of the group, announced an annual scholarship for the top male and female scholar-athletes in memory of Thomas Karam Sr., father of Skip, Bob and Jim Karam, and a lifelong booster of athletics, especially at Durfee High.

Just prior to the memorial scholarship announcement, Superintendent of Schools John Correiro revealed plans to renovate the foyer at the Luke Urban Field House displaying all of Durfee's championship trophies and awards with a special section dedicated to Karam's accomplishments as Durfee High basketball coach over his first 25 years as the Toppers mentor.

And, moments before that, a message to Skip via a video playback, wishing him congratulations, was received from his mother, who is vacationing in Florida.

Skip, his wife, the former Betty DeFusco, and their daughter Jennifer were visibly moved by those presentations.

Karam also received a letter of congratulations from President Ronald Reagan and commendations and congratulatory messages from the School Committee, City Council, Mayor Carlton Viveiros, State

House of Representatives, State Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives.

Providence College has long been a favorite of many Fall Riverites in collegiate basketball. The appearance of Pitero was a pleasant surprise and his comments toward Karam were rewarding to all who follow Durfee sports.

"He is truly one of the greatest coaches in any ranks today," said Pitero of Karam. He added: "Playing for Skip Karam opens a door to any gym in America. He is an outstanding teacher of all young players he has coached and his players are all proud that they have played for him," Pitero noted.

Farias, a former hoopster for Karam, said: "He (Karam) taught me to give 100 percent in everything I do and it has made me what I am today." What Farias is, is a well respected high school basketball coach who has guided Lexington High to several outstanding seasons.

Lynch, known more for his football coaching than basketball prowess, told the gathering of approximately 700 persons. "He (Karam) has instilled loyalty and trust in his players."

Other speakers were Rep. Al Herren, who served as master of ceremonies; Ron Raposa, Jim Gibney, Ernest "Baron" Baroody, City Councillor Steve Camara, Bill Whitty, representing Rep. Barney Frank; School Committeewoman Lillian Darmody, Mary Ann Arruda, representing Major Viveiros; Sen. Tom Norton, testimonial chairman Earl Wright.

Elaine Morris made a presentation from the Boosters Club and Matt Attar and Mike Herren of this year's Durfee basketball team made a presentation from this year's team

**SEVEN HUNDRED HONOR DURFEE COACH
"SKIPPY" KARAM**

(By Doug Chapman)

SWANSEA, MASS.—Tom "Skippy" Karam, the winningest high school basketball coach in New England, was honored last night for his 25 years of service at B.M.C. Durfee High School in Fall River.

More than 700 people, including many sports personalities and officials, attended the roast and testimonial dinner at the Venus de Milo restaurant. The "Salute to Our Skippy" was to raise money for the Durfee Sports Boosters' scholarships.

Karam was called "one of the premier high school coaches in America" by Providence College coach Rick Pitino. "If you're a college coach in America today, you know about Skippy Karam," Pitino said. "For any player to say, 'I played for Skippy Karam,' that is an introduction to any gym in the country."

Karam began his coaching career at Westport High School. After one season, he returned to his high school alma mater to coach in 1960. Now in his 26th season at Durfee, he has amassed a 467-102 record, including state Division I championships in 1966, 1977 and 1984. Karam's winning percentage of 82.1 ranks in the top 10 nationally.

"In 25 years, (he) has carried on and enlarged the Durfee basketball tradition," said John Correiro, Fall River superintendent of schools and a former teammate.

After surveying the crowd, former Durfee athletic director Ernest "Baron" Baroody declared, "Your accomplishments are legend, your friends are legion."

A bronze plaque and a trophy case, citing all of his accomplishments, will be placed

near the entrance to the Luke Urban Field House. A memorial scholarship, which his brothers, James and Robert, helped finance, was established in memory of his father, Tanous Karam.

Besides the plaque and scholarship, Karam received written citations from President Reagan, Governor Dukakis, Rep. Barney Frank, the state Senate, the state House of Representatives, the Fall River City Council and the city School Committee. Fall River Mayor Carlton Viveiros declared yesterday "Skip Karam Day" in the city.

For Durfee hoop fans, the best news was Karam's promising to continue as coach. "I don't think I'll pack it up quite yet," he said. "I look at the talent of our younger players, and I'll have to stick around for a while."

WASHINGTON'S POLICY ON NICARAGUA MOVING CLOSER TO THE BRINK

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the continuing controversy concerning United States aid to the so-called Contras in Nicaragua has been intensified by this administration's decision to request increased funding for their military activities there.

An article in yesterday's edition of the Boston Globe by Mr. Randolph Ryan delineates the dangers inherent in such a policy decision, while underscoring the persistence of the Somocista control in all Contra activities and the savagery of their conduct in Nicaragua.

I commend this article to my colleagues and the American public as a solid contribution toward a better understanding of the problems and the choices we confront in the months ahead with regard to United States policy in Central America.

[From the Boston Globe, Feb. 5, 1986]

WASHINGTON'S POLICY ON NICARAGUA MOVING CLOSER TO THE BRINK (By Randolph Ryan)

Foreign policy militants in the Reagan administration have been scanning the world for opportunities to lay to rest the ghost of Vietnam by overthrowing a government that can be called Marxist. Angola is perhaps the trendiest target at the moment, but Nicaragua remains the standby because it is nearby, weak and unpopular with most of its neighbors, and because so much effort has already been invested.

"No more Cubas, but also no Vietnams," the militants promise. It is central to their premise of tidy "low-intensity" wars that the Sandinistas can be felled without US ground forces.

This winter, as the administration asks Congress for \$100 million for the Contras, the reality the militants dare not admit is that although Nicaragua seems vulnerable—in economic ruin and almost defenseless in key military categories such as airpower—the unsavory force the CIA has cobbled together cannot win with guns and money alone. The Contras have no political legitimacy in Nicaragua. They would have to be installed by US troops.

Although many Nicaraguans chafe under Sandinista rule, neither that discontent nor the fatigue of being besieged translates into support for the Contras.

The administration portrays the Contras as dedicated Thomas Jeffersons. They have just issued a set of high-sounding "principles and objectives" promising democracy. To most Nicaraguans, however, they are not credible patriots or democrats.

Edgar Chamorro, who was recruited by the CIA for the Contra directorate, noted that 46 of the 48 military commands were held by former national guardsmen of the former dictator, Anastasio Somoza. He listened as colleagues on the directorate "talked mostly about recovering their lost wealth and privileged status." He became disturbed by Contra atrocities and CIA control. When he testified about what he had witnessed, he was thrown out.

The Contras have never lived down the identification of their leaders with Somoza. Plagued by their image and by internal divisions, Contra leaders some months ago created an umbrella group called UNO (United Nicaraguan Opposition), Adolfo Calero, the powerful right-wing leader, was camouflaged with moderates, such as Arturo Cruz, who have democratic credentials and a following in the US Congress.

The power had remained with the one who commands the guns—Calero. Ambivalent about his role as front man, Cruz has verged on quitting. In any case, he has no power.

The average Contra soldier is a peasant from isolated regions similar to the backwaters of the Appalachians and holding conservative goals common in such areas, above all they wish to be left alone by the central government in Managua. Much of the killing for which the Contras are notorious has resulted when such fighters have taken advantage of the US-sanctioned violence to pursue grudges that are not political, or at least have nothing to do with the pursuit of democracy as a civic ideal.

CIA and Contra leaders have tried to channel this penchant for mayhem toward "political" targets such as teachers, health workers and other representatives of the Managua government. That has gruesomely neutralized some committed Sandinistas, but has not endeared the Contras to Nicaraguans.

Because the Contras are bankrupt of political support—the key area where liberation struggles are won or lost—the administration has tried increasingly to bill them as a winning team militarily. Last fall, administration officials spoke of steering the Contras away from rural terror toward dramatic shows of force in urban areas. The new look never materialized.

Not only have the Contras lost ground militarily during the past year while Nicaraguan defenses have improved, but they also have been unable to shake the reputation for savagery documented by Washington Post reporter Christopher Dickey in his book "With the Contras."

For the administration the only fruit of Contra activity in 1985 was that it caused the Sandinistas to increase restrictions on civil liberties. That enabled the administration to decry a new wave of repression, but has not made the Contras more popular or more effective militarily.

In the belief that avoiding US casualties is the only condition on which American voters will insist, administration militants vigorously reject the Vietnam analogy. They insist that ground fighting would

never require Americans. Indeed, that is what they hope. What Congress must consider, however, is that as increasing US dollars and credibility are put on the line, the temptation to intervene is bound to increase.

It would be hard for administration militants to admit their plan has gone awry. They want much more than mere demilitarization of the Sandinistas, which is what the Contadora peace process offers. They need a victory.

What Congress must consider is that the administration's embarrassment will deepen if more treasure and prestige are committed to this dubious battle. When it has finally become clear that the Contras cannot take power, even with hundreds of millions in lethal aid, who believes their militant US backers won't want to send troops?

IN SUPPORT OF FREEDOM AROUND THE WORLD

HON. RICHARD ARMEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, America's role in the course of history has been determined by our Founding Father's belief that freedom is a fundamental right given to all men. President Reagan has taken important steps to remind us of our national purpose and implement it through our foreign policy. Since 1980, the United States has strongly supported the forces of freedom and democracy throughout the world.

Currently there are four major battles for freedom taking place around the globe: Afghanistan, Angola, Nicaragua, and Cambodia.

The Soviet Union continues to conduct its ruthless genocide in Afghanistan. They have caused nearly one-third of the entire population to flee the country creating the largest refugee population in the world. They have used saturation bombing of cropland to starve the population into submission. They have imprisoned most of the doctors and have ordered all relief agencies out of the country.

The lack of Western aid to the Afghan freedom fighters is shameful. The West has backed down when faced with confronting its ideological rival and the United States must be willing to take the lead and support Afghan freedom fighters.

A similar situation has taken place in Angola. Soviet supported Cubans have implemented a repressive communist regime that the people don't want. I recently met with Jonas Savimbi, who leads the UNITA freedom fighters in Angola, and we discussed the need for American assistance to kick the 45,000 Cubans out. I will be working hard to see that the United States grants UNITA significant military aid in this session of Congress.

The Cubans have also been hard at work in Nicaragua. Again, tens of thousands of Cubans have been working with billions of dollars of Soviet military aid to repress the Nicaraguan people and establish a beachhead of communism in Central America.

To back down from our commitment to freedom and democracy in Nicaragua would be throwing away the only card we have to play,

which is support for the freedom fighters to Nicaragua.

We have made progress in the Western Hemisphere in combating communism and securing democracy, but the forces of freedom are being battered in Southeast Asia.

Vietnam continues to consolidate its control over Cambodia with the help of the Soviet Union, which supplies between \$1 and \$2 billion in aid to the Vietnamese each year. Congress has recently decided to extend a token aid package to the Cambodian resistance. This is a good first step, and hopefully the beginning of the growing American commitment to freedom in the area.

All in all, we have our work cut out for us, but we have made a good start. President Reagan has rekindled our pride in the principles that made this country great, and redoubled our resolve to work for freedom throughout the world. I will do my best to continue these policies and see that America is once again seen as the champion of freedom in the world.

STATE OF TERROR

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times ran an article on the recent wave of terrorist attacks in Belgium. For those of us who are members of the House delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly, that reign of terror became focused after last year's attack on the offices of the Assembly's Secretariat in Brussels.

Terrorism is the scourge of our time, and the more we know about it and its practitioners, the more likely we are to be able to successfully confront it. I am, therefore, submitting the Times article for the RECORD for my colleagues' perusal:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1986]

TERRORISTS PUT BENIGN BELGIUM UNDER MENTAL SIEGE

(By James M. Markham)

BRUSSELS.—Enveloped by bodyguards, the Justice Minister of Belgium hurried out of his office building and into the darkened square dominated by the Palais de Justice on the other side. A telephoned bomb threat had emptied the ministry.

"We cannot take any risks," said the Justice Minister, Jean Gol, who is also Deputy Prime Minister. He spoke in an interview in the middle of the square here, which had suddenly filled with police vans, black-uniformed bomb squad experts and men in plainclothes who snapped on red arm-bands.

In December, Mr. Gol announced that four presumed leaders of a terrorist band called the Fighting Communist Cells had been arrested in a fast-food restaurant in Namur. "But," he cautioned, "we have seen in other European countries that terrorist movements have been born again like the phoenix."

The Belgians, who a century ago abolished the death penalty and live in one of the few Western industrial democracies that do not permit telephone tapping, find themselves these days in something like a mental

state of siege. They have recently been shaken by two home-grown terrorist bands—one of the left, the other savage but ideologically mute.

TWENTY-SEVEN BOMBINGS IN 14 MONTHS

The capture in December of Pierre Carrette, a 33-year-old printer, and three of his comrades appears to have severely cut into the strength of the Fighting Communist Cells, which over 14 months claimed responsibility for 27 bombing attacks on multinational companies, banks and NATO installations, including a strategic oil pipeline.

From the Saint Giles prison here, the four issued a communiqué acknowledging their membership in the Fighting Communist Cells and calling for "a resumption of combat" so that "the sparks sets the plain ablaze, so that the class struggle burns down history." But so far whatever militants remain at large—Mr. Gol said he thinks they are no more than a score—have done nothing more incendiary than call in bomb threats that have turned out to be false.

According to several people who knew him before he went underground in 1984, Mr. Carrette was a Leninist visionary who repeatedly broke with other tiny leftist factions, regarding them as foolish or traitorous. But Mr. Carrette, described by those who knew him as a cold, lonely and haughty man, seemed to have exercised a certain charisma over a small band of younger disciples.

"He considered himself a soldier of the revolution," said Michel Graindorge, a Brussels lawyer who knew him in the late 1970's through a defense committee for imprisoned members of the West German Red Army Faction. "Pierre never talked about love, happiness, art. For him it was the revolution."

WORKED WITH FRENCH TERRORISTS

Around 1982 in Bussels, Mr. Carrette is said to have encountered two exiled founders of the French terrorist group Direct Action, Jean-Marc Roullan and Nathalie Menigon, and a French revolutionary theorist named Federic Oriach. Briefly joining forces, the two bands staged holdups to raise money and shared, with remnants of the Red Army Faction, 1,760 pounds of dynamite stolen in 1984, according to Belgian and West German investigators.

In his printing plant on the Rue d'Albanie, Mr. Carrette also turned out communiqués for a shadowy group called the Lebanese Armed Revolutionary Factions, which in 1982 assassinated a second secretary at the Israeli Embassy in Paris. This connection has led Belgian officials to explore possible links to Adu Nidal, the leader of an anti-Arafat Palestinian group that has carried out terrorist attacks in Belgium and boasted of ties to the Fighting Communist Cells.

While intrigued by Mr. Carrette's international connections, Mr. Gol said the group appeared to be primarily a Belgian phenomenon. The terrorist leader, whose father is a member of the Belgian criminal investigation police and whose brother is a paratrooper officer, appears to have broken ideologically with the Red Army Faction and Direct Action and did not sign a "Euroterrorist" communiqué issued by the two groups in January 1985.

"He had a megalomaniac desire to be a revolutionary star," said André Darteville, a Belgian television journalist who has closely studied Mr. Carrette and his terrorist group.

"POLITICS REPLACED BY WAR"

"In his vision, politics is always replaced by war. There are those who are correct—the revolutionary vanguard—and the rest, the bourgeoisie, the traitors, the unions. It is a perversion of Leninism, a revolutionary messianism—bizarre, magic, if you will."

For many peaceable people on Belgium's far left, the isolation of the Fighting Communist Cells was its most striking quality. Initially the group's communiqués prompted some leftists to criticize it as a right-wing band masquerading as Leninist. *Solidaire*, a Belgian Maoist publication, once ran a headline referring to the group by its initials in French, C.C.C.: "C.C.C.: Pronounce it C.I.A."

"The C.C.C. are politically isolated, swimming against the current," commented Roger Moel, a 30-year-old printer and anarchist who spent four and a half months in a Polish jail for smuggling a radio transmitter to Solidarity activists. "In Belgium, the social movements of the left are now in a moment of defeat. This sort of action was seen as a kind of revenge."

Some contend that it is not accidental that the terrorist group has its roots in French-speaking Wallonia, whose smoke-stack industries have been most sharply hit by what is known simply as "the crisis."

Mr. Carrette comes from the stricken steel city of Charleroi, and a number of his sympathizers were young drop-outs on the fringes of Brussels' theater and university life.

A RELATIVELY LOW TOLL

Yet, while the group exalted violence, its actions took only two lives—two firemen called in to defuse a booby-trapped car parked in front of the Belgian employers' association on May 1. By contrast, a gang known as "the killers of Brabant" has killed 27 people, many of them women and children, in attacks on supermarkets and other public places since 1982.

The professionally executed shotgun attacks and the inconsequential booty taken by the Brabant killers have persuaded some investigators that they may be a far-right commando group, perhaps composed of former policemen or military men.

THE PRESIDENT'S STAND ON SOUTH AFRICA

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon my colleagues to once again look at the unjust, and unchanging system of apartheid in South Africa. That those who govern this system are unwilling to effect change should be inexorably clear. Yet, through its actions, or more appropriately through its inaction, the Reagan administration continues to tolerate a state of oppression.

What will bring about change, Mr. Speaker? How can each of us contribute to the end of the system of apartheid? As Bishop Desmond Tutu has aptly pointed out, the South Africans understand clearly the power of economic sanctions. The alternative to this is to continue an implied complicity with the Government of South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, the moment approaches to look again at the effectiveness of the President's Executive order which imposed token sanctions on South Africa. As this time approaches, I call upon my colleagues to take a very hard look.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a speech given by Prof. William B. Gould IV. Professor Gould made these remarks on the very special occasion of Bishop Desmond Tutu's visit to the Stanford Law School.

The text follows:

STATEMENT ON BISHOP TUTU'S ARRIVAL AT
STANFORD, JANUARY 21, 1986

"[The government of South Africa plans] to restructure the historically determined hierarchical political system of apartheid into something based on the premise of divided power and joint structure in which discrimination—and this goes without saying—will have to go, but without jeopardizing the non-negotiables of the maintenance of group interest and aspirations within the wider context of security and stability."

So spoke the Minister of National Education, as he traveled to Ronald Reagan's Washington, in a speech described by Joseph Lelyveld in his brilliant book, *Move Your Shadow: South Africa, Black and White*. This is what passes for comprehensible English in what Julian Bond so aptly described as the only pigmentocracy on the face of the globe. Reforms are proclaimed—and even more important—vague intentions about future reforms are trumpeted, simultaneous with the systematic uprooting and removal of blacks from their homes and their consignment to the impoverished "homelands".

The unique immorality of what is now transpiring in South Africa is alarming enough. But, from the perspective of self interest, this country's adherence to any variation of "constructive engagement," however modified by President Reagan's 1985 executive order and its assumption that the apostles of apartheid can define the limits of reform, is both misguided and fraught with peril for our national interest.

True, it is both brave and foolish to write a scenario for South Africa. To say that armed revolution is not around the corner, however, tells us little indeed. But about three things we can be certain: (1) the end of minority white rule—its end is simply a question of when and how; (2) the mass movement whose fury has burst forth so dramatically for all the world to see in '84 and '85 will not dissipate; (3) the longer the transition to black majority rule takes, the more likely it is that violence and anti-democratic institutions will be associated with it. The short and long range prospects for South Africa are instability until apartheid is dismantled through negotiations with the genuine black leaders of that country—not the "homeland" puppets whom the Republic's unrepresentative leadership have selected for themselves.

The view that the South African government cannot be pressured or coerced flies in the face of its own conduct in the post-Soweto period. Economically, and psychologically it needs and craves contact with the West—particularly this country. The view that South Africa is impervious to pressure also fails to take into account, not only the unwillingness of all peoples throughout the world to accept oppression's yoke since 1789, but it also ignores the

emergence of the United Democratic Front, a coalition of black unions, community organizations and religious organizations and the inspiration of the African National Congress which, *mirabile dictu*, began struggling for peaceful change in 1912 and still advocates a multi-radical society and accommodation in South Africa.

Change—that overused and misused word which appears so frequently in the South African media—is coming to South Africa. But it is the change which, as Anthony Lewis of the New York Times, so correctly noted, is a change in black attitudes—the courageous refusal of Winnie Mandela to comply with her banning order and the willingness of black union leaders to advocate divestiture.

One of the most significant elements of change in my view is the emergence of a free black trade union movement which is now more than a half million members strong. Because the South African government still rules by terror through its internal security legislation and bannings and because of the vast reserve army of unemployed who are desperate to take the jobs of striking black workers, its impact to date is limited. The National Union of Mine Workers, who just four years ago only existed on paper, now boasts hundreds of thousands of members! And in my judgment this movement, which only a few months ago took an important step forward towards unity through the formation of a new national federation has and will be the focal point for grievances, protest and organization—just as similar organizations have played that role in Poland, Chile and Brazil. Our country's government, labor movement and private citizens should do all in their power to provide aid and comfort to this new black political opposition.

But simultaneously, as Bishop Tutu has noted, we must apply economic pressure—both the threat of it and the implementation of stern measures if necessary. The Republic of South Africa understands the language of sanctions. That is why it opposes them so fiercely. And South Africa can indeed be pressured. The fall of the rand to 41 cents as American banks refused to roll over the debt this past year gives the lie to the idea that sanctions are inevitably counterproductive.

The alternative is continued complicity with the South African government. By both word and deed, speeches and exports, the Reagan Administration, despite its professed abhorrence of *apartheid*, has assisted Mr. Botha and his government's policies. As Bishop Tutu said in Atlanta this week, black South Africans will "remember" who their friends were in their hour of struggle. As Breyten Breytenbach, the Afrikaans poet has said "the rulers [of South Africa] are destabilizing and ruining the region. . . . They are destroying the credibility and the viability of Western values. They are endangering in the long run, whatever strategic and financial interest the West may have in the area."

It is an honor and pleasure to be here at this historic commemoration of Dr. Martin Luther King and the speech of Bishop Desmond Tutu, whose lives epitomize what is best and brave about the struggle for justice throughout the world. They have dramatized the Christian call for social justice and bring to mind Christ's statement: "Come unto me all ye that travail and are heavy laden and I will refresh you." We honor this commitment if we go forward tonight with both prayerful consideration and renewed

vigor in the struggle against injustice at both home and abroad.

ITALIAN AMERICANS: DESCENDANTS OF A GREAT CULTURE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, we are a nation of many ethnic groups, all of whom have contributed in many different ways to the growth and prosperity of our great Nation. As the son of Italian immigrants who came to this country through the gates of Ellis Island so many years ago, I find great pride that Italian Americans were the focus of an extraordinary film recently released by Anheuser-Busch entitled, "Italian Americans: Descendants of a Great Culture."

It is not possible for any one film to completely cover the broad range of contributions made by Italy to the work and to Americans of Italian descent to the building of a Nation; however, the Anheuser-Busch film has managed to capture the heart, spirit, and pride of a people who have given us some of our greatest scientists, artists, educators, entertainers, soldiers, business leaders, politicians—and the list goes on and on. It may be of interest to note that today, Italian Americans can be proud that citizens across the country have elected 34 Members of Congress from Italian origin, one of which I am proud to be. These men and women serve with honor and distinction on some of the most important legislative and policymaking committees of the Congress. Italian Americans now chair five major committees—Foreign Affairs, Judiciary, House Administration in the House; the Budget Committee in the other body and the Joint Committee on the Library.

"Italian Americans: Descendants of a Great Culture" premiered here in Washington last year at the 10th anniversary of the National Italian American Foundation, a vital organization that I also serve as a member of the board of directors. Since that time Anheuser-Busch has made the film available to every one of its 960 distributors in the United States. Additionally, they have offered it for viewing at no charge to over 250,000 schools, clubs, and organizations throughout the country.

I hope that my colleagues in the Congress have an opportunity to view this special film. Credit for its production must go to board chairman August A. Busch III, for providing an environment at Anheuser-Busch for this project, as well as to Anheuser-Busch president Dennis P. Long, executive vice president for marketing Michael Roarty, and Michael LaMonica, the son of Italian immigrants who, as vice president; marketing staff, helped to encourage, organize, and promote this film project. Joseph Creaturo deserves special credit for writing the script, for, "Italian Americans: Descendants of a Great Culture," a film which can make us all proud.

GENEVA UPDATE: ACTION ON
ARMS CONTROL NEEDED

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my floor statement of November 13, 1985 (page E5242), the Committee on Foreign Affairs will be issuing periodic unclassified updates of the status of the Geneva arms control negotiations. Following my remarks is an updated chart that summarizes the major highlights of the Soviet proposal announced on June 15, 1985, by Soviet leader Gorbachev which calls for the ultimate elimination of all nuclear weapons.

While very cognizant of Soviet propaganda efforts, I am pleased that the President found the proposal constructive and has pledged to examine it at the Geneva Arms Control Talks—an approach which I have long been advocating.

Beyond such an examination, however, the administration should direct our negotiators in Geneva to take a more aggressive and assertive posture in the current fourth round of talks in Geneva. Specifically, the United States should:

First, seek the resumption of bilateral comprehensive test ban [CTB] negotiations because it is naturally complementary to the overall objective that Geneva seeks;

Second, propose a comprehensive verification package that would force the Soviets into concrete action on Gorbachev's offer of onsite inspections and "any other additional verification measures;"

Third, obtain a mutual reaffirmation of both superpowers to adherence to SALT II and to the longstanding interpretation of the ABM Treaty;

Fourth, press United States concerns on Soviet compliance through the private diplomatic channels of the Standing Consultative Commission [SCC] and reject Pentagon recommendations to abandon United States adherence to existing arms control agreements;

Fifth, accelerate efforts to achieve a verifiable ban on chemical weapons by agreeing as a first step to prohibit the production of new chemical weapons and to impose common export controls.

Seeking the immediate resumption of bilateral comprehensive test ban negotiation is one of the primary directives of House Joint Resolution 3 which enjoys broad bipartisan support of 208 cosponsors in the House of Representatives. With its full and strong support, the House leadership has scheduled floor consideration of House Joint Resolution 3 later this month.

Favorable passage and acceptance of this arms control objective which has been backed by every President since Eisenhower would go a long way to determining the genuineness of the Soviet call for a nuclear test ban. Without a forthcoming administration commitment to CTB negotiations, the only propaganda winner is the Soviet Union and the only loser is the United States.

SOVIET PROPOSAL, JANUARY 1986¹

1986	1990		1995		2000	
	1st stage		2d stage		3d stage	
Strategic	Reductions proposed in Oct. 85 begin, and continue over a period of 5-8 years. Procedures for dismantling and destruction are to be agreed upon; verification is to be by NTM, OSI and other measures. Reductions are contingent on space weapon ban.		Reductions proposed in Oct. 85 continue and are completed 5-8 years after their initiation.		All strategic nuclear weapons are eliminated by 2000.	
INF	U.S. and U.S.S.R. eliminate medium-range ballistic and cruise missiles (including U.S. P-15s and GLCMs, and Soviet SS-20s) in Europe, but not elsewhere; missiles withdrawn would be destroyed; U.S. and U.S.S.R. pledge not to supply medium-range missiles to their allies. France and Britain freeze their nuclear arsenals. Eliminations are contingent on space weapon ban.		U.S. and U.S.S.R. implement further measures to eliminate medium-range nuclear weapons including aircraft and they freeze tactical nuclear arms, i.e., those with ranges of 1000 km or less. All nuclear powers eliminate tactical nuclear weapons when the 50% reductions in U.S. and Soviet strategic arsenals are complete. Certain tactical nuclear carriers could be converted to conventional systems rather than destroyed. "Leading industrial powers" join agreement banning space strike arms; participation by other nations is optional.		All nations' medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons are eliminated by 2000.	
Space and defense	U.S. and U.S.S.R. renounce development, testing, and deployment of space strike weapons. Implementation of this measure is necessary for the reduction and liquidation of all nuclear weapons.					
Other measures	U.S. and U.S.S.R. end nuclear testing.		All nuclear powers join test ban. A ban is instituted on the creation of arms which are based on new physical principles, and which have high casualty-producing capabilities.			

¹ Based on statement by Gorbachev on Jan. 15, 1986, and on press conference by Korniienko, Akhromeyev, and Zamyatin on Jan. 18, 1986.
Source: Prepared by Charles Gellner and Jeanette Voas January 27, 1986.

PROTECT US FROM PESSIMISTS

HON. RICHARD ARMEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, as we begin our descent down the slippery slope of increased trade barriers toward the quicksands of protectionism, I found this article to be a foothold on reality. Since I have made this argument at every opportunity, I highly recommend the following statement by David Gergen:

In their delightful book, "The Experts Speak," Christopher Cerf and Victor Navasky collect a memorable series of pronouncements that were authoritative, profound—and wrong:

"This is the biggest fool thing we have ever done," Adm. Bill Leahy told President Truman in 1945 about the Manhattan Project. "The bomb will never go off, and I speak as an expert in explosives."

"Space travel is utter bilge," said the Astronomer Royal of Britain two years before Sputnik.

And the last words of General Sedgwick during the Civil War: "They couldn't hit an elephant at this distance . . ."

These addepleted predictions come to mind again as debate heats up over U.S. trade. The Reagan administration will soon unveil a new trade strategy. It will penalize foreign interests who dump goods on our economy. It will seek better ways to help U.S. workers displaced by imports. But it will also insist on free trade, as the President courageously did in late August with his shoe decision.

Protectionists will no doubt dismiss the President's new strategy as too little, too late. They predict that unless we erect new import barriers along the shores, jobs will be forever lost, industries will crumble and states will die.

The protectionists are wrong on many counts. A trade war will wind up hurting far more Americans than it helps. It is estimated, for example, that had Reagan caved in on shoe imports, our consumers would have had to pay as much as \$26,300 for each job preserved in the U.S. shoe industry.

But at a deeper level, the protectionists are wrong because they have so little faith in the dynamism of the American enterprise system. Over the years, pessimists have again and again written off parts of the country, only to be embarrassed by their comebacks.

For years, as its textile and leather industries collapsed, Massachusetts was dismissed as an economic basket case. Today, thanks to an innovative high-tech industry married to high-powered universities, Massachusetts is enjoying an economic renaissance. Workers in some companies such as Wang have recently been laid off, but so many other new jobs are opening up that state unemployment is the lowest in the country.

In Pittsburgh, where steel is in the doldrums, there is new hope for a burgeoning software industry. Michigan is reviving. North Carolina and Tennessee, once considered provincial backwaters, are bouncing ahead.

In an enlightening series of recent articles, editors of the *Chicago Tribune* found that the one unifying theme in these stories of economic rebirth is education: Where business has been closely linked to strong

educational centers, it has thrived in today's economy.

David Birch, an MIT professor and the man who first discovered that small firms are creating the bulk of the country's new jobs, says that the new force in the economy is the "high-innovation sector." Birch told the *Tribune* that "the primary ingredient here is thinking, what I call 'thoughtware,' which is knowledge and its application."

"We have a tradition of wild and crazy people. Japan doesn't have this tradition," says Birch. "We have an enormous comparative advantage." Often settling near major universities, innovative companies are springing up not only in the computer and communications fields but also in coal mining, paper mills, textiles, preserved foods, bicycles and even steel, where mini-mills are succeeding. "The major resources are brains," says Birch.

Congress should pay heed when it returns to work this September. The country does not need new trade restrictions imposed by Washington in order to preserve its economic base. It needs a government that has the guts to put the nation's finances in order. And it needs policies from Washington that encourage better education, more innovation—and freedom for our producers to work their own magic in the marketplace.

LET'S BE FRANK ABOUT THE FRANK

HON. ROBERT E. WISE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill entitled, "Let's Be Frank About the Frank." My legislation would amend the rules of the House to require that a quarterly statement of the size and postage cost of each mass mailing by a Member of the House be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Senate has begun quarterly disclosure of their mass mailing costs, and House Members need to make their mailing costs public as well. I point out that my bill simply requires that the number of pieces and the cost of franked mass mailings be published quarterly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. My bill is less onerous than Senate Concurrent Resolution 91, which passed the Senate in December. The Senate bill requires the number of pieces mailed and the total postage costs, as well as other operating costs incurred as a result of mass mailings which include direct labor and managerial overhead, supplies and materials and the prorated value of equipment.

I don't believe it is necessary to include such items as prorated value of equipment in order to determine how much was spent on the frank. I'm just interested in making this information part of the public record. My bill is straightforward and clear: Let's be frank about the frank and disclose our postage costs to the taxpayers.

My mailing costs for the last quarter were as follows: Total postage cost was \$10,271 and total number of pieces were 94,200.

H. RES. 377

Resolution amending Rule XLVI of the Rules of the House to require that a quarterly statement of the size and postage cost of each mass mailing by a Member of the House be published in the Congressional Record

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the "Let's Be Frank About the Frank Resolution".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO RULE XLVI.

Rule XLVI of the Rules of the House is amended—

(1) by redesignating clause 7 as clause 8; and

(2) by inserting after clause 6 the following new clause:

"7. In accordance with regulations prescribed by the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards, there shall be published in the Congressional Record, at the earliest opportunity after the close of each calendar quarter, a statement of the number of pieces in, and the cost (computed under clause 1 of this Rule) of, each franked mass mailing by each Member during such quarter."

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by section 2 shall apply with respect to calendar quarters beginning with the first quarter after the quarter in which this resolution is agreed to.

RULE XLVI

LIMITATIONS ON THE USE OF THE FRANK.

1. Any franked mail which is mailed by a Member under section 3210(d) of title 39, United States Code shall be mailed at the equivalent rate of postage which assures that such mail will be sent by the most economical means practicable.

2. After December 31, 1977, the total number of pieces of mail which may be mailed as franked mail under section 3210(d) of title 39, United States Code, during any calendar year by a Member entitled to mail franked mail under this subsection may not exceed an amount equal to six multiplied by the number of addresses to which such mail may be delivered, in accordance with paragraph (4) of section 3210(d) of title 39, United States Code, in the area from which such Member was elected. Any mail matter which relates solely to a notice of appearance or a scheduled itinerary of a Member in the area from which such Member was elected shall not count against the limitation set forth in the preceding sentence.

3. Any Member entitled to mail franked mail under section 3210(d) of title 39, United States Code, shall, before making any such mailing, submit a sample or description of the mail matter involved to the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards for an advisory opinion as to whether such proposed mailing is in compliance with provisions of such section.

4. Any mass mailing which otherwise is frankable by a Member under the provisions of section 3210(e) of title 39, United States Code, shall not be frankable unless the cost of preparing and printing such mass mailing is defrayed exclusively from funds made available in any appropriations Act.

5. In the case of any Representative in the House of Representatives, other than a Representative at Large, who is a candidate for any statewide public office, any mass mailing shall not be frankable under section 3210 of title 39, United States Code, when the same is delivered to any address which

is not located in the area constituting the congressional district from which any such individual was elected.

6. In the case of any Member, any mass mailing shall not be frankable under section 3210 of title 39, United States Code, when the same is mailed less than sixty days immediately before the date of any primary or general election (whether regular, special, or runoff) in which such Member is a candidate for public office.

7. For purposes of this rule, the term "Member" means any Member of the House of Representatives, a Delegate to the House of Representatives, or the Resident Commissioner in the House of Representatives.

This rule was adopted by the House on March 2, 1977 (H. Res. 287), 95th Cong., pp. 5933-53. In the 95th Congress an advisory opinion promulgated by the Select Committee on Ethics interpreting this rule was inserted in the Record (Apr. 21, 1977, pp. 11617-19).

PROBLEMS IN HAITI

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the crisis that has been brewing in Haiti is coming to a head. This is not surprising since the present state of affairs in Haiti is appalling.

Among other things, Haiti has the lowest per capita income of any nation in this hemisphere. Part of the reason for this is that it has been ruled too long by the Duvalier dynasty. The repression of President-for-life, Jean-Claude Duvalier, and his father before him, is infamous, as is the brutality of his security forces, the Tontons Macouts.

I am submitting for the RECORD two articles on Haiti and its present difficulties. I hope my colleagues will take a moment to read them and to also lend their support for the Haitian people's struggle to be free:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 5, 1986]

ONCE MORE, DUVALIER LETS LOOSE THE "BOGEYMAN"

(By James Brooke)

PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI, February 4.—Haiti's President, moving to put down widespread popular unrest, has turned to a feared secret police unit that he previously restrained out of concern for the country's human rights image.

The police, known as Tontons Macoutes, have assumed most of the patrols in this capital, either strolling the sidewalks, rifles slung over their shoulders, or speeding through the streets in unmarked cars.

The state of siege declared here last week gave them power of detention and, some say, license to kill. Haitians and foreigners here say that many of the estimated 50 people killed in Port-au-Prince since Friday were shot by the Tontons.

"I went into my favorite restaurant Monday and asked where my regular waitress was," said an American who has been a longtime resident here. "They said that after closing time on Friday she was on a sidewalk when a carload of Tontons drove by and sprayed her with eight bullets from an Uzi."

FEARSOME REPUTATION REGAINED

Whether the reports are based on rumor or fact, the Tontons—the name means “bogeymen” in Haitian Creole—have regained the fearsome reputation they had during the heyday of François (Papa Doc) Duvalier, the father of the President, Jean-Claude Duvalier.

When the father was President, the Tontons were largely given free rein to torture and murder perceived opponents of his regime.

After his death in 1971, his son took over and curbed the arbitrary power of the Tontons, seeking to improve Haiti's negative human rights image in the world. Even so, the State Department decided last week to cut back aid to Haiti because of human rights abuses.

The Tontons still provided the backbone of security, but they generally acted with less overt violence. Last July, for example, they helped guard polling places in a national referendum in which, the Government says, 99.9 percent of the voters approved the President's life term in office.

But last month, when rising popular unrest almost forced Mr. Duvalier to flee Haiti, his father's former advisers, known here as the old guard, reportedly counseled him to reapply the old methods.

COUNTERWEIGHT TO THE ARMY

For almost 30 years, the Tontons have provided the Duvaliers with their most reliable base of support.

Formed after a failed military coup in July 1958, the Tontons, officially known as the Volunteers for National Security and sometimes referred to here as the V.S.N., the organization's initials in French, were intended by François Duvalier to serve as a political counterweight to the army.

Dressed in blue uniforms and red scarves, they are divided into two ranks, commanders and volunteers. In the capital, both ranks receive some sort of compensation, but in the interior they live off what they can extort from the peasantry.

Today the Tontons number about 15,000—almost twice the size of the 8,000-man army. They report directly to Mr. Duvalier, and their head, Madame Max Adolphe, is not seen here as a political threat to the President because of her sex.

In recent months, Mr. Duvalier has made several appeals for unity between the two security forces, but the Tontons have been responsible for most of the repression in recent weeks. Protesters have made open appeals to the military to depose Mr. Duvalier.

MORE FAITH IN THE TONTONS

“One has the impression that he has more faith in the Tontons than in the army,” said Gérard Gourgue, a lawyer who heads the Haitian League of Human Rights.

Faced last week with losing control of the country, Mr. Duvalier evidently decided to unleash the Tontons.

“The Tontons Macoutes are not playing anymore—they are killing people,” said a Haitian tourist guide who would give only his first name, Pierre.

“The Tontons Macoutes are taking their revenge around town,” said a European priest who lives here.

To date, only seven bodies of people killed in the violence have been found in city morgues, and the Government has not made public an official death toll.

Rumors abound that the Tontons have disposed of the bodies in their own fashion. When asked where the bodies are put, sever-

al Haitians talked about a marsh near Tintanyin, a small village 10 miles north of here on Route Nationale 1.

THEY THROW THEM IN PITS

The European priest said he had been to the site several times to search for the remains of missing parishioners.

“They bring in the bodies in pickup trucks,” he said. “They throw them in pits, pour calcium on the bodies and then cover them with a thin layer of soil.”

Mr. Gourgue described the Tintanyin marsh as a “special cemetery for the indigent and people murdered by the police.”

“The police can't throw the bodies in the sea because they will come back,” he said.

On Monday afternoon, several villagers at Tintanyin described the cemetery as a regular dumping ground for victims of the Tontons Macoutes.

On Route 1, near the village, a billboard carries the highway safety message, “Prudence: the road kills.” Five hundred yards down a dirt road strewn with broken glass and rusted machinery there was a macabre scene.

About 20 human skulls, numerous human bones, shreds of clothing and a woman's purse littered a 100-square yard area.

The bones had long since dried white in the sun. But three mounds were composed of freshly turned black earth that contrasted sharply with the rain-beaten and tan-colored soil surrounding them.

Ten feet away was a three-foot-deep burning pit with two charred skulls at the bottom. The ashes were fluffy and dry.

Although it was impossible to tell when the pit was dug or the mounds made, it is known that the last time it rained here was Friday night.

SMALL HOLES IN THE SKULLS

Without excavating the mounds it is impossible to tell if they contain bodies. The site is distant from houses and local residents interviewed said they had not witnessed any recent burials there.

Three of the dried skulls lying on the ground were punctured by small holes that could have been bullet holes.

In the capital, Guy Mayer, a Government spokesman, said it was “the first time I heard of this in reference to the Tintanyin site.”

“Without the facts I don't know what to say,” he said. But he also added that he did not know if there would be an investigation.

Mr. Gourgue took a different point of view.

“On Friday they killed up to 50 people or more in Port-au-Prince,” he said. “They were picked up like animals and thrown in trucks. Those people are certainly buried in those mounds.”

Mr. Gourgue said he had not visited Tintanyin, which is midway between Duvalierville and a town called Bonrepos, which translates as “sweet rest.”

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 6, 1986]

DUVALIER ACTS TO COUNTER SHUTDOWN OF KEY INDUSTRIES

(By Keith Richburg)

PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI, February 5.—Facing an economic crisis caused by the political tension that has shaken Haiti, embattled President-for-Life Jean-Claude Duvalier today invoked an emergency decree to threaten fines or prison for businessmen who refuse to reopen their shops and factories.

Shopkeepers had begun closing yesterday, reportedly after receiving telephoned threats against their property.

Today, many seemed to comply with the new order and opened their businesses, but the government here faced a potentially more severe economic threat as crucial light industries responded to the pressures of political unrest.

More than 200 plants operate here, taking advantage of Haiti's low wages to assemble items for reexport, mostly to the United States. The plants, which with tourism are the main sources of foreign exchange, began closing yesterday after some reportedly received threats.

Some assembly firms have lost contracts because of the unrest and some foreign managers have left the country, according to foreign analysts. There were reports today that the little remaining investment capital in Haiti was draining away.

Armed security personnel walked the streets of the business district this morning, informing store owners about the decree and the possible penalties unless they opened.

But even those who opened today left their iron shutters and protective metal grates pulled near shut. Some who agreed to be interviewed said they were caught in a dilemma, fearing both opposition elements who have threatened them if they opened and government reprisals if they did not.

“We are open because the Ton-Tons Macoutes came around and told us that we had better open or face the consequences,” said a 47-year-old accountant, who insisted on speaking in English rather than French or the native Creole.

“The businessmen are threatened on both sides. The government right now has the big stick, because under the state of siege, all constitutional rights are suspended. If you get shot in the street right now, you have no rights,” he said.

“The word was passed around today that we'd better open or else,” said the owner of a downtown boutique. “So what can we do? Everybody is open today.”

But about 20 percent of the light assembly plants remained shut, and some of those that had did open were not at full production.

Some American companies here closed yesterday after receiving telephone threats, usually in French, saying their property would be bombed or burned if they stayed open, according to well-informed sources. The calls are presumed to have come from antigovernment protesters trying to keep alive the momentum of the anti-Duvalier movement that mushroomed here over the weekend but was seemingly put down after a state of siege was declared Friday.

One western diplomat here said that the American firms that closed were basically following the lead of their Haitian counterparts. The largest American firm here that closed was GTE Sylvania, an electronics concern. Some textile industries did also.

The assembly sector is the only part of the economy to have grown in recent years. With Haiti's low wages—minimum wage here is about \$3 per day and the average wage is only slightly higher—many firms find it profitable to ship components here for assembly and reexport.

About 60,000 work in this field, which now accounts for an estimated 16 percent of national income. About 85 percent of the components come from the United States. And about 95 percent of the products assembled,

from electronics to handbags and leather goods, return there.

The business slowdown was already having its effect on the capital today, with prices escalating for some basic foods and shortages reported in some areas.

In forcing the shops to reopen, Duvalier invoked a 1957 decree that his father, Francois Duvalier, often used in the past to crush general strikes and uprisings.

Today's joint communique from the ministries of Interior and Commerce said the government "reminded" businesses of the decree and "invited" them to stay open. It said the government will "rely on the good will of businessmen to resist antipatriotic blackmail."

In a separate communique, the government promised to help businesses with tax exemptions and loans if they suffered damages during the looting that erupted during last week's protests.

The business community has emerged as a key player in this most severe test of strength of Duvalier's dictatorship. "Businesses have been concerned about the deterioration of the business climate," said the informed western diplomat. "They have been concerned about the fact that conditions in the country have been aggravated. They know people are hungry and people need jobs."

The Associated Press added:

President Jean-Claude Duvalier requested political asylum in Greece and Spain, and shelter in Switzerland, and was turned down by all three European countries, government spokesmen said yesterday.

In Athens, spokesman Miltiades Papaioannou said Duvalier asked for "political asylum and a residence permit in Greece." The request was made within the last several days through the Greek Embassy in Venezuela, he said.

Papaioannou did not comment on why the request was rejected.

In Bern, the Swiss government said Duvalier asked to visit Switzerland with his family and an entourage of 50. A brief announcement by the Cabinet secretariat said the decision to bar the delegation was taken by the seven-member federal executive.

Spanish Foreign Ministry spokesman Inocencio Arias said a request for asylum came through a Spanish embassy in another European country. The request was turned down.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH M. GIGLIO

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Joseph M. Giglio. He was recently named "Man of the Year" by the New Jersey chapter of the National Italian American Sports Hall of Fame.

Mr. Giglio has held many distinguished positions in both the public and private sector. Honoring him as "Man of the Year" is a most fitting way of recognizing the achievements of this warm, caring, highly motivated, and intelligent individual.

A respected leader in the finance industry, Mr. Giglio served as a cabinet member under Gov. Hugh Carey and as the chief financial officer of one of New York City's largest public benefit corporations.

As a public servant, Joseph Giglio has been involved in a wide variety of projects. He is currently serving as chairman for the Senate Budget Committee's private sector advisory panel on infrastructure financing. Most recently, Mr. Giglio was appointed by the Senate as a member of the National Council on Public Works Improvement.

At the State and local level, Mr. Giglio serves in numerous capacities. He has been closely involved with the development of the proposed New Jersey Infrastructure Bank, as well as with efforts to create other cost-effective infrastructure financing techniques in the States of Massachusetts, Washington, New York, and Connecticut. He also serves on the board of directors for the Orphan Drugs Foundation, the Small Business Foundation of America, Inc., and Continental Health Affiliates, Inc., as well as several other important organizations.

The many achievements of Joseph Giglio would fill several volumes. He is truly a man deserving of the National Italian American Sports Hall of Fame "Man of the Year" award. The accomplishments of Joseph Giglio deserve to be recorded in history as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is, therefore, with great honor and pleasure that I join with so many of Joe's friends in honoring him with this distinguished award.

LAW ENFORCEMENT OPPOSES

S. 49

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks, Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of letters and postcards from law enforcement officials and constituents urging me to oppose the McClure-Volkmer antigun control legislation, S. 49. As you know, the bill's supporters currently are attempting to gain the necessary 218 signatures to discharge the bill from the House Committee on the Judiciary.

I am very much opposed to the McClure-Volkmer bill, and I am concerned about the prospects of a successful discharge petition. I am happy to report, however, that those of us in the Congress who are strong supporters of gun control legislation are not alone in our opposition to S. 49. For the benefit of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD a copy of an editorial in the February 2, 1986 edition of the New York Times which cites the strong opposition to the bill on the part of our Nation's principal law enforcement organizations, including: Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, Fraternal Order of Police, International Association of Chiefs of Police, International Brotherhood of Police Officers, National Association of Police Organizations, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, National Sheriff's Association, National Troopers' Coalition, Police Executive Research Forum, and the Police Foundation.

I believe that every Member of the House of Representatives should understand that the major law enforcement organizations in the

United States are opposed to the McClure-Volkmer bill—legislation which would weaken drastically our Nation's current gun control laws. As the Law Enforcement Steering Committee Against S. 49 noted last month, "the McClure-Volkmer bill would pose an immediate and unwarranted threat to the law enforcement community." I urge my colleagues to read with great care the New York Times editorial:

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 1986]

COPS AGAINST GUNS

"For every Tom, Dick and Dirty Harry," smirks the Connecticut gun shop's newspaper ad. What it's offering on sale are .44 magnums, heavy-duty handguns that have nothing to do with target shooting. No wonder the nation's police, once allies of the gun lobby, are up in arms.

The National Rifle Association and other gun supporters are pushing legislation that would make it easier for the Toms, Dicks, and Harrys to buy those magnums. The measure is the McClure-Volkmer bill, which the gun lobby calls a reform but the police call the "Gun Dealers Protection Act of 1986."

The bill, passed by the Senate, would eliminate the current Federal prohibition on selling guns to out-of-staters, would reduce gun-sale record-keeping and tie the hands of Federal agents investigating dealers who flout the rules. Chairman Peter Rodino has vowed to keep the bill bottled up in his House Judiciary Committee, but the gun lobbyists have collected more than 150 signatures of the 218 needed for a discharge petition.

That's why representatives of 280,000 police officers around the country went to Washington last week to ask signers of the petition to reconsider. Their message was simple: The link between criminality and access to guns is as clear as the link between smoking and cancer. By what conceivable logic can Congress decide to support its local gun dealers instead of supporting its local police? Or, for that matter, public safety?

THE FIREARMS OWNER'S PROTECTION ACT RESTORING THE RIGHTS OF LAW ABIDING GUN OWNERS

HON. RICHARD ARMEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, balancing the scales of justice requires great diligence and steadfast perseverance. It is not an easy job; it is never finished. The balance that exists between the rights of the accused and the protection of the innocent is indeed delicate. Nowhere is this more pronounced than in the debate over gun control.

In the area of violent crime the scales have been tilted in favor of the guilty. In our quest for justice we must guard the rights of the innocent first. We do not take cars away from law-abiding citizens to eliminate drunk drivers. If we ever do, we can safely assert that the insane are running the asylum.

Out of our frustration in failing to deal a serious blow to violent crime we have grabbed the ax instead of the scalpel. Trying to respond to violent criminals we have taken the gun out of the law abiding citizen's hands and given it more force in the hands of the criminals.

I'm pleased to join Mr. VOLKMER and 165 of our colleagues in cosponsoring the Firearms Owner's Protection Act. I would urge all of my colleagues who support this legislation to sign the petition which would bring the bill to the floor for a vote. The people of my district have made it clear: They value their second amendment rights, and they want them back.

There are some inequities in the current law that the McClure-Volkmer bill would correct. Currently a good, solid, law abiding citizen could be charged with a felony for a slight omission or mistake. This bill would clearly define criminal intent and only then could an individual be charged with a felony. This is a necessary protection of the innocent.

Current law is also unique in this area in that searches and seizures can take place without probable cause. Again, McClure-Volkmer would provide clarification that would protect the innocent.

Finally, because of problems in current law, many of our sportsmen must avoid certain States and localities on their way to another location. This is unnecessary and a costly burden to sportsmen.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to balance the scales of justice and reaffirm the rights of law abiding citizens. Restricting the rights of the innocent while trying to respond to the guilty will only make the problem worse. Let's bring McClure-Volkmer to the floor so we can right this wrong and restore the rights of America's law abiding gun owners.

AIRPORT SECURITY BEGINS AT HOME

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a comprehensive bill aimed at beefing up security at U.S. airports. Very similar legislation is also being introduced in the Senate today by my good friend from New York, AL D'AMATO.

Recent terrorist attacks have sparked us to demand tighter security at foreign airports, but we seem to be overlooking glaring airport security deficiencies here at home. Just yesterday, a knife-wielding man commandeered a Delta Air Lines jet and held 232 people hostage at the Dallas-Fort Worth Airport. Obviously, airport security failed to prevent this life-threatening situation, just as it failed to prevent some 98 hijackings of U.S. aircraft since 1974, an average of nine per year.

There are signs the situation may get worse. During the first 6 months of 1985, the number of firearms detected at U.S. airports was 14 percent above average—1,448 firearms detected between January 1 and June

30, 1985, versus an average of 1,269 weapons detected during the previous 10 6-month reporting periods. This is reason for alarm.

That is why I have authored the Airport Security Improvement Act of 1986, which has five major provisions. First, it would exempt Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] civil aviation security programs from automatic Gramm-Rudman budget cuts.

Second, it would increase by 200—from 236 to 436—the number of FAA civil aviation security personnel, which would include Federal air marshals and airport security agents, during fiscal year 1986. Right now, there are only 236 FAA security inspectors to monitor security at 400 U.S. airports and at another 250 foreign airports.

Third, my bill would require monthly FAA security inspections of all 20 U.S. international airports. Currently, these inspections are only done quarterly.

Fourth, the maximum penalty for violating FAA security regulations would be increased from a \$1,000 civil fine to a \$10,000 fine, with these revenues used to enhance civil aviation security programs—presently fines go to the General Treasury fund. It is ludicrous to think that a \$1,000 fine imposed on an airport or airline will somehow help to deter security violations; and it should be noted that the current \$1,000 fine is the extreme. Between January 1 and June 30, 1985, the number of alleged security violations by air carriers, airports, and individuals totaled 1,791, with 150 resulting in civil penalties totaling \$51,795, or an average of only \$345 per fine.

Fifth, this bill would provide a substantial pay increase for FAA police officers, who serve Washington National and Washington Dulles airports. In addition, it would separate FAA police from the general service pay schedule, which is under the control of the Office of Personnel Management, and establish a separate pay system for these officers. A recent General Accounting Office study blamed low pay for severe police understaffing problems at National and Dulles airports. The study recommended that OPM approve higher wages for the FAA police, but OPM rejected the idea, saying that FAA police were not underpaid, all other police forces were overpaid. With such a mentality to contend with, the security situation at National and Dulles airports will not improve as long as OPM controls the pay scale for FAA police officers.

Mr. Speaker, my 23-year New York City police career taught me that acceptable levels of security can only be assured with adequate financial and manpower resources, careful monitoring of existing security systems, and tough penalties that serve as a deterrent to security violations. U.S. airport security falls short in these important areas and the bill I have authored would greatly improve this situation. I strongly urge that it receive the prompt and favorable consideration it deserves.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the full text of this legislation:

H.R.—

A bill to improve airport security by increasing the number of FAA security personnel and the number of airport inspections by such personnel, by exempting FAA security programs from automatic budget reductions, by increasing civil penalties for violations of security regulations, and by improving the pay scale for FAA police, and for other purposes

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 "Airport Security Improvement Act of 1986".

SEC. 2. MONTHLY INSPECTION OF UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 316 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"INSPECTION OF UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORTS

"(g) The Administrator shall, not less often than once every 30 days, inspect each airport in the United States serving aircraft in foreign air transportation for the purpose of determining compliance of the airport operator and each air carrier and foreign air carrier serving such airport with this section and section 315 and the regulations promulgated under each such section."

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—That portion of the table of contents of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 appearing under the side heading

"Sec. 316. Air transportation security."

is amended by adding at the end the following: "(g) Inspection of United States international airports."

SEC. 3. INCREASE IN NUMBER OF SECURITY PERSONNEL.

The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall increase the number of civil aviation security personnel employed by the Federal Aviation Administration to 436 by the end of fiscal year 1986. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 4. EXEMPTION OF SECURITY PROGRAMS FROM AUTOMATIC REDUCTIONS.

Section 255(g)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by inserting after the paragraph relating to the Exchange stabilization fund the following: "Federal Aviation Administration, civil aviation security programs;"

SEC. 5. INCREASE IN CIVIL PENALTIES FOR SECURITY VIOLATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first sentence of section 901(a)(1) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by striking out the period at the end and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or for each violation of section 315 or 316 or any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder."

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for carrying out civil aviation security programs, in addition to any other amounts authorized for such purpose, an amount equal to the amount of any penalty collected under section 901(a)(1) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 for violation of section 315 or 316 of

such Act or any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder.

SEC. 6. FEDERAL AIRPORT POLICE PAY SCALE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PAY SCALE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter VII of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to Federal employee pay rates and systems,

is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“§5376. Police forces of Washington National Airport and Washington Dulles International Airport

“(a) Each employee in a position within the police force of Washington National

Airport or the police force of Washington Dulles International Airport shall be entitled, under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, to have his pay fixed in accordance with the following schedule:

AIRPORT POLICE SALARY SCHEDULE

Grade and title	Annual rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Level 1—Airport police officer.....	18,710	19,190	19,670	20,150	20,630	21,110	21,590	22,070	22,550	23,030
Level 2—Special functions officer.....	20,855	21,390	21,925	22,460	22,995	23,530	24,065	24,600	25,135	25,670
Level 3—Sergeant.....	23,170	23,764	24,358	24,952	25,546	26,140	26,734	27,328	27,922	28,516
Level 4—Lieutenant.....	25,662	26,320	26,978	27,636	28,294	28,952	29,610	30,268	30,926	31,584
Level 5—Captain.....	28,347	29,074	29,801	30,528	31,255	31,982	32,709	33,436	34,163	34,890
Level 6—Deputy inspector.....	31,211	32,011	32,811	33,611	34,411	35,211	36,011	36,811	37,611	38,411
Level 7—Inspector.....	34,292	35,171	36,050	36,929	37,808	38,687	39,566	40,445	41,324	42,203
Level 8—Chief of police.....	41,105	42,159	43,213	44,267	45,321	46,375	47,429	48,483	49,537	50,591

“(b) Classification of positions the rate of pay of which is fixed under subsection (a) shall be under such regulations as the Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe.

“(c) The provisions of sections 5335 and 5336 of this title, relating to periodic step-increases, shall be applicable to employees covered under this section. In applying such provisions to employees under this section, the references contained in such sections to grades and pay rates shall be considered to be references to grades and pay rates specified under subsection (a) of this section.

“(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) the term ‘police force of Washington National Airport’ refers to employees of the Federal Aviation Administration appointed under section 4(a) of the Act of June 29, 1940, entitled ‘An Act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes’; and

(2) the term ‘police force of Washington Dulles International Airport’ refers to employees of the Federal Aviation Administration appointed under section 8(a) of the Act of September 7, 1950, entitled ‘An Act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia’.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after the item relating to section 5375 the following new item:

“5376. Police forces of Washington National Airport and Washington Dulles International Airport.”.

(3) INAPPLICABILITY OF GENERAL SCHEDULE CLASSIFICATION.—Section 5102(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking out “or” at the end of paragraph (26);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (27) and inserting in lieu thereof “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(28) members of the police force of Washington National Airport and members of the police force of Washington Dulles International Airport, whose pay is fixed under section 5376 of this title.”.

(b) PAY COMPARABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5301(c) of title 5, United States Code, relating to the pay comparability system, is amended in paragraph (1) by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, or section 5376 of this title, re-

lating to the Airport Police Salary Schedule”.

(2) HIGHER MINIMUM RATES OF PAY.—Paragraph (1) of section 5303(a) of title 5, United States Code, relating to authority to prescribe higher minimum rates of pay, is amended by inserting “or 5376” after “5332”.

(3) REGULATIONS.—Section 5304 of title 5, United States Code, relating to policies and regulations implementing pay comparability, is amended by inserting “section 5376 of this title,” before “chapter 51”.

(c) GRADE AND PAY RETENTION.—Section 5361 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or section 5376” after “chapter 51”; and

(2) in paragraph (5), by inserting “the Airport Police Salary Schedule under section 5376 of this title,” after “the General Schedule.”.

(d) HAZARDOUS DUTY DIFFERENTIAL.—The second sentence of section 5545(d) of title 5, United States Code, relating to pay differentials for hazardous or intermittent duty, is amended by inserting “, or section 5376 of this title,” after “chapter 53 of this title”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE; TRANSITION PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall become effective at the beginning of the first applicable pay period which commences on or after the thirtieth day following the date of the enactment of this section.

(2) INITIAL ADJUSTMENTS OF RATES OF PAY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the effective date of the amendments made by this section, initial adjustments of the rates of basic pay of individual employed as members of the police force of Washington National Airport or Washington Dulles International Airport on such date shall be made in accordance with subparagraph (B).

(B) DETERMINATION OF INITIAL LEVEL AND STEP.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—An individual whose pay is within a grade of the General Schedule immediately before the effective date of the amendments made by this section shall be paid—

(I) within the appropriate grade of the Airport Police Salary Schedule under section 5376(a) of title 5, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)(1) of this section), as determined under clause (ii); and

(II) except as provided in clause (iii), at that step of such grade which corresponds numerically to the step of the grade of the General Schedule at which such individual

was paid immediately before such effective date.

(ii) TABLE OF GRADES.—For purposes of making the initial adjustment in the rate of basic pay for any individual under this paragraph, the appropriate grade under the Airport Police Salary Schedule is the grade appearing across from the grade of the General Schedule at which such individual was paid as a member of the police force of Washington National Airport or Dulles International Airport, as the case may be immediately before the effective date of the amendments made by this section, as follows:

General Schedule Grade	Airport Police Salary Schedule Grade
GS-4 and GS-5.....	Level 1
GS-6.....	Level 2
GS-7.....	Level 3
GS-8.....	Level 4
GS-9.....	Level 5
GS-10.....	Level 6
GS-11.....	Level 7
GS-12.....	Level 8

(iii) EXCEPTION.—An individual whose pay is within GS-4 immediately before the effective date of the amendments made by this section shall be paid at step 1 of level 1 of the Airport Police Salary Schedule.

(3) STEP INCREASES.—

(A) EFFECT OF INITIAL INCREASE IN PAY.—An increase in pay by reason of an initial adjustment under the preceding provisions of this subsection shall not be deemed to be an equivalent increase in pay within the meaning of section 5335 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of step-increases under the pay structure established by section 5376 of such title (as added by subsection (a)(1) of this section).

(B) CREDIT OF ALL PREVIOUS SERVICE.—For purposes of periodic step-increases under such pay structure, an employee shall be credited, as of the effective date of the amendments made by this section, with all service since such employee’s last periodic step-increase under section 5335 of title 5, United States Code, before such effective date.

(4) NO REDUCTION IN PAY.—No rate of basic pay in effect immediately before the effective date of the amendments made by this section shall be reduced by reason of the enactment of this section.

(5) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “police force of Washington National Airport” and the term “police force of Washington Dulles International Airport” each has the meaning given

such term by section 5376 of title 5, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)(1) of this section).

CRISIS IN DUVALIER'S HAITI

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, we have seen an increasing deterioration in the human rights situation in Haiti. Jean-Claude Duvalier has turned loose his security forces to randomly kill innocent Haitian citizens as a way of quelling the protests against his regime. Many human rights organizations have called for a cut-off of all assistance to Haiti under the current circumstances of undisciplined killings and violence. I have enclosed a recent op-ed piece from the Washington office on Haiti's program associate, Allan Ebert on the current political situation in Haiti. I commend it to my colleagues for review:

THE DAYS OF "BABY DOC" ARE NUMBERED (By Allan Ebert)

The Creole refrain "Aba Duvalier" ("Down with Duvalier") has echoed throughout the countryside of Haiti since autumn. From all reports it resonated down the streets of Port-au-Prince on Friday as surging unrest overtook the capital amid rumors that Jean-Claude (Baby Doc) Duvalier had been overthrown and had fled the country.

Although Duvalier is still in the National Palace, it is no longer a question of whether he will be forced out, but when and of who will take up residence once he's gone.

The people of Haiti want democratic rule by free and fair elections. Nothing short of that will suffice. U.S. military intervention is unacceptable, since on the numerous occasions when it has occurred, things only got worse. In 1915, the United States militarily intervened to "protect American lives" and prevent instability. By the time the marines left—in 1934—thousands of Haitians had been killed in confrontations with the occupiers, prompting a U.S. Navy commander to ask for an investigation into the shameful events. During the occupation, U.S. officials rewrote the Haitian constitution, eliminating the restriction on foreign land purchases and investments and opening the door for wholesale capital penetration.

In 1946, Eli Lescot arrived aboard President Harry Truman's official airplane to take up his position as the new Haitian president. In 1957, the Central Intelligence Agency helped put Francois (Papa Doc) Duvalier, a physician who was head of the national hygiene program under the U.S. occupation and father of the present president, into the National Palace. In 1963, after he showed his brutal, independent streak too often, a frustrated President John Kennedy angrily sent U.S. vessels to the shores of Haiti, threatening to topple him in yet another military intervention. But Papa Doc retained total power until he died in 1971.

At present there is a U.S. military vessel directly off the coast of Haiti carrying marines and weapons and possibly soldiers from other Caribbean nations. This looks like another risky, unwise contingency plan that, if put into operation, would damage U.S. interests worldwide. It would be un-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

justified to overthrow a government that is technically still in power. What could the U.S. marines do if they landed but prop up Duvalier for a longer period of time? That would mean opposing the will of the people.

The people of Haiti, virtually in control of the countryside for several weeks, will not accept a permanent military junta, a possibility that has surfaced, since it is the military and security forces that have been the backbone of the Duvalier family dynasty since 1957. Unrest will undoubtedly continue.

Neither will Haitians accept another U.S.-imposed president. A group of them expressed this sentiment to U.S. Ambassador Clayton McManaway on Saturday, as he visited the strife-torn town of Gonaives. He was there to uncover the reason for American flags showing up at massive anti-Duvalier demonstrations. Residents told him that the enemy was, without a doubt, Jean-Claude Duvalier, the 34-year-old president-for-life, and not the United States. Nevertheless, the flags, they emphasized, were not an invitation for intervention. Any intervention, they threatened in a Haitian radio broadcast, would be met with unrest equal to that currently being waged against Duvalier.

The only reasonable and beneficial role for the United States to play at present is to sever all ties to Duvalier, closely monitor the will of the people, take their demands seriously and begin a dialogue with prominent, credible, civilian leaders.

The Reagan administration must pursue this course delicately since it already has egg on its face from Friday's faux pas, when White House spokesperson Larry Speakes announced aboard Air Force One that Duvalier had been overthrown and fled the country. The error was compounded when officials circulated the names of Duvalier's replacements. This led to serious questions about the U.S. role in the whole mess, which has now apparently resulted in more than 50 deaths. It appears that just before midnight on Thursday, Haitian National Television, which is government-run, told its viewers to stand by for an "important message." Nothing else needed to be said as far as the Haitian people were concerned. They popped open bottles of champagne and sang "Duvalier is out!"

However, at 2:00 a.m. Friday, the scheduled time of the announcement, only the French words "Message Important" appeared on the screen. Nevertheless, at approximately 7:30 a.m., Donald Regan, the White House chief of staff, and John Poindexter, the national security adviser, told President Ronald Reagan that Duvalier had been overthrown and had escaped from the country. An hour later Speakes made his now infamous statement. But, suddenly, Baby Doc appeared on television at the National Palace in Port-au-Prince, saying he was still in power and "fo pase ke makak" ("as firm as a monkey's tail"). The Reagan administration was in a most awkward position and had to retract its earlier statements, pointing its finger at the U.S. Embassy as the cause of the confusion.

Was the United States meddling with the Haitian military? Was there U.S. involvement in a coup attempt, and if so, what went wrong? Who else was involved? Who threw the curve ball? We may never know the answers to these questions. But even if we were to dismiss this theory as paranoid, the Reagan administration's role in Haiti has been intolerable.

First of all, the administration has less than a tea cup of understanding about Hai-

February 6, 1986

tian politics and social forces for change. No U.S. embassy official in Haiti is proficient in Creole, the only language of 90 percent of Haitians. The embassy does most of its intelligence-gathering in French, which is used chiefly by the elite and in reports and periodicals. It is highly unlikely that any embassy personnel have ever ventured to the town of Jeremie in the far southwest, a strong anti-Duvalier city and the diocesan seat of Bishop Willy Romelus, a Duvalier enemy who was nearly assassinated 2 weeks ago by armed men said to be linked to the National Palace.

On Dec. 5, the embassy dispatched staff officer Dundis McCullough, along with a U.S. "religious representative," to the church-run Radio Soleil, which broadcasts in Creole, to complain about "the [Roman Catholic] Church's systematic opposition to the government." Hours later the radio station was shut down, ransacked and sealed off by government troops.

The Catholic Church is the largest, most powerful and most important institution in Haiti not allied to the government. It is about to launch a nationwide campaign to reduce illiteracy, at 80 percent, in the country. It has embarked on wide-ranging economic development projects. The church operates many of the schools, which provide at least two good meals a day to hungry Haitian children and youth, 70 percent of whom would otherwise receive few decent meals a week.

The United States has generously provided a significant amount of economic assistance to Haiti over the years, perhaps as much as \$900 million since the Duvalier dynasty began in 1957. But the United States, because it has been unable, or unwilling, to closely monitor its large aid inputs and protest blatant government corruption, has been implicated by most Haitians as an accomplice in their misery. Some \$450 million has been spirited out of the country by the Duvalier family and government ministers, while as much as \$400 million is owed by the government to its own Central Bank. Meanwhile, Haitian children swallow stones to fill their aching stomachs.

Because the U.S. has failed to tap into the pulse of social forces for change in Haiti, namely the church and the youth, it has missed many opportunities to open a dialogue with credible, reasonable and prominent civilian alternatives to Duvalier.

It is not too late. Fiscal year 1986 funds to the government of Haiti have been cut off due to human rights atrocities. This is an encouraging sign, although it may be too little, too late. There is also growing congressional support for serious discussions with civilian alternatives. On Thursday, Rep. Gus Yatron (D-Pa.) issued a release, stating, "In conducting hearings and investigations . . . it is readily apparent that known, credible and competent individuals exist to fashion a legitimate, broad-based transition government."

Nonetheless, the immediate issue is getting rid of Duvalier and his hatchetmen, the Tonton Macoutes. Until this occurs, no other opposition leaders will emerge, since their safety cannot be guaranteed.

HISTORIC RAILROAD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT EXCITES EX-NEBRASKAN

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most fascinating stories all over the world, and especially in America, has been the railroads. Railroads opened frontiers, made natural resources accessible, took grains, ores, energy products and people all across this land. Once the most exciting single building force available to our ancestors, they are still crucial to us today, even though some routes or spur lines have been abandoned as unprofitable or because there are better routes of service to a region.

In my congressional district, there is an effort underway to revive a 15-mile stretch of track to be called the Fremont-Elkhorn River Valley Railway. The revival will be tourism oriented, and will give families, conventions and history buffs a chance to include a day on the rails which will parallel or past part of the route of the Lewis and Clark expedition, of the explorations of both Maj. Stephen Long in 1820 and John C. Fremont in 1842, the very first Nebraskan military fort, Fort Atkinson, the Mormon Trail and many other trafficways into the Pacific coast and the American destiny. Plans also incorporate a few river boat hours to generally recreate the total transportation atmosphere of another age.

This effort has not only intrigued Nebraska's citizens, but those fellow Nebraskans who have long since left our State but never forgotten their roots. One such individual is Col. Barney Oldfield, USAF (Ret.), now consultant for international relations for Litton Industries in California. He cheered on the project by way of a letter to the Fremont Tribune, which I ask permission to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RAILROAD PROJECT EXCITES EX-NEBRASKAN

May I add my salute to those who are promoting the Fremont and Elkhorn Valley Railroad tourism-attracting project.

As a former Nebraskan, now strayed to some 74 other countries, I have always been intrigued to find those born in that state engaged in some of the most off-beat, demanding and unusual kinds of involvements—and their one common denominator is that they love to recall the sights, sounds, people and things with which they grew up.

In many cases, it is the combination of all those "things" which gives them the courage to come to a conclusion that anything is possible with hard work salted with optimism.

Why would I be excited about a resuscitation project involving a finger-length of railway. Let me tick them off for you.

The night I had my first network experience from Hollywood on the old Lux Radio Theater, and was interviewed by the great Cecil B. DeMille (he invented Hollywood, made its first film), he told me I had to ask him a question at the end of the program and it was about what his future movie plans were. His response was that he had selected his next story which would be a movie called "Union Pacific" which ran across the Nebraska in which I was born

and from which I'd come for that night among the stars. It was a railway which gave me the "local angle" for that night in Hollywood.

Between high school and college, I had driven stakes for a circus which traveled by rail, and laid rails on the CB&Q to raise college entrance money. It was train whistles which were my first lure to life in the mobile state in which I've lived it. It was on a train stopped for water in Bucyrus, Ohio that Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower was called to the freight shed to take a call from President Truman who said he was appointing him Supreme Allied Commander to set up the multi-national military forces of NATO—which put me on a train to Washington when he selected me as his advance man through 12 countries!

And for sheer sentimental reasons, I like the fact that this shortline railway will terminate in Hooper. When I was in the School of Journalism at the University of Nebraska, one of my classmates was Dorothy Howard, whose family owned the newspaper in Ashland. She later went on to run the Hooper Sentinel until she died.

And my grandmother used to take in boarders in Elk Creek and one of them was Frank Anderson, the CB&Q station agent. He took me to the depot with him on Sundays when he worked the two afternoon passenger trains. To keep me from my favorite 8-year-old pastime of walking the shiny rails he took me in his office and beckoned to another way I might amuse myself. He owned the only typewriter in town, so he'd put in a piece of paper and invite me to do my best. The "hunt and peck" system I learned so laboriously in that old depot is the one I still use today.

I'm sure everyone else who had known the small town experience, and Nebraska offers so much of that, has had some connection with a railroad—and when dealing in nostalgia, there are so many for whom the railroad was the way out of town when going for the first adventure—and the way back for returns home. I went off to what would be World War II on a railroad, and came home—alive—on one.

Indeed, I do salute the preservers of this little bit of Nebraska of another time—the Fremont-Elkhorn Valley Railroad, all fifteen miles and all the memories of it, and the thoughts it will provoke in its time.

CRISIS IN THE PHILIPPINES

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow's elections in the Philippines have been much heralded abroad and much contested at home.

The relationship between the United States and its former colony is necessarily unique. It is, therefore, only fitting that we pay particular attention to that nation and its problems. Of course, our two military bases in the Philippines gives us further reason for concern over the instability that has characterized the Philippines for the past few years.

I am submitting an article by Ian Buruma from the January 16 edition of the New York Review of Books on the Philippines for the RECORD for my colleagues' perusal:

WHO CAN REDEEM MOTHER FILIPINAS?

(By Ian Buruma)

The view from the small church in Calamba, a village about fifty miles south of Manila, is spectacular: on one side is a large lake called Laguna de Bay, on the other is Makiling, a sacred mountain with many caves which peasants believe to be the portals of paradise. Between the mountain and the lake lie the rice fields of Luzon, a relatively prosperous region, traditionally hospitable to rebels and bandits, including some now fighting against the regime of President Ferdinand Marcos.

The church itself is unremarkable—it is more like a ramshackle town hall. The walls inside are covered with murals depicting scenes from the Passion, the usual thing in Philippine churches. But there is one peculiar twist: "Christ" is a dapper little man with a mustache, wearing a dark suit, cut in the nineteenth-century European style. And instead of being nailed to the cross on Golgotha, this Christ is executed by a Spanish firing squad in Manila in 1896. He is Dr. José Rizal, a medical doctor and nationalist writer, worshiped by many as a Filipino messiah.

His twelve apostles, all depicted on the church wall, are fellow nationalists and revolutionaries who fought against Spanish rule at the end of the nineteenth century. There are the Fathers Burgos, Gómez, and Zamora, native priests who challenged the power of the Spanish friars. They were publicly garroted for their alleged leadership of an anti-Spanish mutiny. There is Andres Bonifacio, a warehouse clerk from the city of Tondo (now part of Manila and one of the worst slums in Southeast Asia), who founded the Katipunan, a secret society dedicated to violent revolution. (Imelda Marcos would later use the society's initials, KKK, to lend an aura to one of her "people's development" project.) There are Marcelo H. Del Pilar, the brilliant propagandist for reforms, and Apolinario Mabini, the main political thinker behind the Philippine revolution. (Their names now grace the two streets in Manila collectively known as the "strip," the center of go-go bars, massage parlors, child prostitution, and VD clinics.) And there is also Ferdinand Blumentritt, an obscure Austrian schoolmaster, who never set foot in the Philippines, but who owes his holy eminence to his lifelong position as Dr. Rizal's intellectual pen pal.

This particular church dedicated to the worship of Rizal—there are many others like it—is called the Iglesia Watawat ng Nahi, Inc., or Banner of the Race, Inc. It was founded in 1936, when American colonizers required all organizations to be incorporated. The founder, Arsenio de Guzman, claimed to be a new Rizal with the power to lead his followers to the land of promise. A church pamphlet explains that the sect was "purposely organized for the Filipinos to have a Christian religious sect of their own, independent of foreign domination." Rizal, the same pamphlet informs us, was sent to earth as a "Malayan Avatar who was appointed by Divine Power and ordained to earth in this new cycle to redeem His people from slavery."

In more prosaic versions of history Rizal was the highly educated son of upper-class Filipino parents, who, like all members of the elite, were a racial mixture of Spanish, Indian, Chinese, Malay, even Japanese. He lived much of his life abroad, mostly in Spain, where, like many *ilustrados* (enlightened ones), he picked up novel European

ideas such as nationalism. Through his writings, the most famous of which are two novels, *Noli Me Tangere* and *El Filibusterismo*, both compulsory reading at Philippine schools, he propagated these ideas. He was opposed to the power of Spanish friars in the colony, and wanted the Philippines to be represented in Madrid's legislature, not as a colony but as a province. More than anything else, he wanted Filipinos to be treated as equals by the Spanish.

Rizal's holy stature lies in the manner of his death. As the church pamphlet puts it (referring both to Christ and Rizal), with slight historical license: "Both their martyrdom marked the beginning of the need of two once powerful and ruthless empires in the world—the Roman Empire in the case of Christ and the Spanish empire in the case of Rizal." Or in the words of a more conventional though no less reverent historian, Gregorio Zaide: "Rizal's homecoming in 1869, the last in his life, was his saddest return to his beloved native land. . . . Gladly, he desired to meet his enemies and to offer himself as a sacrificial victim to their sadistic lust and unholy designs for he knew that his blood would water the seeds of Filipino freedom."

There is a pattern in this kind of language which has been little studied. It disturbs middle-class Filipino notions of modernity. But like a primary color which endless paint jobs cannot quite hide, it has a way of shining through even the many layers of American-style education. Catholic imagery of death and redemption, the main legacy of three hundred years of Spanish rule, merged with Malay beliefs in spiritual power, or *anting-anting*. Great leaders have such powers because they are the spiritual incarnations of former leaders. The cult of Rizal is, as it were, a Christian form of national ancestor worship. The dominance of Christian forms shows to what extent native forms were wiped out.

One of the few historians to have taken these nationalist beliefs seriously is Reynaldo Ileto. He traces the forms of peasant rebellion back to folk versions of the Passion, in which the Spanish conquest of the Philippines is likened to the fall from Paradise, and Mother Filipinas must be redeemed by faith and sacrifice, by death and resurrection. Such acts of redemption have been led by a succession of messiahs, not usually from the upper class as was Rizal, but peasant rebels promising paradise and freedom. New Filipinized Christian faiths have come up, rejecting the false colonial prophets. Rizal himself is said to be waiting in his cave in Mount Makiling for the right moment to emerge and redeem the motherland. Filipinos are still waiting. In the meantime many messiahs have come and gone.

General Douglas MacArthur came in October 1944. He was nothing if not a good PR man, and knew more than most Americans about the Philippines. "I shall return," promised matchboxes and leaflets dropped from American planes. After wading through the surf at Leyte, corn-cob pipe clenched in his determined jaw—a scene made eternal throughout the country by hideous sculptures—he made a remarkable radio speech to the waiting Filipinos: "I have returned. By the grace of Almighty God our forces stand again on Philippine soil—soil consecrated in the blood of our two peoples. . . . The hour of your redemption is here." This year a newspaper columnist commemorated the event by stating that the landing "finally brought about a

completion of the Fil-American cycle of setback and triumph, of Calvary and Resurrection." There is something extraordinary about a colonized country receiving the general of the colonial power back as a savior. And indeed the spirit of MacArthur hovers around the Philippines as much as Rizal's. But more about this later.

Benigno "Ninoy" Aquino returned to redeem his country from Marcos in 1983. He was perhaps the most Rizalesque of modern messiahs. The *ilustrado* son of a wealthy family of landowners, he was hardly a revolutionary, more a pro-American reformer. At the beginning of his career, he was a typical *macho* politician, tough enough for Marcos to respect him more than any other politician. Part of being typical was to be a womanizer (so, incidentally, was Rizal; the church pamphlet gets around this by stating that women were attracted by "his virtues"). Only during his seven years in jail during the martial law period did Ninoy become more introspective, spending much time reading the Bible, and Rizal. In a letter from jail he wrote: "I now realize why Rizal reserved a little book by Thomas à Kempis, 'The Imitation of Christ,' for his beloved Josephine. . . . It was from this little book that he drew the strength of his spirituality." He then went on to say that if Rizal had been alive today he, too, like Aquino, would have been arrested, and "maybe, reenact his martyrdom. . . . If I, however, understand the truth of our tragedy and have been wanting in my denunciation of the tyrant who dragged back Mother Filipinos to her dungeon in chains, I hope God will forgive me for failing to rise up to the occasion."

He did of course rise to the occasion. And whoever had him killed at Manila International Airport on August 21, 1983, made the same mistake as the Spaniards who ordered Rizal's execution. His death released an extraordinary wave of popular energy. Hundreds of thousands of people demonstrated in the streets of Manila for months. It was one of the rare times in Philippine history that the many disparate forces of society came together in a kind of nationwide fiesta. "Ninoy you are not alone" was one of the most popular slogans on T-shirts, key rings, bumper stickers, and banners. "A Filipino is worth dying for" was another. It was as if only a martyr's death could unite this divided, fractious society; as if Ninoy's death proved to Filipinos their worth as a people; as if this image of suffering briefly gave the nation a sense of identity.

Opposition papers made much of this image. One of the more imaginative ones, called *Mr. and Ms.*, had Ninoy's death mask on the cover. In one issue in late 1983 was the following passage: "Gazing at his blood-soaked chest and his wounded face still bearing its bullet marks, . . . a grief stricken people were actually gazing not only at Ninoy Aquino but at themselves, bloodied and wounded by a long history of colonial domination, still suffering from foreign and native suppression."

It is a typically Filipino kind of hyperbole. The empathy with suffering and death, sometimes bordering on a morbid fascination, is part of everyday life. The visitor stumbles across it in the most unexpected places. Not long ago a bar girl in Manila, after about ten minutes of desultory conversation, said she wanted to show me something and proceeded to fish a photograph from her bag. It showed an open coffin, elaborately decorated with flowers. "My mum," she said matter-of-factly, pointing at the waxen face peering out of the flowers.

In Escalante, a village on the island of Negros, where twenty-seven people were recently shot dead, during a street demonstration, by paramilitary troops sponsored by a local landlord, a group of nuns passed around a sheaf of color photos of the "martyrs," taken at the local clinic. People casually leafed through the pictures, commenting on the more gory wounds. One person arrived with a little bottle, which elicited much interest. It contained what looked like a raw meatball: it was the eye of one of the victims.

Suffering and violent death are a constant theme in Filipino movies. The typical hero is a simple man, who gets abused and humiliated, often sexually, all through the film. The audience feels sorry for him, and identifies with him. This is the point of these films. There appears to be little identification with *macho* killers. The attention is always on the victim. The tension is built up further and further, until the hero cannot stand it any longer and erupts in a climactic scene of extraordinary violence, a kind of frenzy in which brains are blown out, blood splashes over the screen, eyes are gorged. Sometimes, as in a recent popular movie called *Boatman*, the hero is the victim in this final bloodbath. The boatman is a young provincial who goes to the city to be a film star. He ends up as a live sex show performer, becomes the paid lover of the American mistress of a Filipino gang boss, who, in a jealous rage, has the boy tortured to death. We are shown in great detail how his penis is cut off. Filipino critics seriously suggested that the hero be seen as a metaphor for the Philippine people.

The Aquino movement did not last. Like the climactic scene of violence in the movies, a fiesta of grief is cathartic: it erupts and then blows over. By the beginning of 1984, the opposition was as fractious as ever. Within two months of the killing the flight of capital from the Philippines had reached horrendous proportions, estimated at one billion dollars. Businessmen have returned to their offices but do not dare to invest. When the especially appointed Agrava Board came out with an apparently fair report which pointed the finger at high-ranking military officers for their complicity in the Aquino assassination, much of the sting went out of the street demonstrations. Moral outrage seemed to be somewhat appeased. There was hope that justice could still be done. But the recent acquittal of twenty-six military men, including General Ver, Marcos' loyal Armed Forces Chief of Staff, left the population largely apathetic. Hope for justice clearly has been lost. The church is as divided as the rest of the nation. Some priests have taken to the hills to join the communist guerrillas. The prelate, Cardinal Jaime Sin, is a decent man, but he is terrified of disorder which could challenge the institutional power of the Church. He speaks out against Marcos on some occasions, but then blesses and embraces the president on his birthday, amid choruses from Handel's *Messiah*.

This year Filipinos celebrate the two thousandth anniversary of the Virgin Mary's birth. "Happy Birthday, Mama Mary!" it says underneath a huge effigy of the Virgin, richly decorated in jewels, marking the entrance to a section of Metro Manila. The yearly processions of Virgin images are spectacular contests in gaudiness; each one richer, more gorgeous, more glittery than the other. The most lavish procession in Manila is said to be sponsored by a group of wealthy society matrons, who

form the regular entourage of Imelda Marcos, the First Lady. They are collectively known as "the Blue Ladies."

According to this year's Pastoral Exhortation of the Catholic Bishops' Conference of the Philippines, "our Filipino people have always turned to Our Blessed Mother in times of difficulty, of crisis, even of seeming hopelessness. Always we have asked her, groaning and weeping in this valley of tears, to turn her eyes of mercy upon us." The *Mindanao Daily Mirror*, filled with stories of the latest killings in Davao by "unidentified armed men," explained to its readers the "right posture in praying."

There is something curious and disturbing about the way Filipinos of all classes turn to cults and fads in times of crisis, looking for other worldly mercy. Businessmen—not to mention their wives—seek solace in born-again Christianity; students and artists indulge in Zen. One American Zen master has set up a successful business by convincing Filipinos that they, as a people, are especially gifted for spiritual quests. This year's latest middle-class fad is to share with one's friends "as a mark of love" a disgusting brew called Kargasok tea. It is brewed from yeast supposed to come from Russia. Among its many benefits are extreme longevity, robust health, weight loss, and sexual vigor. "I hope it works," said a Filipino friend, who also happens to be a Zen meditator and a seeker after that other eternal Philippine panacea, an emigrant visa to the United States.

"What we need in the Philippines is a *macho* leader," said a government official who is now disenchanted with President Marcos. He spoke in an emotional, exasperated tone, banging on the table. "In the early years of martial law, people were so cooperative. The streets were so clean." Few people are as ready these days to admit how popular martial rule was when it was declared in 1972.

Ferdinand Marcos was a *macho* leader, with *macho* ideas. One of the goals of his New Society was to challenge the power of the "oligarchy"—the old landowning families who had effectively run the country for centuries as power brokers for friends, relatives, and dependents. They managed the country, as dispensers of gifts and privileges, without having the responsibility of actual sovereignty, which lay with the colonial powers. The old quasi-American system of democracy was not based on democratic principles but on a huge network of patronage, some of which seeped down to the lowliest hacienda worker. The main check on any family's power getting out of control was an election, held every four years, so that different patrons could have their turn at the trough. The Philippines that Marcos took over in 1965 was not so much a nation as a collection of regional, family, and class loyalties. It was a country effectively without a national language; Tagalog, the "official" language, is a language of central Luzon that many Filipinos do not speak. Marcos's success proved that national strongmen or communist revolutions arise not from poverty but from a lack of national cohesion, an absence of common purpose.

Marcos argued that the old democracy, imposed by a western power on an Asian country, was holding up vital reforms, necessary to make the Philippines a great nation. What was needed was a "revolution from the center." He aimed to break the power of "the few who would promote their selfish interests through the indirect or irresponsible exercise of public and private

power." He aimed to wipe out the communist threat, then embodied by about three hundred soldiers in one area of southern Luzon. (There are now up to 20,000 New People's Army guerrillas throughout the Philippines.) He needed a new ideology, "a unifying force, an organizing principle for the pursuit of collective ends."

To do all this he hired talented technocrats and thinkers, who could create the New Society and an ideology to match. The ideas were not all bad. Land reforms, industrialization, foreign investment incentives, government-guided economic development—all this looked fine on paper. It has worked elsewhere. Other Asian rulers, such as South Korea's Park Chung Hee, or Singapore's Lee Kuan Yew, though by no stretch of the imagination democrats, delivered the goods: strong economies and rising living standards.

Unfortunately, what Marcos and the First Lady wanted more than anything else was to be king and queen. They wished to shape the kingdom in their own image; like the Sun King, Louis XIV, Marcos wanted to be able to say "*L'état c'est mol.*" According to Adrain Cristobal, a former left-wing writer, and one of Marcos's chief ideological advisers, "Marcos sees the Philippines as a society of tribes." And he sees himself as the great tribal chief, the Datu of pre-Spanish times. He destroyed much of the old network of family and regional loyalties to become the one and only patron, the king of Maharlika.

"Maharlika," a pre-Hispanic term meaning "chief" or literally, "big phallus," was Marcos's nom de guerre as a guerrilla soldier against the Japanese. A highway was renamed the Maharlika Highway. There is a Maharlika broadcasting station, government owned, of course. The main reception room of the Malacañang Palace is called Maharlika Hall, where the chief likes to receive his guests sitting on a golden throne. There was even a move at one time officially to rename the Philippines Maharlika. "Our people are used to being ruled by royalty," observed the First Lady and former beauty queen some years ago. She likes to show herself off in extravagant finery "because my little people expect it of me."

The Big Phallus never gave his technocrats much chance. The economy, like the army, became a tool of political patronage to enhance the power of the chief. A new oligarchy of loyal courtiers controlled such vital sectors of the economy as sugar and coconuts. Trusted generals from Ilocos, Marcos's native region, were put in charge of the ever-expanding armed forces. An estimated ten billion dollars, or more than one third of the country's foreign debt, is said to have been secretly invested abroad by Marcos and his friends, no small part of it in New York real estate.

The political scientist Francisco Nemenzo, in *The Philippines After Marcos*, one of the most useful books to have come out on the Philippine crisis, compares the Marcos state to what Marx called "Bonapartism." It achieved "relative autonomy" from the ruling class with the support of the army and a pliable mass organization. The circumstances which allowed Marcos to assume total power were remarkably similar to what created the opportunity for Louis Bonaparte to pose as the saviour of France; intense contradictions in the ruling class and a mighty challenge from below, resulting in the paralysis of the old state machine.

The First Lady spent fortunes on gigantic projects in Manila: convention centers with

murals depicting the glorious achievements of Marcos and Imelda; a University of Life, where students do not learn regular subjects, but "humanist development values" and the "Filipino ideology," as taught by Marcos and Imelda; a Cultural Center, where their youngest daughter Irene Marcos conducts the orchestra and a Film Center where pornographic films are shown uncensored, to recoup some of the money that has been taken out of the government's coffers. They are monuments to a grotesque sense of inferiority, as if to prove that the Philippines is not just a poor country of "little brown brothers."

A "trainer-facilitator" (teacher) at the University of Life tried to explain the school's aims by drawing diagrams on a blackboard, using terms like "experimental development" and "interactive studies." It sounded like a parody of science. The same trainer-facilitator, who would look more at home in a body-building gym than in a classroom, showed me a book entitled *The New Human Order*, written by Mme. Imelda Marcos. It is an extraordinary work, full of doodles, cartoons, and thoughts like: "The body seeks good, the mind seeks truth, the spirit seeks beauty." There were also triangular shapes that showed how the new human order had to be led by one chief. It is a sad parody of philosophy, the deep thoughts of a fiesta queen.

There is something patently false about Maharlika, like the sign in the lobby of the University of Life, which says: "The world is composed of takers and givers. The takers eat better. The givers sleep better." Or the white walls erected around the slums in central Manila, so that nice people don't have to see them. Maharlika is false because it is not merely based on greed. Like many Great Leaders—Sukarno, Kim II Sung, Mussolini—Marcos is concerned with his place in history. He is a nationalist of a kind. He has written a multivolume history, entitled *Destiny*, in which he links himself spiritually to the great national heroes. Myths have been promoted of Marcos having antingating, or spiritual power. "More power to you!" said a newspaper greeting to Marcos on his sixty-eighth birthday from the Le Pena Sawmill Co., Inc. The Philippine Charity Sweepstakes went one further, and had a page-sized picture printed of Marcos as a young war hero. The text runs: "Heroic blood on sacred soil. When Ferdinand E. Marcos' young blood first flowed freely on Bataan's hallowed hills, a deathless covenant of service was forged . . . to all the people—but especially to the most deprived and underprivileged."

The systematic falsity of Marcos's claims, the way every promise turned into the opposite, is perhaps one of Maharlika's worst legacies. Like the Spanish friars or the Japanese conquerors, who promised independence in the Great East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere, Marcos has become a false prophet. He has lost credibility—a much-used word in the Philippines. A Filipino letter-writer to the *Far Eastern Economic Review* put it this way: "In the Philippines of today, if President Ferdinand Marcos said that the crow is white, here is what would happen next. Hundreds of people from the provinces will testify that this is so after painting black crows with white paint and then photographing the birds. A court of law will decide on the question with hundreds of witnesses lined up to swear that the crow is white." The problem is that it will no longer work.

Adrian Cristobal, Marcos's adviser, looks a tired man these days. He has to uphold an ideology, which he helped to shape, but which hardly anyone believes anymore. Its most fatal flaw is not only that it has been contradicted by reality so often, but that it is associated entirely with one man. Cristobal tries to "tell people to look at the ideology without thinking of Marcos." This is like thinking of the Philippines today without Marcos. One can't and that is the country's—not to mention Washington's—biggest problem. And Marcos, the state of his kidneys permitting, might be sitting in his palace, brooding over his place in history, for a long time yet.

"I am getting impatient waiting for the United States to liberate us from two decades of the Marcos regime," wrote a reader to the editor of *Malaya*, one of the many opposition papers that emerged after the killing of Aquino. It is a widely shared sentiment. Many blame America for not stopping Marcos's declaration of martial law in September 1972, forgetting how much support it had in the Philippines. Most think America, the Big White Chief, can get them out of the Marcos mess.

The thought is, of course, not without ambiguity. Lorenzo Tanada, at eighty-six the grand old man of the opposition, a nationalist former senator and lawyer of Ninoy Aquino, has always spoken out against US intervention in Philippine affairs. Throughout the martial law period his nationalist and anti-Marcos credentials remained impeccable. What should the US do, I asked him. He said: "It is not right for the US to interfere, but they can get rid of Marcos. I am not advocating it, but they can. It is their responsibility."

The same paradox clouds much American thinking. Fred Poole, a New York novelist, and Max Vanzi, a newsman, use much of their book, *Revolution in the Philippines* to attack America for interfering in the Philippines. It is a rather hysterical book, from the title to the constant use of the word "tyrant" for Marcos. The revolution is not yet at hand, nor is Marcos strictly speaking a tyrant. In sweeping historical strokes they manage to cobble together Ronald Reagan, Theodore Roosevelt, the Vietnam war, and Marcos, as if they were all part of the same problem—American imperialism in Asia, or something of that sort. This leads to such baffling non sequiturs as "Marcos spoke of sweeping land reform but failed to carry it out. There was little he even pretended he would do for the nation's rural and urban poor. He became the most vocal supporter in Asia for Lyndon Johnson's Vietnam war." Are they suggesting that Johnson was against the rural and urban poor? Or that there is a connection between Marcos's support of Johnson and Marcos's failure to carry out land reform? What is clear is that both Johnson and Marcos are thoroughly bad guys.

Reagan is of course even worse, for he had managed to convince large parts of Philippine society that America was not so much behind the Philippines in general as it was behind the leaders who had killed democracy and were operating a gulag, ruling by terror." Apart from the hyperbolic language, which could have been lifted straight from some agitprop street demonstration pamphlet (vast street demonstrations in a gulag?), the authors do not pause to think how a US government can express its support of the Philippines in general and oppose the country's leaders without intervention. And if intervention is indeed desira-

ble, how then should Washington go about it? Poole and Vanzi do not get further than a vague reference to "working with the last Filipinos who believed it was still possible to avoid a cataclysm in the islands."

Direct military intervention by the US would be both unwise and unthinkable. Unwise because it would turn a rural-based armed rebellion into a war of national liberation against a real foreign enemy. Unthinkable, because there would be insufficient support for it in America. That is not to say that many Filipinos would not welcome it. One high-powered Filipino businessman said with heartfelt regret that "since the Americans refused to cross the Yalu river, it's been downhill all the way."

I agree with Poole and Vanzi about one thing: America has already intervened more than enough in the Philippines this past hundred years, though the damage was done long before Reagan appeared on the scene. It might have been better for all concerned if General MacArthur had never returned to the Philippines. To be sure, if he had not returned, many Filipinos would have felt betrayed. Disappointment might have caused bitter anti-American feelings; but at least the Philippines would have been weaned away from that adolescent state of dependence known as the "Fill-American relationship."

By returning as a long-awaited liberator, MacArthur confused an already highly confused nationalist tradition in the Philippines, which had long been split between reformists who accepted American "protection," and revolutionaries who did not. The great liberator then confused things even more by moving on to Tokyo, where he proceeded to help the old enemy get back onto its feet. Worship for his return has alternated ever since with resentment about his abandonment.

Poole and Vanzi, as well as David Haward Bain, the author of *Sitting in Darkness*, another book on the Fili-American relationship, emphasize the harshness of early American colonial rule; the brutal killing of over 15,000 "gooks" (a term first coined during the Philippine-American war); the racism of Roosevelt and McKinley. The war was harsh, the killing was brutal—offering to Vanzi and Poole plenty of parallels to Vietnam—and Roosevelt was a nineteenth century social Darwinist. But this is to miss the point. For the psychological dependency of Filipinos is not the result of brutal colonization, but of a relatively benign one. Uncle Sam was not an enemy but a "tutor" and a dispenser of wealth, more a rich uncle than a racist overlord. It is easier to attain psychological independence from a hated enemy like the Japanese than to escape from the clammy embrace of a benefactor.

The longing for the white messiah and the childish belief in American omnipotence—communism will never succeed, one is constantly told, "because the Americans won't allow it"—show how thoroughly colonial Filipinos still are. It explains the irresponsibility of many politicians, both in the government and in the opposition, for deep down they do not feel responsible. Uncle Sam will help me, and if he doesn't now, he'd better soon, or I'll send my wife to Moscow, or collect a Soviet war medal, Marcos thinks, while opposition leaders knock on Senator Edward Kennedy's door. This makes the Philippines fundamentally different from Iran or Vietnam, so often evoked these days in emotional newspaper headlines. Different, but not necessarily easier to deal with.

America is both the savior and the enemy, the promised land and the hated "imperialist." Such influential proponents of Filipino nationalism as the historian Renato Constantino blame everything, from the proclamation of martial law in 1972 to the economic crisis, on US imperialism. Marcos is seen as a mere puppet. One would wish sometimes that he was right; two years ago, after Aquino's murder, Constantino predicted that combined pressure from Washington, the IMF, and the World Bank would surely force Marcos to resign.

In Constantino's view—echoed by the entire Filipino left, not to mention Poole and Vanzi—Washington, through the CIA and the multilateral lending agencies, has deliberately kept the Philippines in a state of colonial dependence, a mere supplier of natural resources. Industrialization did not fail because of incompetence, corruption, and protectionism, but because Washington prevented it. True nationalism is subverted by Washington by offering bright Filipinos scholarships to American universities. The IMF and the World Bank want to break up the crony monopolies so that US corporations can take over. And so forth.

This type of third-world nationalism—not at all unique to the Philippines—comes uncomfortably close to anti-Semitic nightmares of an international Jewish conspiracy of bankers and politicians to dominate the world. It is tinged with the paranoid envy of the backward provincial for the metropole, an envy especially acute in the Philippines where American products, values, and dreams have been held up as superior for almost a century. Mainly through the Philippine public school system America succeeded to an extraordinary degree in shaping the Philippine islands in its own image. One could almost say that the legacy of Spanish Catholicism and second-hand Americana are the two things most Filipinos have in common. Even NPA guerrillas wear UCLA T-shirts. America is like a birthmark on the Filipino identity—no matter how hard you rub, it won't come off.

This is why the communist movement is presented as a war of national liberation. Its goal is cultural liberation as much as economic or political. The official program of the National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDF), an illegal front organization led by the Communist party (CPP), begins with a reference to the history of Philippine armed rebellions. "This history," it says, "is not dead and past; our tradition of armed struggle and resistance in defense of the Motherland and to regain our freedom and independence is still very much alive today. It is alive for one obvious reason; a foreign master—US imperialism—still dominates the Philippines."

This program was presented to me by an upper-class, American-educated businesswoman in her plush Manila office, "I believe in the NDF and its programs," she said. "If we look at it from the nationalist point of view and make political programs for the people, I think there is hope." She thought China might be a good model to follow, "though we could take some shortcuts." An equally well-educated lawyer explained to me that the "NPA and NDF are true nationalists. It's not just lip service. They have the best interests of the country at heart and they have always fought US imperialism."

There is a remarkable naiveté among leftist intellectuals about the "total victory through armed struggle" promised in the NDF program. "I believe the NDF will tell its cohorts to drop their arms if the military

will behave themselves," said the businesswoman. A lawyer in Davao even denied that the NDF advocates armed struggle at all. Most fellow travelers give it little thought. Let us first get rid of the Marcos-US dictatorship and then see what happens, is the most common sentiment.

The anti-Western bias ("throw the multi-nationals out and start from scratch") of a national front movement directed by a Maoist party appeals to many in the middle class—teachers, lawyers, students, in short, readers of Renato Constantino's history books. It also matches a Filipino variety of liberation theology, harking back perhaps to the old millenarian struggle against the Spanish church. One priest active in the NDF explained to me how he resolved his problem of reconciling Christianity and Marxism: "As a Filipino and religious I can only survive by involvement in the struggle."

Rural people are not particularly concerned with American imperialism; they turn to the NPA for protection against marauding soldiers, often sponsored by local landlords. This shows an interesting, and perhaps significant, historical shift, for the bitter root of anti-Americanism goes back to the Great Sell-Out; or, as Constantino would have it, the betrayal by the Filipino elite of the popular struggle against American imperialism at the beginning of the century.

The nationalist revolution against Spain between 1896 and 1899 was one of the few times in Philippine history that the various classes came together in a common cause. The coalition that was formed during those years was made up of *ilustrado* reformers like Rizal, native priests against the Spanish church establishment, and the revolutionary brotherhood—the Katipunan—led by Andres Bonifacio, the clerk from Tondo whose portrait remains an icon throughout the Philippines. In the words of the country's most celebrated modern writer, Nick Joaquin, the coalition showed "a glimpse of a Nation, as though lightning had revealed another side of a face." It was not to last long. The deep divisions that still plague Philippine society came to the surface even before the first Philippine Republic was inaugurated in 1899. Bonifacio's ideals of armed revolution made him as dangerous to the Filipino elite as to the Spanish, and he was executed for treason by General Aguinaldo, the man who was to become the first president of the new republic.

Aguinaldo is one of the subjects of *Sitting in Darkness*. Bain describes well how he was finally hunted down in 1901 by an American expedition led by the diminutive adventurer, Frederick Funston. He rightly lays to rest the nationalist canard that Aguinaldo was simply a cowardly "class traitor." The rest of Basin's book, mostly about his backpacking trek up the same route Funston took, is doubtless interesting to backpacking trekkers, but throws little further light on the Fili-American relationship. There are, incidentally, some unfortunate factual errors, the worst of which is the remark that Ninoy Aquino's father, Benigno Sr., "fought the Japanese in the Second World War." In fact he was an active collaborator, serving as vice-president in the wartime government—some say out of anti-American nationalism. Ninoy often hinted that one of his prime motivations for public service was to wipe out the shame of his father's past.

Aguinaldo had little choice but to surrender. In 1901, after he was captured, he issued his last wartime proclamation, recog-

nizing American sovereignty over the Philippines and recommending that the Filipinos make the best of US rule. Perhaps because of this, perhaps because he lived to a contented old age, Aguinaldo never became a national hero of the same rank as Bonifacio or Rizal. It has often been said that Rizal became a greater hero than Bonifacio because of American propaganda aimed at fostering peaceful reforms instead of violent revolution. Rizal's legacy is certainly safer to deal with for a colonial power than Bonifacio's, but the truth is more complicated. Rizal's image was more congenial to the Filipino elite, which benefited most from American rule. This is where the Big Sell-Out comes in.

By sailing into Manila Bay in 1898, ostensibly to help the Filipino struggle against Spain, America effectively aborted the revolution, turning the first steps toward nationhood into a false start. Although Aguinaldo fought on for a few years, much of the Philippine elite did what they had done for centuries to survive, and as they have done ever since, even, until recently, under Marcos; they made deals with the new power, acting as power brokers for their dependents. And by and large they have prospered by doing so. It was they who became the best disciples of American ways, from party politics to Lions clubs.

It is still they, the Kalaws, the Laurels, the Aquinos, who stand for traditional, moderate politics. But it was rural groups which, from the Sakdalistas in the 1930s to the Huks in the 1940s, kept on erupting in revolts, usually inspired by the nationalist beliefs in martyrdom and redemption. The communist movement is now trying to convince people that they are the true heirs to the first revolution, taking up the thread of history where it was so rudely cut off by the Americans.

José Maria Sison, founder of the CCP, made a speech in 1964, on the 101st anniversary of Bonifacio's, birth. He stated that after the death of Bonifacio, the revolutionary initiative of the peasants and the workers of the Katipunan and the anticolonialist struggle in general was undermined and debilitated by the liberal compromises made by the *ilustrado* leadership. . . . US imperialism was not only superior in industrial might but also well-versed in a liberal jargon which could easily deceive the newly emerged Filipino bourgeoisie.

Deception through the sweet talk of foreigners—that is precisely what the earlier revolutionaries said about the Spanish friars; Mother Filipines must be delivered from alien lies. Marcos himself used a similar argument when he declared martial law. Struggle against the false foreign prophets is what lends legitimacy to every Filipino nationalist movement. It is a potent message at a time when "credibility" is the most precious commodity. The credibility most at stake in the Philippines today is not that of Marcos and his cronies—they have already lost theirs. It is the traditional opposition, the political remnants of the old democracy who are most vulnerable.

This puts the US government in a highly delicate position, for being America's girl or boy could become a liability as easily as an asset. No matter how duplicitous or irrational it may be, Philippine nationalism is now on the side of the left. Once that is said, there is a backlog of more than 450,000 Filipino applicants for emigration to the United States.

So, who in the end can redeem Mother Filipinas? It cannot or should not be the US,

for the US is part of the problem. The communists are seductive, acting like Filipino Robin Hoods in the villages and talking like reasonable nationalists in the cities. But the closer they get to actual power the less seductive they become. In Davao City there is a slum of wooden huts on stilts called Agdao, also known as Nicaragdao, one of the few urban areas in the country where the NPA has some control. No soldier or policeman would ever go there alone. Occasionally the military will enter in groups for "dragnet" operations, trying to hunt down NPAs. In the process, houses often get looted. Young men are arrested for questioning. In some cases their hog-tied, mutilated bodies are found a week later, thrown out of a truck on some country road.

"What about the NPA?" I asked some people at a corner store called "Baby's Place." "We are more afraid of the military, they answered. "Do the NPAs give you orders?" I asked. There was some nervous shifting. "Yes, they do," said a cheerful-looking housewife. "What happens if you disobey?" She put her hand to her head and pulled an imaginary trigger. "We want to be left alone, but now we are like a boat navigating in two rivers."

In a country used to following leaders, the communists have a problem: they have no recognizable leaders. It is a movement without a face. Instead there are many faces, often without names: the smiling young man in jeans who says "we support the struggle of the Khmer Rouge, although they made some regrettable errors"; the priest in the mountains who points at his armalite rifle saying, "This gun is an instrument for a higher value. The value of justice. The value of dignity of man"; the imprisoned poet who writes that "the death of every revolutionary hero is always many times avenged. He always lives in the hearts and thoughts of the masses and of his ever increasing comrades." Someone has to pull these voices together into a cohesive political movement which can jump from the villages into the political jungle of Manila. That someone is not yet there.

Some commentators have predicted that this faceless insurgency could turn into a Filipino version of the "killing fields." Punishing class enemies and repaying blood debts are indeed part of the communist program. But the Philippines is not Cambodia. It is an archipelago, with a population of 55 million people spread over thousands of islands, hard to coordinate under central command. There are no foreign sanctuaries. People have not been traumatized by B-52 bombings. Class hatred lacks the intensity it had in parts of Indochina. There is no evidence yet of the Filipino communists receiving material and financial support from Chinese, Vietnamese, or Soviet comrades. That said, however, the messianic fervor traditionally so much a part of Philippine rebellion could lead to an unhappy combination of extreme idealism and running amok—a violent Filipino movie come to life.

Meanwhile, Marcos has called an election for February 7, 1986. Will the traditional opposition leaders be able to surprise everyone and resolve their differences? Will Salvador Laurel, or Corazon "Cory" Aquino, or Jovito Salonga, or Eva Kalaw be able to redeem Mother Filipinas after all? So far the moderates have looked like a microcosm of the old, squabbling democratic days. "Irrelevant" is a word often used for them. Though this is perhaps too strong a term in a country where most people would still favor a middle-of-the-road government,

their chances do not look good. One could perhaps compare them to a splintered group of German politicians trying to revive the Weimar republic, had Hitler suddenly called an election in 1939.

Still, now that "Doy" Laurel has finally agreed to run as vice-president with Cory Aquino, Ninoy's politically inexperienced but popular wife, running for president, there is at last some hope of a unified challenge to Marcos. Laurel's decision came after a bewildering run of flip-flops. At one point he promised to support Aquino's candidacy. Then he decided to run for president himself, only to change his mind one hour before the filing deadline. The two former Liberal party candidates, Eva Kalaw and Jovito Salonga have pledged their support to the ticket.

Laurel is a typical Filipino politician of the old school: ambitious, opportunistic, and pro-American. This combination—with the promise of a substantial dip in the old pork barrel—would have been fine in the pre-Marcos period of free-wheeling family politics. Now it could be a liability. "He'll be just like Marcos" is an often-heard opinion. Son of the wartime Philippine president under the Japanese, Laurel is known for his strong Japanese connections, which may be a financial asset, but is a weakness in nationalist eyes.

Laurel is leader of one wing of the old Nationalista party and president of the United Democratic Nationalist Organization (UNIDO), which was formed as an umbrella group for opposition leaders. This well-organized party machine is Laurel's major contribution to the "Cory-Doy" ticket. Cory's main strength is her husband's legacy and her long-held determination to remain above the political fray. Many feel that her position as the guardian angel of the Aquino myth will be damaged as soon as she becomes another politician. One left-wing activist shrewdly said that "she is more useful to us as a unifying symbol than as a candidate." How useful leftists will find Laurel, a vociferous anticommunist, is one of the more interesting questions for the coming elections.

All traditional opposition leaders talk much about "credibility" and "restoring the faith of the people." And all express great confidence that once faith has been restored the country's problems will be resolved in due course. Indeed, it is often said that Marcos is the Communist party's best ally. But the communist movement will not disappear with Marcos. One spokesman for the party said that a moderate post-Marcos government "will hasten conditions for the overthrow of the US puppet regime. We will have more room for political work with the masses."

Even if one of the opposition candidates were elected, they would still have to deal with the NPA, who will not lay down their arms before "total victory" has been achieved. They may not have much of a chance.

"They're all communists," said the governor of Davao Oriental, as a young girl whisked away a fly hovering over his plate of roast pork. We were having lunch with the general in charge of counterinsurgency in Davao. "No way the military will back some weak opposition leader. The communists will win." I asked the governor how he thought the military would prevent the communists from winning. He laughed and shouted "coup d'état. The military never had it so good as under Marcos and they're sure as hell not going to let go." The gener-

al smiled indulgently at his friend and made no comment.

Perhaps the country is beyond redemption. Former President Manuel Quezon, who returned with MacArthur in 1944, once said: "I would rather have a government run like hell by Filipinos than a government run like heaven by Americans." Maybe the country will have to pass through several more circles of hell before it can see the light of redemption. That will only happen once Filipinos recognize the best piece of advice that Rizal ever gave them: "Spain, must we some day tell Filipinas that thou hast no ear for woes and that if she wishes to be saved, she must redeem herself."

DISPELLING THE TRADE MYTHS

HON. RICHARD ARMEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, soon we will find ourselves once again in the midst of a fiery and emotional debate over trade. Before Members throw themselves headfirst into the fray, I respectfully suggest that they read the following article by economist Murray Weidenbaum.

Mr. Weidenbaum briefly points out six myths which help to obscure the discussion of our trade policy. They are:

First, Japan is the problem. If they would only open their markets to our products;

Second, the United States is an island in a world of protectionism;

Third, imports are dragging down the American economy and depressing employment, especially in manufacturing;

Fourth, imports are the main reason for the unemployment in steel, textiles, and other key industries;

Fifth, protection is the way to save jobs; and

Sixth, workers in import affected industries deserve special treatment if they lose their jobs.

Mr. Weidenbaum's refutation of these economic fallacies is concise and well worth reading. I commend it to your attention.

[From the Washington Times, Dec. 31, 1985]

DISPELLING THE TRADE MYTHS

(By Murray Weidenbaum)

Congress will be under intense pressure next year, as elections approach, to respond to the pleas of companies and their employees who see themselves threatened by import competition.

But before Congress can act intelligently, it must discard six myths about trade:

Myth No. 1—Japan is the problem. If only they would open their markets to our products . . .

It is true that Japan maintains an intricate variety of obstacles to imports, and that its government reduces those obstacles only in response to our constant pressure. Furthermore, our trade deficit with Japan—\$37 billion last year—is far greater than that with any other country. Yet, even if we had not traded with Japan at all, the United States would still have experienced a record-breaking 1984 trade deficit of \$86 billion with the rest of the world.

Meanwhile, our traditional export surplus with Western Europe has turned into a

trade deficit, \$13 billion in 1984. Our trade accounts with Canada and Mexico are likewise in the red—\$20 billion and \$6 billion respectively. In fact, the United States has a trade deficit with almost every nation in the non-Communist world. It would be foolish to believe that everyone is out of step but us. The United States must be doing something basically wrong.

Myth No. 2—The United States is an island in a world of protectionism.

It would help to clear the air if we acknowledged our own extensive barriers to imports. "Buy American" statutes give preference to domestic producers in government procurement. Half of all commodities financed with U.S. foreign aid must be shipped in American-flag vessels. Imports of sugar, beef, dairy products, and mandarin oranges are restricted. Japanese auto imports are limited by "voluntary" quotas. So are steel imports. Local construction codes keep out foreign building supplies. Despite all the talk about being the only country that practices free trade, only 30 percent of our imports come in duty-free. Numerous non-tariff barriers are imposed by federal, state, county, and municipal governments.

Myth No. 3—Imports are dragging down the American economy and depressing employment, especially in manufacturing.

In reality, the rapid rise in employment in the United States in recent years is the envy of the rest of the world. Civilian employment has increased from 98.8 million in 1978 to 107.2 million today—a far greater increase than Japan and Western Europe together have enjoyed.

What about the supposed decline in U.S. manufacturing? Industrial production reached an all-time peak in 1984. Moreover manufacturing's share of the real gross domestic product has held steady for the last 30 years, at about 25 percent. This is not booming growth, but it is certainly a far cry from the supposed decline and fall of U.S. manufacturing. Manufacturers are performing fewer activities in-house and contracting out more to suppliers, many of whom are classified in the service sector. Employment of production workers rose from 47 million in 1975 to 62 million in July 1985.

Myth No. 4—Imports are the main reason for the unemployment in steel, textiles, and other key industries.

Analysis does not support this contention. A Federal Trade Commission study of the American steel industry shows that generous wage increases, greater than in other industries, have been the largest single reason for the lack of competitiveness and declining employment in steel. As for textiles, research shows that rapidly improving productivity is the main reason for declining employment.

Myth No. 5—Protection is the way to save jobs.

Wrong again. Protectionist actions increase the cost of producing goods and services, reducing the competitiveness of American products. A recent study shows that if the United States had imposed a 15 percent import quota on steel in 1984, as the steel industry sought, 26,000 steelworker jobs could have been saved—but at a cost of 93,000 jobs in the steel-using industries. Higher prices for steel would have made American automobiles and durable goods less competitive.

Protectionism turns out to be the most inefficient welfare program ever designed. A government spending program where the benefits delivered amounted to only 50 or 60 percent of the costs would be criticized as

shamefully wasteful. But in the case of protected industries, the typical increase in prices paid by consumers far exceeds the total wages of the jobs "saved." In the case of footwear quotas, the ratio of costs to benefits was 9 to 1; in the case of steel and autos, 4 to 1.

Myth No. 6—Workers in import-affected industries deserve special treatment if they lose their jobs.

I know no reason why workers in such industries should be considered more deserving than, say, defense workers who lose their jobs when government contracts are completed or canceled—a job loss attributable directly to government action.

Protectionism is a politician's delight because it delivers visible benefits to the protected parties while hiding the costs to consumers, taxpayers, and other affected parties. But as Chrysler chairman Lee Iacocca says, in defending joint production arrangements with foreign companies: "If you don't go to the lowest-cost source, you're an idiot." That should be true for consumers as well as business. Ironically, when consumers follow Mr. Iacocca's advice, they are attacked in TV commercials as unpatriotic.

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED IN SUPPORT OF CONTADORA

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution to reaffirm support for the Contadora process. This resolution is sponsored by both the chairman and ranking minority member of the House Committee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, as well as other bipartisan Members of this body who have been leaders on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, since January 1983, the Contadora nations of Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and Panama have been trying to forge an agreement among the nations of Central America to try to resolve the crisis in that region. In September 1983, the Contadora nations and representatives of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua agreed to a Document of Objectives for resolving the tension which threatens the security and peaceful coexistence of the Central America region. This document supports, among other things, the self-determination of the people in Central America, nonintervention, the sovereignty of the States and respect for their territorial integrity, the peaceful settlement of disputes, democratic principles, social justice, respect for human rights, and the prohibition of terrorism and subversion.

On January 11 and 12, 1986, in Caraballeda, Venezuela, the Ministers of Foreign Relations of the Contadora nations and the Contadora Support Group, which consists of Argentina, Brazil, Peru, and Uruguay, met and issued "The Caraballeda Message Towards Central America's Peace, Security and Democracy." The Caraballeda message reaffirms support for the negotiation process fostered by the Contadora nations and calls for a Latin American solution to the Central American conflict.

In addition, on January 14, 1986, under the leadership of Guatemala's democratically

elected President Vinicio Cerezo, the five Central American Foreign Ministers met in Guatemala and endorsed the Caraballeda Message.

The House of Representatives, on November 17, 1983, passed a resolution, which I sponsored, affirming our support for the Contadora initiatives and the Document of Objectives. In addition, that resolution affirmed our belief that the United States should provide such assistance and support as may be appropriate in helping to reach final agreements based on the Contadora Document of Objectives.

President Reagan, himself, in a letter to one of our colleagues in June 1985, affirmed his determination to seek a political and diplomatic solution to the violence in Central America.

The January 1986 actions of the Contadora nations and the Contadora Support Group have given renewed life and hope to the Contadora process. Based on diplomacy and the search for negotiated political solutions to the region's conflicts, rather than on the use of force or the quest for military victory, it is the single most important, best hope we have of bringing about a peaceful solution to the conflicts in Central America. Our support for Contadora should be part of our overall policy of cooperating with our valuable allies in the region to achieve Contadora's important objectives. It is in our own national interest firmly to support the Contadora process, and to do whatever we can to advance prospects for its success.

The resolution I am introducing today reaffirms the support of this body for the Contadora initiative and Document of Objectives, which sets forth a framework for negotiating a peaceful settlement to the conflict and turmoil in the region. It affirms our support for the Caraballeda Message Towards Central America's Peace, Security and Democracy, which seeks peaceful solutions to the conflicts in the region. Lastly, it reaffirms our belief that the United States should provide such assistance and support as may be appropriate in helping to reach final agreements based on the goals of the Document of Objectives and the Caraballeda message.

This resolution is in the best interests of the countries in Latin America, and of our own country as well. I urge my colleagues to support it. The text of the resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 283

Concurrent resolution to reaffirm support for the agreement on a framework for negotiating a peaceful settlement to the conflict and turmoil in Central America, which resulted from the initiative of the Contadora group

Whereas at the initiative of the four Contadora nations of Colombia, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela, representatives of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua met on September 7 to 10, 1983, and agreed to a Document of Objectives for resolving the tension which threatens the security and peaceful coexistence of the Central American region;

Whereas the Ministers of Foreign Relations of the Contadora Group and the Contadora Support Group (consisting of Argentina, Brazil, Peru, and Uruguay) met in Caraballeda, Venezuela on January 11 and 12, 1986, and issued The Caraballeda Message Towards Central America's Peace, Security and Democracy;

Whereas the Caraballeda Message reaffirms support for the negotiation process fostered by the Contadora group and calls for a Latin American solution to the Central American conflict;

Whereas on January 14, 1986, under the leadership of Guatemala's democratically-elected President Vinicio Cerezo, the five Central American Foreign Ministers met in Guatemala and endorsed the Caraballeda document;

Whereas on November 17, 1983, the House of Representatives affirmed its support for the Contadora initiatives and the resulting Document of Objectives, which sets forth a framework for negotiating a peaceful settlement to the conflict and turmoil in the region, and further affirmed its belief that the United States should provide such assistance and support as may be appropriate in helping to reach final agreements based on the Contadora Document of Objectives;

Whereas President Reagan has affirmed his determination to seek a political and diplomatic solution to the violence in Central America; and

Whereas the January 1986 actions of the Contadora Group and the Contadora Support Group have given renewed life and hope to the Contadora process: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) reaffirms its support for the Contadora initiatives and the resulting Document of Objectives, which sets forth a framework for negotiating a peaceful settlement to the conflict and turmoil in the region, and internal reconciliation and democracy within Nicaragua;

(2) affirms its support for the Caraballeda Message Towards Central America's Peace, Security and Democracy, which seeks peaceful solutions to the conflicts in the region; and

(3) reaffirms its belief that the United States should provide such assistance and support as may be appropriate in helping to reach final agreements based on the goals of the Document of Objectives and the Caraballeda Message.

FAMILY PLANNING

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, as we return to our legislative duties we have the responsibility of reconciling human needs with budgetary constraints. Family planning is an area where responsible decisionmaking is a must in order to assure the health and well-being of millions of people around the world and to avoid the tragedy of abortion. Time and again it has been proven that effective family planning services are the only way to prevent the high incidence of abortion. For instance, the Mexican Social Security Administration estimates that 360,000 abortions have been averted since implementation of a comprehensive family planning program in that country in 1972.

Unfortunately, family planning programs have come under attack by a vocal minority pursuing narrow policy goals. I call to my col-

leagues' attention an article appearing in the New York Times which reveals the true goals of groups opposing family planning. Despite political pressure, I urge you to keep in mind the human and economic dimensions of this issue as we debate the budget over the coming months.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 5, 1986]

ABORTION BATTLE SHIFTS TO AID FOR FAMILY PLANNING

(By Robin Toner)

WASHINGTON, Feb. 4.—Abortion has been a flashpoint in American politics, often dominating elections and polarizing debate over domestic programs.

In recent years, however, activists in the fight against legal abortion have increasingly turned their attention to a new front: United States Government assistance for family planning programs abroad. And they are winning significant victories, with population planning organizations saying they see a fundamental shift in Federal policy.

Over the last 18 months, under lobbying pressure by opponents of abortion, the United States has eliminated money for one major international population planning organization and sharply reduced money for another. In both instances, the abortion issue was central to the decision.

But some anti-abortion activists are also focusing on the type of family planning services offered with United States support. The Agency for International Development has dramatically increased its spending on birth control that relies on periodic abstinence from sexual intercourse.

RULE WAS OVERTURNED

Last year, in a move strongly supported by some Roman Catholic activists, the agency also tried, unsuccessfully, to change its rules so that counselors on this form of family planning could receive Federal money without having to give their clients information or referrals on other forms of birth control. That rule change was later overturned by Congress.

International population planning programs "are now being questioned, and they must be defended in a way their proponents didn't have to 10 years ago," said Robert G. Marshall of the American Life League.

Advocates of population control see things in a considerably different light. "We're seeing what I would consider a reprehensible retreat from reality by the present Administration," said Werner Fornos, president of the Population Institute. At a time when many developing countries are most eager for population assistance, Dr. Fornos added, the United States is "crippling" some of the organizations best able to provide it.

Mr. Fornos and others also assert that these recent developments may be only the first round in a battle over government support of artificial contraception.

Leaders of the largest anti-abortion organization reject the notion that the abortion issue is being used as a "smokescreen" to attack contraception programs. "We think that's a scare tactic on their part," said Douglas Johnson, the legislative director for the National Right to Life Committee.

Officials of that committee say they are trying to halt the "exporting" of abortion policies and practices to developing nations by groups that receive American money. They also say they are trying to keep the United States from supporting programs in countries that coerce abortion.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

But while the National Right to Life Committee takes no position on contraception, other elements of the antiabortion movement do. For example, the American Life League, whose officials were among those who met with President Reagan last month, argues that the Federal Government should cease all assistance for contraception programs at home and abroad.

"We don't think the Government should fund these things—artificial means of birth control," said Mr. Marshall, director of research for the organization, based in Stafford, Va. "They lend themselves to coercion and centralized control over family life."

AGENCY CAUGHT IN MIDDLE

As these international population programs become entangled in the abortion debate, the Agency for International Development increasingly finds itself in the middle. The agency's administrator, M. Peter McPherson, argues that family planning programs help prevent abortion.

Activists on both sides of the issue trace the agency's policy shift to the 1984 world population conference in Mexico City. The United States had barred the use of its money for abortion services abroad since 1973; at Mexico City, the Reagan Administration announced a new prohibition. Henceforth, no Federal money would be provided to private organizations operating abroad that "perform or actively promote" abortion, even if those services were paid for by other sources of money.

As a result, the International Planned Parenthood Federation lost all Federal money last year, an amount estimated at \$11.5 million, although affiliates that comply with the new abortion policy still receive money, according to A.I.D.

In the United States, private organizations that provide abortion services can still receive Federal money for family planning clinics, although the Federal dollars cannot be used for their abortion services.

Last summer, anti-abortion activists won another victory on the international front, when Congress approved an amendment that banned all Federal aid for groups that "support or participate in the management of Government population programs that coerce abortion or sterilization."

That amendment, which stemmed from reports of coercion in China's population program, resulted in a \$10 million cut in Federal aid for another major group, the United Nations Fund for Population Activities.

LOBBYING IMBALANCE CITED

Chinese officials have denied repeatedly that their program includes coerced abortion or sterilization. Still at issue is whether that amendment will lead to a total withdrawal of United States support for the United Nations group this year. Anti-abortion activists and their supporters in Congress are calling for such a cutoff unless the group pulls out of China.

Representative Patricia Schroeder of Colorado, a strong supporter of international population assistance said she feared a steady erosion in support for family planning abroad. Those programs, she said, do not have "a driving, immediate constituency" on Capitol Hill, as opposed to the activists who oppose them.

"Everything's in serious danger" with the deficit reduction law on the scene, she said. "Foreign aid is never particularly popular, and if you have a domestic group that's lobbying hard, and Gramm-Rudman coming from the other side, it's very hard to figure out how you're going to sustain it."

February 6, 1986

Mr. Johnson of the National Right to Life Committee said that if organizations "persist in the linkage of abortion and contraception, they will suffer."

"If they're not engaged in abortion related activities," he said, "we don't care how much they get, because they're out of our purview."

THE EFFECT OF THE PRESIDENT'S FEDERAL BUDGET ON MY STATE

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, a Federal budget defines our Nation's values and establishes our priorities. The nearly \$1 trillion budget that the President submitted to Congress yesterday represents a retreat from our values and misplaces our priorities.

If the budget were enacted as submitted to Congress, more than \$20 billion would be cut from an already frayed social safety net for our elderly and young, and from the programs that keep America efficient, structurally sound and prepared to face the challenges of the future. Programs that will be cut include those that build and repair our infrastructure, educate our young, care for the elderly and cope with the severe social and personal dislocations that result from economic transition.

At the same time, military spending will increase 8 percent—more than \$34 billion in budget authority. We all share a commitment to our national security. Clearly, though, throwing money at the Defense Department is not necessarily going to provide the American people with the defense they expect. The scandalous abuses of the last several years have already demonstrated the inability of the defense community to efficiently administer that level of spending increase. Yet to finance this relentless buildup, the Nation's cities and States are asked to accept great sacrifices and absorb deep cuts.

My own community of Cleveland serves as an outstanding example of the responsible and effective application of Federal programs during a time of economic transition and difficulty. Using the resources made available by urban development action grants, Economic Development Administration and the Small Business Administration, the city in the last 5 years was able to create or retain more than 7,000 jobs, secure nearly \$300 million in private investment that would not have been otherwise possible and bring Cleveland through some its darkest days since the Great Depression. Most of the money invested by Federal and local governments is returned to the Treasury in the form of repaid loans. Enormous addition revenues are added through an economic ripple effect and in enhanced tax payments at several levels of government. These programs are among many that President's budget would eliminate. The loss of these programs, along with deep cuts in infrastructure repair and construction, mass transit, community development block grants and

many others, would wreak enormous damage on the social fabric of our Nation's cities and on the lives of millions of Americans.

An analysis of the President's budget proposal prepared by my office, indicates that

Cuyahoga County in northeast Ohio would have to absorb a loss in excess of \$100 million if the budget were adopted and the State of Ohio would lose well in excess of half a billion dollars. That is the result of conservative

calculations. I ask that the analysis be printed in the RECORD and I encourage my colleagues to give it their careful attention. A similar story would be told in every community of our Nation.

MAJOR OHIO PROGRAMS

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Fiscal year 1986 budget (outlays)	Reagan 1987 budget	Percentage of change (4-percent inflation)	Comments
Programs:				
Medicaid.....	\$1,311.0	\$1,374.0	10.0	The President has proposed to cut Federal Medicaid payments to States in fiscal year 1987 by 6 percent before inflation, and then index such payments to inflation for the next 5 yr, with no increase for added caseload, Ohio could lose \$62,000,000 in Federal Medicaid funds. Ohioans, currently enrolled in Medicare, would feel this cut.
Medicare.....	3,248.0	3,322.0	(¹)	The President's proposed Medicare cuts will cost Ohio seniors and health providers increases of \$142,000,000 in fiscal year 1987. 1,400,000 Ohio seniors will pay an additional \$56,000,000 in premiums and deductibles alone, and can expect inevitable cutbacks in services.
Health block grants.....	45.4	51.9	-16.0	The budget would increase health block grant funds by 14 percent, but include under those grants existing programs for black lung, family planning, and migrant health. Ohio could lose as much as \$14,000,000 in Federal funds from these programs.
AFDC.....	482.4	456.3	-9.0	The administration's changes in program eligibility and funding will cost Ohio \$45,400,000 after inflation.
Transportation (highways and transit).....	593.4	² 571.0	8.0	
		² 454.0	28.0	
Highways.....	482.9	² 466.0	-7.5	
		² 418.0	-17.5	
Transit.....	110.6	² 105.0	-9.0	
		² 36.0	-70	
Revenue sharing.....	191.0	0	-100.0	
Disadvantaged education.....	120.3	144.1	-4.0	The administration proposes to freeze budget authority for ch. 1 compensatory programs for disadvantaged. Because of funding lags, this cut will not be felt immediately. Over 140,000 students could be affected.
Social services block grant.....	120.3	124.4	-9.0	The President would increase social services block grants funds to account for inflation in fiscal year 1987 and then freeze the block grant for fiscal year 1978.
Program outlays:				
Community development block grant.....	161.5			FY '86 budget
	113.0			With G-R cuts & deferral
Low-income energy assistance.....	113.9	113.9	-4.0	The administration proposes to freeze funding at 1986 presequestration levels. Over 42,000,000 Ohio households will have difficulty paying utility bills as a result.
Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).....	144.9	128.4	-14.8	The administration proposes to freeze JTPA block grant funds and rescind over 1/2 of summer youth employment funds.
UDAG's.....	42.0			
Housing program Sec. 8.....	0	0		The President is proposing no new construction.
Sec. 202 (856 new units): ¹				
Current authority.....	¹ 4,368	¹ 0		The President wants no money for new contracts for elderly and handicapped people.
Budget authority.....	¹ 37,068			Do.
Public housing (117 new units): ¹				
Current authority.....	¹ 1,337	¹ 0		No additional units. In Cleveland, 2,443 people waiting for public housing won't get it.
Budget authority.....	¹ 20,136			Do.
Budget impact on Cleveland/Cuyahoga County:				
Medicaid (Cuyahoga County).....	202.9	212.7	-10.0	The county could lose \$10,000,000 in Medicaid funds. An estimated \$157,000 county in Medicaid enrollees would be affected.
Medicare (Cuyahoga County).....	479.2	490.1	(¹)	Over 200,000 seniors in the county will experience higher Medicare premiums and reduction in services. Health providers and the elderly in the county will lose \$21,000,000.
AFDC (Cuyahoga County).....	44.0	41.6	-9.0	The President's proposals for AFDC are in the area of quality control.
Social service block grant.....	43.7	45.2	0	75,000 Ohio beneficiaries of social services block grant could be affected.
Transportation (highways and transit).....	¹ 74.6	² 71.4	8.0	
		² 43.4	46.0	
Highways (Cuyahoga County).....	37.9	² 36.5	7.5	
		² 32.4	17.5	
Transit (Cuyahoga County).....	36.7	² 34.9	9.0	
		² 11.0	70.0	
Revenue sharing:				
Cleveland.....	14.3	0	-100.0	
Cuyahoga County.....	22.6	0	-100.0	
Disadvantaged education (Cuyahoga County).....	17.8	21.3	-4.0	The administration proposes to freeze ch. 1 budget authority. The cuts will not appear in actual outlays for several years. Close to 19,000 students could be affected.
Social services block grant (Cuyahoga County).....	43.7			
Community development block grant:				
Ohio.....	82,573	71,012	-18.0	Ohio: 1986 cuts, \$35,388; entitlement, \$117.9.
Cleveland.....	20,171	17,347	-18.0	Cleveland: 1986 cuts, \$8.7; entitlement, \$28.8.
Cincinnati.....	10,267	8,829	-18.0	Cincinnati: 1986 cuts, \$4,401; entitlement, \$14.67.
Columbus.....	5,519	4,746	-18.0	Columbus: 1986 cuts, \$2,366; entitlement, \$7,885.
Low-income energy assistance (Cuyahoga County).....	17.4	17.4	-4.0	The Administration proposes to freeze block grant funds at 1986 levels. Over 82,000 households in the county will be affected.
Job Training Partnership Act.....	3.75			
UDAG's (Cleveland).....	¹ 28.6	¹ 0	¹ 100.0	

¹ Fiscal year 1985 figures.

² Outlays.

³ Authority.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Program	Cleveland	Fiscal year 1986	Reagan budget 1987	Percentage of change (4 percent inflation)	Comments
Sec. 8:					
Moderate rehabilitation					
Amount.....	\$1	\$922.5	0	-100	The numbers reflect new budget authority. The President requests only money to continue current payments.
Units.....	100	10,000			Do.
Existing:					
Amount.....	\$2	\$2,468	0	-100	Assisted housing reduced by 91 percent since fiscal year 1981.
Units.....	500	32,000			Do.
Sec. 202:					
Amount.....	\$3	\$1,680	0	-100	
Units.....	70	12,000			

HOUSING PROGRAMS—Continued

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Program	Cleveland	Fiscal year 1986	Reagan budget 1987	Percentage of change (4 percent inflation)	Comments
Public Housing—Modernization:					
Amount.....	\$5	\$1,500	0	-100	
Units.....	300	NA			

GOD BLESS STEPHEN

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when President Reagan so ably expressed the Nation's grief following the tragedy at Cape Canaveral—he, had he known of it, could have added an eighth name of a brave little boy who, as the poet wrote, "also put out his hand and touched the face of God."—for, at that very time, a brave 6-year-old boy, Stephen Fiengo, from Longview, TX, was fighting the battle of life and death after being mauled by a pack of pit bull terriers; last Sunday he died.

Stephen, who suffered wounds over his entire body and underwent four surgical operations and seven complete transfusions to replace his blood, was able to rally three times after his vital signs became perilously weak. While he lay in the pediatric trauma unit at Parkland Memorial Hospital in Dallas, reports of his remarkable stamina and will to live permeated the hospital.

I commend Stephen's strength—that he had the courage to fight for days despite the severity of his injuries; the strength of his parents, Stephen and Brenda Sue, who kept a constant vigil at his bedside; the strength of the doctors who worked diligently to save this young boy's life; and the strength of the many friends who offer their comfort and support.

God bless Stephen—and his family, and all who prayed and pulled for him.

MRS. JESSIE THOMPSON:
VOLUNTEER OF 1985

HON. JIM ROSS LIGHTFOOT

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, this past month of January the spirit of giving was honored by presenting a silver platter to Jessie Thompson for her generous and gracious efforts at Jennie Edmundson Hospital in Council Bluffs.

At times such as these in the State of Iowa when there is much difficulty and adversity because of the farm crisis, the survival of our communities will be the result of contributions by its members. So today I rise to pay tribute to Jessie Thompson who exemplifies the community spirit of sharing and for her being named Volunteer of 1985 by the Jennie Edmundson Hospital Auxiliary.

Over the past 8 years, in addition to more than 2,000 hours given to the auxiliary, she

has participated in the Union Pacific Old-Timers, P.E.O. Sisterhood, Parent-Teachers Association, United Way, American Cancer Society, and American Red Cross.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues, the people of Council Bluffs and all of the Fifth District wish to join me in congratulating Jessie Thompson for her unselfish dedication and giving in the service of her community.

REACHING FOR EXCELLENCE

HON. RICHARD ARMEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, we were moved when the President spoke of the "renaissance in education" in his State of the Union Address. It was, after all, only a few short years ago that grim reports were being issued warning that the poor quality of our public schools made America "a nation at risk."

It seemed that we were committing "educational disarmament," producing a generation of young people less educated than their parents and less able to cope with the demands of a competitive world. Today, however, the scores on college entrance exams have risen for 3 straight years and they are now the highest they have been since 1963.

But this renaissance is only beginning, and it is up to all of us to see that these accomplishments continue and that the rising generation of Americans achieves its full potential. Crucial to this renaissance will be two bold, new concepts in education: One to help families provide for their children's college education and another to restore to parents the freedom to choose the best education for their children.

An educational voucher system would provide parents with vouchers which they could apply to any accredited school, public or private. This will allow them to choose the best school for their child's needs. If their child is exceptionally gifted, has a learning disability, perhaps a special interest in a certain area, or simply desires to be educated according to a religious faith, they will be able to find the best school for him.

Of course, many parents will want to continue sending their children to the neighborhood school, and they will be able to use their voucher there in the same way. The important thing is that vouchers will once again give parents the freedom to decide how their children should be educated.

In addition, we will help parents save for their children's college education by providing them with education savings accounts. Modeled after the highly successful IRA legislation, these ESA's would allow parents to con-

tribute \$1,500 a year, or a lesser amount, to a tax exempt savings account. With regular contributions and accrued interest, this account will expand to a substantial amount of money by the time a child is ready for college.

This will help families meet the high cost of tuition on their own, without having to depend on the expensive Government student aid bureaucracies.

Nothing, Mr. Speaker, is more important to the future of our country than the education of our children. By enacting these two vital ideas into law, we will help to assure that the future of America will be very bright indeed.

THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS
EQUIPMENT AND SERVICES
ACT OF 1985

HON. THOMAS J. TAUKE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, on January 13, 1986, the Federal judge overseeing the AT&T consent decree released an opinion "clarifying" several issues related to postdivestiture industry rules and regulations. Clarify indeed. The opinion leaves little to the imagination: The Federal judiciary is now established as a permanent and continually evolving regulatory and policymaking force in the telephone industry. Instead of being allowed to enter the lines of business mandated by customer demand in the marketplace, the Bell Co. will only be allowed to compete in those dictated by the Federal courts.

This action provides ample incentive for Congress to reassert itself as principal architects of U.S. telecommunications policy magnifies the need for legislation like H.R. 3800, which I introduced with my colleague from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to announce that over 50 of our colleagues have joined with us in cosponsoring H.R. 3800. A list of these additional names is attached to my statement, and I include the list as part of the RECORD.

H.R. 3800 allows the Bell Co., with certain regulatory safeguards, to manufacture telecommunications equipment and provide information services—lines of business currently restricted under the AT&T consent decree. The bill increases the competitiveness of the United States in the world telecommunications marketplace, it promises consumers new and innovative services, and guarantees that America's telecommunications infrastructure will not become a technological buggy-whip.

I appreciate the antitrust concerns and the circumstances leading to the AT&T divestiture.

We all want to ensure that consumers are protected from potential anticompetitive practices, and we do not intend for consumers to subsidize the Bell Co. entry into these new business ventures. However, the current approach to minimize the possibility of anticompetitive conduct comes only at a high price to American consumers. There are other ways to gain these assurances without the costly and draconian restrictions imposed on the Bell Co.

The FCC, for example, has suggested in its computer III inquiry that the Bell Co. could be allowed to offer certain types of advanced technological services on a competitive basis, using strict accounting principles to guard against anticompetitive abuses. Indeed, the Commission has stated that certain services will never reach the marketplace unless the Bell Cos. are allowed to offer them. Some, however, disagree with this view and would rather deny consumers the benefits of new services and technology than run an almost nonexistent risk of cross subsidies.

The Federal judiciary cannot, and should not, set broad telecommunications policy, considering issues such as universal service, rate structures, and international trade. This role should be reserved for Congress and the FCC.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in helping Congress to reassert its policymaking role in the telecommunications field. One way this clearly can be done is by cosponsoring H.R. 3800, a bill which clearly demonstrates that Congress should set the rules that guide the future direction of this industry.

COSPONSORS OF H.R. 3800

The Telecommunications Equipment and Services Act of 1985 introduced by Congressmen Tauke (R-IA) and Swift (D-WA).

FEBRUARY 6, 1986

Lott, Nielson, Whittaker, Gingrich, Madigan, Skeen, Sundquist, Wortley, Siljander, Bentley, Monson, Shaw, Quillen, Bilirakis, Duncan, Roberts, Meyers, Franklin, Spence, Vucanovich, Schuette, Arney, Boulter, Barton, T. Coleman, DeLay, Slattery, Matsui, H. Ford, Bustamante, Fuqua, Dowdy, Pepper, Tallon, Hefner, Glickman, Lloyd, Whitley, L. Smith, Ortiz, Fascell, Hatcher, Chappell, Barnard, Boner, Wilson, Stenholm, Dymally, Leath, Robinson, Skelton, R. Young.

RONALD E. MCNAIR: A ROLE MODEL FOR BLACK AMERICA

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ronald E. McNair will, of course, be remembered as one of the seven astronauts who lost their lives in the crash of the *Challenger* shuttle. But he should also be remembered for his achievements as a graduate of a historically black college, North Carolina A&T State University who dedicated himself to supporting black colleges.

Ronald McNair educational and professional achievements as a laser physicist and an astronaut will forever stand as examples of what black Americans can accomplish through hard

work, commitment, and perseverance. In 1978, when he joined NASA, after a successful career with Hughes Research Laboratory in California, he was one of three blacks selected for the space program out of 11,000 applicants. One of his former teachers, Jannie Taylor, who now teaches in Brooklyn, NY, talked about his early dedication and commitment to be the very best he could be.

Ron was a very inquisitive student. He was a very exceptional student whom we knew would go places.

Dr. McNair did go places. And he carried the hopes and aspirations of many Americans, but particularly black Americans on January 28. The Congress has honored Ron McNair and his fellow astronauts with resolutions to name the seven moons of Uranus in their memory and to issue a stamp in their honor. The memory of Ronald McNair can best be commemorated by encouraging black youth to follow in his footsteps as a successful research scientist and someone committed to educational excellence for black children. Dr. McNair has left a legacy that all Americans can be proud of but one that black Americans will especially treasure.

SPACE PROGRAM IN THE AFTERMATH OF THE SHUTTLE TRAGEDY

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, Americans had soared into space 55 times over 25 years, and their safe return came to be taken for granted. All that changed last Tuesday when the flight of the Space Shuttle *Challenger* came to a tragic and abrupt end, taking the lives of seven of this Nation's best and brightest hopes for the future. The Nation and the world continues to grieve and share the tragedy of the *Challenger* and the pain and suffering of the astronauts families. Words to express our sorrow, grief, and concern seem inadequate to express our feelings.

Mr. Speaker, I too am deeply saddened by the tragic loss of the shuttle *Challenger* and its crew of seven. However, despite this tragedy, we must continue exploration and research in space. The space shuttle program has proven to be a stable, successful means with which to pursue this goal. I urge my colleagues to review the following editorial in the Ventura Star Free Press regarding the future of the Space Program:

ONWARD INTO SPACE

It was only 11 days ago that anyone in coastal Ventura County still sleeping at 6 a.m. on a Saturday was awakened by a rumbling sonic boom created by the space shuttle Columbia. Most of us rolled over and went back to sleep, confident that the 105-ton spacecraft that had traveled 2.5 million miles in six days would touch down at Edwards Air Force Base as gently as a single-engine Cessna returning from a pleasure flight.

The record of the shuttle program had been such that we took for granted these remarkable accomplishments of science and technology. All that changed Tuesday

morning with a horrifying explosion in the air 10 miles above Cape Canaveral.

With the tragedy came again the realization that our adventures into space are still adventures of risk.

The knowledge that among those aboard was one of us—a private citizen, a school-teacher who shared our wonder and sense of romance about space travel—made the tragedy more poignant.

Until last summer, Christa McAuliffe was connected with the space program only in the way the rest of us are: She would watch on television and marvel. In answering a question on a NASA application, she said she wanted to be the first U.S. private citizen in space because, "I remember the excitement in my home when the first satellites were launched. My parents were amazed and I was caught up with their wonder."

That has been the magic of the space program: its ability to capture imaginations and satisfy our collective yearning to master new frontiers. From the beginning, the administrators at NASA encouraged the American people to share in the adventure. So now, just as we rejoiced and felt patriotic pride when Neil Armstrong set foot on the moon, we weep and share the national sorrow of Tuesday's tragedy.

What next?

There are questions to be answered. What went wrong? Is it practical to equip the spacecraft with ejection devices that would give astronauts a small chance of escaping a future disaster? Is it wise to proceed so quickly with plans to put a private citizen in space?

The questions will be answered; the space program will go forward.

NASA's safety record has been excellent. Until Tuesday, the fleet of space shuttle had logged more than 50 million miles without injury, a fact which offers little consolation but some perspective.

In 25 years the manned space program has advanced from a simple up-and-down rocket flight to walks on the moon to a point where men now walk in space to repair satellites.

This was to be the year that space travel became commonplace, with 25 shuttle launches planned—one every two weeks, with blastoffs from both coasts. Flights in the next few months were to send unmanned probes to Jupiter and to the Sun.

There will be a re-evaluation of the program, but it will go forward. A manned space station will be built, perhaps planets will be explored.

It will be impossible for the children who will be the future Christa McAuliffes to not be caught up in the wonder.

Today that wonder is tempered with awe and a sober appreciation for the courage of those who willingly take the risks to lead us all to new frontiers.

ALL ROADS LEAD TO \$260 BILLION FOR DEFENSE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the latest deficit forecasts have led many to breathe more easily, believing it will now be much easier to meet the Gramm-Rudman targets. Let me be

the bearer of bad news: nothing has changed. And here's why.

It is true that the latest CBO deficit forecast is more optimistic—but it is also true that the lower CBO forecast starts with lower defense spending. Basically, no matter how you figure it, any rational scenario ends up showing that the defense budget will end up this year at about \$260 billion in budget authority—give or take a few billion.

Let me quickly add that this is not a worst case exercise. This prediction is a conservative one. If I am wrong, the odds are overwhelming that the defense budget will end up even smaller rather than larger than \$260 billion.

Here's what happened to produce the latest confusion. After projecting in January a deficit

of \$220 billion for 1986, the Office of the Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office are now able, seemingly miraculously, to project a 1987 deficit at about \$180 billion. It seems to many, therefore, that the pain of reaching the Gramm-Rudman deficit target of \$144 billion for 1987 may not be as great as feared. Table 1 shows how the logic works.

TABLE 1.—HOW SOME SEE THE BUDGET TASK BECOMING EASIER

	1986	1987
Projected deficit.....	\$220	\$180
Gramm-Rudman target.....	144	144
Approximate cuts required.....	80	40

TABLE 2.—FISCAL YEAR 1987 DEFENSE BUDGET

[In billions of dollars]

	January 6 Aspin Study		January 28 Aspin Analysis for HASC		January 29 CBO Baseline (Preliminary)		February 5 administration baseline		
	Budget resolution scenario	Gramm-Rudman scenario	Budget resolution scenario	Gramm-Rudman scenario	Budget resolution scenario	Gramm-Rudman scenario	Budget resolution scenario without reestimate of defense outlays	Budget resolution scenario without reestimate of defense outlays	Gramm-Rudman scenario
1. Deficit projection.....	187	172	203	178	178	163	182	(198)	162
2. Gramm-Rudman deficit target.....	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	(144)	144
3. Required deficit reduction.....	43	28	59	34	34	19	38	(57)	18
4. Outlay reduction from defense.....	22	14	30	17	17	10	19	(29)	9
Assuming, in the context of budget resolution scenarios, a 2 to 1 relationship between new defense budget authority and outlays from that authority:									
5. New defense budget authority assumed in deficit projection.....	307	286	323	286	301	286	323	(323)	286
6. Budget authority to be cut.....	44	28	60	34	34	20	38	(58)	18
7. Net new defense budget authority.....	263	258	263	254	267	266	285	(265)	268
7a. Net new defense budget authority with reestimate of defense outlays.....	(247)	(244)	(247)	(236)			(265)	(265)	(256)
Assuming, in the context of budget resolution scenarios, a 3 to 1 relationship between new defense budget authority and outlays from that authority:									
8. New defense budget authority assumed in deficit projection.....	307		323		301		323	(323)	
9. Budget authority to be cut.....	66		90		51		57	(87)	
10. Net new defense budget authority.....	241		233		250		266	(236)	

The top line shows the different deficit estimates in each of the eight scenarios. The main gap here is between my earlier somewhat higher figures and the CBO and OMB estimates that have converged at about \$180 billion. The primary reason for the discrepancy is the use of different revenue assumptions.

Line 4 shows the half of the deficit excess that would have to come out of defense under the logic of Gramm-Rudman. The required cuts in defense range all the way from \$12 billion to \$30 billion. Those figures are in outlays.

Moving down to the next section of the table, we shift from outlays to budget authority. Line 6 assumes that the budget authority to be sequestered will be double the outlays that must be stopped. That is the ratio that comes out of the automatic mechanism in Gramm-Rudman. In the context of a budget resolution, this is a very conservative assumption. It means that military personnel and readiness would have to take hefty cuts. More about that later.

One key item to note is the range of defense budgets shown in line 5. Despite this range, as line 7 shows, after all is said and done—after everything is netted out—we end up with a defense budget virtually the same

under either CBO's calculations or my calculations. And that would involve cutting the President's request by almost \$60 billion in budget authority.

This is bit difficult to comprehend. After all, conventional wisdom says that, if deficits are going down, it should be easier to make the Gramm-Rudman target. However, it ain't necessarily so. A lot of other numbers figure into the calculation of the bottom line—revenues, the level of defense spending, the number of officials that can dance on a Pentagon statistic. The last is very much a factor because the administration has made the deficit target this year through some very creative—and low—estimates of how much budget authority the Pentagon will spend. In an effort to make this problem a little clearer, I have included line 7a, which shows a new calculation of post-Gramm-Rudman defense budget authority where every scenario uses CBO's calculation of defense outlays.

One other point. I mentioned earlier that seven of the eight scenarios showed defense budget authority ending up around \$260 billion. One scenario—the President's budget request—ends up much higher, which seems to support the White House argument that it can preserve its defense program by simply jack-

The mathematics is very simple. Our task has been halved. The Sun is rising. All is goodness and light.

But the math is all wrong.

Table 2 tries to put the math on the right track. Its eight columns show eight different scenarios for the 1987 defense budget. But take a look at line 7. Seven of the eight scenarios end up with defense budget authority around the \$260 billion mark.

ing up the request. The problem, however, is that the administration simply waved a wand and made about \$15 billion in outlays disappear this year. That won't wash. The vertical column in parentheses shows what the Reagan budget will look like after the magic wand is removed. Now all eight scenarios end up clustered around the \$260 billion mark.

Now, I mentioned earlier that this assumption of a \$60 billion cut was a conservative one. It assumes that on average we can achieve \$30 billion in outlay reductions through \$60 billion in budget authority cuts.

Here I had better give a brief primer on budget authority and outlays. The Congress appropriates budget authority for Government agencies. When an agency actually spends money, it becomes an outlay. Putting it another way, budget authority is permission to spend; outlays are actual spending. Outlays are important because the annual deficit is determined by subtracting total outlays from total revenues. To give an example, suppose that Congress votes to give the Defense Department \$100 million in budget authority to build a ship. The Navy will spend this over the several years it takes to build that ship. Therefore, while budget authority for the ship this

year will be \$100 million, outlays will be much less—on average only \$6 million. Next year outlays will be \$20 million; the year after \$25 million, and so forth. For the military personnel accounts, budget authority spends out much more quickly—\$100 million of budget authority this year will become \$97 million in outlays this year. In general, the personnel and readiness accounts spend out quickly while the procurement and construction accounts spend out slowly. Stating all this in Gramm-Rudman terms, to stop \$1 in outlays this year, requires stopping \$1.03 in personnel budget authority—or \$1.25 in readiness budget authority—or \$2 in R&D budget authority—or \$8 in procurement budget authority—or \$12 in construction budget authority.

Therefore, it is very unlikely that we would achieve outlay cuts on the magnitude of \$30 billion this year by reducing budget authority by \$60 billion. That assumes we are relying heavily on cuts in the manpower and readiness areas—the fast spending accounts. It assumes that we would be willing to accept large cuts in military manpower and a significant drop in readiness. In recent years, however, Congress has consciously protected personnel and readiness by imposing a larger share of the cuts on the procurement and R&D accounts. As a result, the reductions that Congress has made in recent years have produced \$1 in outlay cuts for every \$3 in budget authority cuts. If we were to continue that 3-to-1 ratio—a reasonable assumption—we would be taking far deeper cuts in defense budget authority. The bottom three lines in table 1 show what happens. Since a 3-to-1 ratio is historically more accurate than the 2-to-1 ratio used to produce a \$260 billion defense budget, we could well end up with a 1987 defense budget between \$233 billion and \$250 billion, as shown on the bottom line—a reduction in excess of 20 percent of the President's request.

H.R. 281: A DISASTER FOR WORKERS AND THE ECONOMY

HON. RICHARD ARMEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, very soon we'll be facing a fight on the House floor to stop what amounts to a heavyhanded power grab by some union officials to gain increased control over individual construction workers.

The bill coming up, H.R. 281, innocently called the Construction Industry Labor Law Amendments of 1986, would essentially prevent unionized construction companies from hiring nonunion workers. The disastrous effects would be twofold: the loss of workers' individual freedom and a devastating blow to a critical sector of the American economy.

In leading the fight to oppose this bill, I will be offering strongly worded amendments to counteract this flagrant abuse of union officials' power. One amendment will put an end to "top down" organizing which forces an employer to make workers join a particular union. Another will require employee votes at each job site on whether or not to unionize—thus

eliminating the automatic provision that would bring untold millions of compulsory dues money into the hands of union officials.

The U.S. Congress has been neglecting the rights of individual workers for too long. It's time to reverse the tendency to continually give blanket authority to union officials at the expense of worker's rights and at the expense of our overall economic well-being; instead, we should reaffirm our belief that workers themselves should have the right to freely choose whether or not to be represented by a union.

H.R. 281 is the wrong bill at the wrong time. I urge my colleagues to join me in putting an end to this type of misguided approach to labor policymaking.

FRENCH ELECTIONS

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, Flora Lewis wrote a particularly thoughtful column today on the upcoming French elections. Her grasp of international affairs, particularly European affairs, is well known. I, therefore, thought my colleagues would like to take a moment to read some of her insights on politics in France.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1986]

THE SERENITY VOTE

(By Flora Lewis)

PARIS.—With five weeks to go before crucial French legislative elections on March 16, there has been an unforeseen and revealing change of tone in the campaign.

For months, the politicians have been exchanging fierce invective and predicting disaster if the voters don't support whichever side the speaker urges. Now, when the campaign might have been expected to reach a climax of frenzy, the politicians are backing away from their dire predictions of constitutional crisis and paralysis of government.

It obviously isn't by happenstance. The politicians who have long been performing before a fairly inattentive electorate seem finally to have listened to the voters' quiet message. People want some change but they don't want a crisis, they don't want high political melodrama, and whoever is perceived to be responsible for creating it is likely to pay at the polls.

So now, the emphasis at the hustings is on the sober, sensible way each leader promises to deal with the inevitably sticky constitutional situation looming.

This goes against nature for the politicians. Their instinctive approach to a campaign has always been to exaggerate, to dramatize issues, to draw sharp lines of battle and mobilize their public. But there is a shrewd, general assessment that the usual tactics risk being counter-productive this time, and the competition has turned into trying to capture the serenity vote.

The central problem lies in the ambiguities of the Fifth Republic's constitution. It was personally tailored for the late Charles de Gaulle, providing vast power for the president on condition that he had a rubber-stamp assembly. Sooner or later, the time was bound to come when the president lost control of the parliament. It is surpris-

ing that that has never happened before, but now it seems certain just ahead.

President Francois Mitterrand's term will continue nonetheless until the spring of 1988, and he has made absolutely clear that he means to serve it out in full regardless of whether the voters give opposition deputies a majority in the new assembly.

The French have given the peculiar name of "cohabitation" to this situation, without exploring the psychological undertones of referring to a divided government in this way. But the implication that there will be no marriage of convenience, that inescapable partnership will in no way inhibit rivalries and jockeying for position in the 1988 presidential race is doubtless correct.

All the leading presidential hopefuls are familiar, they have been on the scene a long time. There are no new faces, no problems of establishing recognition. The suspense rides entirely on the arithmetic of the returns, especially hard to predict this year because the electoral system has just been changed from two rounds of voting in single-member constituencies to a one-round vote on lists with a proportional system of allotting seats.

The very strong probability is that parties on the right will control the assembly and oblige the Socialist president to name one of their leaders as prime minister. For campaign reasons intended to sharpen the choice, the various groups have already taken positions that will constrict their room to maneuver into coalitions, if the arithmetic is indecisive and makes that the evident solution.

This is regrettable, though politicians can always find ways to back down on a promise in the name of necessity. In any case, Mr. Mitterrand has to face sharing power with a defiant prime minister.

That means France is likely to be more than ever difficult to deal with on the international scene in the next two years. It could be a period of disastrous feuding and posturing, as the Socialist and Conservative leaders vie for the appearance of primacy. Domestic policy will veer to the right, though probably not so brusquely as the campaigners pretend, because in the last three and a half years the Socialists have come off their initial ideological binge and have worked hard on pragmatism.

But it can also turn out that a divided French government will be prudent, shying from a lurch to instability, more or less marking time until the big contest for power in 1988. That seems to be the electorate's wish, and the politicians are having to subdue their combative reflexes to appear responsive. There may be no crisis. The Fifth Republic is turning out sturdier, more deeply rooted, than its constitutional flaw in distributing power made foreseeable.

TRIBUTE TO DR. LOUIS HAAS

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and a pleasure for me to commend a great citizen of Bay Harbor Islands, FL, Dr. Louis Haas, upon his 88th birthday. Dr. Haas has been my friend for over 35 years and he has had a long and distinguished career in public and civic affairs. He currently serves as vice

mayor of Bay Harbor Islands and served as mayor in 1976.

Dr. Haas is director of the Florida League of Cities for the 18th Congressional District. He was president of the Civic Association for 23 years. In recognition of his outstanding contribution to the community, Mayor Stephen Clark proclaimed March 11, 1979, as Dr. Louis Haas Day. In 1984, a three-page article extolling Dr. Haas' many accomplishments appeared in the Miami Herald. It read in part, "Claude Pepper may champion the rights of the elderly in Congress, but Dr. Louis Haas remains the elder statesman in Bay Harbor Islands." At 88, he's the oldest elected municipal official in Dade County. And, I might add, a very active one.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that many of my colleagues will want to join me in paying tribute to this outstanding American, Dr. Louis Haas, upon his 88th birthday on February 12, when he will be honored by the Florida Gold Coast Chamber of Commerce at a luncheon.

GARY BALL NAMED "POTATO MAN OF THE YEAR"

HON. RICHARD STALLINGS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Mr. Gary Ball, a resident of my district in Idaho who recently has been named "Potato Man of the Year" by a national produce magazine. Mr. Ball has worked hard to promote our Idaho potatoes through his efforts on the National Potato Promotions Board, the National Potato Council, and in many other areas.

I would like to include in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of an article that appeared in the Rexburg Standard-Journal which describes Mr. Ball's efforts and the award he has received. The article, which follows below, was written by Joyce Hunter.

Farmers are a determined lot. They're determined to grow crops year after year in spite of unpredictable weather, prices, politics, and pestilence.

Rexburg farmer Gary Ball is no exception. And he's been rewarded for his determination not only in working his land, but also for his off-the-farm activities benefiting the potato industry.

The Packer, a national produce magazine has named Ball its Potato Man of the Year after taking a poll of leaders in the potato industry. Ball already had a wall full of plaques and honors. Now he's trying to find a place for the silver chalice The Packer gave him.

But the publicity surrounding the award makes him uncomfortable. "I don't work for awards. I feel better without the recognition," he says.

His motives in being active in potato industry organizations are to gain knowledge and, if necessary, to try to effect change. "You need to be informed. You're better off. Things are changing all the time. We (farmers) need national organizations on our regulatory and legislative side." he says. "If I can contribute, I will."

Contribute he has. It started in 1974, when the National Potato Promotions Board was formed. In that marketing organization, he served three two-year terms as

a director, one as president, and three years as an export committee chairman. He traveled to Japan several times to try to open up that market for potatoes. He also helped organize food shows in Hong Kong. At the same time, he was a member of the National Potato Council. As vice president of its legislative committee, he worked on the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act trust amendment.

He's been a member of the Idaho Potato Growers Association. And as a member of the Idaho Potato Commission for six years, he served as its chairman and as a chairman of its research and education committee.

He holds much praise for the Idaho potato organizations. "I've always had an interest in the Idaho program. It's made me aware of what an organization means to an industry," he says.

Marketwise, the Idaho potato farmer is at a disadvantage because he's so removed from major population centers. "They (Potato Commission members) had the foresight to organize in 1938 to spend millions to promote the Idaho potato," he says. "Everywhere in the world, they know about Idaho potatoes. And we actually do grow the best potatoes."

Of course, he's working to keep it that way. As a head of a tri-state (Washington, Idaho, and Oregon) committee, he's helped develop the Tri-State Varietal Development Program. That potato breeding program has received \$788,000 in federal funds this year to develop better, cheaper-to-produce potatoes. He's also the chairman of an organization developing uses for those better potatoes. He helped found the National Potato Research and Education Foundation, which among other things, explores the potential of the potato as a natural additive in processed foods. "There's a potential there for whole new areas of use," he says. The foundation also sponsors an annual international seed potato seminar and is working to eradicate potato ring rot.

Most of his organizational activities have been relatively noncontroversial. But he's entered the political sphere as a member of a Department of Agriculture ad hoc committee on trade. And he's just been appointed as one of six U.S. members of a joint U.S.-Canada trade committee. "I don't accept it (the appointment) with enthusiasm," Ball says. "Trade—that's a tough one. It's a no-win situation where you can't please everyone."

Meanwhile back at his Rexburg Bench farm, he tries to make the best of a bad potato year. On the farm, he gets a lot of help from his family, especially his teenage sons.

His work with the various organizations is worth the time it takes, even though he receives compensation only for part of his expenses. "It's all a cooperative effort to keep for families a viable industry in Idaho," he says.

WYOMING VALLEY CHAMPS

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to bring to your attention three new additions to the Wyoming Valley Boxing Hall of Fame. The home of Joe Palooka, the Wyoming Valley has produced

some of the finest boxers of this country. I am glad to take this opportunity to give a brief biographical description of each of the fine men recently chosen to enter the Hall of Fame.

Tony Baldoni, the "Heights Bearcat," began his distinguished career as a middleweight at the age of 13. He began under Al Flora and faced such outstanding fighters as Tiger Jones, Joey Girardello, Kid Norris, Sonny Hampton, and Harold Green during his 15-year career between 1946 and 1961. He won 22 of 26 bouts as an amateur before turning pro at age 16. He served in the U.S. Marine Corps from 1950 to 1954 with the Second Marine Division and saw action in Korea.

Eddie O'Leary made his ring debut at the age of 15 as one of the five "Fighting O'Learys" of Pringle, PA. As an amateur he was a Diamond Belt and Golden Gloves champion in the flyweight ranks. Of 239 amateur and pro fights, he won 226. After turning pro he was called into Army service and became lightweight champion at Fort Reilly, KS. He served as a machinegunner with Patton's Third Army overseas and suffered a knee injury in combat, which prevented him from making a successful ring comeback after the war.

The third addition to the Wyoming Valley Boxing Hall of Fame is Francis "Effie" Welsh, sports editor of the Times-Leader Evening News and prominent boxing writer. Born in Freeland, PA in 1888, Effie joined the sports staff of the Times-Leader in 1913 and eventually became sports editor, a position he held at the time of his death in 1951. His column, "Don't Say We Didn't Tell You" was widely read in the Wyoming Valley. He was active in sports promoting, organizing the Armory A.C. and drumbeating boxing matches there for years. A close friend of cartoonist Ham Fisher, he was the prototype of Knobby Walsh, Joe Palooka's manager in the comic series.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to take this opportunity to draw the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to the accomplishments of these three men whose careers have earned them places of honor in the Wyoming Valley Boxing Hall of Fame.

GILMAN OFFERS STRONG SUPPORT FOR THE DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1986

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, the chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], in introducing important legislation that, when enacted, will provide a much needed infusion of State aid for the sole purpose of developing, disseminating, and implementing drug abuse education curricula and teaching materials in elementary and secondary schools throughout our Nation. This measure, the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1986, comes at a time when the select committee, after careful deliberation and many hearings, concluded

that the prevention effort in this country was sorely lacking.

If our children are not taught the proper skills, they enter the workforce unable to contribute in a substantive manner. Similarly, unless these youngsters are the beneficiaries of good nutrition, they are unable to study properly and learn. It is in the vital interests of this Nation that we arm our children with the necessary tools to "say no" to the scourge that is drug abuse, to protect their minds and bodies. And, as ranking minority member of the select committee, I remain aghast that drug education prevention programs are not mandated in every elementary and secondary school across our great land.

This extensive problem was underscored again during a series of hearings the committee presently held in the Southwest. In El Paso, Texas; Tucson, Arizona; and San Diego, CA; the committee heard testimony from law enforcement officials and education experts alike that our children are woefully unprepared to defend themselves against the continuous onslaught of heroin, marijuana, cocaine, PCP, and other illicit substances. That is why, even in this time of fiscal austerity, that I strongly support the legislation in question, which authorizes \$100 million for each fiscal year 1987-91.

The bill allows these funds to be used for demonstration projects of drug abuse education, as well as drug abuse education training for teachers, counselors, and other educational personnel, public service personnel (including law enforcement officials) and community leaders. I am pleased that a particular provision of the bill also allows the use of funds to educate parents, who are such an important part of this total education effort.

These programs, in primary prevention and early intervention, are necessary if we are to ensure that the legacy of this country is passed on to a generation able to shoulder the responsibilities that we as Americans have in this world. And, the legislation insures an equitable distribution of funds by providing that grants to the States shall be made on the basis of the number of K-12 students in a State's school system as it relates to other States. Yet in order to receive moneys, assurance must be made that the State has a statewide requirement that each elementary and secondary school establish a drug education curriculum for each grade. At this time, much of the requirements are voluntary—Mr. Speaker, they must be mandatory.

It is also important to note that the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services are required to cooperatively collect and disseminate information to State and local educational agencies on successful drug education curricula and other proven school based approaches, providing technical assistance to State and local agencies when necessary. Our efforts must be broad, spanning the Federal, State and local levels, and they must be cohesive and comprehensive. It is only through a joint effort that we will win the "war" on drugs. The battlefield is our neighborhoods and our schools, our homes and our parks. We have been infiltrated by this insidious menace, and unless and until we take the bull by the horns, we will

lose the war and our children to ruthless narcotics traffickers.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the full text of our legislation at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I invite and strongly urge my colleagues to join us in this fight through their early cosponsorship and consideration of this bill. The time to act is now, or we may lose our young generation whom we hold so dear.

H.R. —

A bill to establish a program of Federal grants to States for drug abuse education in elementary schools

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Drug Abuse Education Act of 1986".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT.

The Secretary of Education shall establish a program of Federal grants to the States for drug abuse education in elementary and secondary schools in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 3. USE OF FUNDS.

(a) STATE USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) Funds available to a State under this Act shall be used for—

(A) the development, dissemination, and implementation of drug abuse education curricula and teaching materials for elementary and secondary schools throughout the State;

(B) demonstration projects of drug abuse education;

(C) drug abuse education training;

(D) technical assistance to local educational agencies; and

(E) State administrative costs.

(2) Not more than 25 percent of the funds available to a State under this Act may be used under paragraph (1)(E).

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES FOR LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—Funds available to a local educational agency under this Act shall be used for—

(1) the development and implementation of drug abuse education curricula for elementary and secondary schools;

(2) drug abuse prevention counseling programs including peer and professional counseling;

(3) programs of drug abuse treatment referral;

(4) programs of in-service and pre-service training in drug abuse prevention for teachers, counselors, and other educational personnel, public service personnel (including law enforcement officials), and community leaders;

(5) programs in primary prevention and early intervention, such as the interdisciplinary school-team approach developed by the Department of Education;

(6) community education programs on drug abuse prevention, particularly programs for parents;

(7) public education programs on drug abuse, including programs utilizing professionals, and former drug abusers and drug dependent individuals; or

(8) other programs of drug abuse education and prevention consistent with the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 4. ALLOTMENTS TO STATES.

(a) FORMULA.—From the sums appropriated to carry out this Act in any fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve 1 percent for payments to Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Northern Mariana

Islands, to be allotted in accordance with their respective needs. From the remainder of such sums the Secretary shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of the State bears to the school-age population of all States.

(b) REALLOTMENT.—The Secretary is authorized to reallocate any amount of any allotment to a State to the extent that the Secretary determines that the State will not be able to obligate such amount within two years of allotment. Any such reallocation shall be made on the same basis as an allotment under subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "school-age population" means the population aged five through seventeen.

(2) The term "States" includes the fifty States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

SEC. 5. STATE APPLICATIONS.

In order to receive grants under this Act a State shall submit an application with the Secretary which—

(1) provides assurances that the State has a Statewide requirement that each elementary and secondary school in the State establish a drug abuse education curriculum for each grade kindergarten through grade-12 or that the State will use funds available under this Act to implement such a requirement;

(2) designates the State educational agency as the State agency responsible for the administration and supervision of programs assisted under this Act;

(3) provides for an annual evaluation of the effectiveness of programs assisted under this Act;

(4) provides assurances that the State will coordinate its efforts with appropriate State and local drug abuse agencies;

(5) provides that the State educational agency will keep such records and provide such information to the Secretary as may be required for fiscal audit and program evaluation; and

(6) contains assurances that there is compliance with the specific requirements of this Act.

SEC. 6. ALLOCATION TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.

(a) FORMULA.—From the sum made available each year under section 4, the State educational agency shall reserve not more than 20 percent for State activities under section 3(a). The State educational agency shall reserve an additional amount, consistent with the number of children enrolled in private schools in the State, for the purposes of section 8. From the remainder of such sum the State educational agency shall allocate to each local educational agency an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of the local educational agency bears to the school-age population of the State not served by programs under section 8.

(b) PAYMENT.—From the funds paid to it pursuant to section 4 during each fiscal year, the State educational agency shall distribute to each local educational agency which has submitted an application as required under section 7 the amount of its allocation as determined under subsection (a).

(c) REALLOCATION.—The State educational agency is authorized to reallocate any amount of any allocation to a local educational agency to the extent that the State

educational agency determines that the local educational agency will not be able to obligate such amount within two years of allocation. Any such reallocation shall be made on the same basis as an allocation under subsection (a).

SEC. 7. LOCAL APPLICATIONS.

A local educational agency may receive its allocation of funds under this Act for any fiscal year for which its application to the State educational agency has been certified to meet the requirements of this subsection. The State educational agency shall certify any such application if such application—

(1) provides assurances of compliance with the provisions of this Act;

(2) provides for an annual evaluation of the effectiveness of programs assisted under this Act;

(3) provides assurances that the local educational agency will coordinate its efforts with appropriate State and local drug abuse agencies;

(4) agrees to keep such records and provide such information to the State educational agency as reasonably may be required for fiscal audit and program evaluation, consistent with the responsibilities of the State agency under this Act.

SEC. 8. PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN ENROLLED IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS.

(a) **EQUITABLE PARTICIPATION.**—To the extent consistent with the number of children in a State who are enrolled in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools, the State educational agency (from funds reserved under section 6 and after consultation with appropriate private school officials) shall provide for such services and programs as will provide such children equitable participation under this Act.

(b) **AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.**—If a State is unable or unwilling to provide for the participation under subsection (a), the Secretary shall withhold from the allocation of the affected State the amount necessary to provide such services and shall arrange for the provision of services and programs to such children.

SEC. 9. FEDERAL COORDINATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) **FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall through cooperative efforts—

(1) collect and disseminate information to State and local educational agencies on successful drug education curricula and other proven school-based drug abuse education and prevention approaches;

(2) provide technical assistance to State and local educational agencies in the selection and implementation of drug abuse education curricula and programs to most effectively address the needs of the elementary and secondary schools served by such agencies; and

(3) identify research and development priorities with regard to school-based drug abuse education and prevention.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 10. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—Except as otherwise provided, the terms used in this Act shall have the meaning provided under section 595 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981.

(b) **USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.**—Federal funds made available under this Act shall be used to supplement and, to the extent practical, to increase the level of funds that would, in

the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the recipient for the purposes described in this Act, and in no case supplant such funds.

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, and 1991 to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS ON SCHOOL-YEAR BASIS.**—Appropriations for any fiscal year for payments under this Act, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, may be made available for obligation or expenditure by the agency or institution concerned on the basis of an academic or school year differing from such fiscal year.

(c) **AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Funds appropriated for any fiscal year under this Act shall remain available for obligation and expenditure until the end of the fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year for which such funds were appropriated.

SEC. 12. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect October 1, 1986.

IN PRAISE OF OLDER INTERNS

HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks, it has been my privilege to have working as a volunteer intern in my office Mr. Timothy G. Glidewell. Now, it is not my usual policy to make pronouncements of this sort for the interns I have had in my employ. Tim, however, is unique enough that he deserves some special recognition.

The usual state of events for congressional interns is that they are young, fresh-from-college, ignorant in the ways of the world kind of people. This enables members to demand from them extraordinary feats that more hardened veterans of the real world would understandably balk at. This includes such mind-boggling tasks as photocopying several hundred press releases, sorting countless postcards, and running interminable numbers of errands. It is therefore unusual to have to ask a 34-year-old, self-employed businessman to perform these mundane tasks.

Yet, these were tasks that Tim accepted without trepidation, because it was his decision some years ago to continue his education at Stanislaus State College in California. As part of this process, Tim chose to accept a volunteer internship in my office to learn more about how we in Washington make the decisions that shape people's lives. In May of this year, Tim will receive a well-earned bachelors degree in political science.

This was not an easy decision for Tim to make. It meant taking an unpaid leave from his insurance business, as well as an extended separation from his wife Susan, and children Chris and Heather. None of life's important decisions are ever easy, and Tim made this choice knowing full well the difficulties a young man of 34 would face at this point in his life. But he made them knowing that his experiences could also create new opportunities for him.

It is therefore with a great deal of gratitude that I use this time to recognize Tim Glidewell for the contributions he has made to my office these past weeks. I hope that we have contributed to his education, and also hope that he looks back on this experience with the fondness with which we will remember him.

FEDERAL RETIREES DESERVE THEIR COLA'S

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4060—legislation to ensure a Cost of Living Allowance (COLA) for Federal retirees. Just 2 short weeks before they were supposed to receive their checks, Federal retirees were horrified to learn that the 1986 COLA would not be included in their payment. Under the provisions of the recently passed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Balanced Budget amendment, COLA's for Federal retirees were canceled. Gramm-Rudman-Hollings suspended all COLA's (except Social Security) payable between December 10 and March 1. No other automatic budget cuts under the law, however, would begin before March 1, 1986.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that balancing the budget is essential. Spiraling deficits are unacceptable. Quick and drastic action is needed until the budget is balanced. However, we must never balance the budget on the backs of the dedicated men and women who spent their lives working and striving to serve this great Nation. Federal retirees should not bear an unfair share of the burden of reducing our Federal deficit.

Since coming to Congress, I have stated publicly on many occasions that retired Federal employees must not only be respected for the decades of service they rendered to our country, but they must also be treated fairly and equitably in terms of cost-of living adjustments to their retirement benefits.

During the course of the deliberations on Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, I strongly urged that military and Federal retirees be exempt from the provisions of the legislation, as are the recipients of social security benefits. Upon passage of the bill, I stated my desire to work with my colleagues for legislation that corrects this inequity which has been imposed on Federal retirees. I am pleased to cosponsor H.R. 4060, a bill that requires that the COLA payments to Federal retirees be made irrespective of any other legislation.

This bill—which has the support of the National Association of Retired Federal Employees (NARFE)—takes an important step to repair the inequities of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation. I will continue to protect the interests of Federal retirees. I urge my colleagues to join with us to insure that this important legislation is adopted by the House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTA
MCAULIFFE

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to Christa McAuliffe, the talented teacher and space astronaut. Christa's frank and friendly manner had endeared her to an entire nation, just as it had made her a favorite neighbor in Concord, NH. I know she is also deeply missed in Venice, CA, where her sister Betsy lives.

Christa's mission in space, as in life, was to teach. She had taught English and American history since 1970 and was right at home in the classroom conversing on subjects of law, economics, and on the "the American woman," a course which she developed. She had enthusiastically referred to her *Challenger* voyage as the "ultimate field trip," on which she was of course primed to conduct class for an audience miles below.

Christa's curiosity and generous desire to impart her knowledge to others made her a special member of the NASA family. We could not wait for her to return from space for we were assured a wealth of new stories and observations. Similarly, she could not wait to return to the classroom to share her experiences with her students. Christa had promised us that her travels would not be lost on herself.

In her eagerness to touch the future, Christa has encouraged us all to reach for the stars of outer space. In her memory we must continue to search out the meaning of the universe.

Mr. Speaker, in these brief 1 minute segments, I have paid special tribute to the *Challenger* astronauts who have had the most direct connection with my own district. Yet, all of us in Congress and all Americans have been touched and inspired by all seven of these brave Americans—Ellison Onizuka, Francis Scobee, Michael Smith, Gregory Jarvis, Ronald McNair, Judith Resnik, and Christa McAuliffe—and we owe them as a nation an incalculable debt of gratitude. Let us rededicate ourselves to their dream of a successful manned space program devoted to the conquest of space for peaceful means for all mankind.

A TRIBUTE TO ED POLEN

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I know you share with me the sadness which comes with the loss of a dear friend. You have known Ed Polen for many years and loved him as I did. Ed, who was Deputy Chief of Property Supply, passed away over the holidays, on December 21, 1985.

Ed Polen was so much a part of this House that it seems inconceivable that he is no longer walking his rounds through these hal-

lowed halls. Ed always had a friendly word for all who encountered him. He knew the answers to all our questions and he knew where that special piece of furniture or equipment would be hiding. He always knew how to add that special touch to a Members' office to make it seem more comfortable. Ed knew how to fix what was broken and mend what was torn. He could straighten a twisted blind, smooth a wrinkled carpet, remove a stubborn spur or rearrange a room's decor—all in the twinkling of an eye.

Ed was always ready with a friendly smile and reassuring word for that brandnew Member who felt so lost on his or her first day. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ed cared about people's feelings.

I remember well my first few weeks in Congress. I ended up with what I thought was the worst office in the entire complex. Ed Polen walked in and looked around and said, "Well, Congressman, you didn't do so well now did you . . . why don't you just wait and we'll see what we can do." Ed winked, walked out and in no time a bevy of men came marching into my office with some fine pieces of furniture and in no time at all the place was beautiful. I remember how I smiled when a colleague came by and said, "Roy, you must have had one good draw, this office is great."

When you would try to thank Ed, he would just shrink back and say, "Well, just doing my job, Congressman." It was Ed's job to make our every day working lives go more smoothly, and for 42 years he did just that; and he did it as well as it could be done. Yes, Ed was a kind and generous man who was committed to excellence in the work that he did.

Ed Polen was a longtime employee of the Clerk of the House. In fact he served under five of them and each one valued his vast experience and knowledge. They all loved and respected him. To everyone Ed Polen represented a sense of continuity. He knew the Halls of Congress better than anyone alive today. He knew every door and doorknob, every chair and desk and every piece of fabric which ever graced the windows of the U.S. Congress. He knew every inch of the House Chamber and could remember every Member he ever dealt with as a freshman.

Edward Polen had reverence for the history of the House and its contents. I remember how proud he was of the Distinguished Service Award presented to him by the Doorman's Society. He received so many letters of commendations over the years we wouldn't have room in this RECORD to reprint them. Ed Polen was proud of this House and we are all so proud of the service he gave all of us.

Mr. Speaker, Ed Polen was not a famous figure outside this body. He was not a test pilot or an astronaut. He was a good and decent man who served his country in the very best way he knew, every single day of the year. He had an honest heart and a proud spirit. For 42 years he served all of us with character, dignity, and honor. Ed Polen was a great American doing what great Americans do best. I know that we shall miss him dearly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend the best wishes of this body to Ed Polen's beautiful wife Barbara: his lovely daughters, Debra P. Campbell and Dale P. Myers; his brothers Clayton and Robert Lee Polen and to his

three grandchildren, Frances Campbell and John and Sara Myers.

To his family and friends, I would respectfully direct them to the words of Longfellow, words which are close to my heart and I know will be close to the hearts of all who were touched by the life of Ed Polen:

"Lives of great men all remind us,
We can make our lives sublime,
And departing leave behind us,
Footprints in the sands of time."

Ed Polen has left his footprints in the Hallways of the House of Representatives in a trail unending, and the work he did here shall never lose its influence.

HONORING TROOPER R.E.
JONES

HON. HERBERT H. BATEMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the noteworthy act of mercy undertaken by one of my constituents, Trooper Reuben Edward Jones of Yorktown, VA.

On June 15, 1985, while on patrol, Trooper Jones heard the local fire department dispatch an ambulance to a nearby fast food restaurant. He stopped to see if he could be of assistance and found a 3-year-old child lying on the ground. The mother of the child indicated that the child had choked on a piece of food. At this time, the child was not breathing and had turned blue. Trooper Jones began a Red Cross method of clearing the airway but was unsuccessful. He then began CPR and was able to get some air into the child's lungs through a partial airway which he established. The child's color returned and she regained a slight pulse. The ambulance arrived and she was transported to a local hospital where the food was removed from her throat.

Due to the meritorious actions performed by Trooper Jones, the child's life was saved. His performance exemplifies the highest ideals of the concern of one human being for another who is in distress.

On February 13, Trooper Jones will receive the highest award presented by the American Red Cross, the Certificate of Merit. I commend him for his quick thinking and accompanying actions which enabled him to save the child's life. I am certain that all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives will join with me in recognizing Trooper Reuben Jones, an outstanding American.

AID TO JONAS SAVIMBI: THE
WRONG SOLUTION FOR
SOUTHERN AFRICA'S PROBLEMS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has raised the stakes in his game of

cold war chess. His latest gambit is to welcome Jonas Savimbi, leader of the UNITA rebels in Angola, to Washington with the hope of drumming up congressional support for military assistance to UNITA.

As usual, the Reagan administration is viewing the world strictly within the context of our superpower rivalry with the Soviet Union. They see every conflict as a chance to twist the tail of the Russian bear, and every guerrilla movement as "our" guerrillas or "their" guerrillas. No consideration is ever given to the unique local political forces at work.

And what are the forces at work in Angola? Well, for one thing, South Africa dominates the economy and politics of the entire southern Africa region. Nothing occurs without South African input.

Since the fall of Portuguese Africa, Pretoria has waged wars of proxy and destabilization against its neighbors. They have broken their peace treaty with Mozambique, launched raids into Zambia and Botswana, and most recently engineered a coup against Lesotho. Moreover, their most sustained and largest venture has been in support of Jonas Savimbi and UNITA.

Jonas Savimbi has historically allied himself with whomever is willing to buy his weapons for him. He began as a Maoist rebel fighting against the Portuguese. When the MPLA seized power, he made a miraculous shift toward the democratic West, sort of a born-again capitalist. His latest incarnation is that of a conservative Republican, courting such symbols of intolerance as the Heritage Foundation and Jerry Falwell.

President Reagan and others may love his new veneer, but I would like to ask my colleagues whose interests are really being served by supporting Savimbi. He is trying to overthrow a government that actually encourages American oil companies to invest in the Angolan economy.

In fact, his South African allies have tried to blow up the Cabinda refineries in support of his efforts. Yes, he has been successful militarily. But his success is predicated upon South African air support, incursions, and economic aid. When we ask whose interests are being served, it is not our own, but rather South Africa's and Savimbi's.

Mr. Speaker, we should not support Jonas Savimbi's cause. He is not at the vanguard of an anti-Communist crusade, because who knows what his next incarnation will be? Rather, he is a proxy of South Africa, and his movement will only engender more instability and more bloodshed. I ask my colleagues to join together in opposing yet another mistake which we can ill afford in Africa.

TRIBUTE TO CECIL B. MOORE

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring the attention of this body to the memory of the Honorable Cecil B. Moore, who will be honored by the city of Philadelphia on February 13, 1986, on Cecil B. Moore Day.

Cecil B. Moore was born on April 2, 1915, in Folk Hollow, WV, the only son of a school-teacher and physician. He gained a respect for education there that he maintained throughout his life.

Moore attended both Bluefield State College and West Virginia College, and as a teen became active as a young Democrat for Franklin Roosevelt, an experience that would eventually lead to his life in public service.

In the fall of 1942, Moore entered the Marines among the first group of blacks to serve in the corps. He worked hard to ensure better conditions and treatment for black recruits. Following World War II, Mr. Moore was assigned to Fort Mifflin in Philadelphia, until his discharge from the service in 1951. During that time he attended night classes at Temple University Law School and received his degree in 1953.

Moore began to make his mark as an attorney, politician and civil rights leader shortly after he was admitted to the bar. In his prime, he had one of the largest criminal practices of any lawyer in the Nation. Most of his clientele were poor and disadvantaged blacks.

Mr. Moore became president of the Philadelphia Chapter of the NAACP in 1962, increasing its membership from an estimated 7,000 to more than 30,000. During his tenure the Philadelphia chapter was considered the strongest and largest of any in the Nation. As president of the NAACP, he was considered responsible, more than any other person in the city, for the integration of blacks into industry and government jobs. In the early 1960's he led picket lines at construction sites, bus terminals, businesses, labor organizations and many other organizations which were discriminating against blacks.

Perhaps his greatest accomplishment, however, was the successful fight to integrate Girard College, a secondary school established by the will of Stephen Girard which stipulated that only white orphan males be admitted. For more than 7 months, Mr. Moore led protesters at the school site to bring attention to the restrictive admission policy. In 1968, the U.S. Supreme Court decision upheld a ruling that the part of the will stipulating race was unconstitutional.

In 1967, Cecil B. Moore became the first black candidate for mayor of Philadelphia, paving the way for the election of W. Wilson Goode in 1983. In 1976, Mr. Moore won a seat in Philadelphia City Council, representing the fifth councilmatic district. He held the seat until his death in 1979.

I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the memory of a man who practiced what he preached, who served his community, and in so doing, improved the quality of life for all Philadelphians.

MINIMUM TAX ACT OF 1986

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I introduced with my colleagues Mr. CHANDLER of Washington and Mr. TAUKE of Iowa, the Mini-

mum Tax Act of 1986, H.R. 4123. It is obvious that we need a much more stringent alternative minimum tax to be paid by both corporations and individuals. This legislation would use the revenues from the strong alternative minimum taxes to increase the personal exemption for taxpayers, thus helping individuals below the poverty line get off the tax rolls.

The kind of tax reform which everybody can agree upon, Mr. Speaker, is the type which ensures that everyone above the poverty line who earns money pays his or her fair share of taxes, that every business which earns income shoulders its burden of our tax payments system, and that these revenues are used to eliminate from the tax rolls those people who can least afford to pay taxes—those individuals below the poverty line. The United States has the most successful voluntary system of tax payments in the free world, but this system is in jeopardy because many taxpayers perceive correctly that not every individual is paying his or her fair share of taxes. In addition, the fact that various large and profitable corporations have avoided paying any Federal income taxes has angered many taxpayers, justifiably. If there is one best method to raise the funds to remove from the tax rolls those below the poverty line, it is to make more stringent the alternative minimum tax on wealthy individuals and corporations.

Under the Minimum Tax Act of 1986, any individual above the poverty line who earns income would pay taxes. Any corporation which earns income would pay taxes. The bill then directs the Secretary of the Treasury to estimate the revenues from this legislation, which should be substantial, and to increase the value of the personal exemptions allowed each taxpayer correspondingly. Thus, the wealthy will pay taxes and corporations will pay taxes, but individuals who earn less money will pay less taxes, and many of those individuals below the poverty line will pay no taxes.

To be sure, the Tax Reform Act of 1985 (H.R. 3838), passed by the House in December, does include a stronger minimum tax than currently exists in the Internal Revenue Code. However, under the House-passed bill, some wealthy individuals will still avoid paying taxes, even under the alternative minimum tax provisions. In addition, the tax reform bill passed by the House would wreak economic havoc in the name of tax reform and constitutes the antithesis of simplification. The legislation discriminates against women by not allowing a spouse working in the home to set up an Individual Retirement Account and because it repeals the two-earner deduction which is so important to working couples, the bill severely cuts back on the amount of savings an individual can set-aside for retirement plans, and it actively discourages individuals from saving and businesses from reinvesting in their future.

Just as important, although the Tax Reform Act of 1985 contains some very positive provisions which are more attractive than the current Tax Code, President Reagan has announced that he will veto any tax bill which does not raise the personal exemption to \$2,000 for each taxpayer, does not include a top tax rate of 35 percent, and which does not

postpone the elimination of deductions until the new rates take effect. Therefore, as I predicted in December when I voted against the bill, the administration has asked the Senate to repeal the deductibility of State and local taxes in order to generate the revenues necessary to include those provisions. And now, the Senate Finance Committee is seriously considering limiting the State and local deduction.

Although nobody likes to pay taxes, Mr. Speaker, taxpayers will shoulder their fair share of our Nation's tax burden as long as they perceive that their neighbors are doing the same. This is not an unreasonable expectation. It is only fair that everyone who earns income and is above the poverty line should pay taxes. Therefore, because reforming the current Internal Revenue Code, which includes the full deduction for State and local taxes, is preferable to accepting the tax legislation passed by the House, Congressman CHANDLER, TAUKE, and I propose to amend the current code to include a much more stringent alternative minimum tax so that wealthy individuals and corporations shoulder their fair share of America's tax burden in order to lessen the burden on those below the poverty line. This plan promotes fairness and equity. I look forward to working with my colleagues in an effort to enact this legislation.

IN HONOR OF J. CLARK
DEVILBISS

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of J. Clark Devilbiss on the occasion of his retirement as police chief of the city of El Segundo, CA.

Chief Devilbiss joined the El Segundo Police Department in 1957. Shortly after that he was assigned to assist the Los Angeles sheriff's department metro and homicide detail in the investigation of the 1957 murder of two El Segundo police officers.

Devilbiss was promoted to sergeant in 1963, lieutenant in 1967, captain in 1971, and finally, chief of police in 1983.

During Chief Devilbiss' tenure, the police department has acquired a police computer system, developed and fielded a special weapons and tactics team, designed and implemented a mobile command post, and developed a physical fitness program for police officers.

Chief Devilbiss' professional activities include membership in the Los Angeles County Peace Officers Association and the International Association of Chiefs of Police. He is also an active member of the El Segundo Kiwanis Club and the United Methodist Church. He and his wife Patricia have been married for over 30 years. They are long-time residents of El Segundo where they have raised three children: Mark, of Redondo Beach; Cheryl Huffine, of El Segundo; and Laura Berenger, of San Clemente.

Having a long standing interest in health and fitness, Chief Devilbiss plans to put that

interest to work and will become affiliated with the Manhattan Athletic Club in Manhattan Beach.

In reflecting on his years in law enforcement, Chief Devilbiss stated, "My years in police work have been very rewarding, but I'm looking forward to a change of direction."

It is a pleasure to share Chief Devilbiss' accomplishments with my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives. I ask that they join me in wishing the chief the best of luck in all his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO JIMMY DEAN
SMITH

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to recognize Jimmy Dean Smith. For 15 years, Jimmy Dean Smith has served the city of Lompoc in the capacity of chief of police, a position in which he has distinguished himself.

A graduate of La Verne College, Jimmy Dean Smith has utilized his education in sociology-criminal justice in exemplary fashion. Prior to his career in law enforcement, he served in the U.S. Army from 1947 to 1949, later serving 3 years in the U.S. Coast Guard.

In 1953, Mr. Smith was appointed as a police officer with the Fullerton Police Department, was promoted to sergeant, and, in 1962, was promoted to lieutenant. As a lieutenant, he was responsible for training and research, including the police department's recruit academy and all inservice training programs.

From 1966 to 1967, Mr. Smith was a captain in the Tulare County Sheriff's Office, coordinating planning and research activities and assisting in budget preparation.

Jimmy Dean Smith has worked diligently and with dedication for the citizens of Lompoc since 1967, when he was appointed assistant chief of police. In 1970, he assumed the role of chief of police. The Police Department of Lompoc functions as a regional jail for Solvang, Buellton, Lompoc Valley, and the city of Lompoc, and supports 51 full-time employees. Mr. Smith has been responsible for planning, controlling, and directing law enforcement efforts for the community of 30,000 residents for the past 15 years.

Jimmy Dean Smith has also distinguished himself in a number of professional and civic organizations. Various professional organizations include the California Police Chief's Association, the League of California Cities, the California Peace Officer's Association, and the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Civic clubs in which he has played significant roles include the Lompoc Valley Kiwanis Club, the Lompoc Rotary Club, and the Lompoc Valley Boy's Club, serving each as president.

Once again, I commend Jimmy Dean Smith on his outstanding performance as a faithful public servant in law enforcement and, particularly, for 15 years of service as chief of police for the city of Lompoc, CA.

RECONSIDER THE PHYSICIAN
FEE FREEZE

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, when confronted by difficult problems, rational people look for solutions; irrational people search for scapegoats.

The Congress and the administration, I fear, have succumbed to this sort of irrationality in their efforts to slow the growth of health care costs. By imposing and then extending a freeze on Medicare physicians' fees, the Federal Government has perhaps made an appealing political gesture to older Americans. But it has brought them little genuine relief. Instead it has alienated the most important group in the health care system, a group whose support will be instrumental to any sustained attack on health care inflation.

When the fee freeze was first enacted, I condemned it on the floor of this Chamber as "an insult to the integrity of practicing physicians." The enormity of that insult grows ever larger as we again and again extend what was initially described as a temporary policy.

When the freeze was first proposed, doctors did not rush to attack it. On the contrary, they offered to adopt a voluntary freeze. But neither the Congress nor the administration was willing to take physicians at their word.

Once enacted, the fee freeze seems to have taken on a life of its own, extended and reextended with little reflection on its actual consequences. How long will we continue to pursue this punitive and counterproductive policy? I would urge my colleagues to reconsider the value of the Medicare physicians' fee freeze.

TERROR BREEDS TERROR

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker. The city of Paris is being shaken by a wave of terrorist attacks. Each night, for the last three successive nights, a bomb has exploded in a crowded commercial area. In all, 22 people have been injured, some of them seriously. These attacks seem to be part of a calculated campaign of terror to pressure the French Government into releasing several people imprisoned for past terrorist acts.

The spiral of terror continues. Terror breeds terror. Its victims are the innocent, the unsuspecting, people going about their daily business until a bomb blast rips their life into pieces.

On Monday night, customers at a shopping gallery along the elegant Champs-Elysee fell victim to a group calling itself The Committee for Solidarity with Arab Political Prisoners. Eight people were injured.

Later that night, an explosion at the Eiffel Tower was avoided because an employee dis-

covered the bomb that had been placed in a public lavatory. Three million people visit the Eiffel Tower each year. The terrorists who took aim at this famous landmark could have had each of these people in their sights.

On Tuesday night, all three stories of one of the largest, most popular bookstores in Paris were devastated by an explosion ignited in the basement. Four people were injured. Glass from the blast rained down upon the surrounding square across from the cathedral of Notre Dame.

Last night, terrorists struck again. In a sporting goods store, in a huge mall which serves 80,000 people a day, a bomb wounded 9 people.

Tonight, the citizens of Paris live in fear of the next attack. As French police gather evidence linking the bombings to shadowy groups of Middle Eastern terrorists, we all recognize our affinity with the people of Paris. It could be any of us, at a bookstore, a mall, a historic landmark; we too are potential victims of terrorism.

There is no political cause which could justify such random brutality. Anyone who would engage in such tactics, and group or nation that would encourage or condone them, must be branded an outlaw by the world community. But more than that, such acts of terror must bring us together, both leaders and citizens of the world, in a determined, forceful effort to stand united and strong against terrorism.

IN MEMORY OF J. EDGAR
CHENOWETH

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 29, 1986

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, it was with sadness that I learned of the passing of our former colleague, J. Edgar Chenoweth, known universally as Judge. He was a good and honorable man who was already serving on the Science and Astronautics Committee when I was first elected to Congress in 1962.

Judge Chenoweth was of great help to me, as a freshman Member, in learning my way around Congress in general, and the Science and Astronautics Committee in particular.

He was beloved by all and I extend to his family my deepest sympathy for their loss.

FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF
AMERICA

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join with the 325,000 members of the Future Homemakers of America in a nationwide celebration of FHA/HERO Week, February 9-15, with the theme—Future Homemakers of America: A Choice With a Future.

To kick off the celebration, there will be a nationwide, 1-day "Open House America"

designated by the American Vocational Association as National Vocational Education Day. FHA/HERO chapters that are participating will hold an open house on February 9 in the home economics department of their school. During that time, parents and members of the community will have an opportunity to see vocational programs in action, discover what these programs have to offer to students and how vocational student organizations enhance and extend classroom learning.

Activities and projects that the Future Homemakers of America was involved in during 1985 included: presenting a half hour program at the National Governors' Association winter meeting and promoting FHA in the October 1985 issue of Good Housekeeping. In 1985, the Future Homemakers of America published an annual report for the first time.

Nearly 2,000 students and 500 advisers attended the 1985 national leadership meeting in Salt Lake City in July. At this meeting, the "Student Body"—a national peer education program to help teens eat right, be fit, and feel good about themselves—was officially launched after several years of field testing. Also, at this meeting, the film "Skills for Life" premiered. This is a 10-minute introduction to FHA and what it has to offer to members. In the fall of 1985, over 6,000 students and advisers attended cluster meetings—a series of regional weekend conferences—designed to enable more local students and teachers to take advantage of high quality training.

This past year was one of many accomplishments for the members of the Future Homemakers of America. I would like to take this opportunity to commend them for these achievements and to wish them continued success in their endeavors during 1986.

WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA
FLOOD PROTECTION

HON. ROBERT E. WISE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, today my colleague, HARLEY STAGGERS, JR., and I are introducing a piece of legislation designed to avoid a future flood disaster like the one that happened to West Virginia last November.

As many of my colleagues will recall, the rains during the first week of November resulted in a flood in West Virginia and Pennsylvania that devastated homes, businesses, and the people that live and work in them. The Army Corps of Engineers estimated that this flood was of a magnitude that could only be described as "happening once in 500 years." In my district alone 158 homes were destroyed, 378 sustained major damage, and 235 minor damage. Damage to highways is now estimated at \$75 million—damage to bridges at \$30 million. Officials have been unable to complete the estimate of damage to sewer and water systems, but the damage appears to be extensive.

Clearly, this terrible event could not have been adequately predicted, and the only way to avoid a repeat of this tragedy is to be prepared beforehand. It is for these reasons,

then, that I join my colleague from West Virginia in introducing a bill to direct the Army Corps of Engineers to conduct an emergency feasibility study on providing flood protection in the Monongahela River basin in West Virginia and Pennsylvania. The bill directs the corps to study different methods of providing flood protection in the Monongahela River basin, and report back to the Congress not later than 2 years after enactment on its findings and recommendations.

Only in this way can we be prepared to weather the storms of the future. I urge all of my colleagues, especially my friends from Pennsylvania and West Virginia, to join me in working for the quick passage of this bill.

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE OLDER
WORKER WEEK

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the persistence of age discrimination and declining employment opportunities requires us to keep up our fight to improve job opportunities for older Americans who wish to continue working.

Hearings before the Select Committee on Aging have documented the severe hardships which age discrimination causes not only for families who may be forced to deplete their life savings, but also in the loss of millions of hours of productive labor to the economy. According to data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, once workers aged 55 and over lose their jobs, they stay unemployed longer than younger workers, earn less in subsequent employment, have limited access to training programs, and often become so discouraged that they give up looking for work entirely. Older workers are also three times as likely as younger workers to simply give up on the job search and drop out of the labor force after a long period of unemployment.

The causes of these employment problems stem from negative stereotypes and widespread age discrimination in the work force. Overcoming these stereotypes will require a concerted national effort to recognize the productivity and reliability of older workers.

I am encouraged along these lines by what some companies are doing to hire and retrain older workers. Programs such as job sharing, flexitime, retraining, and part-time jobs are being made available to older workers are productive and reliable and that employers can benefit from their expertise on the job. Yet, these programs are more often the exception than the rule. What is worse, age discrimination complaints represent the fastest growing area of civil rights litigation.

Providing employment opportunities for the older worker is an important and necessary goal, not only for today but for the future. Moreover, those older Americans who are employed are most likely to avoid the clutches of poverty. We must work to make further progress toward the elimination of age discrimination in the work place and the promotion of job opportunity.

For these reasons, I, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. TAUKE, Ms. SNOWE and Mr. BIAGGI, along with 44 of our colleagues in the House, today join Senators HEINZ and GLENN in introducing a joint resolution to draw attention to the older worker and to encourage employers to generate employment opportunities for these workers. Specifically, we are requesting that the President authorize the week of March 9 through 15, 1986 as "National Employ the Older Worker Week." During this week special programs would be scheduled around the country to inform employers and the public about older worker resources and to educate older persons about available employment opportunities. The outcome will be increased visibility of the need for employing older workers, a better understanding among employers of the benefits of employing the older Americans and wider employment opportunities for those older individuals who would like to make a contribution to our Nation's society.

If we are to enhance national productivity, reduce the cost to private pension systems, and strengthen the Social Security trust fund, we must eliminate age-based discrimination in the workplace and do a better job of providing employment opportunities for all older Americans. I urge my colleagues to support this important celebration in their communities.

**MARTIN LUTHER KING: THE
DREAM LIVES ON**

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, January 20, 1986, marked the first observance of our national holiday honoring the life and works of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. This day was marked by celebration of the birthday of Dr. King, sadness and anger over his tragic death and rededication to the goals that he pursued. Americans joined together to commemorate the monumental achievements of this great man and to remember and honor his pursuit of true equality for all the citizens of our great land.

Dr. King's struggle for justice began with the simple, dignified and poignant act of Rosa Parks, who refused to give up her seat on a Birmingham bus in 1955. Dr. King and Ralph Abernathy called a public meeting to decide on a response to such obvious and unacceptable discrimination. It was at this meeting that Dr. King decided to lead the boycott of Birmingham's segregated buses. The boycott lasted over a year and ended successfully when the bus company was forced to change its policies. What started with the action of just one brave woman ended in the action of the Federal courts ruling that segregation of public transportation was unconstitutional.

The Birmingham bus boycott followed Dr. King's commitment to non-violent struggle. Though Dr. King's non-violent protests were often met with firehoses, tear gas, attack dogs and prison sentences, he continued in his dedication to this form of protest. His actions earned him the respect and admiration of thousands of Americans.

In just 13 years between the Birmingham bus boycott and Dr. King's tragic death in 1968, he provided leadership, focus and an eloquent voice to the civil rights movement. For his efforts he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. The prize, one of the highest honors any person can receive, recognized his battle for liberty, justice and equality for all the citizens of the world.

Martin Luther King's moral vision was remarkably clear. In the famous letter from Birmingham City Jail in 1963, Dr. King wrote:

We can never forget that everything Hitler did in Germany was "legal" and everything the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was "illegal." But I am sure that, if I had lived in Germany during that time, I would have aided and comforted my Jewish brothers even though it was illegal. If I lived in a Communist country today where certain principles dear to the Christian faith are suppressed, I believe I would openly advocate disobeying these anti-religious laws.

Dr. King's letter includes the famous phrase which rings as true today as the day that Dr. King wrote it, that "injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

Martin Luther King was delighted to see part of his dream fulfilled in his life time. He witnessed the signing of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which eliminated "white only" signs from public places and guaranteed equal job and educational opportunities for all Americans. In 1965 he joined President Johnson at the signing of the Voting Rights Act which made it illegal to ask for literacy tests and other voting restrictions which had prevented blacks from exercising their constitutional right to vote.

Yet, Martin Luther King did not live to see his dream of complete equality and justice for all, everywhere in the world, fulfilled. His dream lives on, not as an ideal or unattainable goal, but as a program for action which we must all continue to strive to reach. His dream was a challenge to all to not accept prejudice and bigotry, but to work for social justice, economic opportunity and justice for all.

**AMERICA WITHOUT "CHALLENGER"
FACES THE CHALLENGE
OF AN AEROSPACE PLANE**

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last week, the space shuttle *Challenger* embarked on a mission of science and commerce. That mission abruptly ended in tragedy when the vehicle exploded 74 seconds into the flight. America lost seven pioneers that morning. For those millions who watched the tragedy live, or watched it later on tape, the names of the *Challenger* crew will be etched in our memories: Francis R. (Dick) Scobee, Michael J. Smith, Judith A. Resnik, Ronald E. McNair, Ellison S. Onizuka, Gregory B. Jarvis, Christa McAuliffe.

A reassessment of the space transportation systems priorities will undoubtedly take place. My colleagues and I on the Science and Technology Committee will play a large role in

that reassessment. Issues will be addressed as to the shuttle launch priorities once it resumes operations. The Defense Department, for example, had been straining the capacity of the shuttle even before Tuesday's shuttle accident, reserving as much as one third of the shuttle launch capacity. The Strategic Defense Initiative's R&D would put additional demands on the shuttle capacity through the 1990's. Clearly, with a complement of four space shuttles, NASA was just able to satisfy the needs of all U.S. customers. The loss of the *Challenger* has resulted in a substantial loss of total launch capacity which will not easily be regained.

To replace the lost orbiter at this point would cost between \$1.7 and \$2.2 billion, and would take from 3 to 5 years to complete. I personally support funding another orbiter as I have in the past, but other interim steps should be taken as well. For example, it may be cheaper and easier to reinvest in expendable launch vehicles to stem the U.S. launch-capability gap caused by the loss of the *Challenger*. Currently, the shuttle is only supplemented by four expendable launch vehicles each year. In 4 years or so, the additional shuttle would again be available to handle the increased demand.

This is also an appropriate time to move forward with an advanced next generation shuttle vehicle. I commend the administration for the farsightedness it has shown by proposing funding for transatmospheric vehicle [TAV] research effort in its fiscal year 1987 budget released yesterday. NASA and the Department of Defense [DOD] would jointly be charged with researching the vehicle over a 2- to 3-year period. The TAV would achieve speeds of 25 times the speed of sound—Mach 25, the velocity needed to achieve Earth orbit.

The TAV, or National Aerospace Plane [NASP] as the Air Force has officially named it, would potentially drive down the cost of delivery payloads into space by a factor of 100. The flexibility of the hybrid vehicle would allow it to launch on demand and take off and land at major airports. The TAV has also been called the new Orient Express because it will have the ability to travel from the United States to anywhere on the Asian Pacific rim in a matter of a few hours. The possibilities for civilian, as well as defense uses of the aerospace plane are evident.

Within DOD, participants include the Air Force, Navy, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA], and the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization. Funding for the initiative would be split approximately 80 percent and 20 percent between DOD and NASA, respectively. I am concerned that this funding structure is weighted too heavily on the military, but I will hold my reservations in check as long as first, the program remains a basic research initiative, and second, no military mission is imposed on the TAV during the research and development stages.

The proposed TAV requires a \$300 to \$400 million 2- to 3-year-ground-test program which would concentrate on advancing and demonstrating key engine, materials, and structure technology. NASA requested \$42.8 million for the program in fiscal year 1987. Although the

DOD contribution is classified, the Washington Post reported this morning that a total of \$200 million is requested for fiscal year 1987 activities. If the ground test phase progresses satisfactorily, a test vehicle could be built by the early 1990's for under \$2 billion. If Congress will take up the challenge of investing in a TAV program, an operational TAV system could be possible by the year 2000. I fully support moving this program ahead.

Mr. Speaker, long after the burning issues of this Congress are forgotten, the latter half of the 20th century will be remembered as the era when the people took the first steps off this planet. Long after Gramm-Rudman-Hollings is forgotten, parents will tell their children about the first lunar landing, unmanned expeditions to the planets, and the start of routine travel to space. It is difficult to compare the benefits of the space program to any other federally funded program. How can Congress analyze the "aspirations," measure the "wonderment," or quantify the "hopes" that are the real benefits of America's space program?

Aside from the satellite industry, what we do in space today may not show significant economic gains in the near-term. What we are investing in is a dream—a hope—which may not show material benefit for many years—far beyond the long-term projections of the most liberal economists. I am convinced that people will establish bases on the Moon and Mars, and eventually settle the entire solar system. From those far away colonies, men and women will undoubtedly begin to contemplate manned interstellar exploration. We will do these things because the urge to explore new territories and travel in space is basic to human nature. We cannot deny this ancient desire.

Most major discoveries in the past have been made by individuals who took up the scientific or exploratory challenge on their own. But, today's pioneers can't tinker in their garages and build a vehicle to take them to the stars. Therefore, we, as a nation, must become the curious star voyager and build those ships. As a collective inquisitor, the nation shares in the rewards of the discoveries made aboard ships like the *Challenger*.

The President has asked for sufficient NASA fiscal year 1987 budget, and I would ask that you support a healthy program when it comes to the floor of the House for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, this past year has been plagued with numerous natural and man-inflicted disasters, but none has touched the human spirit more than the explosion of the space shuttle *Challenger*. Carrying seven heroes, including America's first teacher in space, the loss will not soon be forgotten. However, the potential gains of exploring and developing space have not diminished with this accident. The hopes and aspirations of the crew of the *Challenger* are still very much a part of the consciousness of America. We must draw from this tragic experience renewed determination to explore space, and to make it a place in which all humans can one day safely travel.

PRESIDENTIAL MEDAL OF
FREEDOM

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, January 28, 1986, will forever be etched in our memory as the day our Nation lost seven of our most gifted and courageous people. When the space shuttle *Challenger* exploded seconds after takeoff, Americans were united in grief. We were not Democrats or Republicans that day. We were Americans, one family mourning the loss of loved ones.

The space program has always been very special to our Nation. It symbolizes America's greatness and potential. Those who have traveled in space have, to paraphrase Christa McAuliffe, carried more than their own souls; they have carried the soul of a nation. We mourn the deaths of the *Challenger* crew and we will continue to mourn. But in our mourning we must not forget their magnificent contributions to the space program, our Nation, and the world.

It takes a special kind of person to volunteer and be selected for the space program. It takes a person of extraordinary dedication, knowledge, and courage to even be considered for participation in our Nation's quest to explore the frontiers of space. The crew of the *Challenger* demonstrated these qualities and in one sense Michael Smith, Francis Scobee, Ronald McNair, Ellison Onizuka, Christa McAuliffe, Gregory Jarvis, and Judy Resnik already were honored by being among the select few to pioneer space. The courage of these seven men and women must be recognized once again. For their ultimate sacrifice they deserve no less than to be honored in the highest manner possible by our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, President Truman established the Medal of Freedom in 1945 to honor those Americans who had achieved meritorious war-related service. In 1963 President Kennedy revised the criteria to include those who had meritoriously contributed to "security or national interests of the United States, world peace, or cultural or other significant public or private endeavors." I believe, and I believe all my colleagues share my belief, that Michael Smith, Francis Scobee, Ronald McNair, Ellison Onizuka, Christa McAuliffe, Gregory Jarvis, and Judy Resnik do indeed meet the criteria for this prestigious award, the highest honor that can be bestowed on an American.

My colleagues and I urge the President, on behalf of the American people, to award the Presidential Medal of Freedom posthumously to these seven men and women of the *Challenger*. However small this act may be, I can only hope that it will be of some comfort to the families and friends of the *Challenger* crew in knowing that the work and sacrifice of these seven brave men and women was not in vain. We will never forget the contributions of Mike, Dick, Ron, El, Christa, Greg, and Judy to our Nation and to the world.

THE CHILD ABUSE VICTIMS
RIGHTS ACT OF 1986

HON. MARK D. SILJANDER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced for myself and Mr. STENHOLM the "Child Abuse Victims Rights Act of 1986."

Child exploitation has become a multimillion dollar industry, infiltrated and operated in some cases by elements of organized crime, and by a nationwide network of individuals openly advertising their desire to exploit children. For these reasons, I have introduced legislation to address the critical problem of child exploitation.

There are six major points of emphasis in my bill. The first aspect adds the "sexual exploitation of children" as a provision under the RICO statutes. This means that investigators and prosecutors could begin using wiretaps, special grand juries, and expanded subpoena authority. The increase in investigative powers are just a small part of what this section will do. Current statutes state that the penalties for the sexual exploitation of children are up to 10 years in prison. By placing this under the RICO statutes, penalties will be increased up to 20 years. Injunctive relief will also be given to the courts. This will allow the judicial system to take appropriate steps in prohibiting interstate trafficking of minors and materials related to sexual exploitation of children. These aspects fall under Criminal RICO. My bill also places the "sexual exploitation of children" under Civil RICO. If an offender is convicted under Civil RICO, the Government or the victim is given the right to sue the offender in order to receive treble damages and attorney fees.

The second provision of my bill deals with the kidnaping of children. It would provide a mandatory life sentence for the kidnaping of a child, and if that kidnaping results in the death of that child, a judge will be able to impose the death penalty. Penalties such as these will serve as an effective deterrent for such offenses and reduce recidivism. The Department of Justice states that only 4 out of 24 convicted kidnaping offenders receive sentences of more than 1 year. We must protect our children and society from those individuals because children are generally lacking both physical and psychological strength to resist or defend themselves adequately.

The Department of Justice issued a report last year that stated that "8 out of every 100 persons arrested for offenses against children (including kidnaping and sexual assault) receive prison sentences of more than a year." Those statistics are staggering when we realize that 92 of those 100 are back on the streets in a matter of months. Present legislation is not strong enough. The mandatory minimum sentence under current law is only 2 years and is an insufficient amount of time for rehabilitation of pedophiles, molesters, and pornographers. The third provision of my bill lifts the mandatory minimum sentence from 2 years to 5 years. We must put a halt to the practice of putting offenders back on the

street, only to find their devastating crimes recurring over and over again.

We must recognize the physiological, psychological, and emotional harm caused by these acts of crime. Current judicial procedures add salt to the children's wounds by intensive harassment and confusion for the child. Because of further psychological and emotional damage that can occur when a child testifies, it is important to study possible changes in the Federal rules of evidence as well as criminal and courtroom procedures that could make it safer for children to testify against their tormenters. Among the possibilities are use of two-way mirrors or closed circuit television to observe child witnesses and special sensitivity training for Federal law enforcement officials. This bill requires the Attorney General to conduct a study on this problem. After 1 year after the enactment of this bill, he must submit to Congress a report on his study of possible changes in "Federal Rules of Evidence, Criminal Procedure, Civil Procedure" and other Federal courtroom, prosecutorial and investigative procedures must be included.

A certain amount of this sexual victimization of children involves individuals who know their perpetrators. We are also aware that grandfathers, fathers, mothers, and stepfathers assault, victimize, and molest children. If a 5 or 6 year old child decides to prosecute, it would be extremely difficult for them to testify against someone who they have known for a long period of time. The psychological pressure is enhanced in these circumstances. Therefore my bill provides a fifth criteria that extends the Statute of Limitations of certain offenses involving sexual exploitation. This extension reaches up to the age of 18. By increasing the Statute of Limitations, the trauma experience by children in courtroom procedures can be significantly limited.

Child molesters, and others who prey on children, frequently seek employment in or volunteer for positions that give them exposure to children. Recent cases have discovered these offenders in positions such as leaders of Boy Scout troops, summer camp instructors, ministers of churches and teachers in our school system. It is extremely important to encourage background checks to prevent individuals with a record of any kind of child abuse and exploitation from attaining positions that could harm more children. The sixth provision of my bill requires the Attorney General to modify the classification system used by the National Crime Information Center in its interstate identification index, and by the Identification Division of the FBI in its criminal file. The current Federal files contain insufficient information to identify crimes involving the abuse and sexual exploitation of children.

PRO-LIFE AGENDA

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. KEMP] delivered an eloquent speech at the

proliferate Rose Dinner on January 22, 1986, the 13th anniversary of the Supreme Court's tragic Roe versus Wade decision legalizing abortion.

I agree with Mr. KEMP that we in Congress "must never let an opportunity pass to raise profamily and pro-life issues." While there are many of us in this body who devote a great deal of time and effort to defending the unborn, there can never be too many.

I urge all of my colleagues to read JACK'S speech which I am inserting in the RECORD today. His recent work on behalf of innocent human life in danger of abortion has been outstanding. While JACK and I look forward to the day when the disastrous Supreme Court decision will be reversed, we also look for the day when congressional ranks swell with Members dedicated to saving innocent life.

As JACK so accurately says:

We have a lot of work to do. We must continue working persistently, but patiently and positively and with tolerance to complete the pro-life agenda. I can tell you, I know my colleagues in Congress well. They understand democracy, and they know that in the final analysis the people govern. It is our job to continue educating and lobbying for a strong family and a society that respects the sanctity of human life.

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY CONGRESSMAN JACK KEMP—FOURTH ANNUAL ROSE DINNER, JANUARY 22, 1986

Ladies and Gentlemen: Thank you for that very generous introduction. And thank you for your warm welcome. But you are the people who deserve congratulations. The pro-life movement—men and women, Republicans and Democrats, blacks and whites and hispanics, farmers, suburbanites, and city dwellers—has taken the initiative on a great human and civil rights issue of our day; indeed, you are making it one of the most effective human rights movements in history. You have done so in the tradition of our founding fathers and with the knowledge that our existence as a nation is predicated on the Judeo-Christian values enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, which are based on the law of "nature and of nature's God." The Founding Fathers staked the future of our civilization not upon the capacity for government—far from it! They staked the future of political institutions on the capacity of people for self-government; upon the capacity of people to govern themselves, control themselves and sustain themselves under the Ten Commandments of God. What a philosophical, political, moral, historical idea! That's really what America represents—an idea that people could be free to govern and control and sustain themselves if they were governed by a higher law.

The Congress is fortunate to have a group of active pro-life, pro-family members like the nineteen who joined us at the Ellipse today. We must never let an opportunity pass to raise pro-family and pro-life issues, and with your help we can prevail.

Let me mention some of the progress the pro-life movement has made. We passed the Hyde amendment to stop federal funding for abortion on demand, and we have reaffirmed its principle over and over again. We've written the Smith/Denton amendment into law, prohibiting subsidized abortions under federal employee's health insurance plans. There were 17,000 abortions under those insurance plans before Smith/Denton. Now there are none. In April, the

Reagan Administration issued the Baby Doe guidelines. These regulations will help insure that handicapped infants receive the medically necessary treatment they are entitled to as U.S. citizens. Congress recently passed the amendment I authorized to end taxpayer funding for organizations that support the brutal program of coercive abortion, forced sterilization and female infanticide in the People's Republic of China.

Here's another step Congress can take: it can end federal subsidies for those groups that encourage and perform abortions here at home. The Kemp-Hatch amendment to Title X of the Public Health Services Act was recently defeated by the House Appropriations Committee, and I was denied the opportunity to offer this proposal to the full House for a vote. But we will try again, and again, until all of our nation's family planning funds are directed to organizations that concentrate their resources on preventing unwanted pregnancies, rather than terminating them once they've begun. Abortion is not a method of family planning and federal subsidies for organizations that promote it as such must end.

Ladies and Gentlemen, abortion on demand is wrong and it will end! It will end for a very obvious reason . . . because of the basic values and ideals of our Judeo-Christian system and the efforts of millions of Americans like yourselves who organized at the grassroots level, and because of organizations like Nellie Gray's and Stacy Vogel's Right to Life Committee in my hometown of Buffalo, N.Y. Our ideals and our strong commitment to equal rights for all people tell us there is something wrong when one and a half million unborn lives are taken away every year in our great nation. We know that there must be a better way. In the words of New York's Cardinal John O'Connor: "... this marvelous country must surely have a better answer to the violence of poverty than to inflict the violence of death on the innocent; it must surely have a better answer for the lonely, confused, frightened young woman, the teenager, the ten or eleven year old pregnant girl, than to destroy the new life within her. Our nation must surely have more to offer a bewildered family than the money to pay for a daughter's abortion. Our society must, surely must, have more support for the woman torn with conflict over a pregnancy than to point her toward an abortion clinic."

We have a lot of work to do. We must continue working persistently, but patiently and positively and with tolerance to complete the pro-life agenda. Because I can tell you, I know my colleagues in Congress well. They understand democracy, and they know that in the final analysis the people govern. It is our job to continue educating and lobbying for a strong family and a society that respects the sanctity of human life. But ladies and gentlemen, we can't do the right thing in the wrong way—we must do the right thing in the right way. Millions of Americans will share our cause if they are approached with love, tolerance and persuasion instead of intolerance, animosity and bellicosity.

As I mentioned at the March for Life earlier today, we will succeed because of the simple truth that pro-life means pro-people. For years the left fostered an insidious myth that children, indeed all people are a drain on our national resources in an "era of limits." They used to formulate economic and social policies that assumed that having and raising children is a personal indul-

gence, some kind of luxury society could hardly afford in this new "age of austerity."

But people aren't a drain on our resources; they are our resources. Children aren't just mouths to feed; they are minds and souls and talents and potential for the future. And that's not just a statement of economics. That's a statement of basic morality, or, if you like, a statement about the human spirit. How can one put a price tag on the value of a human life?

Recently I was privileged to hear one of the most remarkable women on this earth—a woman who has touched our lives and our hearts so many times and in so many ways—Mother Teresa. She told the story of when Prime Minister Nehru of India came to her home for little children in Delhi. He said, "Please take care of these little children that you have saved from abortion, because you don't know, one of them may be prime minister one day." What a beautiful thought. Each life we save is precious, not only to God but to the future of the world. No one should have the chance to deprive anyone else of that opportunity, to be a prime minister or an artist, a mezzo soprano or a master carpenter.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we who believe that life and liberty are both natural, human, God-given rights have to remind our critics of the right question. What is at issue in the debate over human life is not a "balancing" of the rights of one person against the rights of another—rights don't shrink when you extend them to someone else—that's zero-sum thinking. If we really believe that God is the source of our inalienable rights and that all people have those same God-given rights, then we must work to extend those rights to all people, including the precious life inside a mother's womb.

The pro-life movement was called into existence by the Supreme Court's tragic decision in *Roe v. Wade*, the greatest court mistake since "Dred Scott." Overturning *Roe* is the goal of our cause. I sponsored a congressional "friend of the court" brief along with more than eighty of my colleagues, asking the justices to reconsider their pro-abortion ruling. For the first time since 1973 the U.S. Department of Justice has gone back to the Court asking them to do just that. The federal government last asked to overturn a ruling thirty years ago, in the famous integration case of *Brown v. Board of Education*. Supreme Court rulings can be changed, errors can be recognized, and they must be corrected.

And if the Justice Department, on behalf of the unborn does not win this time, they will go back again and again. There will be new judges in the future, and there should be new judges at every level who respect the sanctity of human life and believes in pro-family values, so that someday soon the right to life will be restored to its place alongside the right to liberty at the center of our Constitutional system.

Back when I was first getting involved with politics in the 1960s, it was considered progressive to care about social issues. Poverty was a "social" question. Civil rights leaders fought for "social justice." And no one seemed to fear for the separation of church and state when Christian ministers used words like "redemption" and "love" to describe political struggles.

True, my own party wasn't always comfortable with this kind of talk. But that was only because we had lost touch with our roots. After all, the Republican Party was forged by a social issue: the issue of slavery.

What makes a social issue social? Let's stand back for a moment from the right to life, and look at that old debate over slavery. I think we will find that the questions they were asking have a chilling, modern echo. Were black slaves persons, some percentage of a person, or just a piece of property. Should slaveowners be free to choose their own way of living, if they did not try to impose their decisions on their neighbors? What happened when an individual's conscience collided with the country's law?

Abraham Lincoln answered these questions by saying that slaves were human beings, and as such they were, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, "endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights." But he went a step further. Slavery was a social issue. It was a social issue because Lincoln believed that one person's allegedly "free choice" to own another person undermined the foundations of our entire society. It made our claim to democracy in a fundamental sense a lie. And if our nation continued to live a lie we opened the door to self-destruction.

Listen to Lincoln's warning: "Our defense," he said, "is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your doors. Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage, and you prepare your own limbs to wear them." Lincoln's opponents called him an alarmist, and worse. Opponents of today's pro-life movement scoff at the idea that abortion has a "slippery slope." Yet as we grow accustomed to thinking that unborn children aren't really persons, has it not in fact proved easier to think of handicapped infants as somehow less than human? Of the elderly and sick as "leaves that fall from a tree" as they fulfill, in the words of a prominent American governor, "their duty to die?"

This logic is so at odds with America's traditional values that we often see the argument shift ground here. We are told that the value of human life isn't really a social issue after all. It is a religious issue—and no one has the right to impose his or her religious views on anyone else. Of course we could just as easily argue that slavery was a religious issue, or that the Declaration of Independence was a religious document!

We are now only a year away from celebrating the bicentennial of our Constitution. Isn't it strange that when the justices of the High Court were deciding *Roe v. Wade*, they forgot to look at the Constitution's very first words? It says: "To secure the blessing of liberty for ourselves and our posterity." Lincoln wrote that our founding fathers "grasped not only the whole race of man then living, but they reached forward and seized upon the farthest posterity. They erected a beacon to guide their children and their children's children, and the countless myriads who should inhabit the earth in other ages." The U.S. Constitution itself makes the freedom of ourselves and our children, our posterity, the purpose of its whole design. If we "ourselves" have liberty, so must our posterity. If we "ourselves" have rights, so must our children. If we are free to live and develop our talents and potential, so is the unborn child.

Ladies and gentlemen, you and the entire pro-life movement are doing for America what the courts at times have forgotten to do. By upholding the most basic of human rights, the pro-life movement is far more than a lobby for legal reform—it is a pillar of constitutional democracy, a shield of

freedom and the Judeo-Christian ideals of America.

I've said a lot here, but the prophet Isaiah probably said everything in these beautiful words: "Can a woman forget her little baby and not have compassion on the child of her womb? Yet, even if they forget, I will not forget you. Behold, I have carved you on the palm of my hand. I will contend with those who contend with you, and I will save your children."

Ladies and Gentlemen, God bless you for helping to do his work on Earth.

THE DOUBLE STANDARD OF CORPORATE AMERICA

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, most Americans would be shocked and incredulous if they were told that many American corporations treat their foreign employees better than their employees here in the United States. Sadly, however, it's true. The same corporations that ganged up to defeat the plant closing bill last November routinely give their foreign employees not just advance notice of plant closings and mass layoffs, but generous severance pay and retraining programs as well.

Even worse for our constituents, however, is the fact that many of these multinational corporations, with operations in Europe and the Third World, when forced to make cutbacks, close plants, or lay off employees, cut their American work force first. Why? Because—unlike our foreign competitors—we have no laws to protect our working people from sudden plant closings, no laws to guarantee severance pay, and no laws to require bargaining or consultation with American workers over decisions to close a facility or cut employees' pay. Even in many parts of the Third World, working people are treated with more respect and dignity than the average American worker.

Mr. Speaker, a story in the San Jose Mercury News, which quotes American and Japanese corporate managers, international business consultants, and academic experts in international management, should help dispel the myths that clouded the debate on H.R. 1616. The story makes clear that the threat—repeated so often by some of my misinformed colleagues—that an advance notice law, like H.R. 1616, would drive U.S. businesses overseas was an empty, ludicrous threat.

If this Congress wants to protect American jobs, if it cares about the health and economic adjustment of displaced American workers, it should pass H.R. 1616 and provide at least the minimal rights that workers enjoy in Latin America, Europe, and Japan.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the story by Debra Hauser entitled, "Overseas Employees Favored in Cutbacks," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

OVERSEAS EMPLOYEES FAVORED IN CUTBACKS—U.S. FIRMS FIGHT LAYOFF LAWS HERE

(By Dedra Hauser)

When Intel Corp. wanted to reduce its work force in the Philippines this year, the chip maker avoided a layoff by offering workers an attractive severance package as an inducement to resign.

"It's emotional to have a layoff, and we didn't want to create that emotion for workers by saying they weren't wanted," explains Bob Lyon, Intel's international human resources manager.

Yet Intel had two rounds of layoffs in the United States this year in which about 1,700 people were given no choice but to leave the company, although they were given severance pay.

Intel's disparate treatment of its American and Philippine workers is typical of the way U.S. companies manage their worldwide work forces. Because labor laws and cultural norms make it harder to lay people off outside the U.S., workers in Europe, Latin America and the Far East often get better deals than U.S. workers when it comes to work force reduction and pay cuts.

This is true whether the employer is American or foreign. For example, NEC Corp., provides lifetime job security to its Japanese work force, but the company has had two layoffs in its U.S. operations over the past two years, including one that affected Silicon Valley workers. "When we are in the U.S., we do like the Americans," explains Coichi Shimbo, a spokesman for NEC in New York City.

Some U.S. companies abuse or evade the laws and customs intended to protect workers' jobs in foreign countries, observers say. For example, some U.S. companies cut back the workweeks at their plants in the Far East as a way to force employees who can't afford the pay cuts to quit, says David O'Conner, a consultant to the World Bank. And workers aren't given a real choice when it comes to so-called voluntary resignations, he says.

DIFFERENT GROUND RULES

But the basic ground rules, at least, are much more pro-worker outside the U.S. The specific laws vary, but the underlying principles are the same. "In most countries outside the U.S., you have to provide advance notice and severance pay for a layoff," says Richard Sermon, director of human resources at Intel.

For several years, U.S. labor activists and legislators have tried to pass laws at both the state and federal level that would give American workers at least some advance notice and severance pay in the event of layoffs. But U.S. business groups have successfully defeated such proposals in all but a few states. Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin have laws requiring notice and/or severance pay to workers, but only when a plant is permanently shut down. Philadelphia and Vacaville have city ordinances regulating plant shutdowns. Observers say the laws haven't been enforced very rigorously.

WELL-ORGANIZED OPPOSITION

"The business community is very well organized against these bills," says Maxine Waters, a state assemblywoman from Los Angeles who has been proposing layoff legislation for seven years. Corporations have argued that these laws would discourage companies from doing business in specific states or in the United States as a whole, she says.

And yet U.S. companies have learned to live with the same kinds of laws overseas. "Outside the U.S., employers have more responsibility when they give someone a job to keep them employed. It's that kind of scene and that's accepted," says a veteran high-tech executive who requested anonymity.

This doesn't mean that U.S. companies never have layoffs or pay cuts overseas. But because the required severance payments and advance notice make layoffs so expensive, most companies go to great lengths to avoid work force reductions overseas, especially in Europe.

"Companies often carry huge financial reserves on the books of their European subsidiaries to tide them over a recession and avoid layoffs," says Gerlof Homan, dean of the Graduate School of International Management at Golden Gate University in San Francisco.

They also learn to be more cautious in their hiring practices in Europe. "We advise companies to gear their work force to the bottom of the business cycle as opposed to the top when they set up operations in Europe," says Rick Cooper, a partner specializing in international trade for Coopers & Lybrand, a Big Eight accounting firm.

In several countries in Europe, companies have to negotiate with worker representative groups to get approval for any layoff. Companies typically have to provide advance notice of two to six months and severance pay that can equal six months to eighteen months of wages.

In Latin America and the Far East, the requirements are less stringent and usually more negotiable than in Europe, Cooper says. And the cost of severance payments in low-wage Far Eastern operations is dramatically lower than in the U.S., even when companies give the equivalent of several months pay to laid-off workers.

But the combination of laws and cultural norms encourages companies to soften the blow of a layoff in these countries. When companies do have an involuntary layoff or a pay cut overseas, it's often administered differently than in the United States.

"We used voluntary retrenchment in Malaysia that's the way business is done there and that's what our competition did," says Gray Allen, a spokesman for National Semiconductor Corp. of Santa Clara, which laid off about 850 workers in the U.S. and 450 in Scotland this year. "We gave people (in Malaysia) the option of staying or leaving rather than making a unilateral decision."

Since last August, U.S. employees of Hewlett-Packard Co. have been operating on a reduced work schedule that results in a 10 percent pay cut. But in Europe, H-P workers have sustained a 5 percent cut in pay and hours.

Also, H-P's pay-cut program is beginning several months later outside the United States. And European workers are being given five days off with pay to compensate for the salary reduction, says company spokeswoman Karen Gervais.

H-P has to do it that way because the laws and labor contracts governing most European workers make it impossible to simply impose a pay cut, Gervais says. H-P is still negotiating with the work councils that represent French workers on how to structure the pay cut.

H-P's Latin American workers haven't been subject to the pay cuts at all, says Sy Corenson, an H-P spokesman. "The labor laws in Latin America don't permit the kind of shutdowns we're having here," he says.

H-P has instead reduced its Latin American expansion and cut other expenses there to reduce costs, Carnes says.

Despite the looser legal requirements in the U.S., some companies are nonetheless using voluntary retrenchment programs instead of layoffs in their domestic plants. And a growing number of companies give their U.S. workers advance notice of a layoff as well as severance pay.

POLICIES VARY WIDELY

But a recent study of 20 large high-tech companies by a local consulting firm showed tremendous variations in the ways companies handle layoffs.

About 50 percent of the companies gave virtually no notice, while the others provided notice of anywhere from a week to six months, says Kent Wampler, a senior management consultant with Knowdell, Martin and Hagberg in San Jose.

Most human resources professionals in Silicon Valley believe it's much better for both the employees and the company when there is advance notice of a layoff, Wampler says.

Interviews with laid-off high-tech workers indicate that very short notice can cause feelings of bitterness and that those who are left behind may lose faith in the company.

"Companies say they have to get people out quickly because disgruntled employees have been known to do thousands of dollars of damage to equipment. But haven't they ever thought that by offending people the way they do, they do much more damage than that?"; asks Ursula Urrutia, a technical writer who was laid off by a semiconductor company she declined to identify.

"They treated me like a criminal," says Urrutia, who was given an hour to pack up and leave after four years with the company. "Don't they realize that other employees see this, and it creates a lot of cynicism?"

FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS EXPRESS SORROW ON LOSS OF SPACE SHUTTLE

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it has been 9 days since the shocking destruction of the space shuttle yet, the memory of the seven heroes will remain in the hearts of all Americans and of people around the world.

I would like to direct my colleagues attention to letters of condolence from representatives of Mexico, Italy, Thailand, and Japan.

MEXICO

The Permanent Commission of the Mexican Congress wishes to convey, through the Congress of the United States, the condolences of the people of Mexico for the astronaut tragedy which took the lives of notable U.S. citizens.

The people of Mexico have been deeply distressed by this accident, and wish to express the sorrow they feel on this day, and their feelings of grief affecting mankind.

Sincerely,

Representative Eliseo Mandoza Berueto, President; Representative Nicolas Reynes Berezaluce, Vice President; Senator Myrna Esther Hoyos de Na-

varrete, Secretary; Representative Blanca Esponda de Torres, Secretary.

ITALY

Five days ago, television brought to the attention of the entire world the sensational progress which science and advanced technology are constantly achieving in the field of space exploration. The instant broadcasting of the images taken during the exploration allowed the whole world to witness amazing achievements.

The spectacular approach to Uranus which took place on January 26th after a 9 year voyage in outer space, and the simultaneous broadcasting of images of the planet taken on that same day, strengthened the feeling of pride of the entire human race because of the findings of the scientists and for the applications that technicians and explorers were able to make of them.

Yesterday's tragic explosion of the shuttle, which was conveyed to the world at the exact time it took place, has once again confirmed the extraordinary progress achieved in the field of telecasting images from millions of miles away. However, it has also brought to humanity the sad realization of the high price which must be paid by men and women, greatly endowed with knowledge and having ready and tenacious boldness, as well as admirable courage, to the point of sacrificing their own lives in order to carry out tasks which, until recently, were considered to be beyond man's reach.

To the American nation which is at the forefront of today's scientific and technological revolution, and which is the educator of the heroes who were sacrificed yesterday, we extend all our appreciation for the greatness of the enormous price paid for its achievement.

In our appreciation of this progress and in deep sympathy for the mourning which at times accompanies it, we call to memory all the people committed to identical advancements and saddened before by similar losses.

Our thoughts over these losses remind us that the seven heroes who died yesterday, and others who preceded them have sacrificed their lives in order that science, technology and the dedication of everyone could bring to humanity a further progress and to all nations a real peace, without threats of any sort.

AMINTORE FANFANI,
President of the Senate of Italy.

THAILAND

I would like to express on behalf of the members of the House of Representatives of the Kingdom of Thailand our deepest condolences of the tragic death of the seven astronauts which caused great sorrow not only for the people of the USA but also to the people throughout the world.

UTAI PIMCHAICHON,
Speaker.

ITALY

The Chamber of Deputies of the Italian Republic is deeply moved by the tragedy that has struck our American friends, and wishes to express under my name its deep sorrow. The memory of the seven crew members of the shuttle will live in our memory as a testimony of sacrifice and courage for human progress.

With Profound Sympathy,
MAXWELL M. RABB,
Ambassador.

JAPAN

Having heard the sad news of the unexpected accident of the space shuttle, I wish to express my profound condolences and sympathy to yourself, the bereaved families of the courageous crew members, and the people Washington, D.C.

MICHIKA SAKATA,
Speaker,
House of Representatives, Japan.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I thank all the representatives from various governments and individuals who have expressed their sorrow for the families of the crew members of the space shuttle and to all Americans that grieve at the loss of the seven heroes—Francis Scobee, Michael Smith, Judith Resnik, Ronald McNair, Ellison Onizuka, Gregory Jarvis, and Christa McAuliffe—who died performing their duty.

FALL RIVER, MA, MAYOR SPEAKS OUT ON REVENUE SHARING

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most senior and ablest mayors in the State of Massachusetts is Mayor Carlton Viveiros of the city of Fall River. Many of us in the Massachusetts congressional delegation served with Carlton Viveiros in the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and my colleagues know that he is not only an extremely able chief executive, but a man who well understands the hard choices that have to be made in the legislative process. Under his leadership, the city of Fall River has made great progress in dealing with economic problems which he inherited, and which have been gravely exacerbated by the unfair American trade and currency policies which have done so much damage to the important garment and textile industries in that city.

Recently I met with Mayor Viveiros and other members on a range of important subjects, including that of general revenue sharing. Mayor Viveiros has written a strong and persuasive argument in favor of the continuation of general revenue sharing to the Members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation and I believe its message is such that it ought to be shared with the membership as a whole.

STATEMENT OF MAYOR CARLTON VIVEIROS

General Revenue Sharing (GRS) is a federal program that works. It has been highly successful in helping communities provide vital programs; in fact, the most recent U.S. Bureau of Census GRS Survey found that police and fire protection and education are the top three uses of the funding by municipalities nationwide. There is no doubt that these indispensable services will suffer if GRS is eliminated.

It is interesting to note that the price tag for such an important program is relatively minuscule—\$4 billion—when you compare it with the over \$300 billion budget for the defense department, a department which had received a great deal of deserved public attention for its wasteful practices. State and local governments have already done their

fair share of belt tightening. Since 1981 federal aid to state and local governments has been cut by almost 40 percent. Can the defense department make the same claim?

The question has been asked, in these times of federal deficits: How can the federal government share revenue when there is no federal revenue to share? The fact is, GRS was begun in a year of federal deficits (1972) and has been repeatedly reauthorized and funded in years of federal deficits. The program was not designed to share revenues but to return to local control a share of the tax base.

Massachusetts communities are fortunate in that our state's economy and budget are in excellent shape. In fact, there is a possibility that the Commonwealth will be able to reduce the shortfall created by the elimination of GRS. But I view such assistance as limited and temporary because it appears that more and more federal programs, such as Community Development Block Grants and Urban Development Action Grants, will be severely cut or eliminated—leaving the state with the responsibility of providing the vital services currently provided by these and other programs.

I ask of you, and the entire Massachusetts legislative delegation, three things:

(1) Your strong, active support for GRS—a support that is more than a vote in favor, but includes using your position to influence other legislators.

(2) Your strong, active support of measures to make the federal government more efficient and cost-conscious—eliminating the embarrassing stories of over-priced military parts, and the like.

(3) Your strong, active support of translating the successful Massachusetts Revenue Enforcement and Protection Program to the federal level—thereby enhancing revenues without raising taxes and increasing the likelihood of preserving vital programs.

HONORING EZRA ACADEMY OF QUEENS COUNTY, NY

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to draw the attention of my colleagues in this Chamber to the forthcoming 18th anniversary celebration of Ezra Academy of Queens.

A unique and innovative academic institution, Ezra Academy offers an unparalleled service to the Jewish community of Greater New York. As the only academy in the metropolitan area designed to respond to the quest of motivated teenagers who desire to discover their Jewish heritage, Ezra Academy synthesizes culture, heritage, and tradition. To its junior high and high school aged students, Ezra Academy is the only school where, despite their advanced age and lack of an elementary school knowledge, the pupils can be imbued with an understanding of their religion and an appreciation for its time-honored values and traditions.

Mr. Speaker, the vital task of instilling a sense of pride and identity in the hearts and minds of these youths is the cornerstone of Ezra Academy. Its graduates have fully matriculated in both the Hebrew and general studies

departments, and have proven that the task has indeed been splendidly accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, Ezra Academy is the dream and life's work of one dedicated educator, Rabbi Eli Freilich. For the past 18 years, Rabbi Freilich has served as dean of the academy, and has successfully expanded it from a single class of 6 students to its current enrollment of almost 200. To this dean, the greatest source of pride is the genuine love and attachment between the teachers, the students and the administration which permeates his school and lasts many years beyond graduation.

Mr. Speaker, Jewish tradition attaches special significance to the No. 18, for, in reckoning its equivalence in Hebrew letters, it denotes "life." As it celebrates its 18th anniversary, Ezra Academy is in fact reaping the fruits of its dedication to the lives of its youthful constituency.

In marking this milestone, Ezra Academy has also chosen to honor its esteemed dean, Rabbi Eli Freilich, for his devotion and commitment to making the academy a special place where Judaism is rekindled and remains aglow.

At the same time, Ezra Academy will also acknowledge the leadership and ongoing support of four distinguished friends of the institution: Rabbi Yitzchak Sladowsky, Mr. Harry M. Greenberg, Mr. Akiva Teitz, and his wife, Chanita. Their unsparing resourcefulness, steadfast loyalty, and exemplary patronage have helped the academy prepare its students for a brighter future and assure their Jewish tomorrow.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in extending congratulations, best wishes and Mazal Tov to Ezra Academy, to its dean, and to the prominent constituents of my congressional district, who have contributed to its development and are now being recognized, honored, and awarded.

THE "CHALLENGER" TRAGEDY

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, we, as a nation, mourn the loss of the seven crew members aboard the space shuttle *Challenger*. We feel the pain and anguish their families must bear. But, the same dedication that these brave American heroes brought to their work will guide us through and into the future of our space program. Their sacrifice for us will not be forgotten.

There are, and have always been, risks involved with our exploration of space. Those risks will remain a part of every mission we may undertake.

I have confidence, though, that our scientists, engineers, and technology will master our fate and continue to unravel the mysteries of space that lay before us, adding to the already myriad rewards we have gained in practically every field of scientific study.

I am proud to join with my colleagues in supporting resolutions and legislation in the House of Representatives to honor the

memory of our fallen heroes—such as the proposals to name the newly discovered moons of Uranus for the *Challenger* crew members and the three *Apollo* astronauts who perished in 1967. It is appropriate that we do these things, for the future of our country's space program, our children, and generations to come so that we may vividly remember their dedication and sacrifice, without which we could not carry on.

And, even in the face of this numbing national tragedy, I am heartened to see the determined, unbroken spirit that urges us to press forward, expanding our frontiers, mindful of the sacrifices we have made and shall make in man's unending search for knowledge.

In his address to the Nation after the disaster, President Reagan eloquently and insightfully put to words the feelings that all of America shares on this somber occasion, excerpts of which follow:

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S ADDRESS TO THE NATION

Nancy and I are pained to the core by the tragedy of the shuttle *Challenger*. We know we share this pain with all of the people of our country. This is truly a national loss . . .

For the families of the seven, we cannot bear, as you do, the full impact of this tragedy. But we feel the loss and we are thinking about you so very much. Your loved ones were daring and brave and they had that special grace, that special spirit that says, "Give me a challenge and I'll meet it with joy." They had a hunger to explore the universe and discover its truths. They wished to serve, and they did. They served all of us.

We have grown used to wonders in this century. It's hard to dazzle us. But for 25 years the United States space program has been doing just that. We've grown used to the idea of space, and perhaps we forget that we've only just begun. We're still pioneers. They, the members of the *Challenger* crew, were pioneers.

And I want to say something to the school children of America who were watching the live coverage of the shuttle's takeoff. I know it is hard to understand, but sometimes painful things like this happen. It's all part of the process of exploration and discovery. It's all part of taking a chance and expanding man's horizons. The future doesn't belong to the faint-hearted. It belongs to the brave. The *Challenger* crew was pulling us into the future, and we'll continue to follow them . . .

We'll continue our quest in space. There will be more shuttle flights and more shuttle crews and, yes, more volunteers, more civilians, more teachers in space. Nothing ends here. Our hopes and our journeys continue . . .

The crew of the space shuttle *Challenger* honored us by the manner in which they lived their lives. We will never forget them, nor the last time we saw them, this morning, as they prepared for their journey and waved goodbye and "slipped the surly bonds of Earth" to "touch the face of God."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS JOIN IN SUPPORTING LEGISLATION TO PREVENT NUCLEAR EXPLOSIVE TESTING

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1985, JIM LEACH and I introduced House Joint Resolution 3, a measure to prevent nuclear explosive testing. Since that time, House Joint Resolution 3 has gained the solid bipartisan support of 207 of our colleagues—our most recent support having come from the Honorable BARBARA MIKULSKI of Maryland.

Extensive hearings have been held on the merits of our proposal and I am pleased that the House Foreign Affairs Committee has reported House Joint Resolution 3 unamended for further consideration by the House soon after we return from our pending recess later this month. The committee filed its report on this important legislation on July 24, 1985 (Rept. 99-221) and I commend it to my colleague's attention.

Because House rules preclude the addition of cosponsors after a committee has filed a report on legislation approved for House consideration, I am, today, extending my remarks to add the cosponsorship of two other Members of the House who would like to associate their names with House Joint Resolution 3 and urge its passage. They are the Honorable MICHAEL ANDREWS of Texas and the Honorable BERYL ANTHONY of Arkansas. Their support in this effort is deeply appreciated and brings the total number of cosponsors of House Joint Resolution 3 to 209.

THE OIL IMPORT TAX

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, since one of the justifications for considering the oil import tax is its alleged economic benefit, I urge my colleagues to listen to the opinions of the business community. The following article, entitled "Liberty, Not License: A Tax on Foreign Oil Would be Counterproductive," appeared in *Barron's* on February 3, 1986.

[From *Barron's*, Feb. 3, 1986]

LIBERTY, NOT LICENSE: A TAX ON FOREIGN OIL WOULD BE COUNTERPRODUCTIVE

(By Robert M. Bleiberg)

Like *Barron's*, Friedberg's *Commodity and Currency Comments* (as Dick Donnelly, who presides over that *Corner* of the magazine, recently reminded readers) has been right as rain on crude oil and petroleum products. (It's also called the turns on the U.S. dollar and gold.) By and large it takes a similarly low-key approach to the risky business of forecasting, shrugging off one accurate if barely profitable play on the probable fate of the Greek drachma as "like kissing your sister," and frequently reminding clients that "in the interest of survival, we resolve to protect ourselves with prudent and rea-

sonable stops" (or stop-loss orders). In the realm of speculation, that's even better than a generous use of the question mark.

Hence in the latest issue of Friedberg's, dated Jan. 19, 1986, we were jolted by some flat predictions, unequivocal and all-but-unhedged. Not that crude sooner or later will drop "below \$10 a barrel and probably as low as \$5 a barrel"—Al Friedberg has said that before. Here's what surprised us: "NYMEX contracts carry an increasingly probable risk: that the U.S. government will impose an import levy on crude. . . . The political process being what it is, we suspect that the crude import tax, although far from ideal, has an excellent chance of passing Congress and overcoming Reagan's initial opposition. We would therefore advise those holding NYMEX short positions to cover on the fast move below \$20 a barrel that we envision taking place in coming weeks. These positions should eventually be replaced with London gasoil contracts."

Whether the firm's track record will gain or lose from its unusual foray onto the treacherous turf of politics remains to be seen. What's clear is that a very real threat has begun to emerge. Last Thursday, a Senate Finance subcommittee scheduled hearings at the end of February on a bill to impose a tax on imported oil and other foreign energy products. Sponsored (with fine bipartisanship) by Republican subcommittee Chairman Malcolm Wallop of Wyoming and Democrat Lloyd Bentsen of Texas, the bill would mandate a "floating" tax, based upon a "trigger" price of \$22 a barrel, below which the price of domestic crude wouldn't be allowed to fall. "I feel very strongly," said Sen. Wallop, "that this country needs a lasting energy policy. . . ."

Spoken in the spirit of Jimmy Carter's Moral Equivalent of War (or MEO), that great crusade, which, before it squeaked its last, had brought the U.S. long lines at the gasoline pumps, factories shut down for lack of natural gas and a whiff of hot-in-summer, cold-in-winter socialism. Despite all blandishments to the contrary—such a levy, say proponents, would be relatively painless, raise badly needed revenues in a time of mounting fiscal stringency and the like—the results would be equally grim.

At the stroke of a pen, a tax of this kind would largely offset the ponderable benefits, to both the rate of inflation and economic growth, made possible by the collapse in crude. It would tend to make heavy American industry, already hard pressed enough on world markets, less and less competitive. And since "energy policy" (as we have learned to our grief) inevitably means rules and regulations, entitlements, exemptions and exceptions, it would wind up thrusting U.S. energy back into the bureaucratic straitjacket from which it has so recently and thankfully escaped. Give us liberty, not license.

Like bad pennies, bad policies and programs naturally keep turning up on Capitol Hill, where they lurk in some hidden recess until the time is right. Long supported by such statesmen as Democratic Sen. Gary Hart of Colorado, proposals to tax imports of crude oil and petroleum products briefly surfaced last summer as part of an eleventh-hour budget-cutting package deal. The White House promptly turned it down, while the Senate, in a subsequent vote, rejected the idea decisively.

But in politics, never say never. Owing to the sudden collapse in oil prices, and the budget crunch decreed by Gramm-Rudman, this particular bad penny—or, more accu-

rately, the \$10-\$15 billion such a levy would raise—has begun to look more and more alluring. Both the New York Times and William Safire, who may after all deserve one another, are beating the drums for it. Senators Bentsen and Wallop (as noted) have scheduled early hearings, and support is growing fast. In an interview late last week, so the Dow Jones ticker reported on Friday, Democratic Sen. Russell Long of Louisiana said: "I'd vote for it if I thought the President would go along." By the same token, so a Finance Committee aide was quoted as saying: "Baker [the Secretary of the Treasury, who happens to hail from Texas] wants one in the worst way." Added a senior Republican lawmaker: "It's going to happen."

If so, it would be a triumph of politics over economics, bad judgment over good. For openers, it would upset this country's trading partners and trigger demands for retaliation. While it may come as news to Bill Safire, the leading foreign sources of oil and petroleum products to the U.S. happen to include Canada and Mexico, neither of which would (or should) take kindly to such burdensome restraints of trade. Moreover, as the State Department pointed out last summer, when the issue first raised its ugly head, such levies "would be viewed abroad as a protectionist subsidy to U.S. oil producers and refiners. They would . . . undermine our agreement with other International Energy Agency member countries . . . to import products on the basis of market forces. That agreement is critical to our efforts to get Japan to open its petroleum product market, and to prevent a wave of protectionist measures in Europe."

The fallout would be hot and heavy at home as well as abroad. A tax of \$10 per barrel, the figure most often suggested, would lead to an increase of roughly 24 cents a gallon across the board on prices of petroleum products. Thereby, it would weigh heavily on such major energy-using industries as agriculture, chemicals and steel, all of which are having a tough enough time competing in world markets. What's more, it would offset completely the great gains to the whole U.S. economy that promise to flow from cheaper oil. According to new estimates made by the Congressional Budget Office, the decline in crude from around \$30 per barrel to \$20, in the first year alone, will generate an increase of one full percentage point in gross national product and two full points in real industrial output, all the while shaving consumer prices by one-and-one-half percentage points. Shrewd politics? Forfeiture of a once-in-a-life-time strategic advantage and a high price to pay.

And merely a down payment. Sooner or later, any new "energy policy" would plunge the U.S. right back into the swamp of artificial scarcity and unearned benefits from which it has barely emerged. For example, last summer's abortive tariff proposal would have set aside 20% of the take to help subsidize the Northeast. By the same token, under Sen. Wallop's proposal for an "energy policy price," there would be some kind of differential for imported petroleum products—foreign refineries, after all, aren't subject to EPA strictures—and part of the money might go "to encourage retrofitting of our domestic refineries."

Somehow that smacks of the Seventies, when a "small refiner bias," under which inefficient "teakettles" thrived, became the law of the land, while in the manipulative hands of high-powered Washington influence-peddlers, "entitlements" (access to

cheap crude) overnight became the road to riches. Down that road lie the ugly economic distortions, dislocations and disasters that are now only a fading, if still painful, memory. Let's not take the fateful first step.

THE PRESIDENT'S 75 CANDLES

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is noteworthy that President Reagan's 75th birthday today—making him our oldest sitting President—has not gone unnoticed, and that the occasion has prompted even more support for a national leader who already has reached unheard-of levels of popularity.

To cite but one example, the Philadelphia Inquirer, which has often disagreed with Reagan administration policies, has noted the President's birthday in a warm and heartening fashion in a February 6, 1986, editorial. The editorial follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S 75 CANDLES

President Reagan's 75th birthday—surely a thought-provoking milestone in any human being's journey—presents a welcome opportunity today to put aside political differences and pay respect to a most extraordinary man.

The life story of Ronald Wilson Reagan is the stuff of American mythology. Born into poverty in a small Midwestern town, from his father he gained the gift of an Irish storyteller, from his mother, a love of the stage. He worked his way through college. He spent the Depression era climbing steadily up the ladder of success: sports broadcaster, movie actor, finally a national idol of the silver screen.

Politics first claimed him in 1947 when he became president of a union, the Screen Actors Guild. As his film career ebbed, he shifted into television. Hosting General Electric Theater gave him a corporate base, which became a platform for countless speeches, increasingly political and conservative in nature, that he delivered tirelessly for years. Eventually that led to his classic 30-minute 1964 television appeal for Barry Goldwater, a bell ringer that transformed Mr. Reagan into the conservatives' hope for the future.

Two years later he was elected for the first of two times as governor of California, the country's most populous and trend-setting state. Next the Republican Party fell before him, and after that, the nation. In 1980 he swept into the White House on a landslide of approval from the voters; four years later they reaffirmed his triumph even more emphatically. Today opinion surveys confirm that his personal popularity remains undiminished.

He is a man of surpassing charm, a gallant figure tossing insouciant one-liners to surgeons even as his blood spilled perilously from an assassin's wound. His instinct for the generous gesture is unerring, his plucky thumbs-up bravura in the face of cancer characteristic of what endears him to so many and projects his natural qualities of leadership beyond mere politics.

Few presidents in history equal, and none excel, Mr. Reagan at serving as the nation's ceremonial chief of state. His style has rein-

vigorated the presidency as he seeks to re-shape the role of government in modern American society. Whatever one may think of his political philosophy or his record in dealing with domestic and foreign affairs, all must concede that his impact on his times assures him a large imprint upon history and a host of good wishes for the future.

**HONORING DR. MARCIA KNOLL
OF QUEENS COUNTY, NY**

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Dr. Marcia Knoll, an educator from Queens County, NY, on the occasion of her induction as national president-elect of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Mr. Speaker, we in Queens are lucky and proud that one of America's leading educators lives and works in our county. Dr. Marcia Knoll, the principal of Public School 220 in Queens, has been a leader in New York City education since 1963. She has served on advisory committees on teaching and curriculum for Queens, New York City, and New York State. As a recognized expert on learning and the schools, she has been interviewed by several of New York's television channels and radio stations.

Dr. Knoll has published several books and articles on a wide range of education issues, including school supervision, instruction for the gifted, individualized education, and curriculum development. She has been repeatedly honored for her many accomplishments. In 1980, she was awarded the President's Medal at Commencement at St. John's University in Jamaica.

Mr. Speaker, if our children are our most valuable resource, then our educators are entrusted with our most sacred responsibility. The children of Public School 220 in Forest Hills and all the students in the New York area have been benefiting from the innovations of this special woman for over two decades. Now, as president of an important nationwide organization, Dr. Knoll will bring her experience and talent to all the schools and youngsters of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I call now on all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Dr. Marcia Knoll on her new position, and in wishing her continued success in her drive to provide excellence in education for the children of America.

FREEDOM TO GO HOME AGAIN

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, everyday in Congress we are called upon to make decisions on some of the most important domestic, diplomatic, and economic issues of our time. These issues reflect concerns that

impact on the lives of millions of people in this country and all over the world.

However, from time to time our position gives us the opportunity to make a vital difference in the life of an individual. It is times like these that I find most rewarding and personally satisfying.

Several years ago, such an opportunity presented itself to our colleague, BILL LEHMAN, and he responded in a characteristic way—humanely and effectively. The following reprint from the New York Times tells the story.

As we wrestle with the big decisions and masses of paperwork and statistics that come with the job, it is good to keep in mind the philosophy that to save a life is truly to save the world.

The article follows:

FREEDOM TO GO HOME AGAIN

WASHINGTON, Feb. 5.—Looking back, Representative William Lehman says he was driven more by personal than political motives.

His only daughter, Kathy, had died of a brain tumor a few years earlier. "I think subconsciously I may have been looking for a surrogate daughter," the Florida Democrat recalls. "I was also doing something that I think my daughter would have encouraged me to do."

What Mr. Lehman did was go to Argentina, in August 1981, and win the release of a political prisoner, Ester Debora Benchoam, a 20-year-old student from Buenos Aires jailed four years earlier as a political subversive. She was one of thousands imprisoned in the military's "dirty war" that began in 1976 and finally ended in 1983 with the election of Raul Alfonsín as President.

Several human rights groups had been working for the release of Miss Benchoam, who was one of the youngest political activists ever jailed in the dirty war. But until Mr. Lehman paid a visit to the prison, there had been no progress.

"INTERVENTION WAS CRUCIAL"

"There's no doubt his intervention was crucial," said Rabbi Morton M. Rosenthal, director of the Latin American department of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Today, Miss Benchoam lives in Washington, promoting discussion of Argentina, working as a staff assistant in Mr. Lehman's office and studying at Georgetown University. But she still does not call Washington home. She intends to return to Argentina as soon as possible, "to help to develop a strong democratic structure in the country," as she puts it.

"It's almost a duty," she said.

"Her soul is still in Argentina," said Mr. Lehman.

After arriving here, Miss Benchoam met with several members of Congress to discuss human rights in Argentina and to urge them to oppose a Reagan Administration proposal to renew military aid.

The Congressman talks about Miss Benchoam with unabashed pride. "I think the remarkable thing is her positive spirit and her complete confidence—without egotism—that nothing is beyond her reach," he said.

"If I had one thing that I've done that's positive since I've been here," he added, "I would say that one thing is right on top of the list."

A SHOOTING BEFORE DAWN

In the Argentine military's campaign against leftist guerrillas in the 1970's, more

than 9,000 people disappeared and countless others suffered.

Miss Benchoam says she was imprisoned because she had witnessed the murder of her 17-year-old brother, Ruben, who, like her, had been a student activist in Buenos Aires.

She tells her story in a straightforward manner, with energy but little emotion. Before dawn on July 25, 1977, she says, masked gunmen burst into her family's apartment in Buenos Aires and shot Ruben. She was taken to a police station, where she was held for two weeks in isolation, blindfolded and bound. In those two weeks, she says, there was no record of her detention, and her family feared she had become one of the "disappeared."

In the following months, she says, she repeatedly refused to sign a document denouncing both her and her brother as subversives. Eventually, she was sent to Villa Devoto, a prison for women in Buenos Aires.

Four years passed, Mr. Lehman picks up the story. "I had been toying with the idea of going to Argentina," he said. Then, after hearing about Miss Benchoam at an informal meeting on human rights with Representative Michael D. Barnes, Democrat of Maryland, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, Mr. Lehman said, "the focal point of my trip was to try and arrange a meeting with this person."

Officials in Argentina warned him, Mr. Lehman said, that he would regret taking a "dangerous terrorist" back to the United States. But some months later they agreed to the release, on the condition that Miss Benchoam would leave the country.

On Nov. 5, 1981, she was momentarily reunited with her family at the airport before leaving for the United States. She lived at Mr. Lehman's Washington residence for a year before moving to her own apartment.

"He has done so much for me," Miss Benchoam said of Mr. Lehman.

Mr. Lehman did not publicize her release, saying, "I didn't want to do anything that would adversely affect her friends who were still in prison."

She studied English and, with Mr. Lehman's help, landed her first job on Capitol Hill, in the publications room of the Longworth Building. In July 1984, Miss Benchoam married George Rogers, an associate at the Washington Office on Latin America, a nonprofit human rights and foreign policy organization, who had acted as her translator in meetings with members of Congress. Mr. Lehman gave away the bride.

Miss Benchoam hopes to finish her studies in Latin American politics and government at Georgetown University in December 1987, then hopes to get a doctorate before heading back home. "I want to continue the work of my brother, the work of my boyfriend and also the work of my mother," she said.

Miss Benchoam's high school boyfriend, Mauricio Weinstein, had been a student council leader and disappeared in 1978, she said. Her mother was an art professor in Buenos Aires and active in the teachers' union until her death from cancer in 1975.

"It was a terrible experience, but we should learn from it," Miss Benchoam said. It was a "horror," says Mr. Lehman.

**REPEAL DAVIS-BACON, SAVE
TAXPAYERS OVER \$1 BILLION
ANNUALLY**

HON. RICHARD ARMEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, this year like never before we must search for ways to cut Federal spending, but in order to be fair we have an obligation to the taxpayers of America to cut wasteful and unnecessary Federal programs in order to spare cuts from truly legitimate Federal spending.

One of the best ways to save money is by repealing the wasteful and counterproductive Davis-Bacon Act.

The Davis-Bacon Act, passed in 1931, requires the Federal Government to pay the "prevailing wage" for construction contracts. Due to political pressure from powerful union officials, though, this "prevailing wage" has in effect become the prevailing "union" wage, thus unnecessarily raising the cost to the Federal Government. Various reform proposals being offered could save well over \$1 billion annually. A complete repeal of Davis-Bacon would save considerably more.

I am pleased to say that I have already cosponsored H.R. 73 which would repeal the act, and I have cosponsored H.R. 472 which would make substantive reforms in the act.

H.R. 472, introduced by Congressman CHARLIE STENHOLM of Texas, would implement much needed reforms in the Davis-Bacon process, increasing the threshold for coverage from \$2,000 per contract to \$1 million. This important provision would exempt the vast majority of small contractors from coverage. The bill would also prohibit the use of nonlocal wage data to determine wages. This provision would correct the problem of comparing urban vs. rural wage data.

It's utterly ridiculous to preserve a damaging program such as Davis-Bacon and cut other programs that are essential to our Nation's well being. With the passage of the Gramm-Rudman Balanced Budget Act our responsibilities are heightened further. I call on my colleagues to put the public interest ahead of the interest of the AFL-CIO, the Teamsters, and other special interest lobbies and move forward to repeal Davis-Bacon and save the taxpayers' hard earned dollars.

**A LIVING EDUCATIONAL MEMO-
RIAL TO CHRISTA McAULIFFE**

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my wholehearted support for a timely and much-needed bill introduced today by my distinguished colleague, AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, chairman of our House Education and Labor Committee. The bill would name the National Talented Teacher Fellowship Program after Christa McAuliffe, who died so tragically with the crew members of the *Chal-*

enger space shuttle last week in my home State of Florida. The entire Nation has mourned the loss of all of these brave and committed people.

Because Christa McAuliffe was a dedicated teacher, it is most fitting that this bill to honor her should be sponsored by our House Education and Labor Committee. I believe the bill would provide a most appropriate living memorial to this young woman, who captivated the Nation and the world with her joyous and inquisitive spirit, and who awed us with her courage as she sought to reach the stars themselves. Children and adults, students and teachers, ordinary people could identify with her enthusiasm. We were all inspired by the vision of awe and hope which she embodied for us.

One of Christa McAuliffe's chief goals was to touch the future through her role as a teacher. She loved teaching; she loved her students; she loved people. All the teachers in our country can hold their heads a little higher today because of the example that she set. Her loss is a great loss to her profession and to our Nation, especially to our children.

We dearly need more teachers of Christa McAuliffe's caliber, warmth, and enthusiasm. This bill—as a living memorial to her—could provide a means for identifying and encouraging our finest teachers from every corner of the Nation. I am pleased that Chairman HAWKINS is introducing this bill, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of it along with Mr. JEFFORDS and Mr. FORD of Michigan. It is my hope that the Congress will support Mr. HAWKINS in this important and significant endeavor.

**PRESERVING THE COLUMBIA
GORGE**

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to protect one of the Nation's crown jewels—the Columbia River Gorge, which divides with unmatched beauty and historical tradition the great States of Oregon and Washington. I am very pleased that my good friend and colleague from Washington State, Congressman SID MORRISON, is joining me as an original cosponsor of this legislation.

This bill—which is identical to legislation also being introduced today in the other body by the four Senators from Oregon and Washington—is the culmination of a 5-year effort to develop a fair and effective way to protect the grandeur of the Columbia River Gorge without trampling upon individual liberties or stifling the economic vitality of the area.

The legislation we are introducing today creates a national scenic area in the Columbia River Gorge with a two-tiered management system. The Federal Government already owns a substantial amount of land within the gorge, primarily the Mount Hood National Forest in Oregon and the Gifford Pinchot National Forest in Washington. The legislation creates four special management areas made up primarily of these Federal lands and other

critical lands within the gorge. These special management areas would be administered by the Forest Service in conjunction with a newly created 13-member Columbia River Gorge Commission.

This commission will administer the remaining lands within the scenic area. The commission would be made up of one citizen from each of the six counties in the gorge to be appointed by the county governing body and three members from each State appointed by each Governor. One Forest Service employee would be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture to be a nonvoting, ex officio commission member.

Within 2 years of enactment of the legislation, the Commission would develop a management plan for the scenic area. That management plan shall include a resource inventory, land use designations for the special management areas developed in conjunction with Forest Service, guidelines for adoption of zoning guidelines, a recreation plan, a public involvement plan and plans for consultation with Federal agencies in the gorge.

The Secretary of Agriculture will review the part of the management plan pertaining to the special management areas, and the Secretary can recommend modifications to the commission if it is believed the management plan violates the standards set forth in this legislation. I am particularly pleased that the legislation includes an idea I floated almost a year and a half ago, which allows for the commission to override—by a two-thirds vote—any modifications of the management plan made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Under this legislation, the counties are provided every opportunity to implement zoning ordinances that will conform to the standards contained in this law and contained in the management plan developed by the commission. In addition, the cities of Cascade Locks, Hood River, Mosier and The Dalles in Oregon and the cities of Bingen, Carson, Dallesport, Lyle, North Bonneville, Stevenson, White Salmon and Wishram in Washington are designated urban areas and are exempt from the legislation.

The bill also includes several other unique features, including an effective interim management plan, which will protect the gorge from unbridled development while the commission is putting together the scenic area management plan. In addition, the legislation authorizes the creation of a Columbia River Gorge Development Corporation, which will make loans to develop the economic potential of the gorge consistent with the goals of protecting its beauty and cultural heritage. The development corporation will be especially helpful in tapping the tourism potential in the gorge—particularly the gorge's growing reputation as the country's premier windsurfing area.

Finally, this bill is fiscally responsible, in that it limits the amount of Federal funds that can go toward land acquisition and to the development corporation.

My colleagues and I in the House and the Senate who have joined in this effort today want our children and grandchildren—and their children—to know the wonder of 600 foot Multnomah Falls. We want them to know

the historical importance of the earliest settlers and native Americans in the gorge, who have paved the way for the Northwest to become a gateway to the Pacific Rim. We want them to know the grandeur and intensity of the whitewater streams and steep trails that traverse the gorge.

This legislation will allow that to happen. And it will allow that to happen without trampling upon the individual liberties that are the cornerstone of our Constitution and without trampling upon the historical importance of the economic vitality of the gorge.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and the people of the Northwest to pass this critical and historic piece of legislation.

PRESIDENTIAL MEDAL OF FREEDOM SHOULD BE AWARDED TO THE "CHALLENGER" CREW

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, January 28, 1986, will forever be etched in our memory as the day our Nation lost seven of our most gifted and courageous people. When the space shuttle *Challenger* exploded seconds after takeoff, Americans were united in grief. We were not Democrats or Republicans that day. We were Americans, one family mourning the loss of loved ones.

The Space Program has always been very special to our Nation. It symbolizes America's greatness and potential. Those who have traveled in space have, to paraphrase Christa McAuliffe, carried more than their own souls; they have carried the soul of a nation. We mourn the deaths of the *Challenger* crew and we will continue to mourn. But in our mourning we must not forget their magnificent contributions to the Space Program, our Nation, and the world.

It takes a special kind of person to volunteer for the Space Program. Moreover, it takes a person of extraordinary dedication, knowledge, and courage to be selected to participate in our Nation's quest to explore the frontiers of space. The crew of the *Challenger* demonstrated these qualities and in one sense Michael Smith, Francis Scobee, Ronald McNair, Ellison Onizuka, Christa McAuliffe, Gregory Jarvis, and Judy Resnik already were honored by this Nation by being selected to pioneer space travel and exploration. Now, for their ultimate sacrifice, they deserve no less than to be honored in the highest manner possible by our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, President Truman established the Medal of Freedom in 1945 to honor those Americans who had achieved meritorious war-related service. In 1963 President Kennedy revised the criteria to include those who had meritoriously contributed to "security or national interests of the United States, world peace, or cultural or other significant public or private endeavors." I believe, and I believe all my colleagues share my belief, that Michael Smith, Francis Scobee, Ronald McNair, Ellison Onizuka, Christa McAuliffe, Gregory Jarvis,

and Judy Resnik do indeed meet the criteria for this prestigious award, the highest honor that can be bestowed on an American.

My colleagues and I urge the President, on behalf of the American people, to award the Presidential Medal of Freedom posthumously to these seven men and women of the *Challenger*. However small this act may be, I can only hope that it will be of some comfort to the families and friends of the *Challenger* crew in knowing that the work and sacrifice of these seven brave men and women was not in vain. We will never forget the contributions of Mike, Dick, Ron, El, Christa, Greg, and Judy to our Nation and to the world.

HERNANDO/PASCO HOSPICE

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a moment today to bring the attention of my colleagues to the work of a special organization that has touched the lives of countless people in my district. It is an organization that doesn't turn its back upon the less fortunate but, rather, seeks them out and caters to their needs. It is an organization that is present when other friends abandon you. It is an organization that you can count on when the going is roughest. It is Hernando/Pasco Hospice.

Hernando/Pasco Hospice is a community-based, nonprofit organization that was licensed on March 2, 1984, when it helped its first patient in need. It has, since then, helped over 200 other patients and continues to grow to where it is expected to assist more than 300 people in need in 1986 alone. It boasts an average daily census of 30 today, compared to an average daily census of 5 only 1 year ago.

Hernando/Pasco Hospice consists of a staff of 15 persons, most of whom are volunteers. The staff has training in all disciplines, ranging from a medical director who is a physician, to registered nurses, to social service workers, and a clergy counselor.

The great success of this hospice organization is, of course, largely attributable to the selfless and generous human spirit which its members exemplify. Hernando/Pasco Hospice is made up of people of amazing dedication and commitment. They are people, like Dr. Ronald M. Yarrington and Rev. Clayton J. Steele—two of the founding members, who care about the welfare of their neighbors and not about the neighbor's ability to pay. They are people who step in during what is probably one of the most difficult periods any of us will ever have to face and get the job done. They are people who provide comfort to the patient and peace of mind to families—gifts that are invaluable during the last days of a loved one's life.

It is precisely this spirit of volunteerism and community involvement which is the ideal that we must strive for, not only in the health care area, but in all facets of our spending in order to bring some order to today's dangerous deficits. We, literally and figuratively, can no longer afford to look to the Federal Govern-

ment to always step in and carry the fiscal responsibility. We must begin to help ourselves and thereby replace some of the Federal programs with individual and community efforts like this hospice organization has done.

One need only imagine the tremendous costs that the Medicare and/or Medicaid Programs would have to bear if the patients which organizations like Hernando/Pasco Hospice serve spent their last days, weeks, or even months in the hospital. Rather than further burden already overburdened programs, however, it is clear to see how community efforts like this one quickly add up in much-needed savings.

The fiscal rewards of community efforts are, of course, most welcome. They are, however, only icing on the cake in the case of Hernando/Pasco Hospice in comparison to the peace of mind which it brings to patient and family alike. Hernando/Pasco Hospice affords a patient the ability to spend the last days of his/her life in the familiar comfort of his home and in the midst of his loved ones versus the cold and impersonal atmosphere of a hospital. It caters to the patient's needs, both physical and emotional, in a professional and compassionate manner, but does so at the vantage point of the patient's familiar surroundings. Furthermore, it provides the family with the necessary counseling and assistance to help it deal with the reality of the situation with which it is confronted.

For these reasons and many others, Mr. Speaker, I applaud Hernando/Pasco Hospice. The initiative, determination, commitment, and caring which it typifies is truly unique. I commend its members for this good work, and extend my best wishes for their continued success.

SUPREME COURT'S MANDATORY JURISDICTION

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, today, as in years past, I am introducing legislation to eliminate substantially the mandatory jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I am pleased that the ranking minority member of my subcommittee, Mr. MOORHEAD, has joined me as a cosponsor.

The record should reflect that this legislation passed the House unanimously by voice vote during the 97th Congress under the sponsorship of the then-ranking minority member of my subcommittee, Mr. RAILSBACK. A bill also passed the House unanimously by voice vote during the 98th Congress.

However, the Senate has not been able to pass either bill in spite of strong support from the executive and judicial branches of Government. During the 4 years that have intervened since passage of the first House bill, reasons for elimination of the Supreme Court's mandatory jurisdiction have actually grown rather than diminished.

Let me give you some information about the bill and why statutory change is imperative.

Under current law, certain cases may be appealed directly to the Supreme Court and the Court is obligated to hear and decide those cases. In most instances, these cases do not involve important issues of Federal constitutional law or conflicts in the interpretation of statutes by the circuit courts of appeals. The net effect of the bill is to convert the method of Supreme Court review to a discretionary, certiorari approach.

This change in appellate review is supported by all nine Justices of the Supreme Court. As stated in a letter of June 17, 1982, to me, they clearly state: " * * * we write to express our complete support for the proposals * * * substantially to eliminate the Supreme Court's mandatory jurisdiction."

The nine Justices further observe that mandatory cases permit litigants to require cases to be decided by the Supreme Court regardless of the importance of the issue presented or its impact on the general public. With limited time and resources at its disposal, " * * * it is impossible for the Court to give plenary consideration to all the mandatory appeals it receives. * * * " The Court must resort to summary dispositions that sometimes treat litigants in a cavalier way. Even though the summary dispositions of the Court are binding on the lower Federal courts and State courts, such decisions, in the Court's own words, "sometimes create more confusion than they seek to resolve."

The bill, in addition to being supported by the nine Justices, has been endorsed by the administration, the Judicial Conference of the United States, and the American Bar Association. The bill has its legislative roots deeply set in the American Law Institute's "Study of the Division of Jurisdiction Between State and Federal Courts" (1969), the "Report of the Study Group on the Caseload of the Supreme Court" (1971), the Department of Justice's "Report on the Needs of the Federal Courts" (1977), and my subcommittee's lengthy hearings on "The State of the Judiciary and Access to Justice" (1977) and "Supreme Court Workload" (1983).

The bill entails no cost to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, for a more in-depth examination of the proposed legislation, I refer Members to the House Report (No. 98-986) that has been filed. The report provides a lengthy background statement about the current statutory scheme and changes made to it by the legislation introduced today.

I will close by noting, as my full committee chairman, Mr. Rodino, did last Congress on the House floor:

"The High Court can devote plenary consideration only to about 150 cases a year. During the past several times, a substantial percentage of the Court's workload has been devoted to mandatory cases that do not have significant public importance. Elimination of these cases from the Court's docket will not preclude High Court consideration of cases of significant import to the Nation, will not have a deleterious impact on litigants, and will not adversely affect separation of powers or federalism."

As we approach the bicentennial year of the Constitution (1987), it is appropriate that Congress pay careful heed that constitutionally created institutions, such as the Supreme Court, are in good working order. A tailoring of

the Court's mandatory jurisdiction will ensure that the highest court in the land is better equipped to enforce the promises contained in the preamble to the Constitution: " * * * to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility * * * promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity * * * ."

CONCERNING THE ETHIOPIAN GOVERNMENT'S RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution concerning the program of resettlement being carried out by the Ethiopian Government. For some time, that Government has been moving people from the depleted land in the northern provinces to other regions of the country. The stated goal of the program is to take volunteers from overused agricultural areas and resettle them on more productive land. Recent allegations have been made that this program is being conducted under very inhumane and often coercive conditions.

For the past 2 years the United States has sent an enormous amount of emergency famine assistance to the people of Africa. In light of the dire situation faced by millions of starving men, women, and children, we could do no less. In Ethiopia alone we have provided over 450,000 metric tons of food worth nearly \$300 million. It is disturbing to hear that the Ethiopian Government may not place a high priority on relieving the suffering of its own people. This is a priority the international donor community views as paramount under the present drought conditions gripping most of sub-Saharan Africa.

My colleagues who have joined me in introducing this resolution are concerned that the Ethiopian authorities have not devoted enough of their resources to the famine relief effort and may even be diverting humanitarian assistance from Western donors to the resettlement program. Let me make clear at this point that we are not talking about food or trucks provided by the United States. Our assistance is distributed through private voluntary organizations in Ethiopia. It is not provided to the Government. It is assistance from other Western donor nations which is being diverted from its intended purpose. We monitor our aid very closely, and the American public should know that its generous contributions are being properly administered.

To ensure that all donated aid gets to the people for whom it is intended, this resolution makes three very simple and straightforward requests. It calls upon the Ethiopian Government to suspend the resettlement program for the duration of the drought, so that much-needed resources can be channelled into the famine relief effort. It calls for an end to any coercion in the resettlement program and requests that the United Nations monitor the situation. It also calls for free access both to and from the resettlement camps for the par-

ticipants, international observers, and the news media. This is the only way we can hope to get accurate reports of the conditions which now exist.

When the Ethiopian Government first began the resettlement program, it had a goal of moving 100,000 people over an extended time. In 1983, however, Chairman Mengistu proposed a goal of moving 1.5 million people in only 1 year. Reports allege that, in order to meet this quota, Government troops have forced people out of their homelands and into transit camps and resettlement areas. The transfers occur under inhumane conditions and without regard to the breakup of families. This directly contradicts the guidelines under which resettlement is to take place, as expressed by the Ethiopian Government. Only a few weeks ago, United States personnel were able to interview villagers who had been resettled in the Pawe region of Ethiopia. Their reports confirm the earlier allegations of groups such as "Medecins Sans Frontieres"—doctors without borders—and "Cultural Survival" about the deplorable human rights violations that have occurred.

I am not suggesting that we seek to intervene in the domestic politics of a sovereign nation. If Ethiopia is to proceed with an Agricultural Development Program, there may be credible reasons for relocating people to more fertile regions. Whatever the need may be in the future for some type of resettlement program, it is clear that for the duration of the current drought at least, resources should be used for famine relief and not for resettlement. We must continue to insist that famine relief not be used as a political tool by the Ethiopian Government. President Reagan pledged the U.S. commitment to this ideal by stating that a hungry child knows no politics. We in the Congress should work to see that others live up to this commitment as well.

At present, all the moral weight of the international community has not been brought to bear on the Government of Ethiopia. The United States must call upon other donor countries and the United Nations to use all diplomatic means possible on behalf of those now suffering.

Finally, this resolution urges an increased effort on the part of the Ethiopian Government to move relief goods from the port and to the people. A minimum of 2,500 tons per day is needed to maintain adequate food distribution to the needy.

Millions of starving Ethiopians depend on the contributions of the international donor community and on the actions of their own Government for their survival. I believe this resolution states a reasonable course of action in seeing that those needs are met. I urge all Members to support it.

**HONORING SGT. PAUL TUCKER
OF THE PRINCE GEORGE'S
COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT**

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1986, the Prince George's County Fire and Police Annual Awards banquet will honor Sgt. Paul Tucker, a 19-year member of the Prince George's County Police Department and an integral part of its emergency service team [EST].

On June 20, 1985, Sergeant Tucker's career was suddenly interrupted. Responding to a "man with a gun" call, Sergeant Tucker and his colleagues faced a familiarly dangerous situation in which the man had barricaded himself and was threatening suicide. Tragically, just minutes before the depressed man's apprehension, Sergeant Tucker lost his grip due to an oily substance on the ladder he was climbing to assist in the rescue. He fell 18 feet, landing on his back and injuring his spinal cord.

Sergeant Tucker is now paralyzed from the waist down and confined to a wheel chair. His life has taken a dramatic turn for a young man of 41 years of age.

The annual Fire and Police Awards banquet is a chance to recognize Sergeant Tucker's tremendous sacrifice on behalf of his fellow citizens. It is also a chance to celebrate his career, for this is neither an ordinary man, nor an ordinary police officer. His career has been marked by enthusiasm, hard work and heroism. As a philosopher once said, "Deeds of heroism are but offered by those who, for many long years, have been heroes in obscurity and silence."

Perhaps the community at large did not know of his deeds, but Sergeant Tucker had gained the respect and admiration of his colleagues. To date, he has received an incredible 29 letters of commendation. Twice he has received awards of merit, including one for performing lifesaving CPR on a 14-month-old girl who had stopped breathing.

From Paul Tucker's graduation in June 1966 from the police academy to his valiant effort in the June 1985 rescue, his career had been one of accomplishment. Shortly after his assignment to the special operations division in April 1973, Paul Tucker was promoted to sergeant, one of the youngest officers ever to achieve that rank. According to his peers, Paul Tucker had an excellent chance to reach to top of the police department due to his consistently outstanding ratings. Instead, he chose not to compete for lieutenant, for he preferred his job over all others in the department.

In 1976, the Prince George's Police Department formed the emergency services team to deal with an increasing number of high-risk situations. Sergeant Tucker was an original member of the EST and was chosen a squad leader. There is one statistic that reflects Sergeant Tucker's importance to the EST. He has been involved in more than 90 percent of the 201 high-risk situations for which the EST has been called into action over the course of his

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

career. And, despite 10 on-the-job injuries, he did not relinquish his duties.

Sergeant Tucker's career reminds us of the great heroism and sacrifice our Nation's police officers exert every day on our behalf. He deserves our praise, our thanks, and our continued good wishes for his recovery as he faces new challenges. We also extend our best wishes to Sergeant Tucker's wife Shirley and their sons John and Joseph.

**TREASURY COST-SAVINGS
PROPOSALS**

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills, at the request of the Treasury Department, which are intended to improve operating efficiency, increase productivity, and reduce costs associated with two areas of the Department's payment system.

The first measure would establish an orderly system for the payment of all U.S. Treasury checks. The proposal provides that U.S. Treasury checks issued on or after the effective date of the legislation must be negotiated within 6 months after the date on which the check was issued. Checks issued before the effective date of the legislation must be negotiated within 6 months of the date of enactment.

Currently, U.S. Treasury checks are payable without limitation of time. The Treasury Department reports that there are now over 5 million checks valued in excess of \$1 billion that have been outstanding for more than 6 months. These funds could be tied up indefinitely, even though statistics indicate that less than 1 percent of checks that are more than 6 months old will ever be presented for payment.

This proposal would bring U.S. Treasury checks under the same Uniform Commercial Code standard for all other checks. In addition, the bill does not affect the entitlement of any payee to the issuance of a replacement check if that person is still entitled to a payment. Thus, checks that are lost, destroyed, or stolen can still be reissued by the Treasury, as is the current practice. In fact, processing of such claims would be accelerated by this proposal because agency heads will be given the authority to recertify payments.

The second measure, entitled the Electronic Funds Transfer Federal Salary Act, authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue regulations to require that wages and salaries of Federal employees be paid by electronic funds transfer. Benefit checks, such as Social Security, are not included under this proposal.

Under the current system of issuing U.S. Treasury checks for wages and salaries, each check issued costs the Government 24 cents, while the same payment made by electronic funds transfer methods costs 3 cents. It is expected that approximately \$10.8 million annually will be saved through enactment of this proposal.

The U.S. Treasury believes that Federal employees will benefit under this proposal, in that

electronic funds transfer methods will eliminate lost, forged, or stolen checks. In addition, electronic transfer assures speedy payment of wages and salaries to the recipient. The bill prohibits financial institutions from charging Federal Government employees any fees for handling direct deposit payments.

The bill does make exceptions for certain categories of workers. For example, Federal workers employed by the U.S. Government on the effective date of the proposal, whose annual rate of basic pay is less than \$20,000, may be paid by check if they desire. In addition, the Secretary of the Treasury is given the discretion to exempt other categories of employees—such as employees who do not have bank accounts or have payroll assignments which preclude the use of an electronic payment method.

I would like to reiterate that I am introducing these bills by request of the U.S. Treasury. While I encourage all departments and agencies of the U.S. Government to seek reductions in costs, especially in this era of Gramm-Rudman, I do have some reservations about the specifics of this legislation.

For instance, I could foresee situations where an elderly or seriously ill recipient of a U.S. Treasury check is unable to either mail or physically get to their financial institution in order to negotiate their check. I am also aware that for valid reasons, many Federal workers find it more convenient to receive their wages or salaries in the form of a check, rather than an electronic funds transfer. Under these proposals, we may be taking away that option for some people. But, I will be working with the Treasury Secretary to ensure fair and equitable treatment for anyone who prefers that option.

However, one of the best ways to find out the answers to these questions and to explore the cost savings possibilities presented under these proposals is to formally introduce them in Congress. I encourage my colleagues to give these measures their full consideration.

**NEWCOMER PRAISES AKRON
AREA AS A PLACE TO LIVE**

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, every so often, people who have never been there, upon learning that I am from Akron, OH, will say, "Akron. Why would anyone want to live there?" My usual response is that if you come there you would find out why so many people find it a great place to live.

The other day I was reading the Bath Country Journal, a little suburban newspaper published in the Akron area, and came across an article by a lady who came originally from the New York City metropolitan area. Three years ago, she and her husband and three children moved to a small city in North Carolina and 11 months later moved to the Akron area. The article was her paean of praise for life in the Akron area. As the author, Mary Lou Russo said:

We have found Akron to be an area of outstanding educational, cultural and recreational resources. Shopping has been a treat with all the major shopping centers to choose from and no traffic problems or congestion to contend with. We have enjoyed an exceptional variety of cuisines the many restaurants have to offer, and have had the unparalleled pleasure of experiencing the opera, ballet, and symphony at E.J. Thomas Hall and * * * Blossom Music Center.

She ends up her article saying:

I guess the point I am trying to make is, "Wow, Akron, you sure had me fooled! What a wonderful surprise to find you are the best of all worlds."

Mr. Speaker, in my lifetime I have visited every State of the Union and many of the wonderful places in our great country. It does not take away from any of them to see appropriate recognition given to one of the country's finest communities. So I offer the full article by Mrs. Russo for incorporation in the RECORD following these remarks:

NEWCOMER FINDS AKRON AREA GREAT
(By Mary Lou Russo)

"Akron, Ohio? Who lives in Akron, Ohio? Why would anyone want to live in Akron, Ohio?" Those were my words about three years ago when a move to Akron was a possibility.

At that time my husband, our three children and I lived in Packanack Lake, New Jersey. It was a country club community with all the amenities. Our home was in this picturesque, rural setting, but not more than ten minutes away were all the shopping malls, movie theaters and restaurants we could possibly want or need. The piece de resistance, though, was Manhattan. A mere twenty-five minutes away was the Big Apple, the cultural and entertainment capital of the world, where the theater, museums, art forms of all kinds, and restaurants of every possible ethnic variety abound. Of course, we must keep in mind all the problems that go along with these advantages, such as, traffic jams and great masses of people everywhere you go.

Akron, Ohio was the Rubber Capital of the world. That was all I had ever heard about Akron. Now, in my defense I ask you, if you had never been here before, what thoughts do you conjure up in your mind about a rubber capital? Cold? Gray? Dingy? Smoke stacks? The acrid smell of rubber? Are any of these pictures appealing?

At this time we were also offered the opportunity to move to Hendersonville, North Carolina. Now, again, I ask you to use your imagination. What pictures does your mind's eye create about a small town tucked in the foothills of the Great Smokey Mountains of North Carolina? Do you envision lush countrysides? Warm sunshine? Wide open spaces untouched by pollution of any kind?

That is really it and more. We went to North Carolina and lived there eleven months; just long enough to experience "southern hospitality", and to revel in a climate that defies description. We saturated our senses with the majesty of the Great Smokies on every horizon; the fragrance of wildflowers along all the roadsides; the warm springlike climate almost all year long; the sounds of birds and wild critters uninhibited by not too many people, and the taste of bar-b-que and southern fried chicken.

We were also there long enough to see another side. The term "culture shock" now

had meaning for us. There was no live theater or big name entertainment; the one shopping mall in town had a grand total of one department store in it; the one restaurant in town did not serve dinner after 8 p.m. on a Saturday night, and the social event of the year was when the ice cream stand known as "Piggy's" opened for the season!

Just as we were fully realizing what Small Town, USA meant, along came the opportunity, again, to make Akron, Ohio our home. We were so fortunate to have experienced both the New York Metropolitan Area and Hendersonville, North Carolina before coming here!

Now, we can fully appreciate Akron. How wonderfully surprised we were to find the green rolling hills! In the year we have been here we have delighted in the splendor of all four seasons. But more importantly, we have found Akron to be an area of outstanding educational, cultural and recreational resources. Shopping has been a treat with all the major shopping centers to choose from and no traffic problems or congestion to contend with. We have enjoyed an exceptional variety of cuisines the many restaurants have to offer, and have had the unparalleled pleasure of experiencing the opera, ballet, and symphony at E.J. Thomas Hall, and top performers at Blossom Music Center. The children, too, have found all their favorite things nearby from sports events at the Coliseum to the zoo.

This narrative would not be complete, however, if I neglected to mention the warmth of the people and the area's small town charm; it's exciting history, and it's long tradition.

I guess the point I am trying to make is, "Wow, Akron, you sure had me fooled! What a wonderful surprise to find you are the best of all worlds. I truly hope you will be my home for a long time!"

The Russos and their three children live in Tow Path Village. Tony Russo is with Jaitte Packaging. Anthony is in 7th grade at Eastview, David is in 5th grade at Bath School and Allison is in St. Paul's Nursery School. Mary Lou Russo wrote a weekly column for the *Times News* when she lived in North Carolina.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, because of official business activity in my district, I was unable to be present when the House (recorded vote) voted on the following legislation which I fully supported: (Regretfully, I was also unable to be paired on a few of these measures.)

January 29, H.R. 3525, Uniform Regional Poll Closing, rollcall No. 9.

January 30, House Resolution 360, the Rule making in order consideration of H.R. 4055, Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals, rollcall No. 10.

Amendment offered by Representative Waxman to H.R. 4055, rollcall No. 12.

Final passage of H.R. 4055, rollcall No. 13.

February 4, H.R. Food Security Act, rollcall No. 14.

H.R. 3010, Health Planning, rollcall No. 15.

February 5, approval of the Journal, rollcall No. 16.

Reject Walker amendment to House Resolution 368, Committee Funds legislation, rollcall No. 17.

Final passage of House Resolution 368, Committee Funds, rollcall No. 18.

A TRIBUTE TO FRANK HEADLEY

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, Dover General Hospital in Dover, NJ will soon regretfully honor the retirement of Frank Headley from its board of directors.

Frank first joined the Dover General board of directors in January 1951. In over 35 years on the board he has served with distinction as board secretary, and chairman of the executive and nominating committees.

The former county clerk has given a lifetime of commitment and service to New Jersey. Many of his contributions came through the work he has done as a charter member of the Denville Rotary as well as on the Citizenship Council of the Boy Scouts of America. Frank Headley's many years as a public servant have been repayed by the respect, love, and admiration of those who have had the honor of knowing him.

Mr. Speaker I join with all of Morris County and New Jersey in extending to Frank and his wife, Doris, the very best in the years to come, and thanking them for the many selfless hours they have given to make the communities they touched a better place for all to enjoy.

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1986

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today along with members of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I am introducing the "Drug Abuse Education Act of 1986." This bill directs the Secretary of Education to establish a program of Federal grants to the States for drug abuse education in elementary and secondary schools. The bill authorizes \$100 million to be appropriated annually over the next 5 fiscal years to carry out the purposes of this act.

Foreign study missions, field investigations and hearings conducted over the past year by the select committee have confirmed the undeniable fact that illicit narcotics producing and smuggling worldwide far outpace crop eradication efforts in source countries and U.S. interdiction and enforcement capabilities. Increasingly, around the country, Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials who testify before the committee have almost given up hope of getting a handle on the drug traffic because of the enormous amount of illegal drugs being directed at our country. At

best, all they can do at the present time is maintain a holding action against the drug traffickers.

Further, we can expect bumper crops of illicit narcotics this year. The select committee estimates that 150 tons of cocaine, 12 tons of heroin, and 30,000 tons of marijuana will enter the United States in 1986. Even if we were to substantially increase the resources of our drug enforcement and interdiction agencies—the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Coast Guard, and the Customs Service—we can expect to be clobbered by illicit drugs for the next several years.

We cannot abandon our efforts to control the production and traffic of illicit narcotics. If anything, we should redouble our commitment in this area.

We must, however, take immediate steps to defend our children and our families against the massive onslaught of drugs engulfing our communities. Witnesses who testified before the select committee in 1985 unanimously agreed that drug abuse prevention and education efforts must be an integral part of any solution to the drug problem threatening our Nation.

Congress and the executive branch must do much more to make drug abuse prevention and education a larger component of our overall drug strategy. At the present time, the U.S. Department of Education allocates only \$3 million for drug abuse education out of an \$18 billion budget. This is clearly an inadequate response to the threat drugs pose to our children.

Some in this body might ask why in this era of budgetary restraint should a new program of Federal grants to States be initiated? The answer is both mathematically and logically simple. The costs to Government and American society as a result of our Nation's drug problem is staggering. Our law enforcement, corrections, and health care systems are spending enormous amounts of money in dealing with drug abuse and related problems. The cost to our industrial and business productivity as a result of drug abuse in the workplace is unacceptably high. We can no longer afford to give drug abuse education anything but top priority.

Funds available under my bill will be distributed to States on the basis of school-age population within each State. The Secretary is required to reserve 1 percent of amounts appropriated in any fiscal year for payments to Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

Each State is directed to reserve 20 percent of its grant award for State use. The remaining 80 percent is to be distributed to local education agencies on the basis of school-age population within each local education agency. Funds reserved to the State are to be used for the development and dissemination of drug abuse education curricula and teaching materials for elementary and secondary schools throughout the State, drug abuse education demonstration projects, technical assistance to local education agencies, and State administrative costs. No more than one-quarter of the funds reserved to the State may be used for administrative costs.

Grants that a State makes to local education agencies are to be used for the development and implementation of drug abuse education curricula, drug abuse counseling programs, treatment referral programs, training for teachers and other school personnel, primary prevention and intervention programs, drug education programs for parents and other public drug education programs, and other drug abuse prevention and education programs consistent with the bill's purposes.

To receive grants under the bill, States must apply to the Secretary of Education, and local education agencies must, in turn, apply to the State. The bill establishes certain requirements State and local education agencies must meet to be eligible for grants.

One of the key requirements of the bill is that a State, to be eligible for grants, must require each elementary and secondary school in the State to implement a drug abuse education curriculum covering each grade kindergarten through grade 12. States that do not currently have such a requirement may receive grants if they agree to use their funds to establish such a requirement.

This basic requirement is included in the bill because in State after State where the select committee has held hearings, the need for drug education beginning in the earliest years of a child's schooling and continuing throughout high school has been emphasized repeatedly to the committee. It is not my intention that States should mandate a specific drug education curriculum that each elementary and secondary school must adopt. Rather, the bill provides flexibility for local education agencies to structure a curriculum that best meets their needs. The bill also provides flexibility for schools to use their funds for other programs in addition to establishing a basic K-12 drug education curriculum. The basic prerequisite for a State to participate in this grant program, however, is a commitment to establish a statewide requirement for K-12 drug education curricula in elementary and secondary schools.

The bill requires that Federal funds must be used to supplement, not supplant, State and local funds otherwise available for drug abuse education. It also includes provisions for the participation of children enrolled in private, nonprofit schools.

Finally, the bill requires the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to cooperate in collecting and disseminating information to State and local education agencies on successful drug education curricula and other proven school-based drug abuse prevention and education approaches. The secretaries also are required to cooperate in providing technical assistance to State and local education agencies in selecting and implementing drug abuse education curricula and programs best suited to meet State and local needs. The secretaries are also directed to identify research and development priorities with respect to school-based drug education and prevention.

Education alone is not the answer to drug abuse, just as eradication and enforcement by themselves cannot solve our drug problems. Now, however, is the time to capitalize on the strong consensus that exists throughout our country for a nationwide drug abuse education

effort. The health and well-being of our children and the future of our country depend on our success. I urge the House to support this legislation.

SALUTE TO NELLIE WILSON

HON. JIM MOODY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Mrs. Nellie Wilson. Mrs. Wilson, a labor leader in Wisconsin over the last 40 years, is the principal honoree at the sixth Annual Women of Color recognition Dinner, sponsored by the Black Women's Network in Milwaukee. She truly exemplifies the network's 1986 theme, "Women in Labor; A Labor of Love."

Her ties with the Wisconsin labor movement run deep. She was a charter member of two Wisconsin State AFL-CIO committees, The civil rights committee and the standing committee on women. As an employee of the A.O. Smith Corp. from 1943 to 1969, she established the Smith Steel Worker Union Civil Rights Committee. She was also the first black woman elected to office in the Smith Steel Worker 19086 Union. Since 1963, her involvement with the Milwaukee County Labor Council put her in the forefront of every major union issue.

Mrs. Wilson has achieved a great deal both personally and professionally. She also has made an enormous contribution to the Milwaukee community. In 1971 she became director of the AFL-CIO Human Resources Development Institute. She placed hundreds of people in jobs, until Federal and union funding cuts forced the institute to close in February, 1982. At the A. Phillip Randolph Institute, she led numerous civic projects as well.

I salute this dedicated and caring woman for her contributions to the labor movement and to Milwaukee as a whole. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in saluting Mrs. Wilson on this special occasion. I want you to know how proud of her we are in Wisconsin.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I also would like to congratulate the Black Women's Network. Founded in 1979 to promote the economical well-being of black women, it has taken a leadership role in educational, political, and social issues. The network's dedication and commitment has enhanced the status of women in the black community and, as importantly, greatly enriched our State.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN SOUTH KOREA: TIME TO SPEAK OUT

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, the human rights record of the South Korean Government is steadily deteriorating. On January 29, the Reverend Moon Ik Hwan, the noted poet,

scholar, Biblical translator and human rights leader, was arrested in Seoul. Twenty other leaders of the United Minjung Movement for Democracy and Unification, an umbrella human rights organization, have been detained within the last month. Moon Ik Hwan's sole crime was to give a speech calling for a constitutional amendment providing for direct presidential elections.

Kim Keun Tae, former head of the Youth Federation for Democracy, was arrested last September 7, and is now on trial on charges of undermining national security. There is good reason to believe that Mr. Kim was tortured while awaiting trial. For the first time in its history, the Korean Bar Association has taken the courageous step of suing those who tortured Mr. Kim.

Perhaps most disturbing of all, the Government of the Republic of Korea seems to be engaging in a campaign to intimidate its opponents in the United States. On January 20, two South Korean students, Yang Dong Hwa and Kim Sung Man, were condemned to death on charges of spying for North Korea. They had recently returned home after studying at Western Illinois University, where their sole crime appears to have been maintaining contact with South Korean dissidents. The prosecution and condemnation of these students are part of an attempt to frighten other Korean students in the United States into conformity with the dictates of their Government.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the authorities of the Republic of Korea to mitigate the death sentences passed on these two students and to release the Reverend Moon Ik Hwan, Kim Keun Tae, and more than 700 other political prisoners who remain incarcerated.

The United States has traditionally served as a refuge for people from around the world who incurred the wrath of oppressive governments. We prize the freedom to voice political differences, and guarantee that right to all. Our Government and the American people will not let this country be used as a stalking ground for those who would silence their critics. The long hand of repression must not be allowed to cross these shores.

COLD PEACE: EGYPT AND ISRAEL AT THE BRINK

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 4 years, the relations between Israel and Egypt have been marred by what has become known as the cold peace. Although the two countries have signed an historic peace treaty, and although Israel has withdrawn from the Sinai, there is no vibrancy to the relationship itself. Egypt's Ambassador to Israel was withdrawn in 1982—in protest over the invasion of Lebanon—and remains in Cairo even though Israel left Lebanon nearly a year ago. The promise of the peace treaty for tourism, cultural exchanges, scientific and intellectual and artistic collaboration, and trade languishes from Egyptian indifference and neglect.

Recent events have compounded the rift. President Mubarak has refused to send Israel

a report on the horrible massacre of Israeli vacationers near Eilat last October—a tragedy that many believe could have been limited had the Egyptian authorities permitted the timely delivery of emergency medical care. Second, although the Israeli cabinet has agreed to arbitration over Taba, a disputed tangent of the Sinai, the Egyptian Government has refused to concur in the arbitration process, and refused, as a measure of good faith, to return its Ambassador to Israel as the Taba issue is resolved. Third, President Mubarak has rebuffed attempts by Prime Minister Peres to arrange a summit meeting designed to place the relationship on a firmer footing. The Prime Minister's personal emissary, Ezer Weizman, returned empty-handed after seeing President Mubarak in an attempt to break the ice. Indeed, Prime Minister Peres' tenure may end later this year without his ever meeting the Egyptian leader.

These developments can have potentially devastating consequences. On so many fronts, Israel remains besieged. Israel is a target of recurring terrorist attack—abroad and at home. Syria is acting provocatively on the northern frontier. Jordan is flirting with Syria and is unable or unwilling to begin a dialog with Israel. And now Egypt is apparently backing away from even a semblance of a civil relationship.

The peace treaty with Egypt is in danger of becoming nothing more than a nonaggression pact. And in the Middle East, nonaggression pacts have short half-lives. Israel is dangerously close to drawing the conclusion—to reaching a consensus that spans the political spectrum—that moderation carries a heavy price, not the reward of reciprocity and cooperation.

I discussed these issues personally with President Mubarak in Cairo last August. He listened carefully to my plea that meaningful steps be taken to restore trust and goodwill with Israel. But the intervening months have seen several setbacks that are extremely troubling and dangerous. It is still clearly within President Mubarak's power to initiate the modest measures necessary to bring the cold peace with Israel back from the brink, and to prevent the one shining flame of hope of the past 10 years from being extinguished. At this crucial moment between Egypt and Israel, I again urge President Mubarak to consider how much is at stake for the future, and to help Israel help Egypt repair the damage that has occurred.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, as the Department of Education prepares to implement new rules regulating programs authorized under the Bilingual Education Act, I would like to emphasize the purpose of bilingual education, and the clear intent of Congress when it passed Public Law 98-511 during the 98th Congress.

The purpose of bilingual education is to enable the limited English proficient [LEP] stu-

dent to achieve proficiency in English. Native language instruction is used for the purpose of assuring that, in the meantime, LEP students are able to meet promotion and graduation requirements.

Public Law 98-511 allows for more flexibility in the Federal bilingual effort by allowing a portion of Federal dollars to be spent for alternative instruction approaches. At the same time, it requires the continuation of proven transitional methods of instruction. This law also permits local school districts to design their own programs and to determine the extent to which instruction will be provided in the native language.

Bilingual education is a bipartisan concern. This was demonstrated in the 98th Congress when both Houses of Congress overwhelmingly passed and the President signed Public Law 98-511. LEP students are Federal constituents in the same way as handicapped children, disadvantaged children, and other special-needs groups of children. Improving the quality of education available to the Nation's LEP children is especially important because it has been found that in our educational system too many students who do not speak English as a first language are not reaching their potential. It would be a terrible failure for a student to go through this Nation's school system without learning English. It would be a terrible educational failure and a terrible social failure.

I would like to insert into the RECORD the text of a recent speech made by Representative MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ regarding bilingual education. His statement addresses important issues facing bilingual education and raises some very important questions.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

I am pleased that the organizations hosting this press briefing invited me to share with you some observations about bilingual education policy.

Before doing so, however, I would like to say a word or two about these organizations and the work that they do. NABE, LULAC, MALDEF, and the National Council of La Raza have been working for a long, long time to ensure that language-minority students have an equal opportunity to succeed academically. Their work here in Washington has improved Federal educational policy; and their work in communities across the nation has helped Hispanic, Indian, Asian, and other language-minority students to stay in school and to succeed in school.

While I salute the accomplishments of these organizations and their staff I also share their frustration about the continuing educational neglect of language-minority students. And like them, I am outraged by the conduct of the Nation's highest educational official, Education Secretary Bennett.

Two years before Mr. Bennett came to Washington, the National Commission on Excellence in Education issued the report entitled "A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform." This report warned that "the educational foundations of our society and presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people." The Commission didn't mince words. It wrote:

"If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves. We have even squandered the gains in student achievement made in the wake of the Sputnik challenge. Moreover, we have dismantled essential support systems which helped make those gains possible. We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament."

And while the Commission's report emphasized that the "primary responsibility for financing and governing the schools rests with State and local officials," the report also identified areas of Federal responsibility for education. According to the Commission.

"The Federal Government, in cooperation with States and localities, should help meet the needs of key groups of students such as the gifted and talented, the socioeconomically disadvantaged, minority and language minority students, and the handicapped. In combination these groups include both national resources and the Nation's youth who are most at risk."

And while the Commission's dire warnings have prompted public action in all parts of the country to improve and reform our educational system, we remain a "Nation at Risk." And no group of students remain more at risk than language-minority students, a majority of whom are Hispanic.

Language-minority students have the educational needs of all other children. Some are gifted and talented, others have physical handicapped and learning disabilities. A disproportionate number, in the language of the Excellence Commission, are "socioeconomically disadvantaged," and suffer from the consequences of poverty. They and their parents have encountered subtle discrimination and blatant prejudice.

And while language-minority students have a distinctive educational need—the need to learn a new language, English—they must also master the subjects and skills taught in school if they are to succeed in this society. A child who leaves school without mastering English is unprepared for life in America. A child who leaves school without mastering history, mathematics, science, and the study of government, literature and the arts is likewise unprepared for life in America.

If the nation, to use the words of the Excellence Commission, was guilty of committing "unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament" in 1983, I would suggest that Secretary Bennett is guilty of attempting to lead the Nation into an unconditional educational surrender.

For language-minority students, the Bilingual Education Act represents one of "the essential educational support systems" referred to by the Excellence Commission. And, yet, it is this essential educational support system which Secretary Bennett is trying to dismantle.

Secretary Bennett and other Education Department officials have complained to the press that the organizations represented in this room have misconstrued the Secretary's policy "initiative" on bilingual education. I say they have misconstrued nothing, they have merely exposed the Secretary's record—a record of calculated indifference and callous neglect.

Let's look at the Secretary's record.

First, there's the matter of the Secretary's appointments to the National Advisory and

Coordinating Council on Bilingual Education. Several of the people Secretary Bennett appointed to this national council have publicly attacked the bilingual education program as an "Hispanic" or "Latin Hustle". The Chairman of the Advisory Council accused those of us who support bilingual education of being part of a "conspiracy to keep Spanish-speaking children in linguistic bondage," and he told a group of educators in his home state of Illinois that his objective and that of the Reagan Administration was to "dismantle" the Federal bilingual education program. And the Council's Vice-Chairman has repeatedly called for repeal of the Bilingual Education Act.

Then there's the matter of the Secretary's position on funding for Federal bilingual education programs. Last year, the Education Department asked Congress to level-fund the Bilingual Education Act, despite the fact that the population of limited-English-proficient students is growing more than twice as fast as the general school population. At the same time, the Department asked Congress to reduce Federal aid for Title VII teacher training and retraining and to bar funding for several of the programs authorized by the revised Bilingual Education Act, including Family English Literacy Programs.

You would think that the Reagan Administration which professes concern about American families and that Secretary Bennett who says he wants Americans to learn English would push funding for the Family English Literacy program. After all, this program has only one objective, teaching English to parents who don't know the language. And the law doesn't require any use of the parents' native language in these programs. But no, the Department specifically asked Congress to bar funding for this pro-family, pro-English program!

And then there was Secretary Bennett's highly-publicized September New York City speech in which he charged that Federal bilingual education programs and policies had been a "failure". As evidence to support this charge, the Secretary cited the tragically high school drop-out rates of Hispanic students.

As a lawyer, historian, and educator, Mr. Bennett must have known the falsity of his words. How can bilingual education be blamed for the Hispanic dropout problem when the vast majority of Hispanic students have never received bilingual instruction?

You don't have to take my word for it, just look at the new report of the National Assessment of Educational Progress on language-minority students. According to the National Assessment report, language-minority students are far behind their colleagues from English-speaking homes in both academic test scores and grade placement.

The National Assessment report clearly refutes the Secretary's charge that bilingual education is to blame for this tragic situation. Indeed, according to the report, the vast majority of language-minority students who are limited in their English language proficiency are not receiving bilingual instruction; they are not receiving ESL instruction; they are not even receiving the compensatory services provided under Chapter I.

The Education Department's proposed new regulations for the Bilingual Education Act are in keeping with the Secretary's record. As you have heard this morning, these regulations would weaken Federal bilingual education programs. As a Member of

the House Committee on Education and Labor, I will insist that the Department's final regulations be changed to reflect the letter and spirit of the Bilingual Education Act.

In closing, I would like to go back to the words of the National Commission on Educational Excellence:

"If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves * * *. We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament."

Federal bilingual education programs are an essential support system for Hispanic and other language-minority students. These programs should be strengthened, not weakened; they should be expanded, not cut-back.

Secretary Bennett's record on Federal bilingual education policy is clear; he wants to dismantle the program. Those of us who hold leadership positions in the Hispanic community cannot help but view the Secretary's conduct, to borrow a phrase from the Excellence Commission, as "an act of war"—war upon our children and millions of other American language-minority children. We will not allow this to happen.

THE REAGAN BUDGET

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Reagan budget proposal hit Capitol Hill. Simply put, the President proposes a \$33 billion or 8 percent real increase in defense spending authority, while dozens of domestic programs which help the needy in our society would be frozen, cut back, or eliminated. Supporters and detractors of the Reagan budget have wasted little time in expressing their views; clearly, the budget battle has begun.

I do not intend here to discuss the consequences of the Reagan approach. I do, however, want to call your attention to an article which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post, written by Haynes Johnson, one of the Post's most respected and insightful columnists. Entitled "Tilting the Budget," Johnson argues that the enormous Federal research dollars this administration is pouring into defense, rather than into commercial industry, fundamentally weakens another critical area of American security: the Nation's ability to compete economically in today's world. At a time when our trade deficit for fiscal year 1985 approached \$150 billion, and when many American industries are being forced to shut down, this should be especially troubling to every Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, this article illuminates an important, if overlooked, consequence of the fiscal year 1987 Defense budget. I commend it to my colleagues.

TLTILTING THE BUDGET

(By Haynes Johnson)

In the age of the ancient Greeks, when the world was thought to be flat and the

seas and heavens inhabited by supernatural spirits and monsters, man created heroes. Ever since, in times of tragedy or great national undertaking, leaders have evoked God-like heroic figures in human form as a means of banishing fear and instilling a common purpose.

No leader of our time has more effectively employed the ancient heroic image than Ronald Reagan and at no point with more power and poignancy than after the deaths of America's space-shuttle astronauts.

All of this is understandable and probably necessary. Certainly Reagan's words, no less than Lincoln's, have helped bind the nation's wounds. His actions have made more tolerable the profound sense of national suffering over the loss of those seven smiling, confident, prototypical young Americans who embodied what people everywhere recognized as the best in the national character.

But when Reagan invokes these "newest heroes" as a means of winning political support for a further radically altered rendering of national economic priorities, it's time to separate myth from reality.

The budget that Reagan sends to Congress today calls for dramatic increases in spending for the military and the space program, all at the expense of other national needs.

I'm not about to dust off the spurious argument about "if-we-can-go-to-the-moon-why-can't-we-eliminate-poverty-on-Earth?" I do argue that this budget fundamentally weakens a critical area of American security, the nation's ability to compete economically in today's world.

If approved, his budget will further underscore one of the most significant facts of American life today: that a greater and greater percentage of this nation's research money is directly tied to defense spending. And of that increasing share going to defense, more and more is being spent on specific weapons systems rather than basic research that could spin off into commercial products.

In America today, less than 1 percent of federal research money is directed toward commercial industry. Our Japanese and German competitors allocate more than 12 times that amount.

It's estimated today that 70 percent of all federally funded research flows through military channels. That's one-third of all research and development in the United States. And that does not—repeat, not—include the \$76 billion that will be spent on developing "Star Wars" before the decision on whether to employ that system. If Star Wars is implemented as planned, for instance, it could consume all of the electrical engineers who graduate from California universities over the next 10 years.

So what? one might ask. Didn't the space program produce tangible economic benefits—Teflon, Velcro, advanced computer technology and the rest—that assisted American business as well as the U.S. military? Sure. But the outpouring of basic research funds into the military has had another, and adverse, effect in recent years.

As Regis McKenna, one of the leading entrepreneurs in America's high-technology capital in California's Silicon Valley, put it last week after the shuttle disaster:

"While military spending has increased, our competitiveness in commercial and industrial markets has dramatically declined. Over the past few years, there has been a pronounced shift in our spending patterns toward military-oriented development, specifically, weapons development. Jobs are created for missile development, but no new wealth is created to cycle back into the innovative process . . .

"A weapons system, once completed, sits in a parking lot waiting for a war. It does not improve our standard of living, improve productivity or create opportunities for growth."

In the Sixties, when everything in America from city to campus to national seat of power seemed to be falling apart, one area of national endeavor personified security and success—the space program.

While cities burned, leaders were slain and the young experienced the terrors of Vietnam, American astronauts serenely encircled the globe and then vicariously transported all of us to the moon. Eventually, money poured into the space program created a political backlash. But it never was true that we didn't attempt to strike a balance then between defense and domestic needs. Now that is true. That's not heroic. That's foolhardy.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 6, 1986

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention an event of great importance to many of my constituents, and to any American who values freedom for all the peoples of the world. February 16 marks the 68th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence following World War I.

The collapse of Czarist Russia after the end of World War I led the Lithuanian people to seek political independence. On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian National Council met in Vilnius and declared the restoration of Lithuania's independence. Recognized as a sovereign state by the community of nations, Lithuania became a member of the League of Nations in 1922.

Tragically, the Soviet Union began its occupation of Lithuania on June 15, 1940, and a Soviet administration incorporated Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. on August 3. To this day, Lithuania remains an occupied country within the Soviet Empire.

We Americans can sometimes forget how truly free we are, while millions of people around the world live under the subjugation of tyranny. The people of Lithuania, once a free and autonomous nation, have suffered years of harassment, discrimination, and brutality at the hands of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of the 68th anniversary of the declaration of restored Lithuanian independence, there is no better time to remember the hopes and faith of those living under the domination of the Soviet Union. I am sure that every Member of the House of Representatives joins me in recognizing the people of the Baltic republics and their hopes and dreams for true freedom.