

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SOLIDARITY SUNDAY FOR
SOVIET JEWRY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, once again I am privileged to introduce the congressional resolution of support for Soviet Jewry. Each year, to highlight the plight of those denied their religious and cultural rights under international law, the Coalition to Free Soviet Jews, in New York City, organizes a massive rally at Dag Hammarskjold Plaza opposite the United Nations. Nearby are the Shcharansky Steps, which for years commemorated the daily struggle of Anatoly Shcharansky as he languished in a Soviet prison under the false charge of treason. Yet, on May 11, 1986, hundreds of thousands of concerned citizens will stand in solidarity with Soviet Jewry, and will hear the words of the newly freed Anatoly Shcharansky.

This past year has been a time of both joy and frustration to those of us concerned about the plight of Soviet Jewry. Apparently, the recent summit meeting between President Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, helped to bring about the release of several well-known long-term refuseniks and former Prisoners of Conscience, including Dr. Mark Nashpitz, a Moscow dentist with whom I had been corresponding for almost 15 years, and Ilya Essas, a self-taught Hebrew and religious teacher who became the focal point in Moscow for observant Jews. These two men were in Washington recently, where many Members of Congress had the opportunity to meet with them.

Yet, from a high point of over 51,000 in 1979, we saw emigration plummet in the early 1980's. And in 1985, only 1,140 Jewish men, women, and children were allowed to participate in the reunification process as provided for by the Helsinki Final Act.

During the past year, we have also seen other innocent people arrested, harassed, and interrogated for no other reason than they had expressed their desire to emigrate to Israel. Yakov Berenshtein's sight is almost completely gone as a result of having been beaten by criminals in his prison, POC Yuli Edelshtein lies in a hospital, the victim of a badly shattered broken leg and ruptured urethra associated with a suspicious accident while on a construction project at his labor camp.

These innocent people continue to suffer, as do all those who make the decision to apply to emigrate. There are almost 400,000 individuals who are at some point in the application process. Once their decision to emigrate is made, loss of employment is almost certain to follow. Once unemployed, such an individual risks arrest on the charge of parasit-

ism. If the applicant is younger, he most certainly risks being drafted into the Soviet Army, which automatically carries with it the knowledge of state secrets for at least 5 years, certain grounds for emigration refusal. There are so many obstacles ahead of one who decides to emigrate, and so much official discrimination and persecution, that those who pursue their dream are to be admired. They suffer for their principles, but they will not be bowed.

Mr. Speaker, Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry is our annual opportunity in the House of Representatives to make known our commitment to human rights. When Anatoly and Avital Shcharansky ascend the platform on Solidarity Sunday, the free world will see for itself a shining example of the triumph of the human spirit in the face of adversity. Yet we cannot forget the hundreds of thousands who are left behind the Iron Curtain. It is for them that we must continue to speak out, until all those who desire to practice their religious and cultural heritage freely are allowed to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I request that at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of this resolution be printed, and I invite our colleagues to cosponsor this important measure. I anticipate floor action in the very near future, and will be conducting a special order in the week prior to Solidarity Sunday.

H. RES. 420

Whereas on May 11, 1986, the constituent agencies of the Coalition to Free Soviet Jews will convene the fifteenth annual "Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry" in reaffirmation of the American People's resolve to secure freedom for Soviet Jews and beleaguered persons everywhere;

Whereas Americans of all faiths will join in myriad activities on that day in public expression of solidarity with the long suffering Jewish community in the Soviet Union;

Whereas the right to emigrate freely and to be reunited with one's family abroad is denied Jews and many others in the Soviet Union;

Whereas the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations, and the Helsinki Final Act explicitly assert guarantees of those rights;

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union has nevertheless continued to restrict emigration, particularly in the last few months, when the number of Jews allowed to emigrate has declined to extremely low levels;

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting its Jewish citizens and denying them even those few rights and privileges accorded other recognized religions in the Soviet Union;

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union discriminates against Jewish cultural activities by banning and suspending Hebrew and Jewish cultural classes, by arresting teachers of Hebrew, and by harassing those Soviet Jews who seek only to practice their religion;

Whereas a virulent anti-Semitic campaign continues unabated in the Soviet Union and Soviet Jews are increasingly deprived of occupational and educational opportunities;

Whereas thousands of innocent Jews and other persons, having applied to leave the Soviet Union, have been subjected to immediate induction into the armed forces, improper incarceration in mental institutions, expulsion from school, and constant surveillance and harassment;

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union will not succeed in isolating Soviet Jews from their friends in the free world so long as those who cherish liberty continue to speak on behalf of beleaguered people everywhere;

Whereas "Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry" shall provide vigorous expression of American determination to secure freedom for Soviet Jewish prisoners of conscience incarcerated solely for their desire to emigrate; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union refuses to permit the free exercise of religious beliefs and cultural expression and also refuses to remove all obstacles to the free emigration of its Jewish citizens and others who wish to leave and live in other countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby expresses its full support for "Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry", to be held on May 11, 1986, and encourages Americans to participate in the activities of that day.

TRADE LAW IMPROVEMENT ACT
OF 1986

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. ECKART of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today, I along with my distinguished colleague and congressional neighbor JIM TRAFICANT, am introducing the Trade Law Improvement Act of 1986. Both Representative TRAFICANT and myself have worked hard to bring jobs back to northeast Ohio by promoting our local businesses and industries. This bill takes urgently needed steps to save both local and national industries from the invasion of unfairly produced imports which are threatening our economy and endangering jobs in America and in northeast Ohio.

Over the course of the past 5 years, this Nation has suffered a steady erosion of its ability to compete in the international marketplace. This problem has rapidly approached epidemic proportions. Last year, the United States imported \$148 billion more in goods than we exported, causing the largest trade deficit in our Nation's history and turning us into a debtor nation. This staggering figure represents a nearly fivefold increase over the 1980 trade deficit of just \$30 billion.

● 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.

The unavoidable bottom line of this crisis is lost jobs for Ohioans. Over 140,000 Ohioans in auto-related industries have lost jobs due to the import invasion, more than 20,000 people lost their steel-related jobs, and in northeast Ohio alone, tens of thousands of jobs have fallen prey to the growing trade imbalance. In areas like Ashtabula, OH, where unemployment still hovers above 15 percent, and Trumbull County, OH, with an unemployment rate over 12 percent, this comes as no surprise. We are not strangers to the economic devastation and personal ruin brought about by the unfair trade practices which this administration has allowed to exist and proliferate. The administration continues to perilously cling to its weak adherence to free trade while other nations subsidize their industries and erect barriers against American products at their borders.

What has become most disturbing and in need of immediate remedy is the discovery that our Government's current trade laws not only allow this uneven international playing field to exist, they are helping to tip it further from our advantage. The specific problems encountered by RMI Corp., based in Niles, OH, with plants in Ashtabula County and elsewhere, only serve to illustrate the glaring inequities in our trade law which are similarly hurting other industries nationwide. The 1983 contract award for the purchase of titanium sponge by the General Services Administration [GSA] handed 80 percent of the contract to foreign producers at dumped prices. This action blatantly ignored buy-American requirements, favored goods produced unfairly in foreign countries, and threatened our Nation's national security interests. Titanium sponge is a critical element in the manufacture of crucial defense components. It is, therefore, unconscionable that our own trade practices would allow for the development and advancement of foreign manufacturers of this strategic product to the detriment and potential destruction of domestic producers.

This bill contains several key provisions to help level the playing field and erode the barriers to fair and free trade:

It closes existing loopholes in the antidumping laws for certain purchases by the Federal Government to ensure that imports are priced at fair value and domestic producers can compete evenly and openly.

It requires that companies responding to Commerce Department inquiries in antidumping and countervailing duties certify their responses as accurate.

It gives producers injured by customs fraud a private cause of action against the persons involved in the fraud. Widespread customs fraud has recently been discovered in connection with imports of steel and textile products—industries especially hard hit by unfair trade practices.

It provides a workable private cause of action for damages caused by dumping. Existing provisions are revised by the bill to make a more meaningful remedy for damages caused by dumping, as well as to provide a deterrent to future dumping.

Trade policy and the U.S. trade deficit are among the biggest issues facing Congress this year. This bill offers relief to specific aspects of what is indeed a much larger ailment.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

It is vitally important that any—and all—efforts be made to shape a workable and practical trade policy for America. This proposal which Representative TRAFICANT and I are introducing today takes us one step closer toward achieving that goal.

THE TRADE LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to be joining my colleague, Representative DENNIS ECKART, in introducing the Trade Law Enforcement Act of 1986.

In the fall of 1985, representatives of the RMI Co. of my congressional district brought to my attention a disturbing case of how our own U.S. trade and tariff laws were injuring American industry, making it more difficult and in some circumstances impossible to compete in the international marketplace. RMI's particular case of discovering the U.S. purchase of illegally dumped titanium from foreign manufacturers instead of from an adequate domestic industry is literally just the tip of the iceberg in the question of fair trade.

The legislation we are introducing today, the Trade Law Enforcement Act of 1986 addresses the concerns of domestic industries in order to bring a fairer trade policy forward. Specifically, the closing of existing loopholes in the antidumping laws for certain purchases by the Federal Government will insure the opportunity of competition to domestic producers. Likewise, it provides for a private cause of action for damages sustained by "dumping," a situation occurring when a foreign company sells large quantities of a resource or product in U.S. markets at prices below market value. Current U.S. trade law makes this practice illegal and requires a stiff duty be imposed on illegally dumped goods. However, goods purchased by the Federal Government for the national defense stockpile are exempt from this action.

This bill will have a significant impact on the trade policy of this Nation—a policy that desperately needs to be reformed in order to save American jobs and America's industry. Faced with the largest trade deficit in this Nation's history the threat of more U.S. plants closing; and the despair of our unemployed Americans, action must be taken immediately. The Trade Law Enforcement Act as introduced by Mr. ECKART and myself will provide some relief to these problems and reflect a move toward a trade policy that is both fair and just in responding to the pressing needs of our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to join us in sponsoring this important trade legislation.

THE MAJORITY WHIP ON CONTRA AID

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article by THOMAS S. FOLEY, majority whip of the House. His views on the Contra aid question deserve careful consideration before this body votes on this issue again. This article appeared in the Washington Post April 15, 1986, and the text follows:

CONTRA AID: AN ACT OF WAR

(By Thomas S. Foley)

Today the House will revisit the contra aid debate. Shortly before the last vote in the House the administration abandoned its erstwhile strategy of all or nothing on the contra issue. Its new strategy has two facets. On the one hand, it has begun to offer paper compromises. On the other, it has tried to develop some public relations event equivalent to last year's famous trip to Moscow by Nicaraguan leader Daniel Ortega.

Despite strenuous effort, the administration has been unable to rally convincing majorities of the public or Congress to its position. The week following the last House vote on contra aid, the Senate voted by a narrow margin to approve a "compromise" plan which many regard as little more than a cosmetic makeover of the president's original proposal. Key features of that plan were that "only" one quarter of the \$100 million, 18-month financing would be available in the first 90 days, only "defensive" weapons could be bought and the president could not release the remaining funds until an additional 15 days had expired, 15 days in which Congress could veto the decision to release the remaining funds and the president could veto any such congressional action. A thinner compromise could hardly be imagined and, indeed, only a thin majority of the Senate supported the president where he had hoped for an overwhelming vote.

But before the Senate vote, the administration believed the public relations coup it has so fervently desired had fallen into its hands, a highly trumpeted "invasion" of Honduras by Nicaraguan troops in pursuit of the contras. Originally the administration had difficulty in persuading the Hondurans that they should acknowledge the event at all. Their reluctance was understandable in light of the fact that the Nicaraguan action may have been larger than normal but nevertheless closely resembled hundreds of similar reported incidents over the last five years. For Honduras to raise a public outcry would, in its view, publicly acknowledge that the contras were being allowed to stay in Honduras.

Congressional leaders of both parties said the "invasion" had had little or not effect on the Senate vote. In the face of subsequent intelligence and press reports, which substantially reduced the scale of the incident, the administration's public relations machine has had no choice but to seek a new approach.

Now, before the second vote in the House, the administration has launched a new offensive on the Contadora front. The president says the Nicaraguans have "torpedoed" the Contadora peace process with their

latest rejection of a proposed document that called on them to reduce their armed forces without their first being a cut-off in aid to the contras. Diplomatic damage experts have noted that the disappointment of the Contadora negotiators with the latest action by the Nicaraguan representatives was obvious. But the communique issued by the Contadora nations after the recent breakup contemplates getting back to work as soon as possible. It does not resemble an obituary. Nevertheless the administration has seized on the latest development and is now trying to exaggerate its consequence in yet another attempt to weaken opposition to its proposal, a proposal which would wring from both houses a reluctant declaration of a proxy war in Nicaragua.

The Contadora negotiators continually point to the fact that the contras merely frustrate the Contadora process. The Central American nations know what they want from negotiations: regional security. But the administration wants the Sandinistas to negotiate cession of power, a concession it also says it never expects them to give without military defeat by the contras. Yet the continuation of the contra war will reduce, not enhance the security of Nicaragua's neighbors. The administration appears confused about its own goals and in any case is acting at cross purpose to Contadora, as the Latin Americans view it.

We should make no mistake. This is not a one-time vote for \$100 million. We are on the eve of a historic decision. This vote is merely a down payment on hundreds of millions, perhaps billions to come over many years in support of the contras (indeed we have already spent \$1 billion on military preparations in Central America). Much more important than the money, however, is the unprecedented and damaging decision we are about to make to support and finance the proxy invasion of a foreign country with which, for whatever purpose, we maintain diplomatic relations. This course of action sweeps aside the president's own stated concern, only a year ago, that to pursue such a course would be an act of war. In any case, our action would be totally unilateral with no support from our allies anywhere on the globe.

We desperately need a better strategy regarding Nicaragua and, despite the recent setback, Contadora is that strategy.

The Contadora process is far from dead. On the contrary, it has been the administration's own refusal to promote Contadora that has deprived the process of its moral authority to pressure the Nicaraguans. We have been unable to exploit the Nicaraguans' recent action because the other Latin American participants do not view us as supporting Contadora. Reports say that several Central American foreign ministers have come away with the impression that their recent visits from U.S. envoys were actually attempts to undermine Contadora.

If we were wholeheartedly to support the Contadora process, we would vastly improve its possibilities for guaranteeing regional security, U.S. security and liberalization of the Nicaraguans' internal policies. The current policy of aid to the contras, accompanied by lip service support of Contadora, allows the Sandinistas plausibly to claim that their internal repressive policies, their military build-up, their reliance on thousands of Cuban advisers, their close ties to Moscow and their reluctance to negotiate are all the result of their need to repel the American-sponsored contra invasion.

The Contadora process offers us many opportunities to pressure Nicaragua produc-

tively that we do not now have. We would have the support of the rest of Central America to pressure Nicaragua to reduce its armed forces, expel the Cubans, honor its borders and cease support for insurgencies in other countries. We do not now have the support of those countries. We would have the support of the entire Western world when we pressured the Sandinistas to cease their lockdown of Nicaraguan society and honor basic human rights principles there. We do not have such support for our policy of backing the contras.

Some suggest that only the contras can put productive pressure on the Sandinistas, but we must remember that Nicaragua has a weak economy, totally dependent on world trade. Western opinion, if it is united, will mean a great deal to them, and they can ill afford to continue to disillusion Western democracies with their repressive internal policies.

Some Contadora ministers have confided that the contras are the best thing to happen to the Sandinistas in Nicaragua. The story goes that the Sandinistas can survive years of war with ease, but six months of peace would be a terrible threat because of the natural political pressures that would develop within Nicaragua.

If Contadora were ultimately to succeed, and with the enthusiastic backing of the United States, the pressure on Nicaragua to cooperate would be intense, and we would have the moral authority and international support to militarily back up the treaty if that ever became necessary.

What are the risks of Contadora? We need not fear the military loss of Central America while talks continue. Congress will support any action to repel Nicaraguan aggression against its neighbors, or to prevent the introduction of advanced weaponry or to prevent the use of Nicaragua as a base for Soviet and Cuban main forces. Our steady policy of strong support for the other democracies in the region has lessened the Nicaraguans' opportunities for subversion, and we should continue that policy with determination. This is the approach that all the Central American countries we are trying to help urge upon us.

In contrast to Contadora, what risks does the continued policy of support for the contras present? What will we do if, after hundreds of millions of dollars, years of support, training and equipment and an incalculable investment of American political and diplomatic currency, the contras eventually face defeat? What if they face decimation or capture? Will we never send our own forces to help them no matter how desperate their situation? Or will we leave them to their fate in a giant replay of the Bay of Pigs? Will we then be negotiating to save the contras rather than to reform Nicaragua?

Perhaps I view the contras' prospects too pessimistically, although the overwhelming weight of American intelligence and military opinion, some of it on the public record, agrees that the contras have no chance of military victory. A bloody stalemate is their best hope, and even this analysis assumes a static situation without escalation on the other side.

I accept President Reagan's assurance that he has no present intention to send American troops to Nicaragua. But the president's present intentions are not what will determine the outcome. We have all witnessed this inexorable process before. As our commitment increases, our options dwindle, and the day when we are out of options grows nearer.

I have trouble understanding the administration's strategy. On the one hand they say that the contras really don't have to win. They need only stalemate the sandinistas to force them to the bargaining table to negotiate internal reforms in Nicaragua. But administration officials also almost invariably say that no Marxist-Leninist regime will ever voluntarily relinquish power. They often publicly use that as reason why direct U.S.-Nicaragua talks will not succeed. Stalemate will not be good enough. The contras must win or the Sandinistas will simply keep fighting with all the resources they can command or that the Soviets and Cubans can provide. If the contras must win, we must decide now what we are willing to do to ensure their victory, and if we are not prepared to use American forces we must be prepared to accept the possible defeat of our proxy army and the resultant embarrassment to ourselves.

In short, the contra option is a prescription for an unprecedented U.S. proxy invasion of a country with which we are not at war, a proxy invasion with almost no chance of military victory without American participation and no chance of productive results short of victory. Compared with the sometimes difficult course of negotiations, military action seems strong and decisive, but it is fraught with terrible risks. It leaves us with the probable choice of having to use our own forces or accept the defeat of the army we have armed and suborned. Compared with this, Contadora remains the compelling choice.

NEW HORIZONS FOR AMERICAN YOUTH

HON. JERRY HUCKABY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Speaker, our youth of today, as our leaders of tomorrow, will face some stiff challenges in the years ahead. They may very well face a world and a lifestyle unlike what we have today.

For that reason, I am always impressed when I come across the accomplishment of a young person that shows strength of purpose and a realization of what lies ahead.

Mark Oliver of Bastrop, LA, one of my constituents, is such a young man. He was the Louisiana winner in the VFW Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program, a program which has challenged our youth to think responsibly for 38 years.

I commend for your attention the script written by Mark Oliver. I think you will be impressed with him as I was.

NEW HORIZONS FOR AMERICA'S YOUTH

(By Mark Oliver)

A few days ago, as I was sitting quietly, thinking on this topic, how I could tell you exactly the things I wanted to tell you about it, an idea came to me, so I got in my car and I drove out to a nearby field.

The field was large and wide, and there were no trees as far as the eye could see. So as I stood there, feet planted firmly in the wet grass, looking toward a beautiful sunset, I was able to see the most perfectly clear horizon that I've ever seen. But it was then that all these things on which I had been

thinking came together, and they made sense.

That horizon out there is like a goal, a destination, it's the future. I felt as if I would walk across that field, I would soon be there standing on the horizon I saw in the distance.

But the truth is with every step I would have made in that direction I would have created a new horizon for myself. Oh, if I had kept on, I would have eventually have gotten to the spot where I saw the first line, but from there I would see a new horizon, a new goal, a new destination, and a new future.

For you see, there really is no such thing as a horizon. The sky really doesn't meet the earth. It only appears to. But unless we, as America's youth have something to look toward, a horizon to walk toward, our feet will remain firmly planted in the wet grass, and we will go nowhere.

Just as I had to step out of my nice dry home, and go and stand in that wet field, to see that physical horizon; we as America's youth are going to have to step out to see our horizon's. We have to picture them. You can't begin your journey to the future on the horizon until you know where it is, until you've caught a vision of it.

But now understand this; the field where I stood was a rare sort. I haven't seen very many fields that are that broad and that bare, and thus with a horizon that clear. Oh, there is one place you can always see a perfect horizon: and that's standing on the sea, and looking out over the seemingly calm waters, but those are the hardest and most dangerous of all horizons to reach.

This occurred to me as I was returning home that evening and had looked out to see behind a small hill covered with trees, the beautiful colors of the sunset; red, orange, and purple radiating in the sky.

You see, most of our horizons are much harder to see. Sometimes we have to start by just following the signs. Now I knew there was a horizon over that hill, and if there wasn't, and all I found was another hill, well, as long as I could see the light I'd know that the horizon was there, just over that hill or perhaps the next. A new horizon for an American youth.

Oh, thank God I'm an American youth. I took a picture of that perfect and clear horizon. And when I returned home I sat down with that picture. I reached into my desk and took out a roll of dark tape, and with the tape I covered the horizon. In the picture now I could see a glow rising above the dark band that was like a wall between me and it. If that was my horizon on the other side of that wall, it didn't look like I would ever be able to reach it. Just like many young men and women in other nations around the world have set their eyes to a goal, a destination, or a future; but can't get over the wall that's been built in front of them. Oh, thank God I'm an American youth, and if any of you listening to me have ever fought for my freedom, I thank you, because of you I can reach for my horizons.

Basically, what I'm trying to say to you and the youth of America is that first of all we, the future leaders and protectors of our nation must get out and look for new horizons, and realize that as we travel toward them they change, and become anew every day. And it's very rare one sees a destination clearly and unobstructed, and if one does there is more often than not unforeseen dangers lying ahead. In most cases our horizon is over a hill or behind some trees, but

it's there all the same. And as long as we catch a vision of it and where we're going, we can get there; and when we do . . . we'll find a new horizon, a new goal, a new destination, and a new future.

MONEY LAUNDERING

HON. J.J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means has investigated problems associated with money laundering. The subcommittee held a hearing, last year, focusing specifically on the responsibilities of the Internal Revenue Service in this area. In addition, several members of the subcommittee toured the IRS training facilities at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, GA, to learn more about the IRS enforcement in this area.

Our subcommittee's investigation resulted in two important findings. We found that because of loopholes in the current law, the Government has been unable to successfully prosecute the person who puts together schemes that allow illegal source cash to be laundered. We also found that problems existed in the ability of IRS to seize illegal source income when a criminal, such as the drug dealer, launders his illegal source income through domestic financial institutions.

We as a nation, are losing our battle against the flow of illegal drugs. Money laundering is an intricate part of the drug trafficking process. Therefore, any efforts to try to stop the drug traffic must stop the money laundering associated with it. Also, I should point out that businesses and individuals in the United States are laundering income, from both illegal and legal activities. This problem is a growing one. As a result, I am concerned about the impact of money laundering operations on the collection of U.S. Federal income taxes.

As members are aware, the enforcement of the Bank Secrecy Act reporting requirements is the responsibility of the Secretary of the Treasury, who has delegated his authority to the IRS. Under current law, domestic financial institutions must report cash transactions of \$10,000 or more to the Internal Revenue Service. In a typical scheme, money launderers often break up large sums of money, into transactions of less than \$10,000, to avoid having the financial institutions report the cash.

I asked the administration to work with me in drafting legislation that will close loopholes in the law that have not allowed the government to successfully prosecute money launderers and will give the IRS adequate seizure and forfeiture authority. The bill I am introducing today, "The Money Laundering Prevention Act of 1986," represents the results of this joint effort. This bill (H.R. 4523) was drafted by the administration with close consultation with my staff. The bill closes the loopholes in current law which allow the money launderer to escape conviction and provides the IRS with seizure and forfeiture authority when

there are violations of Bank Secrecy Act reporting requirements.

The bill, as drafted, is primarily under the jurisdiction of the House Banking, Financing and Urban Affairs Committee. I will share the proposal, with its distinguished chairman, Mr. ST. GERMAIN and members of that committee. I am confident that this committee will proceed to carefully evaluate this legislation.

Before I outline my bill, I think one thing should be made clear. The administration has developed its own comprehensive approach to address the entire area of money laundering. Their proposals are being actively worked on in the House and Senate Judiciary Committees. I encourage all efforts in this area.

My bill, which has administration support, is designed to complement other money laundering proposals. My bill, even if it is enacted on its own, will be a useful addition to current law in combating money laundering activities.

Let me briefly outline this legislation. H.R. 4573 does the following:

Section 1 of my bill expressly subjects persons to criminal and civil liability where they cause or attempt to cause an institution to fail to file a required report or an incorrect report. This will be helpful in not only getting the smurf who does the actual transaction, but also those who plan the activity. This would also allow Treasury and IRS to act before the 15 days the financial institution has to formally file a CTR report.

Also, the bill creates an offense of structuring or assisting in structuring a transaction to evade the reporting requirements. For example, this provision would prohibit the structuring of a transaction to circumvent the reporting requirements by involving two or more financial institutions.

Section 2 of my bill allows forfeiture and seizure authority to be used by the IRS to seize laundered cash and property directly traceable to the laundered cash. Thus, both the IRS and the Customs Service will be able to use seizure and forfeiture authority more effectively to get the money or the property before it disappears.

However, there are protections in my bill for innocent third parties. If a person proves he was a good faith bona fide purchaser or could prove that it was not a willful violation, he would not be subject to forfeiture.

Section 3 of my legislation provides a new civil penalty for violations of the Bank Secrecy Act. The amount of the penalty would be the difference between the amount forfeited under section 2 and the total amount of the laundering transaction. Again, the standard for this new civil penalty would be a willful violation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe the need for this legislation is obvious. Federal courts have taken the position that there is inadequate legislative authority to prosecute people who are actively engaged in money laundering operations. At a minimum, this loophole should be closed forever. Under my bill, it would be. Also, for the first time, this legislation will allow the Internal Revenue Service to seize and forfeit cash and property that is involved in a violation of the Bank Secrecy Act. As members may know, laundered money cannot be seized because there is difficulty in proving that there is a nexus be-

tween the laundered money and a criminal activity. In most cases, the case involves illegal drugs. My bill also represents a careful effort to strengthen IRS enforcement authority against money laundering, while at the same time, protects third parties.

H.R. 4573

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Bank Secrecy Act (31 U.S.C. 5311 et seq.) is amended as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 5313 of Title 31 of the United States Code is amended by adding to the end of subsection (a) a sentence which reads as follows:

No person shall cause or attempt to cause a domestic financial institution to fail to file a report required by this subsection, shall cause or attempt to cause a domestic financial institution to file a report required by this subsection that contains a material omission or misstatement of fact, or shall structure or assist in structuring a transaction for the purpose of evading the reporting requirements of this subsection.

Sec. 2. Section 5317 of Title 31 of the United States Code is amended by:

a. Revising the first sentence of section 5317(c) of Title 31 of the United States Code to read as follows:

(c) A monetary instrument being transported, or which has been transported, or any interest in any property, including any deposit in a financial institution, traceable to such instrument, may be seized and forfeited to the United States Government when a report on the instrument under section 5316 of this title has not been filed or contains a material omission or misstatement.

b. Adding a new subsection (d) which reads as follows:

(d) United States coin or currency (or other such monetary instrument as the Secretary may prescribe) or any interest in other property, including any deposit in a financial institution, traceable to such coin or currency involved in a transaction or attempted transaction in violation of section 5313(a) of this chapter may be seized and forfeited to the United States Government under the procedures of subchapter C of Chapter 75 of Title 26 of the United States Code whenever a person (excluding a domestic financial institution examined by a federal bank supervisory agency or a financial institution regulated by the Securities and Exchange Commission liable under subsection 5321 (a) of this chapter) violates section 5313(a) of this chapter. No property or interest in property shall be forfeited under this subsection if it can be established that the owner is a bona fide purchaser for value who took without notice of the violation or if the violation or attempted violation of section 5313(a) was not willful.

Sec. 3. Section 5321 of Title 31 of the United States Code is amended by:

a. Adding to subsection (a) a new paragraph (4) to read as follows:

(a)(4) The Secretary may impose a civil penalty on a person or persons (excluding a domestic financial institution examined by a federal bank supervisory agency or a financial institution regulated by the Securities and Exchange Commission) willfully violating section 5313(a) of this chapter. A civil penalty under this paragraph may not be more than the amount of the United States coins and currency (or other monetary instruments the Secretary may prescribe) for which a report was required under section

5313(a) of this chapter. A civil penalty under this paragraph is reduced by an amount forfeited under section 5317(d) of this title.

b. Deleting "or (2)" from subsection (b) and adding in lieu thereof ", (2) or (4)".

c. Deleting "5317(b)" in subsection (c) and adding in lieu thereof "5317(c) or (d)" and by deleting "subsection (a)(2) of".

Sec. 4. Section 7302 of Title 26 of the United States Code is amended by deleting "such property" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "property under this section and under the forfeiture provisions of Title 31 of the United States Code enforced or administered by the Internal Revenue Service" and by adding "or under the provisions of Title 31 of the United States Code enforced or administered by the Internal Revenue Service" after "section" in the fourth sentence.

Sec. 5. Section 7321 of Title 26 of the United States Code is amended by adding "or under any provision of Title 31 of the United States Code enforced or administered by the Internal Revenue Service" immediately following "title".

Sec. 6. Section 7327 of title 26 of the United States Code is amended by inserting immediately following "internal revenue laws", the following: "or under provisions enforced or administered by the Internal Revenue Service under Title 31 of the United States Code, to the extent not inconsistent with the provisions of Title 31."

Sec. 7. Section 7608(b) of Title 26 of the United States Code is amended by adding "or any provision of Title 31 of the United States Code enforced or administered by the Internal Revenue Service" immediately following "responsible" in paragraph (1) and immediately following "the internal revenue laws" in paragraph (2)(C).

"BACKDOOR BROKERING"
IMPORT POLICIES

HON. RON MARLENEE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, our cattlemen have been suffering from years of economic stress and it is time that we send a signal to the Canadians that their "backdoor brokering" import policies are placing the results of an unfair trade practice right at the front door of the United States producer.

A major concern of America's cattle industry is Canada's import policy, particularly subsidized imports from the European Community. This can cause a disproportionate amount of imports into the United States from Canada. The extra imports into Canada from the EC displaces Canadian beef into the United States. We are essentially a safety valve for anything Canada cannot consume.

Subsidized beef imports from the European Economic Community to Canada may be displacing the Canadian market to such an extent that Canadian beef products are being imported in the United States in increased quantities. This substitution or "backdoor brokering" needs immediate attention.

For example, in 1983, Canada imported around 13 to 14 million pounds from the EC. In 1984, this rose to almost 50 million pounds. The Canadian cattlemen have fought this practice.

The irony of this situation is that the Canadian livestock producers commissioned Canada's equivalent of our International Trade Commission [ITC] to study whether EC beef being imported into Canada is subsidized. The preliminary findings by the Canadian tribunal have determined the EC beef is subsidized.

Today I am introducing legislation to stop "backdoor brokering" from Canada. The legislation places a moratorium on Canadian beef products. This moratorium includes both live cattle and fresh, chilled, or frozen beef.

The moratorium remains in place while the ITC undertakes and completes within 6 months a study under section 201 of the Trade Act of 1974 to determine if beef products are being imported from Canada in such increased quantities as to be a substantial cause of serious injury to America's industry producing live cattle and fresh, chilled, or frozen beef.

Upon completion of the study, if the ITC does not find serious injury to the livestock industry, the moratorium will be lifted. If, however, serious injury is found, the moratorium will remain in effect. The ITC will periodically update the study—not less than twice each year. If, as a result of any study update, the ITC finds that the injury is no longer serious, the moratorium will be lifted.

The EC's export subsidies have brought some cheap beef into Canada, which has displaced local production. Ultimately, the surplus ends up in the United States.

Unless Canada does something about importing subsidized EC beef, we will bear the brunt of it in the long run.

SHEET-METAL JUSTICE

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an important editorial which appeared in the Sacramento Bee on Sunday, March 2, 1986.

The editorial, entitled "Sheet-Metal Justice," examines attempts by the Justice Department to reverse many of the civil rights gains made over the last 30 years. The Justice Department has sought to amend Executive Order 11246 and has argued against affirmative action in the courts.

I commend this article to all of my colleagues.

SHEET-METAL JUSTICE

Until it was ordered to integrate by a court in 1964, Local 28 of the Sheet Metal Workers union was lily-white. The New York union had a clause barring non-whites from membership until 1946, but even after that was struck down nothing changed in the racial composition of the union's membership.

In 1966, the union was forced to give a court-ordered aptitude test but sought to void the results because blacks had scored too high. When the union administered the test again the following year, it paid for tutors for white friends and relatives of union members.

The union refused to organize non-union shops that had no white employees, would

only accept as transfers members of other unions who were white and, in the years between 1968 and 1972, after a court ordered the union to give preference to minorities in admitting new members, the union issued only temporary work permits. Of the more than 400 such permits, only one went to a non-white. In 1971, it refused to comply with a plan by the mayor of New York to admit one minority trainee for every four members employed.

What's the proper remedy for such a record of discrimination?

For the U.S. Justice Department in 1971, the answer was clear. It sued the union and, in 1975, won a federal court order requiring the union to strive for a minority membership of at least 29 percent, a figure that more or less reflected the racial composition of the community. The 29 percent goal was upheld by an appellate court, which ruled that it did not constitute a quota, only a target to remedy a clear history of discrimination.

In 1981, having raised minority membership to only 7 percent, the union was held in contempt. It appealed the decision, lost in the circuit court, and is now before the Supreme Court, where the Justice Department, having reversed two generations of federal civil rights policy, is arguing the union's side. The Civil Rights Act, the Justice Department claims, was never meant to force employers to hire by race. Counting by race is racism, says Attorney General Ed Meese.

In a case like this, what should be counted? Of course it would be better if all judgments—on the job, like everywhere else—were made without reference to race. But how, without guidelines, can a union or company with such a record be trusted to do the "color-blind" hiring that the administration proposes as an alternative? If enforcement depends on each applicant for union membership who is a victim of discrimination hiring a lawyer, collecting the required evidence, itself often impossible to get, and waiting for a case to move through two or three levels of courts, there will be no remedy for discrimination of any sort, certainly not within any reasonable time.

The issues and problems arising from affirmative action policies are rarely easy, but the country has made progress with them. For the courts to begin reversing them now would not only undercut that progress, but also make a mockery of the ideals and objectives that the nation, and not least the federal government, have honorably been pursuing for more than 30 years.

GLENDALE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE RECOGNITION LUNCHEON: WOMAN OF THE YEAR—MARLENE HAMILTON, MAN OF THE YEAR—RICHARD JUTRAS, ORGANIZATION OF THE YEAR—GLENDALE FEDERAL SAVINGS & LOAN, GOLDEN SERVICE AWARD—FLOYD C. "BABE" HERMAN

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on April 23 the Glendale Chamber of Commerce will host

its annual special recognition luncheon at which three individuals and one organization will receive deserved and special recognition.

The chamber will honor Marlene Hamilton as Woman of the Year, Richard Jutras as Man of the Year, baseball great Babe Herman as the recipient of the Golden Service Award and Glendale Federal Savings & Loan as the Organization of the Year.

Marlene Hamilton has been a community mainstay for years. Her record of involvement is extensive and long standing. She has served the chamber, the Days of Verdugo, the Tournament of Roses Float Committee, the United Way, the Building Industry Association, the Verdugo Hills Mental Health Association, the YMCA, and the city of Glendale with charm and efficiency. Each entity has benefited from Ms. Hamilton's energy and dedication.

Richard Jutras is an active and involved member of the chamber of commerce and the Kiwanis Club. He served on the Glendale Planning Commission for 6 years, the last as its chairman. He has served on the board of directors of the Salvation Army and Los Conquistadors of the Glendale YMCA. Mr. Jutras' record of civic involvement and success is one worthy of the special tribute.

The Golden Service Award is presented to an individual who has demonstrated a special brand of community devotion for a long period of time. Few Glendalians are more worthy of this honor than Babe Herman. While we all know that Babe has skillfully served the legend and lore of baseball with a great 14-year major league career, his numerous contributions to the city of Glendale are not as well chronicled but just as appreciated by his many friends and fellow residents. Babe Herman is one of those individuals a community delights in calling one of her own.

The success of Glendale Federal Saving & Loan as a financial institution and community benefactor is virtually without equal. It is one of the largest federally insured savings institutions in the Nation and it is the principal underwriter of much-lauded Glendale Symphony Orchestra. It has recently become a sponsor of the LPGA's tournament at Oakmont Country Club, a growing community tradition.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Glendale Chamber of Commerce paying special tribute to Marlene Hamilton, Richard Jutras, Babe Herman and Glendale Federal. I am also grateful to each of the honorees for their contributions to the city and its residents. We all have benefited because of their charitable ethic.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 78, I inadvertently pressed the aye button on the electronic voting device when I had intended to vote no and did not realize my mistake until after the rollcall had been completed. While I am officially recorded as voting "aye" my correct vote was intended to have been "no." A correct no vote, unfortunately, would not have changed the result.

BERN HUMAN CONTACTS EXPERTS MEETING OPENS

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, today, April 15, 1986, marks the opening of the Bern Human Contacts Experts Meeting, one of the followup meetings between the 35 signatories of the Helsinki accords which have become an integral part of the Helsinki process. This meeting is mandated to discuss the development of international contacts among persons, institutions, and organizations. Among the topics for discussion which the U.S. delegation considers most important is the Soviet Union's record of noncompliance with the human contacts provisions spelled out in the Helsinki accords. Specifically, the U.S. delegation will raise numerous cases in which the Soviet Union has obstructed the reunification of families.

Family ties, the firm foundation of so many American values, are taken for granted by most U.S. citizens. Unfortunately, families with relatives living in the U.S.S.R. cannot take these for granted. Families divided by the Iron Curtain are given little reason to hope for reunification with their loved ones. Their applications for visas are routinely rejected; even the submission of an application for a visit or emigration can result in serious persecution. Life has become miserable for these family members.

The case of Kaisa Randpere is a prime example of the Soviet Union's flagrant disregard for the pledges it made in Helsinki in 1975. At the age of 3½ years, Kaisa is the world's youngest refusenik. In August 1984, her parents Valdo and Leila—a senior aid to the Estonian Minister of Justice and a popular Estonian singer, respectively—managed to secure passage to Sweden while on a tour of Finland. Once they had requested asylum from the Swedish authorities, the Randperes requested that their 13-month-old daughter be allowed to join them. They never imagined that the Soviet authorities would refuse this request, and instead of the month-long separation they had expected, Valdo and Leila have been waiting for nearly 2 years to see their daughter. Since 1984, Kaisa's parents, many organizations and individuals, including 110 Members of Congress, have made repeated attempts to secure Kaisa's release. Instead of acting positively toward these request, the Soviet Government continually has harassed the child's grandmother, with whom Kaisa is staying, threatened to send Kaisa to an orphanage, and told the Randperes, "You will never see her again." Such is the Soviet Union's shameless attitude toward family reunification.

The Bern meeting provides us with a forum to reemphasize our commitment to realizing the humanitarian goal of bringing families together rather than forcing them to live apart. My fellow Commissioners and I hope that this meeting will result in concrete actions on the part of the Soviet Union and its East European allies to facilitate human contacts between our citizens.

**NEW AMERICANS: FREE
CITIZENS IN A FREE SOCIETY**

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last month my colleague from New York, Congressman STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, was asked to deliver an address to a very special audience at the Federal courthouse in Brooklyn: The event was the swearing-in of 397 new American citizens.

The audience in that courtroom represented people from 59 countries. These men and women had worked and studied hard to fulfill the requirements mandated by the Congress to become citizens of this great Nation. Now they were freely choosing to accept the duties and responsibilities of American citizenship.

The address which Congressman SOLARZ delivered was a brief, but eloquent, explanation of just what our democratic way of life means and what citizenship in this Nation entails. STEVE SOLARZ, like many of us, represents a congressional district which welcomes many newcomers each year and which is a microcosm of the wonderful mosaic of ethnic, racial, and religious groups which make this Nation so unique and so dynamic.

Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of the naturalization process in our political life, I ask that the entire text of Congressman SOLARZ' address be reprinted in today's RECORD.

**FREE CITIZENS IN A FREE SOCIETY—
WELCOMING 397 NEW AMERICANS**

A few moments ago, each of you swore to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States.

With those few words, you ended a long journey from your homeland. How you begin anew—as free citizens of a free society.

Today I am proud to welcome you to this great nation—to this citadel of democracy and freedom—the United States of America.

We are not an ancient nation. But we are dedicated to some of the oldest and most profound truths associated with the human enterprise.

We believe and we cherish what Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence: "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

And we have taken to heart another timeless message of Thomas Jefferson: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Where many other countries are founded on fear, our country is founded in freedom. Where many other societies are torn apart by hate, ours is held together by hope.

In many other countries, an iron curtain descends to bar the free flow of people and ideas.

In America, we refuse to lock people in or lock ideas out.

In many other lands, leaders launch a relentless assault against the human spirit. In America, we celebrate the human potential.

We reward artistry in literature, theater, and music. We never define the creative expression of the soul as a threat to the continued existence of the state.

In America, we do not remain indifferent to the fate of freedom in other lands. We understand, as Malusi Mpumwana, a black South African priest and friend of Steve Biko, has said, "The measure of your freedom is to what extent you are able to recognize the unfreedom of others and battle to undo it."

And so we have reached out to rescue those who have been trapped in the gulags of the Soviet Union or the killing fields of Cambodia. Often we fail. But when we succeed—when, after a decade of struggle, we save Anatoly Shcharansky from the clutches of the KGB or when we aid Dith Pran in his death-defying flight from the genocidal Khmer Rouge, we honor our sense of national purpose.

Last Thursday morning, in this very room, Dith Pran took the solemn step you have taken today. And on Thursday evening, Tom Brokaw, the anchorman for NBC News, spoke for all Americans when he said, "I am proud to share a citizenship with Dith Pran."

America is not a perfect nation. But we pledged in the Constitution to form a more perfect union, and we remain committed today to perfecting and improving our system of government.

One hundred and fifty years ago, a French citizen named Alexis de Tocqueville wrote a book called *Democracy in America*. He wrote, "America is a land of wonders in which everything is in constant motion and every change seems an improvement. No Natural boundary seems to be set to the efforts of man: and in his eyes what is not yet done is only what he has not yet attempted to do."

Or as the playwright George Bernard Shaw once said, "Some men see things as they are and ask why. Others dream things that never were and ask why not."

We build no walls to keep people in, and we build no ceilings to limit their achievements. Last year, the daughter of immigrants, Geraldine Ferraro, came upon the world stage as the first woman ever nominated for the second highest office in our land.

And last month, when the space shuttle Challenger exploded, we saw dramatic evidence of our diverse heritage. America grieved for its seven fallen heroes—Baptist and Buddhist, Catholic and Jew, Black and white, men and women. From different parts of America, from different backgrounds, races, and religions, they came together, united in a drive for excellence and scientific advance, and in doing so, they brought America together as well.

The United States is not—as we once thought—a melting pot. But we are a remarkable mosaic of many races, creeds, and ethnic backgrounds. Look around you in the City of New York. You will see not a clash of cultures, but a place where each culture leaves its own imprint and enriches us all.

Each new wave of immigrants—from Europe, from Asia and the Pacific Islands, from Africa, from South America, from the Caribbean—has brought new ideas and new ambitions, new drive and new achievements to our society.

Indeed, we are not just a mosaic, but a kaleidoscope, a changing canvas of many

colors and many cultures, the emblem of a dynamic and free society.

America is not a government of men and women, but a government of law.

In this country, we seek to change the policy of our government through the ballot, not the bullet.

We reject the concept of arbitrary state action or the confiscation of private property.

We settle disputes through our public courts, not private armies. We resolve conflicts by hiring attorneys, not assassins.

We cherish the right to disagree—privately or publicly—with our government, and our press reminds us that self-criticism lies at the heart of a free society.

Now you are part of this revered American tradition. Now you, too, share the rights and responsibilities of American citizens.

You are free to work and live where you will.

You are free to practice any religion or no religion, according to the dictates of your conscience, not the dictatorship of any state.

You can join any political party, or none at all.

You are free to read or publish any newspaper or magazine, to listen to or watch any radio or television program.

At the same time, you are responsible for obeying the law and respecting the rights of your fellow citizens.

In a few months, we will celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the Statue of Liberty—our heroine and herald of freedom. I suspect that just as you are very proud today of all that you have achieved in becoming an American citizen, so, too, you will look with special pride at the festivities next July.

More than most Americans, you will see beyond the glitter—beyond the fireworks lighting up the sky and the spectacular procession of ships in our harbor. You will not lose sight of the symbolism of the Statue of Liberty—reminding America of our special status as a refuge for the dispossessed.

On that day—indeed on any day, all Americans can reflect upon the words of the songwriter, Phil Ochs, "This is a land full of power and glory—beauty that words can not recall. The power shall rest on the strength of her freedom. Glory shall rest on us all."

May God bless all of you and our great nation, of which you are now a part.

**MATT SNYDER, NEBRASKA
WINNER 1985/86 VFW VOICE OF
DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP
PROGRAM**

HON. VIRGINIA SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the winning entry in the Nebraska Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary.

The author is Matthew Snyder of Broken Bow, NE, and I am extremely proud of his in-

spirational thoughts about the future of America. I hope my colleagues will find his essay of interest:

NEW HORIZONS FOR AMERICA'S YOUTH

We stand right at the mid-point of the decade. In only fifteen years we will be welcoming a new millennium—the year 2000. As we look toward that horizon—toward the twenty-first century—we realize that it is today's American youth who will determine our nation's course.

How will we do? It is appropriate and timely for us to begin now, preparing for the challenges America and our generation will face.

First, let me backtrack a little to consider how earlier generations of Americans prepared themselves for the coming of a new century. From our nation's very birth, Americans have accepted challenges which seemed to threaten our future. As we approached the nineteenth century, colonial farmers and merchants, trappers and bookkeepers, formed hometown militias and risked their lives in battle against those who would deny basic human rights in this new land.

Midway through that century, Americans again were called to take up arms to preserve the unity of our young country, and our nation came out of this internal struggle a freer and stronger country.

Barely into the twentieth century Americans were called to battle twice, joining free forces all over the world—forces determined that mankind would not be ruled by fascist tyrants. Once again we proved to ourselves and to others, that America was strong and more than willing to protect that invaluable freedom with the strength that is America.

I think it is appropriate, as we consider the new millennium on our horizon, that we remember the lessons of yesterday—that they might guide us tomorrow. Consider, for a moment, one of those lessons as described by an American poet, Douglas Mallach, in the first stanza of this poem. He creates an imagery which seems very appropriate here.

The tree that never had to fight
For sun and sky and air and light;
That stood out in the open plain
And always got its share of rain,
Never became a forest king,
But lived and died a shrubby thing.

Facing challenges with optimism and courage has become an American tradition—a tradition we must carry with us into the twenty-first century. If we see a better life on the horizon, we must not be blind to the challenges which lie between us and that dream.

We know that if we are to conquer disease, we must begin our preparation today. If our horizon holds dreams of energy independence, it is today's graduates who will have to find new ways to tap new deposits of oil and coal below the earth's surface. If the very spirit of America is to serve us well into the new era, we must accept the challenge of instilling American values in the next generation.

America is rich in resources—resources beyond minerals and food, beyond medical advances and education. And we are at this moment at the brink of discovering and developing that which I am convinced is our greatest resource of all, our generosity and pride of nation.

It is a unique opportunity for America's youth to lead this exploration and develop-

ment. And when today's youth reach those horizons which they explored and then developed, they can say,

America fought.

And America will be that forest king.

When we meet those horizons we have set, we must not stop. We must expand them. We must not only find way to reach below the earth's surface, but we must put our energy resources to work to keep America the industrial giant of the world. We must not only prepare to conquer disease, but we must continue to improve the quality of life. We should not stop at instilling American values in the next generation, but must live so that each new generation has cause to be proud of their country. And after we have expanded and passed those horizons we set, we can say with pride in our voice,

America grew,

America is the forest king,

And America will never die a shrubby thing.

THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCEDURES HAVE FAILED ONCE AGAIN

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Congress has failed again to meet its budget deadlines. Today is April 15, the new deadline for House and Senate agreement on a budget resolution, but there is once again no budget resolution to be found.

That's not really surprising though. Last year, Congress didn't reach agreement on the first budget resolution until August 15, 2½ months late. In 1984, we were 4½ months late. In both 1982 and 1983, Congress was 5 weeks late.

According to the Budget Act of 1974, the first budget resolution is supposed to be non-binding. It's the second budget resolution that is supposed to be the binding budget guideline. But our record with the second budget resolution is even more dismal. We haven't passed one in any of the last 4 years!

How ironic that we have set April 15 as the new deadline for a first budget resolution. This is the same date that American taxpayers must meet the deadline to file their income tax returns. Congress has established penalties for taxpayers who don't meet these deadlines. Maybe we need to establish penalties against Congress when we fail to meet our deadlines.

I believe, however, there is another solution to our budgetary difficulties. Let's revamp the current budget process, which has become too cumbersome and just doesn't work. To begin, I propose at least a temporary 2-year budget cycle to allow us to get caught up with budgetary matters. I also propose to abolish the House and Senate Budget Committees and the new level of bureaucracy they have established with Congress. In place of the Budget Committees, the Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees would meet early in the process to issue a statement of

receipts and outlays that cites estimated revenues for the budget period and a maximum level of expenditures.

New deadlines would be established for authorizing legislation to be brought before Congress prior to the consideration of any appropriations bills. Finally, a 1-month period would be set aside for the sole consideration of the 13 regular appropriations bills.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, it's obvious to me that Congress has failed miserably in meeting its fiscal deadlines and responsibilities. Not only have we failed with regard to the budget process, but more importantly, we have failed to meet our appropriations deadlines. Seven of the 13 regular appropriations deadlines. Seven of the 13 regular appropriations bills were included this year in a massive continuing resolution. Continuing resolution are a symbol of our failure to discharge our responsibilities, and unfortunately, they have become a rule rather than an exception.

The Library of Congress recently analyzed the record of Congress with regard to appropriations bills since the institutions of the 1974 Budget Act. According to the report:

Before the Budget Act it was highly unusual if all 12 months of a fiscal year went by without passing the regular appropriations bills. It is now a common occurrence. From fiscal 1968 through fiscal 1975, only two appropriations bills were under a continuing resolution for an entire fiscal year. From fiscal year 1976 through fiscal 1985, that figure jumped to 27.

Because of our failure to meet budget and appropriations deadlines, our Government was on the verge of fiscal chaos last year. The Secretary of the Treasury even had to resort to the disinvesting of the Social Security trust funds in order to make good on Federal obligations.

We funded the operations of our Government on a week-to-week basis under continuing resolutions for 2½ months. We let important legislation pile up to the point that we had to consider temporary extensions to prevent programs from expiring.

We were asked to vote on major legislation in excess of 1,000 pages with little or no time to review key provisions. This happened with regard to the tax bill, farm bill, and reconciliation bill.

The situation became so bleak that Members were willing to accept the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings concept and turn over to computers our constitutional responsibilities to make important financial decisions for the Federal Government. I opposed Gramm-Rudman because we shouldn't turn our backs on casting the tough votes and making the difficult Federal spending decisions. That's why we have been elected to Congress.

The conduct of Congress the past few months is a sad commentary of how the greatest Nation in the world conducts its fiscal affairs. We need to work together to find the solution to our problems. We need strong and effective leadership to guide us on our course. We need to resist gimmickry and return to

procedures that will enable Congress to make the tough decisions we're charged with making in a timely fashion.

Above all else, we need to make a commitment to quit wasting time and to fulfill the responsibilities of governing our Nation. Since we reconvened here January 21 for the second session of the 99th Congress, the House has met to conduct official business on only 29 of a possible 59 days. On eight other days, the House convened in pro forma session or conducted no legislative business.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can move forward by working together to discharge our duties in a responsible and timely fashion. As a cornerstone of this effort, I look forward to working with my colleagues to craft a new, streamlined budget process that will get us back on track in making the important funding decisions so we can do our job to reduce Federal deficits and ensure a strong and thriving national economy.

A CONSTITUENT RESPONSE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, recently, there has been a great deal of discussion in the House about public opinion toward how best to achieve peace in Central America and to reduce nuclear proliferation. And, later this week, the House will, once again, meet to make key policy decisions on these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a distinguished constituent of mine, Allan J. Bing, a retired lecturer of philosophy at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, which raises a number of compelling points with respect to these issues. And, while the jury may still be out as to overall public opinion, Mr. Bing's letter is just one example of how a majority of the residents of the 21st District of Ohio view U.S. policy in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I submit his letter to be inserted into the RECORD and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

MARCH 28, 1986.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STOKES: I must vehemently protest against the underground nuclear bomb explosion which took place in the Nevada desert on Mar. 22. As you must know, the bomb was ten (10) times as powerful as the one exploded at Hiroshima, and shook all the major buildings in Reno, seventy miles away.

I can only regard this explosion as a completely irrational defiance of the Soviets, especially in view of the Moratorium on nuclear explosions which the Kremlin proposed, and itself rigidly adhered to, since last July 30. Most peace groups, both in Cleveland and in Washington, regarded this proposed moratorium on testing as the most significant breakthrough on the issue of nuclear disarmament, since the two superpowers began to build their arsenals. Pres. Reagan must be off his nut to order this explosion. As Nina McLellan, head of the Cleveland chapter of the Sierra Club, said, as quoted by the Cleveland Plain Dealer on March 23:

"The reason that Pres. Reagan refuses to negotiate a test ban is that he wants to test and build new, advanced nuclear weapons. These weapons represent a significant change in nuclear technology and are a dangerous escalation toward nuclear war. A test ban could easily be verified."

On the somewhat related issue of the question of aid to the Contras in Nicaragua, I refer you to the lead article in the current issue (March 31) of *Time Magazine*. After attempting to regard the Sandinistas in a more reasonable and human light than the President has, the writer concludes: "In fact, if the peril posed by the Sandinistas were as great as the President's political rhetoric suggest, he would be irresponsible not to send in American troops."

This President needs to have his head examined. Please personally see to it that his irrationality and stupidity are tightly contained.

Very truly yours,

ALLAN J. BING.

APRIL IS MONTH OF THE MILITARY CHILD

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has designated this month, and every April thereafter, as "Month of the Military Child." I would like to join military families throughout the world in recognizing the important role our youth play in the development of this great land of ours.

This year's theme has been appropriately titled, "Children and Youth: Our Investment in the Future."

In the March 28, 1986, edition of *Astro News*, Lt. Gen. Forrest S. McCartney, Space Division Commander at Los Angeles AFS, has written an excellent editorial on the significance and importance of recognizing the many contributions of military children. This article is as follows:

[From the *Astro News*, March 28, 1986]

COMMANDER SALUTES YOUTH

(By Lt. Gen. Forrest S. McCartney)

April 1986—and every April thereafter—has been designated the "Month of the Military Child" by Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger to recognize the important role that our youth and their activities play in our lives.

The theme this year, "Children and Youth: Our Investment in the Future," appropriately reflects the effort we have placed in our programs which care for and nurture our young family members.

These programs include the Fort MacArthur Youth Center, the Youth Elite Society, and the station's child care program.

The center is an outstanding source for a wide variety of activities which help develop social and intellectual values. It also provides an outstanding perspective of Air Force life for high school-age participants who aspire toward military careers.

The Youth Elite Society, which has benefited our children for four years, holds activities which set social, intellectual and spiritual standards as guidelines for growth.

The society's field trips help its members

widen their horizons, and its service projects help teach them how to set example and meet goals. The society also recognizes those who excel in their scholastic and extracurricular activities.

The child care center, when completed later this year, will provide much-needed day-time supervision of our infant children and thus ease their parents' concerns for adequate care.

Those concerns have already been considerably alleviated thanks to many of the wives at Fort MacArthur who have become certified to care for children in their homes.

Our youth activity coordinators work very hard in support of our families. They are planning activities at the Fort in commemoration of the Month of the Military Child. I encourage you to participate in the efforts.

SMALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, the economic crisis of our times has forced education to be on the back burner of priorities for our Nation. This displacement of education within the nation within the framework of our national priorities comes at a time when the illiteracy rate of our Nation is at an all time high; the drop-out rate of our youngsters from high school is devastating to our national security; and, local school districts do not have the economic resources to properly and appropriately address the issues of today.

On Friday, April 4, 1986 the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the House Education and Labor Committee held a hearing in Paramount California to address some of the problems which are being encountered by the cuts in Federal funding to small school districts. Among those who submitted testimony was Mr. Willard H. Murray, vice president of the California Voter Education and Research Action, Inc., who succinctly characterized the problems in education as a result of the cuts in Federal spending on the State of California.

Herewith is Mr. Murray's statement:

Congressman DYMALLY: Thank you for allowing me to present this testimony to you to be a part of the Committee print of this hearing. I am Willard H. Murray, Vice President of the California Voter Education and Research Action, Inc. (VERA). While not an expert, I am knowledgeable of the effects that are being realized by the State of California and the Assembly district which I seek to represent—which includes large and small school districts. I will address federal cuts in education as a whole and a beam of hope that I see on the horizon.

It is my position that in order to ensure a strong educational system and a vital nation, the State, Federal government and local school districts must be in the position to carry out their roles and work in accord with one another. The cuts in Federal funding, which have been the trend of the Reagan Administration, have placed an undue and unfair burden on the State of

California, and this burden is felt in greater proportions by local school districts. This burden comes at a time when the United States of America is witnessing the worst economic crisis for the poor and the farmer since the Great Depression of the 1930's, and the deficit of this great nation of ours is at an all time record.

In the area of Elementary and Secondary Education, the cuts in federal spending have mounted to such great proportions that it may take years for our nation to recover. When comparing the actual federal appropriations from 1980 until the present, and adjusting for inflation, there is actually a 23.9 percent decrease in funding of the Chapter 1 program. This program provides funds for supplementary education and related services to educationally disadvantaged children. California suffers because of this.

Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, the program which provides block grants to State and local educational agencies and provides programs such as basic skills development, educational improvement and support services along with special projects in elementary and secondary schools has experienced a 54.6 percent cut (with inflation considered). The impact was felt greatest in urban areas which is much of what the district that I seek to represent consists of. California suffers because of this.

Bilingual Education, a subject that can not be ignored by the State of California at any level, has experienced a 44.7 percent decrease since 1980 (inflation adjusted). The impact of this cut for California is that more state funds will have to be allocated to this area at a time when economic crisis throughout the Nation does not allow the State to secure more taxes and thereby making revenues unavailable to sustain the program at the level needed. I must add that bilingual education is negatively correlated with income wealth or other measures of taxing and spending capabilities. California suffers because of this.

The Impact Aid Program provides financial assistance to local school districts for the cost of educating children. A cut in Federal activities has caused a financial burden to the district. The cuts in Federal funding of Impact Aid by approximately 36.2 percent has been especially hard for the State of California because of the amounts of Federal property which is in the state. California suffers because of this.

While education of the handicapped has fluctuated in terms of federal funding, the overall results have been negative and the nation has witnessed a 7.8 percent decrease. Mr. Chairman, the same is true for Vocational Rehabilitation.

Vocational education, the portion of education which is necessary in order for the State of California to meet the needs of the workforce of the future and ensure equity and equal opportunity for all Californians, has been cut to such a level that the industries of California will be hard pressed to have a workforce within the next few years. Nevertheless an educated and qualified one will ensure the national defense and stability of these United States. And, yes, California suffers because of this.

While the list goes on and on and includes such topics as adult education and adult literacy, I wish to speak now about a beacon of hope.

The hope I speak of is a piece of legislation which was recently introduced in the House of Representatives by the distin-

guished Chairman, (H.R. 747) "The Effective Schools Development in Education Act of 1985".

While it is true that the State of California has long since implemented a program similar to this Legislation, in my opinion this legislation is much farther reaching and will benefit the 54th Assembly District as well as the State of California in most significant ways.

The effective schools bill has the purpose of assisting and encouraging State and local education agencies in broadening and improving effective school programs that they have developed and/or implemented. Through grants provided to states, this legislation will create effective schools by providing basic educational skills to the functionally illiterate parents; enhance a child's very early pre-school education; help parents learn how to teach three to seven year old children; and, help the school administrators, teachers, and other school staff, parents and community to learn how to organize an effective school through school analysis of all of its functions and, then, develop and implement plans which will vastly improve those functions.

Mr. Chairman, the federal cuts in funding are hard for the State of California to adjust to. Your bill should help us do the job of educating our students in a more appropriate sound manner. California will be thankful when this bill becomes law. Then, perhaps we can make do with the awful cuts that we are experiencing.

NO AID TO THE CONTRAS

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from the State of Washington, the distinguished majority whip, TOM FOLEY, wrote an excellent, well-reasoned op-ed piece on why we shouldn't aid the Contras. I will not express my own views at this time on why we should not send them aid, other than to say that I agree with my colleague wholeheartedly. I am inserting the article in the RECORD for my colleagues' perusal.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1986]

CONTRA AID: AN ACT OF WAR

(By Thomas S. Foley)

Today the House will revisit the contra aid debate. Shortly before the last vote in the House the administration abandoned its erst-while strategy of all or nothing on the contra issue. Its new strategy has two facets. On the one hand, it has begun to offer compromises. On the other, it has tried to develop some public relations event equivalent to last year's famous trip to Moscow by Nicaraguan leader Daniel Ortega.

Despite strenuous effort, the administration has been unable to rally convincing majorities of the public or Congress to its position. The week following the last House vote on contra aid, the Senate voted by a narrow margin to approve a "compromise" plan which many regard as little more than a cosmetic makeover of the president's original proposal. Key features of that plan were that "only" one quarter of the \$100 million, 18-month financing would be available in the first 90 days, only "defensive" weapons could be bought and the president could not

release the remaining funds until an additional 15 days had expired, 15 days in which Congress could veto the decision to release the remaining funds and the president could veto any such congressional action. A thinner compromise could hardly be imagined and, indeed, only a thin majority of the Senate supported the president where he had hoped for an overwhelming vote.

But before the Senate vote, the administration believed the public relations coup it has so fervently desired had fallen into its hands, a highly trumpeted "invasion" of Honduras by Nicaraguan troops in pursuit of the contras. Originally the administration had difficulty in persuading the Hondurans that they should acknowledge the event at all. Their reluctance was understandable in light of the fact that the Nicaraguan action may have been larger than normal but nevertheless closely resembled hundreds of similar reported incidents over the last five years. For Honduras to raise a public outcry would, in its view, publicly acknowledge that the contras were being allowed to stay in Honduras.

Congressional leaders of both parties said the "invasion" has had little or no effect on the Senate vote. In the face of subsequent intelligence and press reports, which substantially reduced the scale of the incident, the administration's public relations machine has had no choice but to seek a new approach.

Now, before the second vote in the House, the administration has launched a new offensive on the Contadora front. The president says the Nicaraguans have "torpedoed" the Contadora peace process with their latest rejection of a proposed document that called on them to reduce their armed forces without their first being a cut-off in aid to the contras. Diplomatic damage experts have noted that the disappointment of the Contadora negotiators with the latest action by the Nicaraguan representatives was obvious. But the communique issued by the Contadora nations after the recent breakup contemplates getting back to work as soon as possible. It does not resemble an obituary. Nevertheless the administration has seized on the latest development and is now trying to exaggerate its consequence in yet another attempt to weaken opposition to its proposal, a proposal which would wring from both houses a reluctant declaration of a proxy war in Nicaragua.

The Contadora negotiators continually point to the fact that the contras merely frustrate the Contadora process. The Central American nations know what they want from negotiations: regional security. But the administration wants the Sandinistas to negotiate cession of power, a concession it also says it never expects them to give without military defeat by the contras. Yet the continuation of the contra war will reduce, not enhance the security of Nicaragua's neighbors. The administration appears confused about its own goals and in any case is acting at cross purpose to Contadora, as the Latin Americans view it.

We should make no mistake. This is not a one-time vote for \$100 million. We are on the eve of a historic decision. This vote is merely a down payment on hundreds of millions, perhaps billions to come over many years in support of the contras (indeed we have already spent \$1 billion on military preparations in Central America). Much more important than the money, however, is the unprecedented and damaging decision we are about to make to support and finance the proxy invasion of a foreign coun-

try with which, for whatever purpose, we maintain diplomatic relations. This course of action sweeps aside the president's own stated concern, only a year ago, that to pursue such a course would be an act of war. In any case, our action would be totally unilateral with no support from our allies anywhere on the globe.

We desperately need a better strategy regarding Nicaragua and, despite the recent setback, Contadora is that strategy.

The Contadora process is far from dead. On the contrary, it has been the administration's own refusal to promote Contadora that has deprived the process of its moral authority to pressure the Nicaraguans. We have been unable to exploit the Nicaraguan's recent action because the other Latin American participants do not view us as supporting Contadora. Reports say that several Central American foreign ministers have come away with the impression that their recent visits from U.S. envoys were actually attempts to undermine Contadora.

If we were wholeheartedly to support the Contadora process, we would vastly improve its possibilities for guaranteeing regional security, U.S. security and liberalization of the Nicaraguans' internal policies. The current policy of aid to the contras, accompanied by lip service support of Contadora, allows the Sandinistas plausibly to claim that their internal repressive policies, their military build-up their reliance on thousands of Cuban advisers, their close ties to Moscow and their reluctance to negotiate are all the result of their need to repel the American-sponsored contra invasion.

The Contadora process offers us many opportunities to pressure Nicaragua productively that we do not now have. We would have the support of the rest of Central America to pressure Nicaragua to reduce its armed forces, expel the Cubans, honor its borders and cease support for insurgencies in other countries. We do not now have the support of those countries. We would have the support of the entire Western world when we pressured the Sandinistas to cease their lockdown of Nicaraguan society and honor basic human rights principles there. We do not have such support for our policy of backing the contras.

Some suggest that only the contras can put productive pressure on the Sandinistas, but we must remember that Nicaragua has a weak economy, totally dependent on world trade. Western opinion, if it is united, will mean a great deal to them, and they can ill afford to continue to disillusion Western democracies with their repressive internal policies.

Some Contadora ministers have confided that the contras are the best thing to happen to the Sandinistas in Nicaragua. The story goes that the Sandinistas can survive years of war with ease, but six months of peace would be a terrible threat because of the natural political pressures that would develop within Nicaragua.

If Contadora were ultimately to succeed, and with the enthusiastic backing of the United States, the pressure on Nicaragua to cooperate would be intense, and we would have the moral authority and international support to militarily back up the treaty if that ever became necessary.

What are the risks of Contadora? We need not fear the military loss of Central America while talks continue. Congress will support any action to repel Nicaraguan aggression against its neighbors, or to prevent the introduction of advanced weaponry or to prevent the use of Nicaragua as a base for

Soviet and Cuban main forces. Our steady policy of strong support for the other democracies in the region has lessened the Nicaraguans opportunities for subversion, and we should continue that policy with determination. This is the approach that all the Central American countries we are trying to help urge upon us.

In contrast to Contadora, what risks does the continued policy of support for the contras present? What will we do if, after hundreds of millions of dollars, years of support, training and equipment and an incalculable investment of American political and diplomatic currency, the contras eventually face defeat? What if they face decimation or capture? Will we never send our own forces to help them no matter how desperate their situation? Or will we leave them to their fate in a giant replay of the Bay of Pigs? Will we then be negotiating to save the contras rather than to reform Nicaragua?

Perhaps I view the contras' prospects too pessimistically, although the overwhelming weight of American intelligence and military opinion, some of it on the public record, agrees that the contras have no chance of military victory. A bloody stalemate is their best hope, and even this analysis assumes a static situation without escalation on the other side.

I accept President Reagan's assurance that he has no present intention to send American troops to Nicaragua. But the president's present intentions are not what will determine the outcome. We have all witnessed this inexorable process before. As our commitment increases, our options dwindle, and the day when we are out of options grows nearer.

I have trouble understanding the administration's strategy. On the one hand they say that the contras really don't have to win. They need only stalemate the Sandinistas to force them to the bargaining table to negotiate internal reforms in Nicaragua. But administration officials also almost invariably say that no Marxist-Leninist regime will ever voluntarily relinquish power. They often publicly use that as reason why direct U.S.-Nicaragua talks will not succeed. Stalemate will not be good enough. The contras must win or the Sandinistas will simply keep fighting with all the resources they can command or that the Soviets and Cubans can provide. If the contras must win, we must decide now what we are willing to do to ensure their victory, and if we are not prepared to use American forces we must be prepared to accept the possible defeat of our proxy army and the resultant embarrassment to ourselves.

In short, the contra option is a prescription for an unprecedented U.S. proxy invasion of a country with which we are not at war, a proxy invasion with almost no chance of military victory without American participation and no chance of productive results short of victory. Compared with the sometimes difficult course of negotiations, military action seems strong and decisive, but it is fraught with terrible risks. It leaves us with the probable choice of having to use our own forces or accept the defeat of the army we have armed and suborned. Compared with this, Contadora remains the compelling choice.

GUN BILL RECORDS CHECK DELETION

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 10, 1986, the House of Representatives passed legislation (H.R. 4332) changing the focus of the Gun Control Act of 1968. During floor consideration of the measure I had planned to offer an amendment to the Judiciary Committee's version of the bill to delete the records check section of the bill, but instead withdrew the amendment due to time constraints. And, while the House did finally pass a measure that did not incorporate a records check, I feel that the House should be aware of the reasons for objecting to a records check provision.

The records check section of H.R. 4332 as passed by the Judiciary Committee was included in an effort to maintain some control over who purchases a handgun. While admirable in intent, the practical aspects of a records check are far less positive. Simply stated, a records check requirement would place a tremendous burden of cost and labor on the FBI but would yield few if any of the protections of criminal history tracing supposedly available. I submit to the House for the edification of the Members a letter from John R. Bolton, Assistant Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice, to Representative BILL MCCOLLUM, ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Crime, regarding the Department's feelings on the handgun records check requirement of H.R. 4332 as passed by the Judiciary Committee, and hope that if considered again a records check provision will be reworked to correctly address the problems it is trying to amend.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AND INTER-
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, March 19, 1986.

Hon. BILL MCCOLLUM,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on
the Judiciary, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCOLLUM: The Department of Justice has deferred to the Department of the Treasury as to the substantive portions of S. 49, which passed the Senate on July 9, 1985, and H.R. 4332, the Federal Firearms Law Reform Act of 1986, which was ordered reported by your Committee on March 11, 1986. However, I would like to address one particular section in the House bill which directly affects the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and poses serious problems.

Section 14 of H.R. 4332 makes it unlawful for a licensed dealer or other persons to sell or transfer a handgun to an individual who is not licensed unless the transferor promptly sends by registered or certified mail a copy of the documentation of transfer to the chief law and enforcement officer of the transferee's place of residence and to the FBI. The FBI is then required to examine "Federal official records which may reveal any circumstances making illegal the receipt or possession of a handgun by the transferee" and report such information to the chief

law enforcement officer of the transferee's residence.

Our primary concerns with this language are as follows:

(1) The proposed examination of Federal records is based on an individual's name and other identifiers (date of birth, place of birth, etc.). Those persons with a criminal record who are prohibited from purchasing a handgun are the ones most likely to obtain false identification documents to support a new name. As to felons using a false identity, the name check will not reveal any information regarding the purchaser's criminal activity which might make him ineligible to own a handgun. Even if the purchaser uses his true name, it may not be possible to determine with certainty whether or not a criminal record belongs to the purchaser or another person with the same name. There are many people with identical names and similar identifiers who have criminal records. It is possible that the FBI might identify a half dozen individuals with criminal records whose name is the same as the purchaser; further, even if we identify only one record in an individual's name, that does not mean that the record belongs to the purchaser. The outcome of the name check may be that persons with no previous contact with the criminal justice system will be further investigated merely because they wish to purchase a handgun while those with a disqualifying criminal record will perhaps be able to escape closer scrutiny.

(2) The bill would require the FBI to check all "Federal official records which may reveal any circumstances making illegal the receipt or possession of a handgun by the transferee . . ." Currently, the FBI estimates that the cost of a name check of its Identification Division criminal record system is about \$7. However, the broad language of the bill would not only require a name check of the Identification Division system, but the FBI's central records system as well. I understand that the National Rifle Association is estimating that from 2 to 4 million handguns are purchased each year. The cost of the name check of just the FBI Identification records could be as much as 30 million dollars a year. However, the bill does not provide any additional funding for the FBI to cover its costs.

(3) The bill would conflict with State laws governing criminal record checks currently performed in connection with firearms purchases. Pursuant to Public Law 92-544, the FBI is permitted to exchange identification records with officials of state and local governments for licensing and employment purposes if authorized by state law and approved by the Attorney General. Public Law 99-180 (the Department of Justice Appropriation Act for 1986) authorizes the FBI to collect fees to process fingerprint identification records for noncriminal justice employment and licensing purposes and credit up to \$13,500,000 of such fees to its appropriation to be used for salaries and other expenses incurred in providing this service. The states have enacted various types of laws which mandate a criminal history record check based on fingerprints for different licensing and employment purposes, i.e., to license teachers, child care workers, real estate brokers, etc. Twenty-one states including the District of Columbia and three territories now require handgun purchases based on their fingerprints. The fingerprints are submitted to the State Identification Bureau or other similar central state authority. If the central state authority finds anything in its records which dis-

qualifies the purchaser, it will be submitted to the FBI for processing. The FBI charges \$14 for this service. (The states may have additional charges). The FBI's fees are funneled back into its budget to cover costs. For Fiscal Year 1985, the FBI processed 864,085 fingerprints for noncriminal justice licensing and employment purposes and collected \$9,577,969 in fees.

If the Congress considers it important to require a check of handgun purchasers, we believe that such legislation should take advantage of current procedures. In doing so, the Congress would avoid placing any additional burdens on the 21 states which now have laws and procedures in place which are intended to keep handguns out of the hands of criminals. Further, by mandating a criminal history check based on fingerprints, the FBI would be able to charge for its service. The cost of doing a name check as mandated by H.R. 4332 could not be recovered by fees; therefore, the Bureau's budget would have to be enhanced. Most importantly, by requiring a fingerprint check, law enforcement will know beyond a doubt that the criminal record in fact belongs to the purchaser.

To further illustrate the benefits of a fingerprint check, I am attaching a news article from The Star-Ledger (Newark, New Jersey), dated February 23, 1986. As reported in this article, an Edward Morris, who was wanted for forgery and grand theft in Tallahassee, Florida, had been hired by a Newark bank using the name of Kenneth Taylor. Taylors' fingerprints were routinely taken by the bank and submitted to the FBI Identification Division for processing. The results led to Taylors' arrest just in time as he was found to have in his possession \$5,000 in cash, a cashier's check in the amount of \$57,000, and a new car valued at \$13,000. Taylor was charged with bank fraud and embezzlement. A name check would have been worthless in this case.

If the Committee wishes further information on this issue, representatives of the Department are available to discuss current fingerprint processing procedures and to suggest legislative language which would address the concerns identified above.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. BOLTON,
Assistant Attorney General.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE BUSINESS ACHIEVEMENTS OF LEROY OZANNE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues attention to an article that recently appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer that traces the career of Leroy Ozanne, an outstanding Cleveland business pioneer, entrepreneur and the owner of the largest black contracting company in the Cleveland area.

Mr. Ozanne's climb to the top of the business world demonstrates that hard work, foresight and a few breaks are essential elements to survival in the highly competitive construction business. The Ozanne Construction Co., represents a success story we are very proud of in Cleveland, and I am pleased to bring it to

the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

The article follows:

VENTURES PAY OFF—BLACK CONTRACTOR BUILDS REPUTE AND BUSINESS

(By Angela D. Chatman)

More than 30 years ago, Leroy Ozanne saw an opportunity to be what was then a rarity: a black general contractor.

As a city building inspector in the early 1950s, he saw few black contractors come to the Cleveland Building Department for permits and information.

"There was actually no representation in construction and that's what got me interested. I said, 'This is going to be my shot,'" he said recently in his offices on E. 25th St. He was right.

Thirty years after the Ozanne Construction Co.'s incorporation in 1956, Leroy Ozanne, 59, and son Dominic, 32, run what is identified as the largest, most prominent of the 10 or so minority general contractors in the Cleveland area.

It has in the past been listed among the nation's top 100 Black businesses by Black Enterprise magazine.

Its 1985 workload was in excess of \$10 million. During his first 12 years, he was able to put together at most \$200,000 in projects in any one year.

In those first 12 years, Ozanne was a sole proprietor. Today, the company employs 14, eldest son Dominic is president, and Ozanne is chairman of a three-person board on which his son and wife, Betty, serve.

The elder Ozanne's first job as a contractor was the conversion of a porch into a real estate office for a friend. Today, the company name is associated with such major projects as housing projects, Martin Luther King Plaza, the Justice Center, the Cleveland Hopkins International Airport expansion, the U.S. Postal Service headquarters on Orange Ave., and Lexington Village.

"They're a strong, aggressive company with a good track record," said Joseph A. McCullough, vice president and operations manager for Turner Construction Co., which does quite a bit of joint venture work with Ozanne.

"They are the area's largest minority contracting company. . . . They are a highly respected company within the construction industry," said Catherine A. Barry, editor of the Construction Register, a publication of the Builder's Exchange, a non-profit trade group for the Ohio construction industry.

It wasn't always that way.

In fact, there was a time when Ozanne considered leaving Cleveland.

The company say some good times and some lean times in its beginnings. Back then, Ozanne's first idea was to get into the remodeling business.

"I spent about three to four years in the Building Department and (I) saw minorities buying into the Hough area and buying into new areas that needed work. My first idea was to get involved in remodeling, converting buildings and that kind of thing," he said.

He was familiar with all building codes and could draw plans. He began doing remodeling on the side in 1954, while he still was employed by the city.

After a short time in the remodeling business, Ozanne decided that he preferred the commercial end of building. So in 1956 and 1957, he looked for commercial work.

His first commercial venture was with the city of Cleveland, building a service station

at the old incinerator plant on W. 3rd St. ". . . I built it. I mean I literally built it. . . They put a metal roof on there and I had to weld it myself," he said. The only thing he didn't do was lay brick, he said.

It was his first time dealing with a bonding company and the first of 16 service stations he would eventually build.

He was bonded for \$5,000 for the \$4,595 city project.

Once he was able to get bonding, he could go after larger projects. It was then that he went after more service station work, building stations for Gulf Oil Co., Shell Oil Co., Texaco Co. and Cities Service Co.

His next bonded job was a Gulf service station at the corner of Lakeview Rd. and Durant Ave. The bond was for \$35,000.

"I think the biggest thrill I ever had in my life was when I got two gasoline stations at once. . . . And, that bond had to be awfully large, \$70,000. . . . That was really big stuff. That was just before 1958," he said.

"When you started around the \$100,000 mark in those days, you were considered heavy," he said.

In 1959, he successfully bid to build the Brooklyn fire station.

Then there were sudden obstacles. Many times, the company bid unsuccessfully. There were even times when the company was the low bidder, but didn't get the job, he recalled. Such has been the case with many minority-owned firms.

He got more proficient in the work, but the big projects did not come his way, he said.

"We bid a lot of work . . . remodeling work and things like that . . . but new building additions never came to Ozanne Construction or new school buildings never came to Ozanne," he said.

The company had to settle for doing work for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and doing other jobs it was able to pick up along the way, he said.

Despite his relatively successful start, he did not add staff until 1968 when he had more than one project going at a time.

That also was the year Turner Construction chose Ozanne as its joint venture partner on the Martin Luther King Plaza project.

When the call came, Ozanne was planning to leave town.

"My bags were packed to move to Denver . . . I'd had enough of it. Cleveland had just gotten me right up to here," he said raising his hand to his neck.

The native Texas had never been to Denver, but was willing to go just "to make a major change," he said.

The call from Turner Construction turned what was a dismal point in his career to a positive turning point, he said.

"That was a turning point and we saw it as an opportunity to work with company like Turner, because they took a complete interest in our people and they exposed us to" building systems and techniques, he said.

The Ozannes are advocates of joint venturing as a way for minority contractors to learn building techniques from other contractors, even though such arrangements aren't always lucrative.

Over the years, Ozanne Construction has done six joint ventures with Turner Construction, among them the Orange Ave. postal facility.

The joint venture lent credibility to Ozanne Construction as a general contractor.

There was no long-term strategy for success, Ozanne said, just aggressiveness.

"You know, it's just like a treadmill. You can't stop it. You have to keep it going . . . The necessity of just having new jobs come in the office all the time required us to bid very ferociously for new work," he said.

He said having his son in the business had helped.

Dominic Ozanne began working with his father on jobs when he was 11 or 12, Ozanne said.

Although Dominic Ozanne has a degree from Harvard Law School and worked for two years with the local law firm of Thompson, Hine & Flory, he always wanted to join the family business, he said.

TESTIMONY OF HON. BYRON DORGAN BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as a colleague of Representative BYRON DORGAN on the Select Committee on Hunger, I want to call attention to his timely testimony before the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee. Mr. DORGAN trenchantly makes the case for realigning our foreign aid priorities—away from massive growth in military aid toward greater investments in economic and food aid. His analysis of our aid mistakes in the Philippines warrants particular attention.

I also want to commend our colleague for his thoughtful remarks about the value of investments in child survival programs and universal immunization. As the author of a bill to increase the U.S. commitment to global immunization, I found Mr. DORGAN'S remarks on the subject to be right on target. We can save the lives of millions of children for literally pennies per child and it's time we capitalized on the opportunity.

Mr. DORGAN'S testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF HON. BYRON L. DORGAN, APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify today on the right kind of foreign aid. I know that you have wrestled with this tiger—often times by yourself—so I know that my remarks do not fall on deaf ears. I want to commend you and members of this Subcommittee for trying to develop a foreign aid package which advances our legitimate interests and also meets the pressing needs of the developing world.

This can be a thankless task. Yet, it's a job which must be done if we are to craft a foreign policy that makes sense. I want to try to illustrate some severe blunders in our foreign assistance program and also to highlight what kind of aid really works for us and its recipients.

A MESS IN MANILA

Rarely do we have a chance to look into the belly of a dictatorship to see how our aid went sour. The collapse of the Marcos regime affords us a great chance to see how our aid can be wasted and squandered, if we don't link it to sound policy and if we don't provide the right kind of aid.

It now seems likely that money which we sent to help poor Filipinos was stolen to buy Gucci shoes, fur coats, gold bullion, stocks, bonds, and Manhattan real estate. Over the

past 20 years we have poured in nearly \$2 billion in aid to the Philippines—about half of it as military aid.

But did this buy us a more democratic government in a key Pacific ally? Did this ensure a long-term lease for vital U.S. military bases in the Philippines? Did this aid help its people shake loose from staggering external debt and a stagnant economy? We know that the answer to all these questions is NO!

We don't yet know all the reasons why things went so awry. We do know that we waited too long to press for democratic reforms. We also waited too long to monitor carefully how our aid was being used. We further assumed naively that massive amounts of military aid could prop up a dictatorship with clay feet.

On the future, we can do better. We can insist that policy and aid are linked together. We can press for tougher oversight and audits on aid. We can change the mix of aid to developing nations, so that we place greater emphasis on food for the hungry, medicine for the sick, teachers for the illiterate, and technical help for self-sufficiency.

Unfortunately, the Administration is proposing the same tired and fruitless program for FY 87 to the Philippines as before. The White House wants to double military aid, virtually drop food aid, and freeze economic aid. I hope that the rise of the Aquino government will realign our priorities and urge this Subcommittee to grab the bull by the horns if President Reagan does not show some leadership.

I would also encourage this Subcommittee to support appropriate efforts to establish a commission to X-ray our aid to the Philippines. We need to find out how that aid was abused and where it ended up. The Philippine Fraud Commission and our own Foreign Affairs Committee simply don't have the resources to find out how President Marcos, with a \$5,400 a year salary, managed to spirit away an estimated \$5 to \$10 billion into foreign real estate, stocks, and bank accounts. This is no small change; it equals the total foreign debt of the Philippines in 1983.

The American taxpayers and the Philippine people deserve an answer to these questions. I have urged the President to appoint a Special Commission to investigate the Marcos money ring. But I hope your Subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, will consider your own initiatives.

TRENDS IN FOREIGN AID

I cite the Philippines as a specific case of a lamentable infatuation with military aid as a security sweetheart. The appended chart of the Congressional Research Service show that this is no aberration in recent years.

You will see that between FY 1981 and FY 1987 we have seen a sizable 62% growth in foreign aid, including a 12% proposed increase for FY 1987 alone. I want to say that I am puzzled at best to understand how the President can propose this when he simultaneously wants to cut all domestic programs by 6%. If getting our budget house in order is one of the best ways to help developing nations, by reducing their debt service costs through lower interest rates, why not start with restraint in foreign aid? I believe we can freeze total aid at the FY 1986 level, or even make cuts, and still meet our obligations.

I also fail to see the budget sense or foreign policy value in a 100% plus growth in military aid, including an 800% growth in

the Military Assistance Program. The growth in the MAP account makes the Pentagon's big spenders look like country bumpkins. But the Reagan Administration sees this account as the salvation of governments like Marcos' Philippines. Well, it did not work in Manila and it's not going to work in Port-au-Prince, Haiti—despite the White House plans to pump more riot control equipment and military aid into a country with the lowest literacy and worst hunger problems in the Western Hemisphere.

What the people in the Philippines, the Caribbean, Africa, and Central America need is a fighting chance—not more chances to fight. They need to arm themselves with literacy, self-sufficiency, and health to defeat their real enemies—the scourges of poverty, hunger, and disease. These are the carrion on which Marxism feeds. I only hope we start funneling our aid into these programs with tough controls, instead of into security aid for dictators which ends up in Swiss bank accounts and Imelda Marcos' wardrobe closet.

I won't take time to tackle the tough issue of aid to the contras of Nicaragua to finance our proxy war to overthrow an admittedly distasteful and repugnant Sandinista regime. Let me simply say that we are threatened in Central America—in Wisconsin, North Dakota, Kansas, and Iowa. We are being threatened with the loss of our family farms and small towns.

So I ask the President to spend some time helping our Central America, the Central America at home, before we send down machine guns and rockets to a band of thugs and murderers. I ask this Appropriations Subcommittee to help straighten out our budget priorities so that we preserve genuine security with a strong economy, a defense that works, and the right kind of foreign aid.

HIGH ON THE HOG

I also would like to underscore my concern about the salaries and perks of employees of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Congress can exercise some control over what I consider a misuse of foreign aid by restraining the U.S. contributions to these development institutions.

Salaries at the World Bank and IMF remind me of James Michener's description of the fictional missionaries in Hawaii: "They came to do good, but ended up doing very well." Much the same could be said of the international civil servants who staff the Bank and IMF.

For example, where can you find a job in the U.S. Government that pays a \$130,000 a year salary and offers 4-5% loans for home purchases and 4% loans for children's education? You can at the IMF. If you are an American IMF employee, you'll find that 40% of all employees earn a pay grade with a midpoint of at least \$70,000. Moreover, you and everyone else garners what amounts to a tax-free salary. Nice work—if you can get it!

I wonder how we can square the Wall Street salaries and benefits of IMF staff with the pressing needs of nations too poor

to even collect accurate employment and national income data. Shaving 10% off the IMF personnel budget, for example, would not in itself save the IMF from an onslaught of Third World debt. But the savings would have been large enough to cover the 1985 overall IMF loss.

I would like to see some belt-tightening around the middle of the IMF and World Bank—not just around the necks of dairy farmers and wheat growers. If we can keep lining the pockets of international aid elites, why can't we afford to let family farmers earn enough to pay their bills?

I plan to ask GAO to look into the salary and benefit packages at these two financial institutions. I want to know if these salaries are out of line with comparable organizations, our own budget goals, and the stated intentions of the Treasury and State Departments.

I have no interest in undermining the legitimate work of these needed agencies. But I believe that they can only help bridge the development gap if they enjoy the solid support of donor governments. I simply think we need to make sure in Congress that the World Bank and IMF are on the right track.

ON THE RIGHT TRACK

Fortunately, we can also point to some real success stories in foreign aid. We do have a responsibility to help our poorer neighbors and to advance the development of younger nations. The question is what kind of aid is the right kind.

For the most part, I think that it is food aid, health aid, and development. Judicious amounts of security aid can undoubtedly help in the right circumstances; but military aid will not do the job if it is used as a surrogate for building genuine security.

For example, our recent provision of emergency food aid to Africa points to the best in the American tradition of helping others. Without timely delivery of American grain and dairy products thousands or millions more Africans would have perished in the recent famine.

Nor has the need for food aid evaporated, despite the good news of better harvests in Africa. Some 69 food deficit countries will need to import 10 million tons of cereals, beyond commercial import levels in the next year, just to maintain consumption at present substandard levels. To meet adequate nutritional levels, they would have to obtain donations of twice that level, according to USDA's 1986 report on World Food Needs and Availabilities. So I don't support the Administration's plan to cut Food for Peace by 6% next year.

Food for Peace builds bridges which last with aid which brings life. When provided creatively in emergency feeding stations or as part of food-for-work projects, such aid can lay the groundwork for survival and longer-term development. As one commentator observed, "People don't eat in the future, they eat every day."

INVESTING IN IFAD

Naturally, the wrong kind of food aid can create a deadly addiction to outside help and sap the nerve of self-sufficient food production. And this need not happen with

well-run programs such as we find with CARE, Catholic Relief Services, Lutheran World Relief and others.

But inevitably, the need for people to feed themselves surfaces. It costs \$400 to ship a ton of emergency food aid, but only \$200 for the International Fund for Agricultural Development to assist individual farmers in improving yields by a ton every year for a lifetime.

In my view, the International Fund for Agricultural Development provides one of the surest, leanest, and most progressive ways to invest in the self-sufficiency of developing nations. IFAD has a proven record of efficiently promoting self-sufficiency, as shown in evaluations by AID.

Most notable of IFAD's successes is its ability to manage and leverage limited resources. It has financed some 152 projects in 83 countries at a cost of about \$8.2 billion through early 1985. Yet, its direct contribution was only \$1.9 billion. Even more remarkably, IFAD has achieved a loan repayment rate of up to 99%—the envy of any Wall Street banker—with a staff of 100 and very low overhead.

This also is the right kind of aid. I strongly urge the Subcommittee to fund the regular replenishment for IFAD's next three years—at about \$30 million a year—and to willingly consider added funds for a Special Africa Fund.

SAVING LIVES FOR PENNIES

Finally, I would like to urge the Subcommittee's support for the purpose of H.R. 3894, which would make available an added \$50 million beyond the FY 1986 level for the Child Survival Program of AID.

Every year about 3½ million children die from six easily preventable diseases. These tragedies need not occur. We have on hand the vaccines to prevent these diseases, but only a fraction of the world's children are immunized. To reach the goal of universal immunization by 1990, the United States will have to join other nations in contributing as generously as possible to this worldwide effort.

It makes good sense. For every \$1 invested in immunization, \$14 in health costs will be saved. And a coordinated child Survival Program can save lives, too. UNICEF estimates that the rate of 40,000 child deaths per day could be cut in half by advancing a simple, four-point program of proven health techniques for literally pennies per child.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman crafting the right kind of aid is no small task. But it's both possible and workable. I have attempted to shine the caution spotlight on some kinds of aid which don't work, like our run-away pre-occupation with aid that explodes. I have also sought to showcase the right kind of aid: Food for Peace, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, and the Child Survival Program. We can do this within budget limits, if we put some clamps on security aid.

Thank you for your attention and I gladly would try to answer any questions which you and members of the Subcommittee may have.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS: FISCAL YEARS 1981, 1986, 1987

(Dollar amounts in millions)

	1981	1986 (post-GRH)	1987 (request)	1987 (+/-), 1986 dollars	1987 (+/-), 1986 percent	1987 (+/-), 1981 dollars	1987 (+/-), 1981 percent
Multilateral aid: Int Bank for Recon and Dev.....	\$32.8	\$105.0	\$182.8	\$77.8	74.1	\$150.0	457.3

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS: FISCAL YEARS 1981, 1986, 1987—Continued

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	1981	1986 (post-GRH)	1987 (request)	1987 (+/-), 1986 dollars	1987 (+/-), 1986 percent	1987 (+/-), 1981 dollars	1987 (+/-), 1981 percent
Int Development Assoc	520.0	669.9	750.0	80.1	12.0	230.0	44.2
IDA African Facility		71.8		-71.8		0	
Int Finance Corp	0	27.8	35.0	7.2	25.7	35.0	
Inter-American Dev Bank	251.5	85.8	143.5	57.7	67.2	-108.0	-42.9
Asian Development Bank	139.6	107.1	143.2	36.1	33.7	3.6	2.6
African Development Fund	41.7	59.6	75.0	15.4	25.8	33.3	79.9
African Development Bank	18.0	15.5	18.0	2.5	16.1	0	0
Multi Invest Guarantee Ag			44.4	44.4		44.4	
Subtotal, Int Financial Inst	1,003.6	1,142.6	1,391.9	249.3	21.8	388.3	38.7
Int Organizations and Programs	210.4	337.2	186.0	-51.2	-21.6	-24.4	-11.6
Int Fund for Agricultural Dev	0	28.7		-28.7		0	
Total, multilateral aid	1,214.0	1,408.5	1,577.9	169.4	12.0	363.9	30.0
Bilateral economic aid:							
Agriculture	635.0	669.9	709.9	40.0	6.0	74.9	11.8
Population	190.0	239.3	250.0	10.8	4.5	60.0	31.6
Health	135.0	192.2	150.8	-41.4	-21.5	15.8	11.7
Child Survival Fund		23.9	25.0	1.1	4.5	25.0	
Education	101.0	162.7	179.8	17.1	10.5	78.8	78.0
Sci Dev Act/Science and Tech	123.9	177.1	231.5	54.4	30.7	107.6	86.8
Subtotal, development accounts	1,184.9	1,465.1	1,547.0	81.9	5.6	362.1	30.6
Amer Schools/Hospitals Abroad	20.0	33.5	10.0	-23.5	-70.1	-10.0	-50.0
International Disaster Asst	73.0	21.5	25.0	3.5	16.1	-48.0	-65.8
Sahel Development Program	91.0	77.0	80.0	3.0	3.8	-11.0	-12.1
Foreign Service Retirement	27.9	41.2	45.5	4.3	10.3	17.6	63.1
AID Deob/Reob Authority		4.8		-4.8		0	
AID Operating Expenses	300.6	360.2	388.9	28.7	8.0	88.3	29.4
AID Inspector General Op Exp		20.2	21.8	1.6	8.0	21.8	
Trade and Development Program		18.1	18.0	.1	.6	18.0	
Housing and Investment Guarantees			10.0	10.0		10.0	
African Development Foundation	(0.5)	3.7	6.5	2.8	74.2	6.5	
Inter-American Foundation	15.8	11.5	10.8	-7	-6.0	-5.0	-31.6
Peace Corps	105.5	124.4	126.2	1.8	1.4	20.7	19.6
Int Narcotics Control Program	36.0	55.0	65.4	10.4	18.8	29.4	81.7
Migration and Refugee Asst	490.7	324.3	347.5	23.2	7.1	-143.2	-29.2
Emerg Migration and Refugee Fund			25.0	25.0		25.0	
Subtotal, bilateral development	2,345.4	2,560.6	2,727.6	167.0	6.5	382.2	16.3
Public Law 480 (food aid)	1,229.0	1,243.3	1,164.4	-78.9	-6.3	-64.6	-5.3
Subtotal, bilat development/food		3,804.0	3,892.0	88.0	2.3		
Economic Support Fund	2,104.5	3,540.9	4,093.8	552.9	15.6	1,989.3	94.5
Anti-Terrorism Program		7.1	9.8	2.7	38.4	9.8	
Peacekeeping Operations	25.0	32.5	39.0	6.5	19.9	14.0	56.0
Nicaragua Contra Aid							
Total, bilateral economic aid	5,703.9	7,384.5	8,034.6	650.1	8.8	2,330.7	40.9
Military aid:							
Military Asst Program (MAP)	110.2	748.4	996.5	248.1	33.2	886.3	804.3
Int Military Ed and Training (IMET)	28.4	52.2	68.8	16.6	31.9	40.4	142.3
Foreign Military Sales Credits	3,045.2	4,966.8	5,661.0	694.2	14.0	2,614.8	85.8
(FMS Forgiven Credits)	(500.0)	(2,966.7)	(3,100.0)	(133.3)	(4.3)	(2,600.0)	(520.0)
(FMS Market/Concessional Loans)	(2,546.2)	(2,000.1)	(2,561.0)	(560.9)	(28.0)	(14.8)	(0.6)
FMS Guarantee Reserve							
Total, military aid	3,184.8	5,767.4	6,726.3	958.9	16.6	3,541.5	111.2
Total, foreign assistance app	10,102.7	14,560.4	16,338.8	1,778.4	12.2	6,236.1	61.7

FOUR HONORED AT MOST DISTINGUISHED GREEK AMERICAN BANQUET

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the United Hellenic Voters of America, headquartered in Addison, IL, held its most distinguished Greek-American Banquet in March and honored four distinguished Greek-Americans in the fields of medicine, religion, government, and business.

This year's honorees were:

DR. ALEXANDER DOOLAS—MEDICINE

Dr. Doolas is presently a senior attending surgeon at the Rush Presbyterian St. Luke's Hospital in Chicago. He is also a director of undergraduate surgical education at the Rush Medical College and a very respected individual in the Greek-American community.

REVEREND FATHER EMMANUEL M. LIONIKIS—RELIGION

Father Lionikis has served the church in many capacities during his 39 years in the Diocese of Chicago. He has also published a number of church service books. He is well known and respected in the community at large.

STEVEN G. NASH—GOVERNMENT

Mr. Nash was elected to the Senate of the Illinois General Assembly in 1978 and served until 1982, he was then elected to the House of Representatives in the Illinois General Assembly. He is well respected as a legislator and community leader.

TOM ANGELOS—BUSINESS

Mr. Angelos was formerly a newspaper publisher and editor in Greece. He is presently the owner and manager of the successful Ambassador Banquets in Elmhurst, IL.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in congratulating these four distinguished members of the Illinois Greek-American community, and in wishing them continued success.

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, recently our distinguished colleague and my fellow Ohioan, MARY ROSE OAKAR, of Cleveland, was featured in the Washington Post. I include this article in the RECORD for the benefit of this entire body.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 31, 1986]

MARY ROSE OAKAR—A LEADER IN THE HOUSE WHO SPEAKS HER MIND

(By Spencer Rich)

About a month ago, recalls Rep. Mary Rose Oakar (D-Ohio), President Reagan told a "welfare story" at a meeting with congressional leaders. It was about a jobless welfare recipient who phoned the employment service ostensibly to look for work, but

who hung up immediately when told it was available.

Oakar, who attends the White House meetings as secretary of the House Democratic Caucus, says she and other Democrats who were there—led by the Speaker of the House—were "livid."

"So I raised my hand and the president said, 'Yes, Mary Rose?' I said, 'A lot of unemployed people are very proud and don't want welfare. I know 50-year-old unemployed workers who will not take welfare. It's not true that people prefer welfare.'"

The incident illustrates a lot about Oakar and why she is receiving increasing attention as a tough legislator squarely within the liberal Democratic social welfare tradition.

"She speaks up, that's for sure," said a Republican who asked not to be named. "She stands by her guns and doesn't hesitate to let you know what she's thinking—and she knows what she's talking about," said a Democratic official.

The perception is also beginning to spread that Oakar, 46, a 10-year veteran of the House, is a strong party activist of remarkable energy. She is unusual in serving on four committees: Banking, Aging, Post Office and Civil Service, and House Administration. At the Select Committee on Aging, she heads the task force on Social Security, elderly and women. She also chairs the key Post Office and Civil Service compensation and benefits subcommittee, which handles federal employe pensions, health benefits and pay.

And in recent years, Oakar has risen within her party. A member of the Democratic National Committee, she serves as House congressional liaison to the DNC and as an at-large House Democratic whip. She is starting a political action committee called Economic Security PAC to help female candidates, and she speaks at colleges to help recapture the campuses for the Democrats.

"I think the kids are coming around," she says. Oakar calls herself a "moderate" Democrat, but others call her a traditional liberal. She says that when people hear the specifics of what President Reagan wants to cut in domestic programs, they respond well to the Democrats.

Oakar, first elected to the House in 1976, has won most elections since by huge margins; in 1984 she had no opposition and only 44 write-in votes were cast against her. Representing downtown Cleveland and suburbs that include many white ethnic working-class people, she has built a strong pro-labor record.

Increasingly, Oakar also has become associated with women's issues—pay, pensions and Social Security protection—and with consumer matters. These issues have been in political decline in recent years, but Oakar persists.

On the other hand, while she supports the Equal Rights Amendment and family planning and has sponsored numerous bills on women's benefits, she recognizes that "certain women's groups will never endorse me" because of her stance on abortion. She opposes Medicaid funding of abortions and favors special benefits for pregnant women to provide alternatives to abortion.

The youngest of five children in a Maronite Catholic family, Oakar was born in Cleveland, attended Roman Catholic schools, got her B.A. in English, speech and drama at Ursuline College in Cleveland and her M.A. in fine arts from nearby John Carroll University. Her father, a Lebanese im-

migrant, was a steelworker, construction worker and stonemason.

She once thought of working on the stage, but turned to teaching instead—for four years at a high school and for six years at Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland, where she taught English, speech, drama and fine arts. Although she almost was fired for starting a union at the college, she says, "technically I am still on leave from Cuyahoga."

She began her political career as a neighborhood activist, served on the City Council from 1973 to 1976, and made a bid for Congress when the incumbent sought a Senate seat.

When she came to the House, Speaker Thomas P. (Tip) O'Neill Jr. (D-Mass.) kept calling her "Rosemary." When she mentioned this, he explained that he has a daughter named Rosemary and a sister named Mary Rose, and that he's always had trouble keeping the names straight.

Oakar is philosophical about being a leading woman in a traditionally male club. "I really can't say I have suffered discrimination in the House because of being a woman. At times the fellows go out of their way to not leave you out." But she says women in the House do feel a special bond, "because after all, there are only 24 of us."

Oakar has a heavy agenda in the 99th Congress, with a special emphasis this year on banking legislation. Because many banks "only want to cater to large accounts," she is pressing to require banks to give certain free services, to bar a minimum balance requirement and to pay interest on all balances.

She is concerned about interstate banking takeovers in which big banks buy smaller banks and funnel the money from depositor savings to investments in other areas. With Rep. Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.), she wants to introduce legislation requiring large banks to reinvest money in the local community and to make their portfolios public. The Banking Committee has endorsed the idea.

She also has been pushing (so far without success) for big increases in Social Security benefits for women; more free credits for years of absence from the labor force for child care, better benefits for widows and widowers, and above all, for earnings-sharing—a highly controversial plan to give a person Social Security credits for half the earnings of her or his spouse, thereby entitling these people to Social Security disability or old-age benefits on their own.

She is also a strong advocate of improving private pensions for women—for example, cutting the 10-year vesting requirement, which works to the disadvantage of women who join the work force late or who make time off for child care, to five years.

An Oakar-engineered House bill calling for a broad study of pay equity for women and minorities in the federal pay system awaits Senate action. "Women are now 40 percent" of the federal labor force, she says, "but they're clustered in the bottom four rungs" of the scale.

Oakar also describes herself as "a big advocate of federal workers. This administration is just trying to take everything away from them—gut the retirement system, gut their health benefits and gut their pay, too."

While cutting an increasingly high profile in Washington, Oakar still has that other attribute of successful politicians: she's a big home-town booster. Cleveland, she says, is enjoying a "fabulous regrowth" after being

hit hard by the shrinkage of heavy industry. Employers based in the city or nearby include TRW, Standard Oil, Eaton, LTV Steel and the only National Aeronautics and Space Administration center "north of the Mason-Dixon line and east of the Mississippi." Cleveland, she says, "is second only to New York in the arts, with the Cleveland Orchestra, all the museums, magnificent old theaters now being revived instead of turned into parking lots, outstanding health institutions."

In fact, Cleveland's health institutions are such that "one year, five members of Congress had heart bypasses at the Cleveland Clinic. I kept sending them baskets of flowers."

BACKGROUND

Elected to House of Representatives in 1976. Ran unopposed in 1984. Represents Ohio's 20th District, including Cleveland. Serves as secretary of the House Democratic Caucus, House congressional liaison to Democratic National Committee and at-large Democratic House whip, and on four committees. Special interest in labor, consumers and women's issues.

MOSCOW MUST START COMPLYING WITH 1975 HELSINKI AGREEMENT

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, today marks the opening of the Helsinki Review Conference on human contacts in Berne, Switzerland. The United States has sent a strong delegation headed by Ambassador Michael Novak.

To commemorate this occasion, the New York Times has printed two excellent statements on the conference, which I am introducing into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Former Soviet prisoner of conscience Anatoly Shcharansky sent one statement to open the Parallel Helsinki Review Conference. The Parallel Conference is a meeting of nongovernmental organizations which has been organized by the Sakharov Institute and Resistance International. Shcharansky highlights the repression and reprisals taken against the original Soviet Helsinki Monitoring Groups, himself the most visible member, and the intolerable treatment being accorded to Dr. Andrei Sakharov, and calls for the Soviet Union to begin—after 10 years—to comply with the Helsinki agreement.

In his article in today's New York Times, Leonard Sussman stressed the importance of focusing attention on the consistent violations of the Helsinki Accords on the part of the Soviet Union. Sussman points out that we are presently in a position to influence human rights practice, and we should take advantage of this forum to do so.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 13, 1986]

MOSCOW MUST START COMPLYING WITH THE 1975 HELSINKI AGREEMENT

(Anatoly B. Shcharansky, who left the Soviet Union in February, is living in Israel. This statement is to be delivered tomorrow in Berne, Switzerland, at the Parallel Helsinki Review Conference, a meeting of non-

governmental representatives designed to coincide with the official Helsinki review conference. The meeting was organized by the Andrei Sakharov Institute and by Resistance International, human rights organizations.)

(By Anatoly B. Shcharansky)

I left the world of the gulag only a few weeks ago, and I am not yet ready to speak in public. Nevertheless, I could not refuse to greet you, if only in a recorded message, because the problems that brought you here today are extremely important to many people fighting for their rights in the Soviet Union and elsewhere in the world.

Ten years ago, several dissidents in the Soviet Union created a public group to monitor Moscow's compliance with the Helsinki agreements. Our idea was that many of the human rights issues that divide the governments of the Eastern and Western blocs could be agreed upon by independent representatives of public opinion—people in both East and West who have a vital interest in the implementation of the Helsinki agreements in their own countries. So we voluntarily took upon ourselves the task of examining how the Helsinki agreements were being implemented in the Soviet Union.

Ten years have passed, and what do we see? The Jewish emigration that began in the early 1970's has been brought to a stop by the Soviet authorities. Several hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews who want to leave the Soviet Union cannot do so for no other reason than that the Soviet Government has decided that they cannot.

I spent nine years in Soviet prisons and camps, and I can certify that the conditions in which political prisoners are detained have been getting steadily worse. I shall mention only two particular problems.

First, a new article of the Penal Code, article 188-1, introduced in late 1983, allows the Soviet authorities to extend almost at will the length of time that one remains in prison or in camp. This measure has already been applied to several members of Helsinki monitoring groups now in prison. It is used by the authorities both to prolong the detention of political prisoners who resist "re-education"—who refuse to comply with efforts to make them change their ideas and convictions—and to intimidate the others.

Second, according to a new official directive introduced barely a year ago in the Soviet Union, political prisoners who start a hunger strike can be immediately thrown into a dungeon—a measure that very much aggravates their sufferings.

These are only two examples of the many ways that the authorities are cracking down on political prisoners in camps. Why is this so important? Because, as a rule, the policy regarding the camps very much reflects the general situation in the country—the disregard for the rule of law and the harshness of the repression.

I would like to attract your special attention to the Sakharov case. I do not need to remind you that Andrei Dmitrievich Sakharov is a hero, a model of a honorable man who continues the very best traditions of the Russian intelligentsia, fighting for the trampled rights—be they national, religious or political—of all the people of the Soviet Union.

Needless to say, his present situation is extremely difficult. He is cruelly and unjustly isolated from his family and friends, barred from scientific work and normal social activities. His state of health inspires growing fears. I consider it vitally important at this moment to raise our voices and call for the

Soviet Government to stop its persecution of Andrei Sakharov—to grant this remarkable man the possibility to continue his noble activities in dignity and normal conditions.

Looking back at the first documents issued by our Helsinki group 10 years ago, I must say that the longer I spent in prison, the more accurate they seemed and the more important. I also believe that it is more necessary than ever now for international public opinion to press the Soviet Union on these matters. It is high time for Moscow to begin complying with the Helsinki agreement signed in 1975.

I think that the Andrei Sakharov Institute and Resistance International have made a great contribution by organizing this meeting. I hope this work will be continued and will lead to further contacts, contributing at a real détente and to the establishment of genuine trust between the superpowers. In the long run, however, there will be no trust or détente until both sides show full respect for human rights in the keeping with the Helsinki agreement.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1986]

IDENTIFY ALL HELSINKI VIOLATORS

(By Leonard R. Sussman)

President Reagan's statement last month attacking human rights violators on the right as well as the left drew great attention from the American press and public—and it was indeed newsworthy that a President known for chiding the Soviet Union began to chastise right-wing oppressors. But will the press remain interested when the camera focuses once again on the authenticated evils of the Soviet empire?

That test starts today and continues through May 26 as delegations from the 35 countries that signed the Helsinki accords in 1975 meet in Bern, Switzerland, to examine whether each signatory is fulfilling its pledge to improve "human contacts."

The meeting will focus on rather intimate human activities—family reunification, travel within and between countries, broadening contacts among citizens of different countries, marriage of people of two nationalities and cross-border contacts between religious groups, labor unions and other institutions.

It all sounds innocuous enough, but crossing borders—whether for simple travel or to reunite families—can still be a dangerous, even deadly business in Europe. Barbed wire and police dogs still deter any crossings from East Germany that have not been paid for by a Western government supplying ransoms for the reuniting of families. Just last year, Czechoslovak guards shot and killed Frantisek Faktor for crossing to Austria. Yugoslav border police killed another Czechoslovak citizen already on Austrian soil, and several others drowned while crossing between Yugoslavia and Austria.

Most prominent Polish human rights activists do not travel abroad for fear they will not be allowed to return to Poland. And the second largest category of political "patients" in the psychiatric hospitals of the Soviet Union—dissidents make up the largest single group—is composed of people who have attempted unauthorized border crossings.

It wasn't surprising, then, that the Soviet Union and its allies strongly opposed the Bern meeting. They belatedly agreed only when the West insisted on maintaining "linkage" between these humanitarian questions and the security aspects of the Helsinki accords.

Bureaucratic procedures for expanding human contacts may not seem newsworthy, but change could reflect significant improvements in the closed societies of the Eastern bloc. Besides, even without significant change—and it is unlikely that this six-week conference will lead to major openings—the quiet oppression in Soviet-bloc countries is always newsworthy, and providing publicity is the most important thing we can do for the victims in the gulags.

The human rights violations that receive most attention occur in countries with significant public connections to the United States. Yet the worst human rights abuses routinely occur in places where we have little or no connections—Iraq, Cambodia, Vietnam, Afghanistan, North Korea and Eastern Europe, among others. Because Washington has relatively little official business in these countries, there is little press coverage of violations there, and the public receives a distorted view of where the worst oppressors are headquartered.

Of course, the countries where we have the best connections are also the places where we can do most good, using our leverage—usually the promise of economic or military aid—to influence human rights practices. But we can have an effect even on countries where we have no leverage—by providing persuasive public and private expressions of unflagging American abhorrence of human rights abuses and of our determination to work by all effective means to eliminate them.

That abhorrence will be aired in detail by the American delegation at Bern—and it should be properly reported in the press these next six weeks. The Administration is making an important effort to balance its human rights policy, and it is time for the press to provide similar balance in covering the human rights story.

The Soviet Union has insisted that the Bern meetings be closed to journalists, but the American press and public have a responsibility to attend to the "naming of names" at the Helsinki review conference.

H.R. 3002: EXPERIMENT IN VOLUNTARY SERVICES

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see H.R. 3002, the Executive Exchange Program Voluntary Services Act of 1986 come to the floor of the House. The need for this limited experimental program, which would allow the volunteers to be paid by their private industry employer, makes the point that Federal employees, including managers, do not receive salaries which are comparable to their private industry counterparts.

The second aspect of the bill, as amended by the committee, which is significant is the emphasis on the application of laws and regulations on conflicts of interest, financial disclosure and standards of conduct for Federal employees to the private sector volunteers. This section will need attention if we are to ensure that voluntary placements in Federal agencies are not simply a vehicle for making contacts which will benefit the volunteer and his or her parent company for years to come.

This experiment upon which we embark is an exceedingly limited one. There can be up to 10 volunteers sponsored by their parent companies over the next 3 fiscal years. The limited nature of the experiment makes it possible for me to support it. Let us all monitor this experiment closely lest we find that we have created a new way to preserve revolving doors which have worked against the best interests of the American taxpayer.

THE COMMON BOND OF GENERATIONS

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, to call the members' attention to an important report released at the committee's April 8 hearing on the interdependence of the generations. This report, "The Common Stake: The Interdependence of Generations," is the definitive statement on the common bond of generations in the health and economic security of Americans of all ages. Yesterday, I distributed copies of this report to each member of the House on behalf of its author—the Gerontological Society of America [GSA]. Today, I urge the Members to carefully review the report's findings.

The results of the committee's April 8 hearing and the GSA report highlight the emotional and economic interdependence of families across generations and their common stake in programs for both young and old. They also alert the Nation to the serious problem of poverty among children that threatens their and America's future. Most important, they warn against the divisive and destructive notion of "intergenerational conflict" that has been recently popularized in the media.

Clearly, we face a serious challenge in meeting the needs of today's and tomorrow's children, young families and elderly—a challenge that calls for a reassessment of current funding priorities. Where some, however, would pit the generations against one another in funding decisions, the GSA report offers a responsible framework for public policy based, instead, on the interdependence of young and old within the family and in society at large.

Few would deny the common bond that exists among family members of all ages and the benefit to older generations of investing in their own children and grandchildren. Few would deny the relief that programs for the aged provide families on whom the elderly would otherwise depend. Yet, after 5 years of cutbacks in programs for America's vulnerable citizens, rising inflation and a deplorable increase in poverty among children, a notion of "intergenerational inequity" has emerged.

This is a frightening notion that defies the strength of traditional family bonds and draws an artificial, simplistic parallel between poor young and "well-off" elderly. The issue is not whether one generation has been assisted at the expense of another, but whether the needs of all vulnerable Americans will be met now and in the future. To the extent that we

have made progress in improving the economic security of older persons—the Nation can be proud. To the extent that older persons and their families remain unprotected against the catastrophic costs of long term illness—the Nation must move quickly to provide protection. To the extent that children are being driven into poverty—the Nation must move immediately to pull them out.

The GSA report provides us with the means for educating ourselves and the public on the common bond of generations. With this report in hand, it is my hope that we can redirect the notion of "intergenerational conflict" toward what, in reality, are serious problems of poverty and health-related financial destitution that strike Americans of all ages and carry a heavy toll for the entire family. I urge you, as Members of Congress and as spokespeople for Americans of all ages, to join with me in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, the attached summary of the GSA's report follows:

"THE COMMON STAKE: THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF GENERATIONS"

PREPARED BY THE GERONTOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA [GSA]

Released April 8, 1986 at House Select Committee on Aging hearing "Investing in America's Families: The Common Bond of Generations"

This fact sheet outlines four key issues that are covered in the Gerontological Society of America's (GSA) report, "The Common Stake: The Interdependence of Generations", and that the Society considers essential to a proper framing of the upcoming policy debates on the growing needs of an aging society.

Responsible use of data

It is undoubtedly true that the elderly population of the U.S. is growing and will continue to increase. This leads some researchers and policy makers to question whether there will be sufficient resources to support a retired baby boom generation and whether future taxpayers will have to shoulder unreasonably heavy burdens. These fears are being used to justify short-sighted policies and are helping to create the very conflict between generations that this group hopes to avoid. However, these arguments are based on "voodoo demographics" and ignore a significant part of the picture. Specifically:

Their assumptions do not take into account the effects of economic growth. Given a realistic assumption of two percent growth, the real costs in 2030 of supporting each dependent could be 5 to 6 times greater than in 1960 without increasing the burden on society.

This view also ignores the fact that the aged dependency ratio is only part of the overall dependency ratio. According to the Census Bureau, the dependency burden—which includes underage dependents as well as the elderly—will remain below the levels of the mid-1960's, even at the height of the retirement of the baby-boom generation.

Lastly, this view fails to account for the increasing proportion of the elderly who work. The aged dependency ratio assumes that the elderly do not contribute to the economy and that all persons 18-64 are productive—obviously not true. One-quarter of men aged 65 to 69 worked in 1984 and, in the future, a larger proportion of the elderly will continue to work.

Interdependence of generations

Fifty years ago the framers of our Social Security Act understood that the generations are interdependent. They realized that "old age pensions are in a real sense measures in behalf of children,"—that societally guaranteed benefits to the elderly benefit children and young adults because those public dollars relieve younger generations of heavy financial burdens. The elderly likewise benefit from programs aimed primarily at the young. Each generation has a stake in social policies targeted at those in other age groups:

Younger generations have two important stakes in programs which assist the elderly maintain a decent quality of life. First, programs which assist their grandparents and parents to remain as autonomous as possible in old age relieve younger families of financial burdens and intra-family stresses. And second, they will be served by those programs when they become old.

By providing cash benefits to older family members, Social Security frees up younger and middle-aged family members to concentrate more financial resources on their children to help them become productive members of society.

Social Security stabilizes family and community life by enabling family members to partially protect themselves from major financial risks.

Social Security provides disability and survivors protection to young families.

The elderly benefit directly and indirectly from education, training, and health programs which help increase the productivity of the workforce. The eventual contributions to economic growth and tax revenue will benefit current workers as they age.

A July 1985 Harris poll indicates that, given a choice between cutting defense spending or cutting Medicare, more than 70 percent of adult Americans respond that they would prefer to see defense cuts.

Family care

Contrary to myth, the elderly have not been deserted by their families. However, current public policies are putting extreme pressure on already overburdened caregiving families. If the government does not respond to these growing pressures many families will be overwhelmed by the stress of providing care to relatives. This could effectively undermine the family and ultimately add to the economic and social costs to the nation.

Families, not the government or social agencies, provide 80-90 percent of the health/social supportive services: medically-related care and home nursing, hands-on personal care, household maintenance, transportation, and shopping.

Only 4.3 percent of the daily services needed by older people are provided by Government or social agency workers. The rest is either purchased or given by the family.

Families nowadays provide more care, and more difficult care, over longer periods of time to more older people than ever before. They also strenuously avoid placing older people into institutions, often exhausting themselves emotionally, physically, and financially before taking that step.

When adults aged 18-64 are asked to indicate which public programs they would support, even if an increase in taxes were required, they overwhelmingly favor income security and health care for the old.

Diversity of the elderly

Stereotypes of the elderly—as either all rich or all poor, all healthy or all ill, all retiring voluntarily or all retiring involuntarily—are inaccurate and do not provide a realistic basis for policy making. The older population is actually composed of many different groups of different ages, with vastly different needs. Just as the old image of all the elderly being poverty stricken and eating dog food was inaccurate, so is it now untrue that they all are rolling in wealth. In fact:

In 1984, more than one-fifth (5.6 million) of all elderly were classified as poor and near poor—that is, below the near poverty thresholds (\$6,224 for a single elderly person and \$7,853 for an elderly couple).

Well over half (56 percent) of women aged 65 and older are not currently married and therefore are likely to be facing old age alone. In addition, not only do older women have substantially lower incomes than men, but most are not entitled to pension benefits and many have no health care insurance.

Certain groups of the elderly—namely widows, the very old and minorities—have very high poverty rates. About 23 percent of all Hispanic elderly, 36 percent of all black elderly, 24 percent of elderly unmarried white women, 46 percent of elderly unmarried Hispanic women and 63 percent of elderly unmarried black women had below poverty incomes in 1983.

While about four-fifths of the non-institutionalized elderly report their health as "good" or "excellent", the other fifth report being unable to carry on a major activity of daily living.

**FORT LEONARD WOOD: BEST
BASE IN THE U.S. ARMY**

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of personal pride that I rise today to inform my colleagues that the Department of Defense has chosen Fort Leonard Wood, MO—located in my congressional district—as the best base in the U.S. Army. This army-wide award given Fort Leonard Wood, was based on how they treat their people, perform their mission, and wisely use resources. Fort Wood was also praised for having innovative management programs that improve productivity and quality of life.

The commanding general of the post, Maj. Gen. James W. van Loben Sels, will be coming to Washington to receive the Commander in Chief's Award for Installation Excellence later this month.

Along with providing basic training for between 30,000 and 40,000 new soldiers each year, Fort Leonard Wood is in process of becoming the leading military engineer training center in the free world. The decision last year to move the Army Corps of Engineers officers' training school to Fort Wood by 1989, will continue the tradition of excellent instruction at the base that helped win the Presidential award this year.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain all the Members join me in congratulating the men and women of Fort Leonard Wood, and wishing them all

the best as they continue to do the most important of jobs—protecting liberty, freedom, and our way of life.

**PUBLIC SERVICE OF McGLADREY,
HENRICKSON AND
PULLEN**

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity today to thank the accounting firm of McGladrey, Henrickson and Pullen for demonstrating that good tax policy is consistent with good politics.

Partners of McGladrey, Henrickson and Pullen ran a tax reform workshop in my district last fall while the tax bill was under consideration by the Ways and Means Committee. This workshop provided me with the opportunity to see how my constituents would fare if various tax reform provisions were enacted.

The workshop was conducted on September 5, 1985 in Dublin, CA. Forty-nine constituents volunteered to bring in their 1984 tax returns for confidential analysis by the accountants. The accountants collected the 1984 tax information and compared how much in taxes each constituent actually paid in 1984 with what they would pay if the President's tax reform proposal were enacted. The accountants who ran the workshop analyzed the effects of proposed changes and explained these effects to the workshop participants. The constituents then received a computer printout of their tax analysis for their personal records.

The tax reform workshop was important to me because it illustrated to my constituents that rate reduction could offset the loss of a tax preference or even a combination of tax preferences.

McGladrey, Henrickson and Pullen adapted their computer analysis as the tax reform bill moved through the legislative process to provide a comparison of the various proposals. With each modification, the majority of the workshop participants received a larger tax cut.

By stripping the code of outdated and inefficient tax preferences and reducing the rates, Congress will enable businessmen to concentrate on the economics of their business decisions without getting waylaid by complicated tax considerations.

Closing corporate loopholes to broaden the tax base and reduce tax rates dramatically reduces the tax burden of individuals. Ninety percent of the constituents who volunteered to have their tax returns analyzed would receive a tax cut if H.R. 3838 were enacted today.

The average tax cut for these individuals was \$760.90 a year!

Data like this helps remind us as legislators that although the tax reform process is complicated and painful, the result of our labor, if we let good policy prevail, is sweet and simple—more money in the pockets of most individual taxpayers!

The Senate Finance Committee is grappling now with the same tax reform issues and the

pressures of provincial interests seem insurmountable. I am delighted to share the results of the McGladrey, Hendrickson and Pullen tax reform workshop to show the beauty of tax reform.

**TEXTILE INDUSTRY HONORS
WAYNE COUNTY RADIO STA-
TION**

HON. DON SUNDQUIST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted today to bring to the House's attention a very high honor that has been bestowed upon a radio station in my district. WNBG Radio in Waynesboro, TN, under the leadership of Station Manager Lisa Nutt, has been awarded a \$25,000 cash prize for its efforts to promote the "Crafted With Pride in the U.S.A." campaign. Of 753 entries nationwide, WNBG placed first for its outstanding promotion of American-made goods, specifically in the textile and apparel industries.

In light of the fact that WNBG won first prize over stations with literally 100 times its wattage, I'm proud of this high achievement. But I'm even more proud of the total community effort from the industries of Wayne and Hardin counties that made this award possible. Lisa and her staff rallied the resources of merchants, workers, political leaders, and concerned residents—from Girl Scouts to senior citizens—to promote American made products.

Stuart Epperson, national chairman for radio broadcasters for the Crafted With Pride in the U.S.A. Council, will formally present the \$25,000 this week. "We're talking about more than just a contest," said Mr. Epperson. "We're talking about American jobs. A lot depends on what we do to save the entire manufacturing industry in this country."

Though the Crafted With Pride Council is primarily affiliated with the American textile industry, WNBG used the contest as a vehicle also to promote Wayne and Hardin Counties' shoe and furniture industries.

More than any other area of my congressional district, these counties are impacted tremendously by international trade fluctuations in these industries. And despite all of their successful efforts to produce superior products at the lowest possible price, everyone knows that these industries cannot survive without Federal Government policies and practices that enable our industries to be competitive worldwide.

As chairman of the Republican Task Force on International Trade, I'll continue to work in Congress to create a stable and fair world trading atmosphere in which all of us can compete and prosper.

I get pretty fed up when I hear that American businesses must fail because they are wasteful and can't compete in world markets. That's nonsense. I'm familiar enough with our textile and shoe industries to know that these industries are doing more to modernize and stay ahead of the game than practically any other industries in the world. I'm convinced

that Americans can and will produce superior products at fair prices. The efforts that culminated in the award to WNBG Radio demonstrate this commitment.

I frankly can't think of a better cause—a display of pride in our American fiber, textile, shoe and home furnishing industries. WNBG's efforts to promote Wayne County products represents perhaps the finest display of good citizenship and pride I've witnessed from a radio station since becoming involved in public service. Lisa Nutt in particular deserves all the credit in the world for her hard and persistent work on behalf of these industries. I salute WNBG for its outstanding performance.

**JOANN BURRIS TO RECEIVE
KERN COUNTY'S REGISTERED
NURSE OF THE YEAR AWARD**

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 6, the Kern County Registered Nurse Society will present its annual "Nurse of the Year Award" to Joann Burris.

Joann is most deserving of this prestigious award. Throughout her 19 years of service, she has continually demonstrated the utmost dedication of excellence in her field. As supervisor of a high risk neonatal area at the Kern Medical Center, Joann has implemented many programs to improve the entire area of maternal child health.

In addition to the numerous medical organizations in which Joanne participates, she takes the time to initiate programs to improve the growth and development of her patients and staff. She pioneered the Infant Stimulation Program at Kern Medical Center which teaches both staff and new mothers how to respond to infant signals. She also established the Active Outreach Program which utilizes stabilization techniques to decrease high risks to the newborn. She combines the sharp sense of professionalism necessary for crisis care with a unique sensitivity to the emotional needs of the newborn and their families.

Joann makes continuing contributions to her field by sharing her knowledge and expertise with those around her. She has organized orientation programs, led lectures and demonstrations, and has published significant research on neonatal crisis care. She is consistently innovating so that her work will reach the largest number of people possible and all may benefit from her skills and experience.

Joann is an example of one who is dedicated to improving the lives of others. Her contributions are even more impressive when one considers the delicacy of newborn lives. She is most certainly an asset to her profession, and I consider her a tremendous asset to the Bakersfield community.

I would like to extend my deepest congratulations to Joann and wish her continued success in her flourishing career.

**JACK KEMP ON REAL MILITARY
REFORM**

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, JACK KEMP, has, in a recent Wall Street Journal essay, closely examined the defense bureaucracy and found it sorely wanting. Too many procurement bureaucrats are zealously watched by too many congressional overseers. Their primary product is confusion and paralysis. This centralized, multilayered complex is Robert McNamara's legacy to a nation facing an enormous budget deficit and a menacing, expansionist Soviet Union.

JACK KEMP's proposed remedies are eminently sensible; many of them are currently at work in America's best-run corporations. Central staffs must be cut; accountability must be restored; internal competition must be encouraged, and innovation must be rewarded. But for these reforms to work, Congress must also curb its voracious appetite for micromanagement. The ultimate result should be greater efficiency in meeting and defeating the Soviet military challenge. I urge all my colleagues to read carefully the following essay by Representative KEMP.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 9, 1986]

**MILITARY REFORMERS, TAKE A CUE FROM
BUSINESS**
(By Jack Kemp)

Last fiscal year more than \$250 billion was spent on defense. Now for the quiz: Name just one item that the Defense Department bought with your money.

If my recent conversations about the defense budget are any guide, about half of you will give the following answer:

A \$700 toilet seat.

In 1985 that "toilet seat" became the symbol of the defense-reform debate. To would-be reformers it offered a memorable caricature of everything wrong with our "military-industrial complex." To their opponents it demonstrated not just a disregard for the truth, but even worse, a willful distraction from the serious business of restoring America's defenses.

Both sides have a point. Most Americans have heard only a misleading account of the \$700 toilet seat. But the true toilet-seat story also supports the case for defense reform—reform of quite a different kind than Congress is now pursuing.

"SEAT, WATER CLOSET"

Back in fall 1983, the inventory of spare part P/N 941673-101 for the Navy's fleet of P-3 long-range patrol aircraft fell to its replenishment point. Now, the Navy doesn't just go out, negotiate a price for his item, and buy it. Instead, this and most similar purchasing is done centrally for all the services by the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA).

So DLA put in the order for item P/N 941673-101: "Seat, Water Closet," proposed Lockheed price \$618.

The junior purchasing clerk at DLA may have scratched his head at a \$618 "Seat, Water Closet." But it was not his job, nor, most likely, did he have the technical expertise, to evaluate what a P-3—whatever that

is—required. Probably the thing was a lot more complicated than it sounded. And so it was. Part P/N 941673-101 is actually the large molded plastic assembly that holds a \$10 toilet seat.

Was \$618 a reasonable price for this item? Federal law, as passed by Congress, and federal regulations, as administered by another central defense agency, the Defense Contract Audit Administration (DCAA), are quite specific about how contractors set their prices.

In this case, everything appeared to be in order. So the purchase was approved—with a \$100 DLA surcharge tacked on.

The "\$700 toilet seat" later caused a stir because it was misleadingly labeled. What should have drawn attention, however, was the \$700-plus price tag on an item that the Navy's "price fighter team" subsequently concluded should have cost, even with substantial overhead charges and the DCAA-approved profit margin, about \$350: half the DLA price.

The Navy analysts also calculated the price using DCAA-approved charges. They estimated that direct labor and materials would come to \$140 per unit, while overhead charges, all fully authorized, would come to \$356, or more than twice the direct costs. Add on a few other allowable charges, plus profit, and the Navy calculated the DCAA-recommended price at \$628: about what Lockheed charged.

In many ways, this is already a tale of defense reform. Central purchasing by DLA was instituted in the 1960s to enforce uniform purchasing policies among the services, and to take advantage of economies of scale. Regulated, "by-the-book," pricing was established to ensure consistency, to combat fraud, and to simplify review. Centralization, rationalization: These were the goals of dedicated people struggling to bring our huge, diffuse defense establishment under control.

To American business, this story will sound familiar. The multiple administrative layers and swelling headquarters staffs, the overambitious pursuit of economies of scale through centralization, the by-the-book decision-making, the erosion of line operators' authority and accountability: Today these are all well-recognized management problems.

Twenty years ago, of course, they were popular management solutions. And no one represented that approach better than Ford's Robert McNamara, who imposed it vigorously on the Pentagon.

Numbers tell part of the story. Between 1962 and 1968 the total of civilian and military personnel employed by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other central agencies such as the newly created DLA grew from 32,000 to 89,000: Today it is close to 95,000. With this vast growth in the central agencies came more consistency and central control. With it, too, came more administrative layers, more paper work, less responsibility and accountability at every level. And as each new agency or office gained the opportunity to delay decisions or add pet requirements, weapons and equipment grew more and more expensive and took longer and longer to reach the field.

Today America's businesses are busy applying lessons from the past. In a new wave of corporate reform, companies are cutting central staffs, restoring accountability to line operators, fostering innovation, even encouraging internal competition. The need for strong central direction is no longer in-

terpreted as a call for centralization. Rationality is no longer confused with rigid regulation and uniformity.

Unfortunately our government, seldom learns so quickly. Many of the reforms being urged by Congress today would actually produce not less but more centralization and regulation.

In defense procurement, for example, there has been little effort to explore, much less clear, the vast jungle of laws and regulations. At a time when budgets are shrinking, the services themselves would have a powerful incentive to get more for their money—if they were allowed more flexibility in negotiating contracts, or saw success rewarded with something other than an immediate subtraction of any savings realized from the relevant line item in the budget.

But instead of restoring incentives and accountability to the military services, Congress has made itself one more administrative layer: a kind of giant corporate staff that second-guesses and micro-manages every defense program. In 1970 Congress made changes to 180 line items in the defense budget. In 1985, we made 1,315. Even the current legislative proposals to inject more competition and market discipline into defense contracting are mostly just more procurement rules.

This preoccupation with centralized control shows up, as well, in proposals for reorganizing the Defense Department. For example, legislation now before the Senate Armed Services Committee would concentrate power in the hands of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS). The chairman would replace the corporate JCS as the principal military adviser to the secretary of defense, and would also gain control over the JCS staff, which prepares strategic plans for the U.S. military. While this "reform" would give our civilian leaders more uniform advice—indeed, the advice of a single uniform—it would also help suppress the competition of ideas and encourage civilian leaders to abdicate their responsibility for making hard choices about our nation's defense policy.

Yes, our defense establishment needs reform—a different kind of reform. Rather than further concentrating control in the hands of central Pentagon bureaucracies or a single military adviser, we should be reducing red tape, eliminating bureaucratic layers and restoring responsibility to our line operators—the military services—while making them more accountable for their results. My colleagues Jim Courter (R. N.J.) has taken the lead in many of these issues. For a start we should cut back the size of the central defense bureaucracies. The Hudson Institute, a respected defense think tank, has proposed a 20% reduction. Navy Secretary John Lehman told the House Armed Services Committee last summer that the bureaucracy could be halved—so long, he added, as it didn't have to continue devoting over 700,000 employee-hours a year to answering congressional queries.

Nor should the services escape the knife. Their own bureaucracies have grown large and cumbersome, partly in response to the need for central "coordination" with the rest of the department.

For the most part, the work of the Packard Commission has reflected these concerns. President Reagan's directive to the Pentagon last week to implement virtually all of that panel's recommendations on reorganization and cuts in the bureaucracy should provide the impetus for progress. Now Congress should begin reexamining its

own contribution to the chaos. Instead of rushing to pass new laws regulating defense procurement, such as Rep. Les Aspin's bill up before a House Armed Services subcommittee this month, we should first take a long, hard look at what's already on the books. Instead of trying to direct every small decision made by the Defense Department, we should spend more of our time looking at the overall direction of defense policy.

MORE REALISTIC EXPECTATIONS

Finally—and this is not going to be a very popular suggestion—we must develop more realistic expectations about what any defense reform can achieve.

We may have a bloated defense bureaucracy. We do not have a bloated defense budget. The gross inefficiency of the Soviet Union's centrally planned economy has not prevented a leadership willing to impose great sacrifice on Soviet citizens from accumulating enormous military might. Greater efficiency on our own part will not let us escape the consequences of that Soviet buildup. President Reagan's defense program has started us down the road toward regaining our strength. We must seize the opportunity for significant defense reform; but we must not allow reform to become a smokescreen for returning to the policy of weakness that threatened peace and freedom just a few short years ago.

THE LAND OF FREEDOM

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the future of our Nation rests in the hands of the young people of America. And we should be proud that there are many bright, hard working, dedicated young people today who are willing and able to carry the torch of freedom in the years ahead.

I'd like to share with my colleagues the thoughts of one young woman from my State of North Dakota. Penny Knutt, a 16-year-old attending Rock Lake Public School in Rock Lake, ND, is the State's winner of the annual Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States' "Voice of Democracy" contest.

Penny makes several vital points in her winning entry which follows:

Past generations of Americans look back on their younger years and say, "Oh, those were the good ole' days." They seem to look at society and see no hope for the young people of today. They just look back on how good things were. But they are overlooking one small detail. They have to see the advances that have been made in the last 75 years or even in the last 10.

Who would have ever dreamed during World War I and II that someday wars might be fought in outer space. Or that man could even walk on the moon and explore our solar system. Or who would have ever thought that the human heart could completely be transplanted or man could live with a man made heart.

The advances and discoveries made in the last century have opened many doors and new opportunities for the young of today; that makes it very difficult to choose a field or profession. With all the opportunities just knocking at our door, all it takes is a

little initiative and encouragement, and there's a whole world of things just waiting to be explored.

One thing that being an American gives me is pride—pride in being from such a great country and pride for being part of the American people. As we've seen in recent events, the people of this great country seem to pull together in a great crisis. The overtaking of the TWA flight in which many American hostages were taken is an example. Or all the people in the country pulling together to help their brothers abroad and within the country with their financial difficulties is another. When one is hurt, everyone feels. When one is in trouble, they try their best to help him out of it. It's a sense of brotherhood that makes American people so unique. This gives us, as the future of America, a reason to do everything we can to keep that alive.

When people from other countries look at the United States, they see the land of freedom. From way back in the early history of our nation, people took their chances on the long treacherous voyages to seek freedom in the new world. They wanted freedom of speech and religion. Some came desperately seeking to save their own lives. In many countries today, the people still don't have the freedom that Americans do. In many countries the youth are not allowed to choose a career and pursue it. They are either chosen for them, or they are not allowed to or are unable to continue their education. This should inspire the young people of today even more to take advantage of all that America has to offer them—to make them realize that they really can "be all that they can be".

Because of this freedom, America's youth can strive to do the best at whatever direction in life that they choose. It is our duty to do all we can to make a better today and brighter tomorrow for our children and the generations to follow. I know that because of what America is today, I will be a better person, and I too will someday be able to say "Ah, yes, those were the good ole' days".

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCRIPT- WRITER CONTEST WINNER

HON. RONNIE G. FLIPPO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Speaker, the Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program was initiated 38 years ago with the endorsement of the U.S. Office of Education and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Sponsorship was provided by the National Association of Broadcasters, Electronic Industries Association, and State Association of Broadcasters.

Starting in 1958-59, the program was conducted in cooperation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars with the broadcasters still serving as sponsors. In 1961-62, the Veterans of Foreign Wars assumed sole sponsorship responsibility.

During the past 24 years under VFW sponsorship, the annual national scholarships have been increased to six, totaling \$32,500, with the first-place winner currently receiving a \$14,000 scholarship to the school of their choice. To date, over 5 million students have

participated nationwide with the winners receiving more than \$3 million in scholarship awards.

The winning script for the State of Alabama was written by Chever Hardin Kellogg of Huntsville, AL. Chev is a senior at Randolph School. He is an Eagle Scout, has served as president and vice president of the Student Government Association, and has received numerous awards for academic achievement.

This year's contest theme was "New Horizons for America's Youth." I want to congratulate Chev Kellogg on his thoughtful and insightful script, and I ask that his winning composition be reprinted here.

NEW HORIZONS FOR AMERICA'S YOUTH
(By Chev Kellogg, Huntsville, AL)

The sun. Every morning it rises, spraying its warm light over the dark earth. Every morning it rises, awakening people to a new day and new deeds. All over the nation it rises, a daily testament to the eternal hope and glory of mankind, and all over the nation the hopes and dreams of America's youth rise with it.

This dawn, like all the ones that came before and all that will follow, symbolizes the mission of American youth. Although the essence of a sunrise remains the same from day-to-day, the constantly changing contours and colors create a distinctly different effect each morning. Just as the sunrise accomplishes its age-old duty in a different way each day, American's youth constantly searches for a perfect solution to the problems that face our country today.

I am reminded of a story I once heard. It involved a man whose home lay through a maze of tiny streets and finally past a nearby junkyard. Because of these complicated directions, the man's journey to and from his home was always an arduous task and no guests could be directed to his house. This problem was solved, however, when the man became lost on his way home one day. In this lost condition the man drove through a few short streets and finally stopped at a peacock farm for directions. As he angrily stepped from his car the man suddenly saw his home in the distance and realized that he had found both a shorter and because of the peacock farm, more beautiful way home.

Just as this man found a more effective and more satisfying path to his home, the new horizon for America's youth lies in the search for new and better answers to old problems.

This search for new solutions is readily apparent in the solution of modern environmental problems. Parts of America are currently vexed by a major smog problem. In an attempt to stop this pollution of our environment, several cities raised the heights of their smokestacks. This height increase diffused the smoke higher into the atmosphere, where it was subsequently spread over a vast area, ending the smog problem. Unfortunately this diffusion of smoke contributed to another problem: acid rain. America is now seeking to solve both the smog and acid rain problems without further damage to the environment.

Just as America is seeking a solution to the constant problem of pollution, America's youth must use new ideas and new technologies to solve problems that, in the past, have seemed insoluble. Although the youth of America will rely on the same patriotic devotion to America, they must seek new routes to solve such problems as social security funding and the high crime rates na-

tionwide. Just as a tree, always growing upward, must send its branches in all directions to survive and grow, America's youth must search for new solutions to America's problems, and through the solving of these problems the nation will be made stronger.

The sun is setting now, with mere wisps of fleeting daylight left to remind us of its presence. But this sunset is not an end. It is instead a symbol of the unending promise that tomorrow holds for the new horizons of America's youth.

GEORGE BUSH'S MISTAKE

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, the saga of GEORGE BUSH's mission on behalf of higher oil prices is one of the most intriguing we have seen unfold in awhile. Despite some obfuscation, it does seem clear that Vice President BUSH thought it appropriate to lobby in various quarters—including Saudi Arabia—for higher oil prices. The fallacy of that policy has been cogently laid out in two recent articles which I ask be printed here.

Lester Thurow in the April 8 Boston Globe points out that while it is reasonable to have an element in national policy that deals with a particular economic distress that certain sectors of the economy encounter, that ought to be done in an explicit and open fashion and not by lobbying foreign nations to charge all Americans higher prices for a vital commodity.

And an editorial in the April 28 New Republic provides a very thoughtful and balanced analysis both of the problems and advantages presented to us by rapidly dropping oil prices, and proposes intelligent policies to take advantage of the opportunities and diminish the problems. Lobbying the Saudis to keep oil prices high is not one of the policies proposed.

The articles follow:

[From the Boston Globe, April 8, 1986]

AN INAPPROPRIATE TRIP

(By Lester C. Thurow)

Last week's newspapers reported that Vice President George Bush was off to Saudi Arabia to persuade the Sheiks to hold up the price of oil. The announced reason for this mission was to prevent oil firms and their associated service industries from going broke in the oil patch—Texas, Oklahoma and Louisiana—and to lessen the probability that Third World oil-exporting countries would go broke.

If treason is defined as a betrayal of American interests, then such a mission should be viewed as something close to economic treason. The United States imports approximately one-third of its oil supplies. Any country that is a net importer of oil unambiguously benefits from a fall in the price of oil. Americans have to spend less of their money buying energy and as a result they have more income left over to buy other goods and services.

Any vice president interested in the welfare of America would be working to lower the price of oil—not raise it. For America, higher oil prices are bad, lower oil prices are good, and there are no circumstances that reverse this conclusion.

This does not mean, however, that every American benefits from falling oil prices. That, of course, is not true. America produces about two-thirds of its own oil and those associated with the oil industry are going to suffer much lower incomes—some of them will, in fact, go broke as the price of oil falls. But the income losses imposed on those in the oil industry will be smaller than the real income gains harvested by the rest of America.

If America produced all of its own oil, a \$15 dollar per barrel fall in the price of oil would neither raise or lower the average American income. Some American oil consumer would have \$15 extra since he could buy oil for \$15 less, but some American oil producer would have \$15 less to spend since he was selling his oil for \$15 less.

But if America imports one-third of its oil, the American consumer gets a \$15 gain when the price of oil falls, yet only two-thirds of the loss (\$10) is suffered by American producers. The rest of the loss (the other \$5) accrues to oil producers in the rest of the world.

It is perfectly appropriate for the Reagan government to want to do something to prevent massive bankruptcies in the oil patch. But to go to Saudi Arabia to ask them to hold up the price of oil is perfectly inappropriate. It is perfectly inappropriate since it is the most expensive way imaginable to help those in the oil patch. If help is to be given to the oil patch, there are much cheaper home-grown alternatives.

The cheaper domestic alternative is to tax the oil consumers whose real income is rising with an oil tax and use the revenue from this tax to give income subsidies to those in the oil patch whose income has fallen. Even if this were done to the extent that those in the oil patch suffered no income reductions (they were given 15 extra dollars for every barrel of oil they produced), the American consumer would still be left with an extra \$15 for every barrel of imported oil.

If Saudi Arabia raises the price of oil, the American oil consumer is effectively being taxed by Saudi Arabia and he loses not just the income that must be taken away from him to subsidize those in the oil patch, but also the income that must be taken away to subsidize those who sell imported oil—Saudi Arabia. If Americans are to be taxed to help those in the oil patch, an American tax beats a Saudi Arabian tax every time.

Given this reality, why then is Vice President Bush off to Saudi Arabia to ask the Saudis to raise their taxes on Americans? One does not have to be completely cynical to understand the rationale.

To tax American oil consumers overtly to subsidize American oil producers is a political non-starter of the first magnitude. Far better to have the Saudis raise the price of oil and covertly tax the American oil consumer to subsidize the American oil producer. In addition, President Ronald Reagan has promised not to raise American taxes. A Saudi tax increase is not a technical violation of his "no new taxes" pledge.

If one is only slightly cynical, other factors come into play. The oil industry is a major source of campaign financing for the Republican party and that no candidate for the presidency, especially one from Texas, could really run for the presidency without oil money. One gets such money by asking for higher oil prices. In addition, if too much of the oil industry goes broke, the oil industry will have no money to contribute

to any campaigns—no matter how much they may love him.

Personally, I have some sympathy with adopting domestic public policies to prevent a total collapse of the oil-patch economy—it is part of America—and America should be willing to come to the aid of its different regions when they are in trouble, although I admit Texans don't make it easy to be sympathetic. But I have no sympathy with the vice president's mission to Saudi Arabia. It is a wrong policy at a wrong time in a wrong place.

(Lester C. Thurow is the Gordon Y. Billard professor of economics and management at MIT.)

[From the New Republic, April 28, 1986]

OIL DRIP

The ideal price for oil would be \$0 a barrel. As Henry George explained more than a century ago in *Progress and Poverty*, the cost of natural resources is nothing more than a tax on the productive elements of the economy—labor and capital. The \$15 plummet in the price of oil during the past few months—from about \$27 to about \$12 a barrel—has been like a \$90 billion annual tax cut for the American economy. The policy question is what we should do with our \$90 billion.

Vice President Bush thinks we should give part of it back. Well, who knows what—or if—George Bush really thinks. During the first week in April, Bush said regarding the proper price of oil: (a) that he was going to urge the Saudis "that we not just have a continued free-fall . . . without a parachute"; (b) that "our answer is market, market—let the market forces work"; (c) that whereas the Saudis want higher prices, the United States "ought to be pleased" by low prices; and (d) "I don't know." He continues to imply, though, that there is some danger to the nation if prices get too low. Others say it outright.

The ostensible danger of low oil prices is fourfold. First, prices could go up again if we allow ourselves to get too dependent on foreign supplies. Second, apart from price, we need the guaranteed supply of oil that only a large domestic industry can provide. Third, low prices are devastating the energy-producing regions of the country, with potential ripple effects, mostly involving the collapse of banks. And fourth, Mexico and other Third World producers are also being devastated, with potentially explosive consequences, both political and economic.

The United States is a net energy importer. Therefore, it is a mathematical certainty that the nation as a whole is better off, not worse off, with lower prices. As with any dramatic economic change, there are winners and losers, but that's capitalism. When oil prices were going up, an equally dramatic and far less desirable change, those now complaining the loudest felt very strongly that the government shouldn't interfere. As for the ripple effects, banks in trouble are forever holding themselves hostage and demanding ransom. We're skeptical. But even if a bailout were required, doing it directly would be far cheaper than showering the oil regions with money in the hope that some of it will land where it's needed.

The foreign policy consequences of cheap oil are also generally favorable. Yes, it's bad for Mexico. But it's also disastrous for the Soviet Union. Cheap oil may cost the Soviets a third of their hard-currency earnings. It's a blessing for the very poorest nations—those with no oil of their own. And it's bad

for the terrorist international, whose formerly oil-rich patrons will be watching their pennies in the future.

The national security argument for maintaining a domestic oil capacity cannot be laughed off. Nor can concerns of a future OPEC rip-off if we lower our guard too much now. What can be laughed off are most of the estimates of how the domestic industry would dry up with lower prices. For one thing, prices are not likely to stay as low as they are now. If they settle at \$15 to \$18 a barrel, most of the most productive wells will still be profitable, and so will continued exploration. In addition, there's a countervailing factor at work. If a steel plant shuts down, you don't have a steel plant. If an oil well shuts down, you may not have an oil well, but you do have the oil—in fact, you have more of it, in more accessible locations, than if you kept pumping away full speed. When and if prices go back up, you can reopen the well. (Yes, it's not quite that easy. But it's also not as hard as oil industry apologists would have you believe.)

Of all the policies being proposed for dealing with these problems, real and imagined, the most insane is Bush's original suggestion, echoed by Secretary of Energy John Herrington, that we should talk the price of oil back up, or at least try to prevent it from falling further. To start with, this would negate all the foreign policy benefits of lower oil prices worldwide. (And surely direct aid to Mexico would make more sense than indirect aid to Mexico, the Soviet Union, and Libya.) Financially, every dollar extra we pay for oil is a 30-cent gift to foreigners and a 70-cent subsidy to domestic oil producers.

An import fee is only marginally more sensible. At least in this case the foreigners' share of the take would go to the U.S. Treasury instead. But since an import fee will raise the price for domestic oil by an equal amount, it is in effect a huge and utterly unjustified handout to domestic oil producers. A ten-dollar-a-barrel import fee, for example, would raise about \$20 billion for the government and transfer another \$40 billion from oil consumers (including businesses) to producers.

A gasoline tax or other broad-based energy levy would prevent this unjustified windfall. In terms of preventing renewed overdependence on foreign oil, guarding our achievements in conservation is at least as important as continued domestic production. A gas tax would have the same effect in encouraging conservation as an import fee, but for any given burden on consumers and businesses, it would bring three times as much revenue to the government. The rule of thumb is that every penny increase in the gas tax would bring in a billion dollars of revenue. A 20-cent gas tax increase, for example, would be an easy \$20 billion. Gasoline prices would still be below where they were six months ago, way below what consumers pay in almost every other country, and—in real terms—even below where they were at the beginning of the energy crisis.

How to use the money? Part of it should be used to fill up the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and, if possible, to create new reserves while oil remains cheap. Huge stockpiles of quickly available oil are our best defense against either a huge price hike or a sudden shutoff by foreign producers. Buying the oil from foreigners now at \$12 a barrel makes a lot more sense than paying our own producers \$27 a barrel in the hope that they'll still be producing at that price when and if we need them.

The rest of the money could be used to reduce the deficit which isn't going to go away even with all this good news. If that's intolerably sensible, it also could be used to finance a reduction in the FICA (Social Security) tax, the most regressive and economically destructive of all federal taxes, and one that has increased dramatically during the supposedly tax-cutting Reagan years.

Oh. And a few dollars might profitably be invested in a copy of *Progress and Poverty* for George Bush.

A LETTER FROM AMBASSADOR FENWICK

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues, a letter which I received from our former colleague—Ambassador Millicent Fenwick. Ambassador Fenwick graciously wrote to me regarding a report on Social Policy by the House Wednesday Group, which I currently chair.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues have great respect and admiration for Millicent. Not only does she perform admirably in heading the U.S. mission to the U.N. Agencies for Food and Agriculture, but she still takes time to share her important views about the things happening on this side of the Atlantic.

Her letter, like the Wednesday Group report, speaks to issues affecting families and child care, welfare policy, health policy, and civil rights. In the area of welfare policy, she points out that it is "unwise to give independent welfare status to a very young teenager . . .". The hope of an independent apartment and income, of medicaid and food stamps, constitute an escape from many a crowded welfare household. But, more importantly, no escape from the welfare syndrome."

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak on behalf of all our colleagues when I say how much we appreciate Millicent continuing to share her wisdom with us on these vital issues.

I am pleased to include a copy of her letter for the RECORD:

UNITED STATES MISSION TO THE
UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES FOR
FOOD AND AGRICULTURE,
Rome, Italy, March 6, 1986.

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR BILL: The Wednesday Group agenda, "Social Policy," arrived here in Rome Tuesday. It is an excellent document and, as always with Wednesday Group proposals, I am stimulated to write concerning a few ideas that might be useful, or worth considering:

FAMILIES AND CHILD CARE

1. I think repeal on the tax on marriage would be a great boom to all two-earner families. My bill in the House had 160 co-sponsors, as I remember it. It received a slight nod of acceptance while I was still in the House, but some States have a simple, direct form we really should copy.

2. Trying to do something about child care when I was still in Congress, I found an excellent system devised by the Chicago Telephone Company, which had an overwhelming majority of women as employees. It was organized by one competent social worker, employed by the company, who presented this plan to the women: "If you need child care, get together with some of these employees who live near you and are mothers. Choose a woman in your area to whom you would be happy to confide your children while you are at work. Five children would be the maximum for any one such child care center, operating in the home of the one you have chosen. The company will interview and, if necessary, give the necessary training to this foster mother." The foster mother may be a low-income—or even a welfare recipient—who has the confidence of the working mothers. The working mothers pay her a very small sum each week. The expense to the company is the high-powered social worker that they provided to organize the whole system, and to check the ability of the one the mothers have chosen. There was also a very good child care system in Maryland, and another in Maine but I don't remember the details.

3. I am convinced—by the California experience—that preventive care for mothers and children is the wisest of all investments. But I cannot see why WIC and MCH are not merged. Unless the regulations have changed, a pregnant woman can go to WIC for advice on nutrition. So can her child, for 5 years. The mother, however, is limited to one year's services of WIC after the birth of the baby. So we have two sets of books, practical inconvenience for the mother, and an uncoordinated system. I proposed this merger to the Labor and Education Committee and the key witness against my proposal was a professor from Johns Hopkins. I was forced to go to a Foreign Affairs meeting scheduled at the same hour and missed the professor's appearance. When I telephoned him to inquire about his testimony I found that his main and only objection was that maternal and child health had no nutrition specialist. I asked if he would approve the merger if maternal and child health were required to include nutritional counseling by a qualified person. And the answer was "Well, we are all set up this way." Here we have a ridiculous situation—inconvenience for the mother; lack of continuity in health care; useless duplication and expense for the taxpayer.

WELFARE

1. The Plainfield Chapter of the Red Cross under Mabel Sias' direction, runs a program whereby welfare mothers are trained as Home Health Care Practitioners. Over 90% of them receive jobs in private employment. I believe Charlie Rangel is the author of this legislation—in any case, when funds were threatened, Mrs. Sias asked me to put her in touch with Charlie, and apparently it worked.

2. Another point was made in a most interesting article in the New York Times written by Francis Cline, the sociologist. The article strongly suggested that it was unwise to give independent welfare status to a very young teenager who was still under the necessary protection of the child labor laws. The hope of an independent apartment and income, of medicaid and food stamps, constituted an escape from many a crowded welfare household. But, more importantly, no escape from the welfare syndrome. Cline quoted the teenager he interviewed as saying, "My girlfriend told me all about how

to do this." This will perpetuate what Ken Auletta has called the permanent underclass.

HEALTH

1. The HMO process has always interested me. I worked hard with organized labor in New Jersey to encourage and facilitate the establishment of an HMO and I cannot see why the system has not developed more quickly and more widely.

2. Home health care, and long-term medical care, need to be completely reoriented, I think. Our New Jersey nursing homes, in order to get a license, had to take a certain number of indigent patients paid for by the public. The cost was roughly half or a little more than half what rich people paid. For example, at a time when average nursing homes cost \$70.00 a day, the indigent was cared for at \$40.00 a day (the State nursing home costs over \$80.00 a day!) My hope was to give the patient—or the family—half the nursing home cost in a home health care subsidy. My interest in all this was sparked by a pitiful letter, and subsequent telephone call, from a woman whose mother was in the hospital and was threatened with being transferred to a nursing home. Both mother and daughter were horrified by the prospect, and the doctor, too, thought it would be most damaging. The therapy the mother needed could have been paid by a home health care subsidy which could go directly to the daughter. All that was needed from the State was a bimonthly visit to make sure that the patient was happy and the therapist was being paid. (The sad sequel to this is that I could not arrange home health care. The mother went to the nursing home and died of "transfer trauma" within three weeks). These sums are probably out of date but the point is this: when doctor, patient and family urge care at home and when the payment to the family covers the cost of the necessary therapy at half the cost to the taxpayer, it seems ridiculous to continue an expensive, anti-human system. HEW Secretary Califano greatly approved this idea and tried it, he said, in Texas in a rural and in an urban district. But I found after repeated checking that the money was not given to the family but instead to a variety of organized therapists. (For example, an elderly Mexican-American woman was being given speech therapy when her family and she were quite accustomed to the communication system they used for many years).

3. Another point can be made when one considers that in many areas hospitals are overbuilt and have empty wards. These wards could be used for nursing home care at less cost than nursing home prices. The only reason they are not used in this way, as one hospital administrator explained it to me, is the Federal regulation which stipulates that Federal support for the care of the indigent will be "at cost." This means factoring-in CAT scans, ultra sound and other expensive equipment. The simple solution to the problem would be to change the regulation to read "at cost or less."

CIVIL RIGHTS

1. The description of the lack of civil rights in the housing field is absolutely disgraceful. Page 7 of your paper reads "... if an alleged violator of Title VIII refuses to participate in such proceedings, there is little HUD can do." That is outrageous and I agree that with the last paragraph on page 15 which suggest corrective as well as punitive sanctions. Most people just want a house, and justice under the law, and would rather get a house than be involved in a court fight.

2. I have also been very much interested in affirmative action programs. I would like to suggest that all Federal and State agencies, particularly those located in core-cities, should form teams of their employees, to go into the high schools and tell the students what the requirements are for each of the occupations, in which the employees are involved. For instance, I see a white truck driver, a black doctor, a female administrator, a Puerto Rican or Asian nurse who—without mentioning race—would by their very presence, and composition as a group, make clear the goal of equal opportunity. Companies in the area should be encouraged to do this to.

Bill, I know you will turn this over to one of our wonderful staff members but I hope some of it will be useful.

All the best to you, as always.

Sincerely,

MILLICENT H. FENWICK,
Ambassador.

OPENING OF THE BERN HUMAN CONTACTS EXPERTS MEETING OF HELSINKI SIGNATORY STATES

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind my distinguished colleagues that today marks the opening in Bern, Switzerland, of the Human Contacts Experts Meeting of Helsinki signatory states. As Co-Chairman of the U.S. (Helsinki) Commission, I can point with some institutional pride to the convention of the 6-week conference, which is the brainchild of the Helsinki Commission. The Commission, under the leadership of Representative DANTE FASCELL, developed the idea in 1979 as it worked with the State Department to prepare for the Madrid Review Meeting of Helsinki signatory states. The Commission strongly believed that holding a human contacts meeting as well as other human rights forums were necessary to counterbalance the expected post-Madrid security conference.

The U.S. delegation, under the direction of Ambassador Kampelman, and other Western delegations to the Madrid Conference, eventually adopted the Commission's idea and, after 3 long years of tenacious negotiation, achieved agreement with the East to hold the human contacts conference.

Bern is coming at the midpoint between summits when prospects for East-West relations will be a matter of intense popular speculation and comment. As Anatoly Shcharansky pointed out in his message to representatives of nongovernmental human rights advocacy organizations meeting in Bern: "I hope this work will be continued and will lead to further contacts, contributing to a real détente and to the establishment of genuine trust between the superpowers. In the long run * * * there will be no trust or détente until both sides show full respect for human rights in keeping with the Helsinki agreement." Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that the entire statement by Anatoly Shcharansky as reported in The New York Times on April 13 appear

in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The overriding humanitarian theme for the United States at the Bern meeting is the expansion of people-to-people contacts across East-West borders, on an individual basis or by groups, whether for the purpose of emigration, family reunification, repatriation, or travel for personal or professional purposes.

The U.S. Helsinki Commission has urged the U.S. delegation to begin from the premise that Europe is unnaturally divided by force. Artificial barriers to the free flow of people having extensive common ties and interests have been erected. Physical barriers, such as the Berlin wall, have been built. In addition, legal, procedural, and financial obstacles are imposed and methods of intimidation are applied by East bloc governments in order to dissuade would-be emigrants or travelers.

In the decade since the accords were signed, the West has chronicled some steps forward as well as a litany of Eastern human rights violations. In the human contacts field, for example, there have been some welcome easements in the emigration and travel policies and practices of some East bloc countries and a net increase has been registered in East-West travel. Yet, despite their Helsinki commitments, a number of the participating states continue to maintain policies stringently limiting and controlling the movement of their citizens. Helsinki monitors, human rights activists, religious believers, unofficial peace group members, and free trade unionists continue to be prosecuted for their efforts to maintain independent contacts with Eastern and Western counterparts.

In itself, the Bern meeting will not provide any guarantee of Soviet or East European compliance with the human contacts section of the final act and of the Madrid document. It will, however, provide an excellent and timely mechanism for examining how human contacts provisions have been implemented and will be a useful forum to encourage greater compliance with them in the future. In light of Eastern violations, it would be detrimental to the Helsinki process if the exchanges at the conference were limited to technical discussion. The freer flow of people across East-West borders should be forthrightly raised as the overriding humanitarian theme of the Bern meeting.

I, therefore, encourage my colleagues in Congress to lend their active support to the U.S. delegation in Bern, ably led by Ambassador Michael Novak, in a common effort to draw international attention to existing human contacts violations and to seek practical solutions to humanitarian problems in this field.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 13, 1986]

MOSCOW MUST START COMPLYING WITH THE 1975 HELSINKI AGREEMENT

(By Anatoly B. Shcharansky)

I left the world of the gulag only a few weeks ago, and I am not yet ready to speak in public. Nevertheless, I could not refuse to greet you, if only in a recorded message, because the problems that brought you here today are extremely important to many people fighting for their rights in the Soviet Union and elsewhere in the world.

Ten years ago, several dissidents in the Soviet Union created a public group to monitor Moscow's compliance with the Helsinki

agreements. Our idea was that many of the human rights issues that divide the governments of the Eastern and Western blocs could be agreed upon by independent representatives of public opinion—people in both East and West who have a vital interest in the implementation of the Helsinki agreements in their own countries. So we voluntarily took upon ourselves the task of examining how the Helsinki agreements were being implemented in the Soviet Union.

Ten years have passed, and what do we see? The Jewish emigration that began in the early 1970's has been brought to a stop by the Soviet authorities. Several hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews who want to leave the Soviet Union cannot do so for no other reason than that the Soviet Government has decided that they cannot.

I spent nine years in Soviet prisons and camps, and I can certify that the conditions in which political prisoners are detained have been getting steadily worse. I shall mention only two particular problems.

First, a new article of the Penal Code, article 188-1, introduced in late 1983, allows the Soviet authorities to extend almost at will the length of time that one remains in prison or in camp. This measure has already been applied to several members of Helsinki monitoring groups now in prison. It is used by the authorities both to prolong the detention of political prisoners who resist "re-education"—who refuse to comply with efforts to make them change their ideas and convictions—and to intimidate the others.

Second, according to a new official directive introduced barely a year ago in the Soviet Union, political prisoners who start a hunger strike can be immediately thrown into a dungeon—a measure that very much aggravates their sufferings.

These are only two examples of the many ways that the authorities are cracking down on political prisoners in camps. Why is this so important? Because, as a rule, the policy regarding the camps very much reflects the general situation in the country—the disregard for the rule of law and the harshness of the repression.

I would like to attract your special attention to the Sakharov case. I do not need to remind you that Andrei Dmitriyevich Sakharov is a hero, a model of a honorable man who continues the very best traditions of the Russian intelligentsia, fighting for the trampled rights—be they national, religious or political—of all the people of the Soviet Union.

Needless to say, his present situation is extremely difficult. He is cruelly and unjustly isolated from his family and friends, barred from scientific work and normal social activities. His state of health inspires growing fears. I consider it vitally important at this moment to raise our voices and call for the Soviet Government to stop its persecution of Andrei Sakharov—to grant this remarkable man the possibility to continue his noble activities in dignity and normal conditions.

Looking back at the first documents issued by our Helsinki group 10 years ago, I must say that the longer I spent in prison, the more accurate they seemed and the more important. I also believe that it is more necessary than ever now for international public opinion to press the Soviet Union on these matters. It is high time for Moscow to begin complying with the Helsinki agreement signed in 1975.

I think that the Andrei Sakharov Institute and Resistance International have made a great contribution by organizing this meeting. I hope this work will be continued and

will lead to further contacts, contributing to a real détente and to the establishment of genuine trust between the superpowers. In the long run, however, there will be no trust or détente until both sides show full respect for human rights in the keeping with the Helsinki agreement.

THE REAGAN NICARAGUA POLICY: A PRECONCEIVED, PARANOID, OBSESSIVE SCRIPT

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, a most intelligent article titled "Reagan's Nicaragua Obsession Puts All the Hemisphere at Risk," by Mexican novelist and former diplomat Carlos Fuentes, appeared in the April 6, 1986 Los Angeles Times. I want to share it with my colleagues.

The author writes, in part:

Ronald Reagan's failed Central America policy is less of a danger to Nicaragua, which is geared to defend itself for a long, long time, than to the United States' friends on the continent and, eventually, to the United States itself, acting in this matter as its own worst enemy ***

A great deal—the respect and credibility of a whole continent; a whole range of political opportunities—is being sacrificed to very little—a preconceived, paranoid and obsessive script.

Mr. Speaker, giving money to the Contras will undermine our relationship with all of Latin America, and will in no way advance our own national and security interests. Mr. Fuentes' article, which follows, articulately explains why, and I urge our colleagues to read it. Thank you

The article follows:

APPROACHES TO THE AMERICAS—REAGAN'S NICARAGUA OBSESSION PUTS ALL THE HEMISPHERE AT RISK

(By Carlos Fuentes)

The real political choice for the United States in this hemisphere is between the contras and the governments of Latin America. Perhaps in all its history, Latin America has never before been governed by such an exceptional group of men: capable, honest, democratically oriented and internationally educated individuals. To name not all: Argentina's Raul Alfonsín, Uruguay's Julio Sanguinetti, Brazil's Jose Sarney, Peru's Alan Garcia, Mexico's Miguel de la Madrid, Guatemala's Vinicio Cerezo, Venezuela's Jaime Lusinchi and Colombia's Belisario Betancur (as well as his probable successor, Virgilio Barco) form a constellation of heads of state offering the United States an unparalleled opportunity for cooperation and the solution of problems.

These men appear on the scene, however, during a period of harrowing economic and social dilemmas. It is far from certain they will find solutions. Too many intractable forces—a disillusioned middle class, a mob of urban marginals, a deeply dispossessed working class, a blighted agricultural proletariat—are seething under the veneer of stability. The democratic gains of the last few years, so fervently hailed by those who did nothing to bring them about, run the gravest risks of becoming mere swallows caught

in a sudden winter storm. The military, unwilling to administer the crises, are nevertheless waiting in the wings.

One dreams of what leaders such as Franklin D. Roosevelt or John F. Kennedy would have done together with a comparable group of Latin Americans. Certainly not offer them a contra war in Central America, distracting attention from the really important questions of economic survival, draining energies from the internal to the international stage, dividing national opinion and threatening, in sum, the feeble stability of the continent. The last thing that De la Madrid, Alfonsin or Sarney need is an escalating conflict in Latin American territories, leading inexorably to generalized war—by accident, by slippage or by will.

Ronald Reagan's failed Central American policy is less of a danger to Nicaragua, which is geared to defend itself for a long, long time, than to the United States' friends on the continent and, eventually to the United States itself, acting in this matter as its own worst enemy.

For example: During almost half a century Mexico has offered the United States the most precious of gifts: a secure southern border. In effect, the United States is that rarity in universal history, a great power with only two neighbors, both weaker than itself. But the Reagan Administration seems willing to create havoc in Mexico by forcing the *contra* war and, eventually, the American war on Nicaragua. Mexico, a nation of 80 million, will not be drowned by a red tide flowing from Nicaragua. In fact, well before reaching Harlingen, Texas, any venture some Sandinista battalions would be blown apart at the Honduran, Salvadoran or Guatemalan borders.

But Mexico would be politically ripped apart by pressures to take sides in an American conflict in Central America as either enemy or satellite of the United States. The Mexican government, seriously damaged by economic, moral and physical problems, would probably lose its strongest claim to legitimacy—the sovereign conduct of its foreign policy—if it caved in to Washington's demands. But it would also suffer grievously, for other reasons, if it seemed to undermine the security of the United States for refusing to follow Washington's lead in Central America. The result would be turmoil on the border, but not for the reasons Reagan paints in his TV graphics.

A great deal—the respect and credibility of a whole continent; a whole range of political opportunities—is being sacrificed to very little—a preconceived, paranoid and obsessive script. Brazil has had to ask—twice—that it not be painted red on Reagan's maps. President Betancur of Colombia has had to denounce publicly, on more than one occasion, the State Department's penchant for saying that he says one thing in private and another in public. Betancur's latest correction: "All of Latin America opposes the Reagan proposal [of aid to the *contras*]."

Former President Carlos Andres Perez of Venezuela has warned that all of Latin America would rise against the United States in the event of an invasion of Nicaragua. President Garcia of Peru has declared before the Argentine Congress that his country would "break relations with the aggressive power" if Nicaragua were invaded and "do everything in its power to defend the brother country." And the newly elected president of Costa Rica, Oscar Arias, has wryly suggested that the \$100 million in

proposed contra aid be given to the Central American countries for economic development. Farmers, scientific researchers, the rootless and quite a few U.S. schoolchildren must feel the same way.

Latin America cannot be faulted for criticizing while abstaining. Latin governments have repeatedly offered rational political and diplomatic solutions to what they consider a very minor international crisis in Central America—although it is a major economic and social crisis for those extremely weak countries, more and more dependent on foreign military and financial aid, wherever it might come from.

Why not listen seriously for once to the Latin American solution? It takes care of the security concerns of the United States better than Reagan's theater of horrors. By now everyone knows that the solutions include ending external support for any guerrillas; freezing the acquisition of arms and then diminishing them gradually suspending international military maneuvers; reducing and finally eliminating foreign military advisers and bases.

Since it is now evident that the Reagan Administration, caught in its own web of fictions, will not give the Latin American solution that serious try, I believe Latin America should take a bold initiative to negotiate with the five Central American governments and offer Latin Americans—the four Contadora nations and the four countries forming their support group—as guarantors of the peace agreement. This is a Latin American problem and it deserves a Latin American solution. "Left to ourselves," a former president of Costa Rica told me recently, "we Central Americans would solve this problem in a few weeks."

If any of the Central American governments then faulted on the agreements freely arrived at with the Latin American community—if, say, Honduras were to offer continued sanctuary to the *contras*, or Nicaragua a base to the Soviet Union, or if El Salvador were to turn against its traditional foe, Honduras—then all hell would break loose. But the solutions and eventual sanctions would all be inspired by Latin America, guaranteed and headed by Latin America; the United States would be spared the divisive contests, the debasing rhetoric, the ignorance in high places that have seriously damaged it during these past few weeks.

Men such as Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass), Sen. Christopher J. Dodd (D-Conn.) and Rep. Michael D. Barnes (D-Md.) have saved the honor and the voice of the United States for a better, more rational day. The *contras* cannot win, but the United States and Latin America can lose. It is time to stop playing games, physical or rhetorical, and take serious diplomatic initiatives. The time is now, in the hiatus between voting on contra aid in the Senate and the House. The stakes are indeed high, but not for the reasons Reagan offers. Most of the new Latin governments have the legitimacy to carry through the harsh solutions needed for economic recovery. If they consent to American adventurism in Central America they will end by losing this legitimacy. Economic disaster, erosion of the social fabric and political upheaval will ensue, from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn.

Where will the security of the United States be then?

NATIONAL CEMETERY NEEDED IN OHIO

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to pay homage to the hundreds of thousands of men and women who have defended their country to preserve our freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of these sacrifices that I introduce H.R. 4594 a bill that would require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to conduct a study for the purpose of locating sites in the State of Ohio suitable for development as cemeteries in the National Cemetery System.

The veterans in my district have urged my support for a new national cemetery. Presently, Ohio has only one cemetery which is located in Dayton. This cemetery is expected to be filled by the year 2001. Another regional cemetery, located at Fort Custer, MI, is 260 miles away from northeast Ohio. Statistics indicate that 538,000 veterans are living within a 50-mile radius of Cleveland and 790,000 within a 100-mile radius of Cleveland. By the year 2000, it is expected that 260,000 veterans within Ohio will die.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that it is our duty to establish a final resting place for our veterans within a reasonable distance, so that friends and family will be able to visit. According to Paul T. Bannai, Chief Memorial Affairs Director for the Veterans' Administration, "the Veterans' Administration recognizes that an aging veteran population may have significant impact on the National Cemetery System in years to come. Cleveland, with its large veteran population, is included in our long range planning."

It has been my pleasure to work closely with the Veterans Affairs Committee under the leadership of my good friend and colleague SONNY MONTGOMERY. We have worked together on issues concerning health benefits, distinguished service, memorials, and medical care for veterans. Now, we must recognize the need to establish this cemetery because of the even-increasing size of the aging veteran population in my district.

A TRIBUTE TO MARK SEBASTIAN PALERMO

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Mark Sebastian Palermo, a member of my district. Mark has been chosen as the California State winner in the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

During the past year, over 250,000 students participated in this contest nationwide. I would like to commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars organization for sponsoring this contest

which helps to instill patriotism in the heart's of young Americans.

As a fitting recognition of his achievement in this contest, I wish to enter Mark's winning speech into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NEW HORIZONS FOR AMERICA'S YOUTH

You know, I've heard some people say, "What kind of adults are America's youth going to be? Things are so different now. Our kids face population explosions, new diseases, energy problems, pollution problems, the constant threat of war. What kind of future is that?" But is our future all that bleak?

Couldn't I just as well say, "What a terrific future our children have! With advancements in medicine, transportation, communication, energy, space exploration, and pollution control, our kids will have the best lives any human being has ever seen!"

When you were young, there were plenty of folks that thought your generation would simply flounder in its tracks. But did it? No! Even a horror like war can't stifle the liveliness of Americans. The fact that the VFW is sponsoring such a youth oriented, thought provoking event like this, shows the strength and comradery of its members, and the hope they have for our future. They see that right here, in America's youth, is that same strength and comradery.

The problems today's youth face are really no different than those of any other age. Poverty is an inherent problem. Somebody will always be considered impoverished; however, we will continue to put out our hands to the less fortunate. What about medical problems? Just about everything is a carcinogen these days, and we have a deadly new threat in AIDS, but these afflictions have always been around. We are now aware of them, and looking for their cures. The questions we are faced with about energy sources and pollution control are the same as they've always been. Each age simply provides different answers. New scientific advancements made by the youth will provide the solutions to today's energy and pollution problems, just as you did to yours. As a generation, we know the importance of solving our international differences peacefully, but we also know the importance of national defense, and protecting our rights and our heritage. Today's youth is striving to make a better life for all Americans.

As we grow up and start families, move into the workforce, and contribute to politics, our new minds will bring new ideas and new technological advancements. We will help our impoverished brothers. We are discovering more cures than we are new medical mysteries, and more ways to produce energy than use it. We are bent on controlling pollution, and working toward its irradiation. We will do our best to negotiate through political differences, but if our nation calls us to arms, America's youth will not let you down. We will stand by this nation and defend its ideals, our families, and our freedom. Technology, advancement, better standards of living, national pride, politics, and families, these are the new horizons for America's youth.

THE PRESIDENT HAS ACTED EFFECTIVELY AGAINST LIBYAN TERRORISM

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, the President's action against military and terrorist targets in Libya demonstrates a new resolve to defend Americans against the scourge of terrorism. The President's action in defense against terrorism shows that America has both the capability and the will to counter threats to the safety and well-being of Americans here at home and around the world.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I must not discuss the content of matters which come before the committee in executive session. I can say, however, that the President is absolutely correct that the evidence linking the Qadhafi regime of Libya to terrorism against Americans is clear, direct, and irrefutable.

Given the Libyans' state-sponsored terrorism directed at Americans, the United States has the right—indeed, the duty—to act to reduce the capability of the Libyan regime to wage terroristic war against the American people. Before employing force in self-defense, the President clearly and repeatedly warned the Libyans that their continued terrorism would bring a tough United States response. In developing that response, the President consulted with leaders in the Congress. The President also consulted with our allies around the world, including the United Kingdom, whose support for the United States action deserves the special thanks of the American people. After issuing warnings and after extensive consultations, and in accordance with international law, including article 51 of the United Nations Charter, the President chose a carefully measured, proportionate response involving use of force in self-defense against the Libyans.

The President has sent a clear message to terrorists around the world: The United States will not stand still while terrorists wage war against the United States. The United States will protect its citizens from terrorism, including when necessary by direct application of military force. The United States of America will protect its citizens around the globe.

IN MEMORY OF THE "CHALLENGER" ASTRONAUTS

HON. GEORGE C. WORTLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Common Council of the City of Syracuse has passed a resolution requesting the mayor of Syracuse to lower the flags at all city installations on each January 28 in memory of the brave women and men who died aboard the space shuttle *Challenger*. Dick Scobee, Mike Smith, Ron McNair, Ellison Onizuka, Judith Resnik, Greg Jarvis, and Christa McAuliffe. I respect-

fully request that the text of the resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RESOLUTION NO. 133-R

RESOLUTION—REQUESTING THE MAYOR TO CONSIDER LOWERING FLAGS AT ALL CITY INSTALLATIONS TO HALF-MAST ON EACH JANUARY 28TH IN HONOR OF THE MEMORIES OF THE CHALLENGER ASTRONAUTS

Whereas, on January 28, 1986, at approximately 11:39 a.m., the horrendous and calamitous explosion of the space shuttle *Challenger* that took the lives of the seven brave men and women aboard, completely shattered the tranquility and confidence of all Americans, the flaming wreckage spewing untold grief and utter disbelief throughout this entire proud and mighty nation; and

Whereas, since that time, the pain and horror of that day has begun to ease, explanations concerning the cause of this terrible tragedy are being brought to light and investigated, and Americans are once again beginning to bring themselves to look toward the future; and

Whereas, although no one will ever be able to forget this shocking and painful event in our history, time heals, answers will help to lighten the overwhelming burden we have been carrying within our hearts and minds; and

Whereas, members of this Common Council have been requested by Mr. Jerry Efron, a World War II veteran presently hospitalized at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Syracuse, to ensure the date is prominently remembered; now therefore be it

Resolved, That this Common Council, on behalf of the citizens of the City of Syracuse, hereby joins with Mr. Efron in seeking to preserve the memories of the *Challenger* Astronauts by respectfully requesting Syracuse Mayor Thomas G. Young to consider lowering the flags at all City installations to half-mast on each January 28th.

PROFILE OF HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

HON. MARILYN LLOYD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues a profile on MARY ROSE OAKAR, secretary of the Democratic caucus, which appeared in the Washington Post during the Easter district work period. This article details the exceptional record and strong tireless leadership of our friend and colleague, MARY ROSE OAKAR. The article is as follows:

MARY ROSE OAKAR—A LEADER IN THE HOUSE WHO SPEAKS HER MIND
(By Spencer Rich)

About a month ago, recalls Rep. Mary Rose Oakar (D-Ohio), President Reagan told a "welfare story" at a meeting with congressional leaders. It was about a jobless welfare recipient who phoned the employment service ostensibly to look for work, but who hung up immediately when told it was available.

Oakar, who attends the White House meetings as secretary of the House Democratic Caucus, says she and other Democrats who were there—led by the Speaker of the House—were "livid."

"So I raised my hand and the president said, 'Yes, Mary Rose?' I said, 'A lot of unemployed people are very proud and don't want welfare. I know 50-year-old unemployed workers who will not take welfare. It's not true that people prefer welfare.'"

The incident illustrates a lot about Oakar and why she is receiving increasing attention as a tough legislator squarely within the liberal Democratic social welfare tradition.

"She speaks up, that's for sure," said a Republican who asked not to be named. "She stands by her guns and doesn't hesitate to let you know what she's thinking—and she knows what she's talking about," said a Democratic official.

The perception is also beginning to spread that Oakar, 46, a 10-year veteran of the House, is a strong party activist of remarkable energy. She is unusual in serving on four committees: Banking, Aging, Post Office and Civil Service, and House Administration. At the Select Committee on Aging, she heads the task force on Social Security, elderly and women. She also chairs the key Post Office and Civil Service compensation and benefits subcommittee, which handles federal employee pensions, health benefits and pay.

And in recent years, Oakar has risen within her party. A member of the Democratic National Committee, she serves as House congressional liaison to the DNC and as an at-large House Democratic whip. She is starting a political action committee called Economic Security PAC to help female candidates, and she speaks at colleges to help recapture the campuses for the Democrats.

"I think the kids are coming around," she says. Oakar calls herself a "moderate" Democrat, but others call her a traditional liberal. She says that when people hear the specifics of what President Reagan wants to cut in domestic programs, they respond well to the Democrats.

Oakar, first elected to the House in 1976, has won most elections since by huge margins; in 1984 she had no opposition and only 44 write-in votes were cast against her. Representing downtown Cleveland and suburbs that include many white ethnic working-class people, she has built a strong pro-labor record.

Increasingly, Oakar also has become associated with women's issues—pay, pensions and Social Security protection—and with consumer matters. These issues have been in political decline in recent years, but Oakar persists.

On the other hand, while she supports the Equal Rights Amendment and family planning and has sponsored numerous bills on women's benefits, she recognizes that "certain women's groups will never endorse me" because of her stance on abortion. She opposes Medicaid funding of abortions and favors special benefits for pregnant women to provide alternatives to abortion.

The youngest of five children in a Maronite Catholic family, Oakar was born in Cleveland, attended Roman Catholic schools, got her B.A. in English, speech and drama at Ursuline College in Cleveland and her M.A. in fine arts from nearby John Carroll University. Her father, a Lebanese immigrant, was a steelworker, construction worker and stonecutter.

She once thought of working on the stage, but turned to teaching instead—for four years at a high school and for six years at Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland, where she taught English, speech, drama

and fine arts. Although she almost was fired for starting a union at the college, she says, "technically I am still on leave from Cuyahoga."

She began her political career as a neighborhood activist, served on the City Council from 1973 to 1976, and made a bid for Congress when the incumbent sought a Senate seat.

When she came to the House, Speaker Thomas P. (Tip) O'Neill Jr. (D-Mass.) kept calling her "Rosemary." When she mentioned this, he explained that he has a daughter named Rosemary and a sister named Mary Rose, and that he's always had trouble keeping the names straight.

Oakar is philosophical about being a leading woman in a traditionally male club. "I really can't say I have suffered discrimination in the House because of being a woman. At times the fellows go out of their way to not leave you out." But she says women in the House do feel a special bond, "because after all, there are only 24 of us."

Oakar has a heavy agenda in the 99th Congress, with a special emphasis this year on banking legislation. Because many banks "only want to cater to large accounts," she is pressing to require banks to give certain free services, to bar a minimum balance requirement and to pay interest on all balances.

She is concerned about interstate banking takeovers in which big banks buy smaller banks and funnel the money from depositor savings to investments in other areas. With Rep. Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.), she wants to introduce legislation requiring large banks to reinvest money in the local community and to make their portfolios public. The Banking Committee has endorsed the idea.

She also has been pushing (so far without success) for big increases in Social Security benefits for women: more free credits for years of absence from the labor force for child care, better benefits for widows and widowers, and above all, for earnings-sharing—a highly controversial plan to give a person Social Security credits for half the earnings of her or his spouse, thereby entitling these people to Social Security disability or old-age benefits on their own.

She is also a strong advocate of improving private pensions for women—for example, cutting the 10-year vesting requirement, which works to the disadvantage of women who join the work force late or who take time off for child care, to five years.

An Oakar-engineered House bill calling for a broad study of pay equity for women and minorities in the federal pay system awaits Senate action. "Women are now 40 percent" of the federal labor force, she says, "but they're clustered in the bottom four rungs" of the scale.

Oakar also describes herself as "a big advocate of federal workers. This administration is just trying to take everything away from them—gut the retirement system, gut their health benefits and gut their pay, too."

While cutting an increasingly high profile in Washington, Oakar still has that other attribute of successful politicians: she's a big home-town booster. Cleveland, she says, is enjoying a "fabulous regrowth" after being hard hit by the shrinkage of heavy industry. Employers based in the city or nearby include TRW, Standard Oil, Eaton, LTV Steel and the only National Aeronautics and Space Administration center "north of the Mason-Dixon line and east of the Mississippi." Cleveland, she says, "is second

only to New York in the arts, with the Cleveland Orchestra, all the museums, magnificent old theaters now being revived instead of turned into parking lots, outstanding health institutions."

In fact, Cleveland's health institutions are such that "one year, five members of Congress had heart bypasses at the Cleveland Clinic. I kept sending them baskets of flowers."

BACKGROUND

Elected to House of Representatives in 1976. Ran unopposed in 1984. Represents Ohio's 20th District, including Cleveland. Serves as secretary of the House Democratic Caucus, House congressional liaison to Democratic National Committee and at-large Democratic House whip, and on four committees. Special interest in labor, consumer and women's issues.

A TRIBUTE TO MARTY ROSE

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a testimonial dinner was held in Oswego, NY, on April 5 for a very close personal friend of mine, and one of the most dedicated labor leaders I have known in my 24 years in Congress—Martin (Marty) Rose.

Marty Rose symbolizes to me the very best of the labor movement in the United States. He is a man dedicated to his fellow workers, to his community, to his State of New York and to our Nation. His personal dedication has been translated into a lifetime of service. And for that outstanding record of service, I and more than 400 of his friends attended the April 5 testimonial in his honor.

Marty Rose knows the problems of workers and of Americans generally. He knows their desires and their dreams. He understands the desire of men and women to earn a decent wage, to afford their children the opportunities of education, to create a quality of life and standard of living that befits our Nation and the principles for which it stands. Marty is from Oswego County, which is in my congressional district, and which is part of Upstate New York that is suffering from economic flight.

Oswego County and upstate New York in general, could not have a more aggressive advocate than Marty Rose. He is concerned about his community and the union he represents. He is tireless in his efforts to attract and assist businesses located in, or seeking to locate in, Oswego County and upstate New York. His efforts have brought many results. Oswego County is an area of growth and growth potential, thanks in no small measure to Marty's work. Operation Oswego County, Onward Oswego, his work on a number of particular projects, his unfailing commitment to his union membership, all contribute to the area. These accomplishments and his record of service are all especially impressive when one considers that Marty Rose is blind. However, loss of sight has diminished neither his spirit or his ability to get a job done and done well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a biography outlining the career and record of service of Martin (Marty) Rose:

Martin Rose was elected as a delegate to The Oswego Federation of Labor-A.F.L. in 1942, representing the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. The O.F.C.-A.F.L. Central Body recommended the I.L.G.W.U. was the appropriate Union to represent a group of workers who were seeking to be organized. Consequently, three shops were successfully unionized.

The I.L.G.W.U. workers received a charter for Local 396 on August 14, 1941.

Marty has been a continuous delegate and served as chairman of many committees in the Central Body. Also he has served as an assistant Secretary, Vice President and has been President since 1957 of that Central Body.

Marty served as Vice President to the Upstate New York and Vermont District Council and when the then President of the District Council accepted a State job, Marty was elected President of the Upstate New York and Vermont District Council.

The "Antiprofessional Strikebreaker Ordinance" was entered into the record books of the City of Oswego, spearheaded by Marty and a committee of labor leaders, which was approved by the then Mayor of Oswego John O.C. Conway and successfully passed through the Common Council. Attempts to place the similar legislation in the City of Fulton failed after being presented in two common council meetings with Presidents of various local labor unions assisting in the presentation.

He was appointed by President George Meany as a member of the National AFL-CIO Volunteer Organizer Corps.

He was the AFL-CIO Community Service Councilor.

He was appointed to the committee on International Year For Disabled Persons by Governor Carey.

Marty was appointed by the N.Y. State AFL-CIO President Edward Cleary as honorary Chairman of the 1984 N.Y. State Convention.

Marty represented the Union Label Department and the International President of the I.L.G.W.U. at a convention of the Aluminum Workers in Messina, N.Y., also at the Switchmen of North America Convention, held in Buffalo, N.Y.

Marty has addressed many organizations in behalf of advancing the purchase of Union Label, and Garment Workers. He also urged respect for Union Label goods and services in the family of Trade Unions.

He served many years, and continues to serve as the Vice President of the Union Label & Service Trades Department of the State of N.Y., AFL-CIO.

Marty served on CETA, Private Industry Council, currently serving as member of Oswego County Job Training and Partnership Act.

He served as the first Secretary Treasurer of Labor's League for Political Education. He currently serves as the Chairman of the Oswego County COPE. In addition he serves as a member of the N.Y.S. AFL-CIO COPE Advisory Board.

Marty serves as a member of the Advisory Board of the Central N.Y. Labor Studies of Industrial Labor Relations School at Cornell, and has been utilized to speak at graduations and serve on panels.

Marty was the Director of the Oswego County March of Dimes in 1975.

Marty served on Onward Oswego. He served eight one year terms on the Commercial and Industrial Relations Commission of the city of Oswego. He was appointed by Sal Chaikin and David Gringold, Associate Directors of the North East Department of the I.L.G.W.U. as a Union Label Representative in 1960.

Following the separation of Vermont into the newly created New England States District, Marty was elected President of the Upstate New York District Council of the New York State District of the I.L.G.W.U. and as President of Local 280.

ARTIE WALLACE RECEIVES GOD AND COUNTRY AWARD

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform my colleagues of a young man's accomplishments from my congressional district. Artie Wallace of Oberlin, PA. will be receiving the Boy Scout God and Country Award on Sunday, April 20, 1986, at the Salem Lutheran Church.

Artie, a fifth grader at the Tri-Community Elementary School has been involved in scouting for the past 2 years and is presently a member of Boy Scout Troop 95 in Enhaut. He started working toward this award 5 months ago as a Cub Scout, and has worked extensively with the pastor of the Salem Lutheran Church. He has also kept a daily prayer log and completed a service project at the church. Artie is a member of the midget baseball team in Enhaut.

I would like to congratulate Artie on his fine work and wish him continued success in all his endeavors.

APRIL 15 MARKS THE OPENING OF AMERICAN AIRLINES HUB IN NASHVILLE

HON. WILLIAM HILL BONER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Nashville is on the move.

Today, April 15, marks the expansion of major air service to and from Nashville. Today, American Airlines begins hub service in Nashville, thereby linking Nashville and middle Tennessee by direct air service to more than 35 cities in the East and Midwest.

Middle Tennesseans have worked hard for this day. City officials, airport authority officials, businessmen, women and labor leaders, everyday Nashvillians, as well as officials here in the Federal Government, have all worked to attract the American Airlines hub to Nashville. This investment of personnel and equipment not only promises future growth for Nashville and middle Tennessee but, just as importantly, it indicates the confidence that American Airlines has in Nashville's business and labor community to provide the support necessary to maintain a major airline hub.

I join my fellow Tennesseans in welcoming American Airlines' expanded service to and from Nashville. And I congratulate the officials, business men and women, and labor leaders in landing the hub at Nashville. I am proud to have played a role in these efforts and I look forward to continuing this partnership.

I am including an article from the Nashville Banner describing the importance of the hub to the continued growth of Nashville and middle Tennessee, and several articles from today's Tennessean commemorating the beginning of expanded service.

[From the Nashville Banner, Apr. 14, 1986]

HUB PROVEN KEY TO AREA'S GROWTH

(By Mary Hance)

Cities across the country are increasingly aware that having a hub—having good air service—is a critical link to economic development and community growth.

With this week's startup of the American Airlines hub, Nashville joins cities like Atlanta; Charlotte, N.C.; Dallas/Fort Worth, all of which have prospered and attribute much of that prosperity to the superb air service that a hub makes possible.

In Memphis, for example, where Republic Airlines last year established a hub, "Republic added overnight \$55 million in payroll," said Larry Cox, director of the Memphis International Airport.

"They added 1,200 employees. And as far as sales and purchase of goods and services, I would say the impact was between \$25 million and \$30 million."

Republic, which already had a sizable presence in Memphis with 55 daily flights, increased that to 159 daily flights when it launched its hub in April 1985.

"It has exceeded all of our expectations," Cox said, adding that the proposed merger of Republic with Northwest Orient would mean even more service.

David Cooley, president of the Memphis Chamber of Commerce, described the airport as "a very significant economic factor" for this region.

He said recent figures show the total economic impact of the Memphis airport is \$1.5 billion for 1985, the airport employs 17,000 people, and it has a total payroll of \$450 million.

In June 1985, American made its announcement that it would establish a hub here—a hub representing an investment of \$115 million dollars, a hub that would increase the number of daily flights to 103 from its current 15. From there American would build the hub to as many as 200 daily flights.

The hub, which is being developed in phases, begins with the first phase that kicks in Tuesday.

The hub, which already has created 500 American jobs here, is expected to create as many as 1,350 jobs directly under American Airlines and thousands of associated jobs.

American began looking for an eastern North/South hub location about 18 months ago—and selected Nashville and Raleigh/Durham, N.C., from about 20 perspective airports.

"The hub city is clearly the element that benefits from the hub," said Wes Kaldahl, director of corporate communications for American, "—not only the non-stop service to an increasing number of points, but an incredible economic benefit because of the traffic."

In Atlanta, where there are 2,100 daily flights, including more than 350 a day each from Delta and Eastern, the impact is even more significant.

"I'm not aware of any economic measurement of what it has done," said Gerald Bartels, director of the Atlanta Chamber. "But the airport is absolutely the single most important factor in Atlanta's historic development."

"It is Atlanta's biggest asset," Bartels said. "That is sort of universal opinion among thinking people."

Meanwhile, other cities—cities like Birmingham, Ala., and Louisville, Ky.—are struggling to get full hubs, minihubs, regional hubs—any variation that means better air services.

In Louisville, the situation has gotten to the point that Greyhound Bus Lines not long ago launched an advertising campaign to shuttle Louisville travelers from the Greyhound Bus Terminal to the Greater Cincinnati Airport, where the prices and the variety of flights are vastly superior.

"It is actually cheaper to drive to Cincinnati (about two hours away) and catch a plane there," said Terry Feathers, director of government affairs for the Louisville Chamber of Commerce.

Louisville has the disadvantage of being located closed to very active airports in Cincinnati and in Indianapolis, Ind. In addition, it does not have enough room to add a parallel runway—and almost mandatory element in a full hub operation.

Bob Michael, director of Standiford Field at Louisville, said even without the runway, his airport could handle considerably more traffic than it does now. And that is what airport officials, Louisville Mayor Jerry Abramson and the business community are going after.

"There is a perception of poor air service, and we want to turn that around," Michael said. "We have a deficit that is impeding our economic efforts."

In Birmingham, where air service is perceived as notoriously bad, the mayor and business community have also taken an aggressive approach to improving the air traffic situation—the Alabama House of Representatives has passed a bill granting certain tax exemptions to airlines establishing large daily flight schedules or hub operations at the Birmingham Airport.

"It (inadequate air service) is a terrific disincentive to people and businesses wanting to locate here," said Ed LaMonte, executive secretary to Birmingham Mayor Richard Arrington.

"It is an albatross around our neck in an otherwise effective economic development campaign," LaMonte said.

Delta Airlines, and to a lesser extent Eastern Airlines, are credited with creating the hub-and-spoke concept about 25 years ago.

Nashville's road to becoming a hub city started in the late 1970s—after it was clear that deregulation was sure to make trouble for airports the size of Nashville's.

Sam Bartholomew, attorney to the Metro Airport Authority, said the first strategy of deregulation was the "save what we have" game plan.

"We realized that with deregulation we would have a big time problem," he said. "So what we decided was that we would have to keep our airlines happy—keep the airlines who were serving Nashville from pulling out. That was the game plan."

It was then that they established programs like the Airline Executives Conference to bring the airlines' top management

here to see Nashville first hand and build personal and professional relationships with the city and its leaders.

"In 1981, we looked at it and said, 'hey, we've been successful. What do we do now?'"

"In 1981 John Tune (chairman and one of the founders of the authority, who died in 1983) and I sat down and realized that if we were ever going to be a major city we would have to have a hub.

"A new phase of hubbing was developing and we saw that if we missed out on this second phase of hubbing, we would never be able to attract any corporate headquarters," Bartholomew said.

[From the Tennessean, Apr. 15, 1986]

AMERICAN'S NASHVILLE HUB OPENS

American Airlines is celebrating the opening of its new Nashville hub today with a special package of introductory, unrestricted discount fares of \$49 each way to feeder cities and \$98 each way to Los Angeles.

The fares provide discounts ranging up to 83% and apply to all 23 points American will serve from the Nashville hub, except Dallas/Fort Worth. They also will apply to all 11 markets to be served from Nashville by American's commuter airline partner, American Eagle, during the start-up period.

The fares are available for purchase through next Tuesday and will apply to travel to, from or through the Nashville hub today through May 15. They will apply to all coach seats on all Nashville flights at all hours of the day or night.

At a news conference at the Nashville City Club, Donald P. O'Hare, American's southeastern division president, said the discounts are the airline's way of saying "thank you" to the Nashville community for its support and encouragement.

"Nashville has given its heart to the American Airlines over the past several months," O'Hare said, "and now we are giving the community a special 'thank you' in return.

By offering the low fares to people in the feeder cities, American hopes to more quickly familiarize them with the Nashville hub."

O'Hare also announced at the news conference that Robert L. Crandall, American's chairman and president, will conduct the hub's opening ceremonies today and that Crandall will be joined for the event by Gov. Lamar Alexander, Mayor Richard Fulton, Metro Nashville Authority Chairman Robert Mathews, and Gen. William Moore, the airport director.

Led by Crandall, the board of directors of AMR Corp., parent company of the airline, will hold its regular monthly meeting in Nashville tomorrow as part of the overall hub celebration.

In addition, over 500 key travel agents and convention and meeting planners from throughout the American Airlines system are being flown to Nashville during the inaugural week to see the hub operation first-hand and to learn more about what Nashville has to offer major events like national conventions.

The special "thank you" fares were put on sale April 7 through American's SABRE reservations system.

Savings with the fares are substantial. For example, the \$49 "thank you" fare is a 76 percent discount from the normal one-way coach fare of \$210. The \$49 price is 83 percent less than the normal Boston fare of \$290 and 73 percent below the regular New Orleans fare of \$182. To Los Angeles, the \$98 "thank you" fare is a 76 percent savings from the regular fare of \$418.

By June, when the first phase of the hub is fully developed, American and American Eagle together will operate a total of 106 flights a day to 37 destinations. American will have 60 daily flights to 23 points, and Eagle will offer 46 flights a day to 14 cities.

O'Hare said advance bookings for the hub have been strong and that American expects to board an average of more than 100,000 passengers a month during the first several months of operation. The airline anticipates that for its first full year of hub operations, its total boardings will exceed 1.1 million passengers.

The Nashville hub is being established as a north-south connecting center. As a result, the cities American and American Eagle will serve from Nashville will be about evenly divided north and south.

To the north of Nashville, American will have daily service to 12 points: Boston, Mass.; Buffalo, N.Y.; Chicago, Ill.; Cincinnati, Cleveland and Columbus, Ohio; Detroit and Grand Rapids, Mich.; Newark, N.J.; Philadelphia, Pa.; New York's LaGuardia Airport, and Washington's National Airport.

To the south, American will have 10 destinations: Baton Rouge and New Orleans, La.; Birmingham, Huntsville and Mobile, Ala.; Chattanooga, Tenn.; Jackson, Miss.; Little Rock, Ark.; Dallas/Fort Worth, Texas, and Memphis, Tenn.

Additionally, there will be non-stop service to Los Angeles in the west.

American Eagle's cities to the north will be Terra Haute and Evansville, Ind.; Springfield, Mo.; Lexington and Paducah, Ky.; Tri Cities and Knoxville, Tenn.; Asheville, N.C., and Roanoke, Va.

To the south, Eagle will serve Tuscaloosa and Montgomery, Ala.; Albany, Ga., and Columbus and Tupelo, Miss.

American will serve the hub with 142-seat Super 80 twin-jet, one with 115 seats and a larger version with 150 seats. American Eagle will fly its Nashville schedules with 17-seat Metros and 30-seat Brasillias.

FLIGHT APPROVAL SOUGHT TO MEXICAN RESORT CITIES

American Airlines has asked the U.S. Department of Transportation for authority to begin daily non-stop jet service between Nashville, and Cancun and Cozumel in Mexico's Yucatan peninsula.

If approved, the route authority would give American its first international service for the hub at Metro Nashville Airport, which opens today.

Donald P. O'Hare American's southeastern division vice president, said the airline would like to begin the Mexico service "as soon as possible."

"With creation of the hub," O'Hare said, "American will be in an excellent position to serve Cancun and Cozumel from Nashville. We will be the largest carrier at Metro Nashville Airport, and the existence of the hub will benefit passengers in feeder cities with convenient connections to the Yucatan."

O'Hare said American has received strong indications that the Mexican government "would look favorably on a request from the U.S. government to allow Nashville-Yucatan service." Cancun and Cozumel are popular resort destinations, and the Mexican government is eager for increased tourism throughout its country, O'Hare said.

In its filing with the DOT, American said it would service the Nashville-Yucatan market with 142-seat Super 80 jets. The southbound flight would leave Nashville at

10:10 a.m. and arrive at Cancun at 11:37 a.m., and at Cozumel at 12:41 p.m.

The northbound flight would leave Cancun at 12:20 p.m. and Cozumel at 1:25 p.m., arriving at Nashville at 4:58 p.m.

NASHVILLE HUB DEVELOPMENT

	Phase 1, minihub, spring 1986	Phase 2, new terminal, late 1987	Phase 3, ultimate potential
Gates	9	15	As required.
Departures:			
American Airlines	50-60	75-85	Up to 135.
American Eagle	40-45	65-75	Up to 100.
Cities served:			
American Airlines	20-25	45-50	Up to 60.
American Eagle	15-20	20-25	Up to 28.
Added jobs	598	843	1,350.

AMR BOARD SETS MEETING FOR OPENING

The visit to Nashville this week of the board of directors of AMR Corp. reflects American Airlines' strong commitment to the new Nashville hub, officials say.

The board of AMR, parent company of the airline, meets here tomorrow as part of a full week of gala inaugural events and activities in connection with the formal opening of the hub.

"It is a distinction we can be proud of," said Donald P. O'Hare, American's southeastern division vice president, "and it illustrates the enormous importance American has attached to the success of the Nashville project."

The official ceremonies begin at 10 a.m. today in the new lounge area for Gates 1A-B-C. Other events scheduled this week include:

A special black-tie gala event for key community leaders at Opryland Hotel today that will feature a performance by the Nashville Symphony Orchestra, with Maestro Kenneth Schermerhorn conducting.

Tomorrow, Thursday and Friday, a series of special Nashville "Product Fairs" at Opryland Hotel that will tell the story of Nashville and its new hub to more than 500 of the nation's leading travel agents and meeting and convention planners.

O'Hare said the Product Fairs will be attended by some of the most important travel leaders in the country.

"They represent the very elite of travel decision-makers in the country—the people who actually select cities and hotel properties for major meetings and conventions," he said. "The decisions these people make can pump millions in the local economy."

O'Hare said the Nashville hub will be the largest single startup of new service in American's history and will constitute for American and the community "a giant leap into a stronger and more dynamic future."

American is making a total financial commitment of about \$115 million for the long-term development of the Nashville hub. Phase One is the interim hub that opens today in an expanded nine-gate facility in the existing terminal building.

Phase 2 of the hub will begin in January 1988 when the airline moves into a 15-gate concourse in the airport's new terminal complex. At that point, American will increase its Nashville service to as many as 85 flights a day serving 50 cities, and American Eagle will increase to 75 flights a day to 25 cities.

The ultimate potential of the hub, called Phase 3, envisions American operating about 135 flights a day and American Eagle operating an additional 100 flights. At that

point, American will be serving 60 cities from Nashville and American Eagle will be serving 28 for a total hub operation of 235 flights and 88 cities.

American estimates that when the hub reaches full potential, the airline alone will have added more than 1,350 new jobs to the Nashville economy.

American Airlines

City	Nonstop frequency
North:	
Boston	3
Buffalo (1-stop)	3
Chicago	3
Cincinnati	3
Cleveland	3
Columbia (1-stop)	3
Detroit	3
Grand Rapids (1-stop)	3
Newark	3
Philadelphia	3
New York (LaGuardia)	3
Washington (National)	4
South:	
Baton Rouge	3
Birmingham	3
Chattanooga	3
Dallas/Fort Worth	6
Huntsville	3
Jackson	3
Little Rock	3
Memphis	3
Mobile	3
New Orleans	3
West:	
Los Angeles	1

American Eagle

City	Nonstop frequency
North:	
Terre Haute, IN	3
Evansville, IN	3
Springfield, MO	3
Lexington, KY	3
Tri Cities, IN	3
Knoxville, TN	6
Ashville, NC	3
Paducah, KY	3
Roanoke, VA	3
South:	
Tuscaloosa, AL	3
Montgomery, AL	3
Albany, GA	3
Columbus, MS	3
Tupelo, MS	3

Note: Columbus, MS, and Terre Haute began May 1; Montgomery and Springfield began May 15; Albany, GA, will start June 1.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN A "SNOOKS" KELLEY

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to John A. "Snooks" Kelley, a true all-American, who was called from us Thursday, April 10 at the age of 78.

Snooks Kelley was a legend throughout New England for his contribution to the sport of hockey and the hundreds of young student-scholars he inspired while serving as Boston College hockey coach for nearly four decades. This man was known as the architect of the Boston College hockey program, now one of the Nation's finest amateur athletic organizations.

Snooks believed in America and he believed in Americans. As patriarch of a hockey program that could have catered to outstanding foreign talent, Snooks always looked to this country's youth first for hockey talent and then taught them as much about life as he did about skates, slap shots, and forechecking.

This man, a New England sports legend, was the first college hockey coach to win 500 games. He did this while compiling an astounding record of 501-243-15 during his 36 years at Boston College. Only three other college hockey coaches can boast of 500 or more wins.

This was not the only record Snooks achieved. During his distinguished career, he coached nine teams to the national championships and that record stands to this day. Snooks, a BC alumnus himself, coached his first team to victory and continued winning from that point on.

Snooks Kelley was also a founding father of the now famous Beanpot Tournament and led eight of his own teams to victory in the celebrated New England hockey fest. The awards and distinctions he received during and after his career are far too numerous to list but bear testament to the commitment he made to a sport that is truly part of New England.

His record is not one that will soon be matched and I have no doubt he will long be heralded for his accomplishments by the students and athletes whose lives were changed by his persevering optimism.

Beyond hockey, Snooks Kelley stood for education and development of sound, well-rounded American youth. He taught at Cambridge High and Latin School for 30 years, giving young scholars the same encouragement and insight he instilled on the hockey rink. This was a man who cared about people, a man who developed young minds and bodies to their fullest potential while maintaining the good heart that his friends and associates will remember him by.

Snooks Kelley, member of the National Hockey Hall of Fame, member of the Boston College Hall of Fame, friend, coach, pioneer, and above all Great American, will be sorely missed.

IN HONOR OF GEORGE BARKS

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor George Barks, who will retire from the Hermosa Beach City Council after 12 years of dedicated service.

George is a native of Hermosa Beach, CA, and attended neighborhood schools including South Valley Vista, Pier Avenue, Redondo Union High School, El Camino College and UCLA.

He is a property owner and has owned a small business in Hermosa Beach. In addition, he teaches adult school auto shop at Redondo Union High School.

George has two children, Georgia, and George, Jr.

As the congressional representative for Hermosa Beach, I have enjoyed working with George during the two terms that I have been in office. After serving the community of Hermosa Beach for 12 years, I know George will be missed. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing him the best of luck in all his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF ANTHONY G. PENNUCCI

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the commitment and dedication of Mr. Anthony G. Pennucci, who is a business representative of the Carpenters Union Local 620, in Madison, NJ. I hope that by my statement, my fellow Members will appreciate the years of service that Tony has given to the Occupational Training Center for the Handicapped.

In 1959, Tony Pennucci recognized a need. He knew the importance of reaching out to all people in the community and the importance of providing opportunities for all. More importantly, Tony recognized the responsibility that we all have to see that those who are less fortunate than we have an opportunity to live as active and productive members in our communities.

Twenty-seven years ago, Tony Pennucci made a personal commitment to the Occupational Training Center, and as a result the center has become an unsurpassed resource in our county. The center builds bridges that help everyone. Its network provides access and opportunity. Most importantly it provides promise.

Much of the success of the Occupational Training Center is the result of the activities of Tony Pennucci, and people like him.

Mr. Speaker, we all speak of voluntarism. We all try to encourage and foster voluntarism. Tony Pennucci is a volunteer of the highest order. He has given selflessly of his time and effort, and we have all reaped the benefits of his service.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Tony, and to urge my fellow Members to learn from his example.

Thank you.

PENSIONS: RETIREMENT SECURITY FOR AMERICA'S WORKERS

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, today I'd like to take a moment to praise American industry and its effort to provide workers with a secure future through pension plans.

Often times we focus solely on the benefits of Social Security, and rightly so, as it is an essential part of a retiree's life these days. However, there are other aspects to a retiree's

income, sometimes overlooked, yet just as important. I'm speaking here of pension plans.

Thanks to advances in labor law and labor agreements, most American workers are covered by some form of pension plan on their jobs. These plans vary from basic, straight cash paybacks to complicated cash-stock-investment portfolio plans, the so-called "cafeteria plans," 401k benefits. But no matter what the composition, pension plans are set up by employers, along with the employees, and their unions to help workers plan reasonably and logically for the future.

Though pension plans are generally regarded as providing only income to retired workers, pension plans do much, much more. Funds collected from present day workers not only serve to pay pensions to retirees, but they avail pension plan members of a whole host of services. Many pension plans offer investment services, health benefits and educational opportunities for their members. In fact, the Sheetmetal Workers International Association, in the very spirit of this service, has erected a new pension building solely devoted to the purposes and promotion of the American worker.

I make this statement because I believe it is, and always will be, part of the American work ethic to work toward one's own financial independence. Retirement should be the culmination and achievement of that independence. The Sheetmetal Worker's building is a monument to the effort. For this reason I have introduced a resolution calling on the President to proclaim National Pension Day. I feel strongly that efforts by industry and by labor to improve the retirement prospects of the American workers should be duly recognized and that my resolution, House Joint Resolution 600, is one small way to doing so. I encourage and welcome all my colleagues to join me in this tribute to the American laborer—backbone of American industry.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMSTRONG'S BRAINTREE, MA, PLANT

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, 1986 marks the 50th anniversary of Armstrong World Industries' Braintree, MA, plant, and I would like to take a moment to congratulate the employees, management, and retirees on this milestone.

The Armstrong Cork Co., as it was known then, purchased the facility from the Stedman Rubber Flooring Co. in 1936 to add rubber floor tile to the company's product line.

In the half century since, the Braintree plant has shifted from making flooring to producing industrial rubber and insulation products, but the facility remains an important component of the region's economy, providing about 500 jobs.

Armstrong's Braintree plant is located on one of the oldest manufacturing sites in the Western Hemisphere. In 1643, Braintree's

early settlers established an iron works at the same location, along the Monaquot River. In 1776, a saw and grist mill was set up. In 1820, the metalworking firm begun by patriot Paul Revere acquired the site for a copper and bell foundry.

The site was purchased in 1909 for a newly formed Monaquot Rubber Works Co., which evolved into the firm purchased 50 years ago by Armstrong.

During those five decades, Armstrong and its employees have made a continuing, important contribution to the life of the community. We, their neighbors, congratulate them on their 50th anniversary and we look forward to a long continuation of our association with them.

WHY MILITARY AID TO HAITI?

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, are we set to slide down the same slippery slope in Haiti which embarrassed us in the Philippines? It looks like the White House wants to pump in military aid to Haiti's new military council, just as we did for so many years for the Marcos bunch in the Philippines. I am very concerned that we provide the right kind of aid to help Haiti on the road to recovery and stability.

Haiti has not ranked high among our military aid recipients. But last month, the administration approved some \$383,000 worth of riot control gear. Now it seems poised to provide unconditional security training for a new police force to fill the vacuum left by the demise of ex-dictator Duvalier's hated militia, the Tontons Macoute.

I sincerely hope that we will not be arming and training another instrument for the repression of the Haitian people. Any such aid must include strict human rights conditions to ensure that it is only used to stomp out the vestiges of the Duvalier system, not to entrench new military power.

As one Haitian Catholic priest remarked, "Until we get rid of the Duvalier system, we will continue to say no, no, no." No doubt the people will say no until democracy arrives, just as the people of the Philippines pressed their cause to purge the Marcos system.

I support the administration in its provision of emergency food aid, I submit that food and other emergency economic support is the kind of aid most needed by Haitians—not shotguns, teargas, and birdshot. Even nonlethal aid should be provided with great care.

The following articles describe recent aid developments in Haiti and I call them to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 4, 1986]

CRISIS FOR CHANGE LOUDER IN HAITI

UNTIL DUVALIER SYSTEM GOES, PRIEST SAYS,

"WE CONTINUE TO SAY NO"

(By Edward Cody)

PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI.—Suddenly released after 29 years of repression, demands for political change are sweeping over Haiti

like a Caribbean hurricane too powerful and unpredictable to control.

Thousands of youths, emboldened by success in driving Jean-Claude Duvalier from power, are reveling in a discovery that for the first time they can challenge authority and not only get away with it, but also force a response.

So far, they have proved to be the country's main political force in a chaotic array of competing power centers.

More than six weeks after Duvalier's fall, their power in the streets has yet to be harnessed by civilian political leaders able to channel the demands for change and deal with the military officers who inherited authority when Duvalier fled.

The result has been an explosion of political activity with little, if any, direction * * * groups, causes, or aspiring presidential candidates. The one cause most street youths appear to have agreed on recently is a growing call for the military to step aside for a provisional civilian government even before elections can be organized.

"*Bum palais-la, burn Palais-la,*" they chanted in Creole during a recent demonstration challenging the military's right to rule. "Turn over the palace turn over the palace."

Lt. Gen. Henri Namphy, who heads the National Council of Government, fired two council members and a key adviser on March 21 who were associated in the public mind with Duvalier's abuses. Namphy's action came in response to weeks of demands by demonstrating youths. But by the time he moved, the popular demands had expanded to include his own removal.

Diplomatic and Haitian sources said some military officers, uncomfortable with the disorder, have discussed the possibility of moving against Namphy. These sources said the contacts, among a small group of colonels and majors, appeared so far to be tentative and inconclusive. But they were enough to send rumors of a coup d'etat percolating through Port-au-Prince a few days ago.

The extent of a U.S. influence over these officers has remained unclear. The Haitian military, abiding by tradition, has mostly kept silent. Neither U.S. Ambassador Clayton McManaway nor his military attache has been available to reporters to discuss U.S. contacts in the military.

Publicly, however, the Reagan administration has offered strong support for Namphy. Within one month of Duvalier's departure, Washington flew in \$384,000 worth of riot gear including 150 shotguns with 10,000 rounds of birdshot, 5,000 tear gas canisters and some radios and bullet-proof vests.

In addition, a ship bearing \$2.3 million in emergency U.S. wheat donations arrived two weeks ago.

Haitian youths have complained angrily that the United States also sent in the hard rubber truncheons used March 21 to beat a number of protesters in Port-au-Prince. U.S. Embassy issued a statement calling this an "unfounded allegation." But young men burning tires during disorders March 24 said they did not believe the denial.

Aspiring political leaders have said in interviews that such youth often has unrealistic demands and attitudes because of inexperience and lack of education. The political figures appeared unanimous, for example, that the military must remain in power for a time until elections are held because no civilian could manage the country under present conditions. This assessment was in direct contradiction to demands shouted by the demonstrating youths.

"A civilian government without the military, what is that worth?" said Gerard Gourgue, who resigned March 20 as the council's longtime anti-Duvalier leader.

Gourgue and other civilian figures have been in contact in an effort to work out a civilian leadership coalition as a moderate counterweight to the military, said Lafontant Joseph, one of those involved. But Hubert de Ronceray and Gregoire Eugene, both presidential candidates, said they would not be part of the group and urged instead that the military work faster to organize elections.

"Everyone is a presidential candidate," said DeRonceray. "What kind of association can we form?"

Rene Theodore, the Haitian Communist Party leader recently returned from exile, has suggested instead a "national debate" to select a replacement for Namphy's National Council of Government. In a public document, he urged that each of Haiti's nine regions delegate a spokesman for the debate.

The Roman Catholic Church, which played a leading role in toppling Duvalier, has pulled away from the present confusion, apparently to leave the way clear for political leaders. Activist priests have remained close to the street demonstrations, however.

One, The Rev. Jean-Bertrand Aristides, led a small demonstration recently in which students sang for peace and changes in the government at the same time. "Until we get rid of the Duvalier system, we will continue to say no, no, no," Aristides told reporters.

Aristides said the will of the people has to be respected; if they say the military must leave the government, that is the solution.

Other demonstrators have been similarly rigid. A group of taxi drivers demanded improvements in a crowded street recently, for example, and added in a message to the government:

"We will wait only eight days for the Department of Public Works and Transport to make known its plan to carry out [improvement projects]. If not, we will consider the department is no longer competent and will take the appropriate measures."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 4, 1986]
U.S. TO GIVE HAITI MORE MILITARY AID
(By Marlies Simons)

PORT-AU-PRINCE, April 3.—A high-ranking American official said today that the United States intended to increase military and economic assistance to Haiti and also to help it recover some of the vast riches stolen from the country by the Duvalier Government.

The official, Elliott Abrams, Assistant Secretary of State of Inter-American Affairs, made the announcement at the conclusion of a two-day visit here.

He was accompanied by Brig. Gen. Fred Gorden, director of the Inter-American region at the Defense Department.

SMALL LEFTIST GROUPS CITED

The visit appeared to reflect the growing United States concern with the stability of this impoverished Caribbean nation of six million people that has remained politically and economically stagnant in the two months since the flight Feb. 7 of Jean-Claude Duvalier.

Haiti's military dominated ruling council has quickly lost its popularity because of its general lack of achievement. In recent days, United States and other diplomats have begun to cite the presence of small leftist groups as a source of growing concern.

In a news conference before his departure, Mr. Abrams said: "We have increased the

amount of aid we are giving to Haiti and we hope to increase it more."

The size of the aid increase, he said, would depend on Congressional action. Newly approved emergency food shipments will bring the amount of United States assistance to Haiti to close to \$60 million this year.

Mr. Abrams said that Haiti's most pressing needs were for food and jobs. "But if you want to maintain order in the country, then the military is going to have to modernize and professionalize, which it wishes to. Obviously a new democratic Haiti will need a new professional force to maintain order."

TRAINING IS DISCUSSED

Mr. Abrams declined to specify if more military equipment would be sent to Haiti. "But certainly training, yes. I think the Army wants training. This is something we can offer and that I think will be very useful for the armed forces here."

Both the Haitian military and police forces, according to officials, will begin a recruiting program this month to fill the vacuum left by the Duvalier militia known as the Tontons Macoute. This feared paramilitary force of some 15,000 armed men and some 300,000 members was widely believed to have been the vital instrument for maintaining stability. Its members performed often arbitrary police duties and served as a nationwide political spy network.

Since it was disbanded, Haiti's security forces consist of 7,800 mostly poorly trained men, which include the fire brigade, a small Navy and Air Force and about 1,000 police in the capital.

ON STOLEN FORTUNE

Long low on the list of United States military and recipients, Haiti's allotted portion of \$500,000 of aid was spent largely last month, when the United States sent \$383,000 worth of riot control gear here.

Asked if the United States Government would help Haiti recuperate part of the fortune stolen by the former president and his associates, Mr. Abrams said: "Yes, we want to and we will in every way we can. We will work with the Government of Haiti on the information that is needed." He said the issue had been discussed with the President, Gen. Henry Namphy. But referring to similar attempts to recover Ferdinand E. Marcos's holdings, Mr. Abrams said that the case of Haiti was much more difficult. "We had the Marcos documents and we could give them to the new Government of the Philippines," said Mr. Abrams, "we don't have the Duvalier documents."

To Haitians, who are not used to such concentrated attention from the outside world, the procession of American politicians during the last two weeks has been variously a source of punishment or concern. Haitian politicians repeatedly question foreigners on what they believe to be the American design behind the high-level attention from Washington. Besides today's delegation, in the past week Haiti also has had visits from Peter McPherson, the administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, from State Department officials and five American Congressmen.

"We have never seen such a constellation of stars of the American system," said one pro-American presidential candidate who asked not to be named.

DAVID PACKARD SPEAKS OUT
ON SCIENTIFIC BRAIN DRAIN

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, last October, I introduced H.R. 3480, the Science and Technology Revitalization Act, to authorize alternative personnel management systems for scientific and technical personnel in the Federal Government. I introduced this bill because, in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology, I have observed an alarming decrease in overall quality of personnel beginning careers at our Federal laboratories.

At a recent hearing held by our Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, we heard from Hon. David Packard, who chaired the White House Science Council's Federal Laboratory Review Panel. Mr. Packard dramatically highlighted this alarming trend for the Science Committee, and called our attention once again to the contribution of Federal personnel management systems to the problem. Simply stated, the current system is just not working to attract and retain the high quality Federal scientists and engineers we need.

Mr. Speaker, I believe what David Packard is saying is of the utmost importance if we are to maintain the traditional quality of work at our Federal labs. Not only do our national prestige and our international competitiveness rest heavily on that quality, but even more important, our national security is heavily dependent on maintaining a technological lead. For this reason, I would commend the following article by Mr. Packard to the Members of this body, and to everyone who is concerned that we obtain quality work in science and technology for our Federal tax dollars. The article appeared in the spring 1986 edition of *Issues in Science and Technology*, the public policy journal of the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine.

THE LOSS OF GOVERNMENT SCIENTIFIC AND
ENGINEERING TALENT

(By David Packard)

PROLOGUE: From AIDS research to plant biotechnology to the Strategic Defense Initiative, the federal laboratories are entrusted with much of the nation's vital R&D. In 1985 the laboratories received \$17 billion, or one-third of the federal R&D budget, and federal support is increasing. But, David Packard warns, the government is skimping on the laboratories' most essential element: scientists and engineers.

Because of low salaries and noncompetitive fringe benefits, the federal laboratories are having difficulty attracting, retaining, and motivating high-caliber scientists and engineers, says Packard, who headed a White House review of the laboratories. Here he outlines several measures to correct these problems and to reduce the general rigidity and inertia of the federal personnel system. He urges Congress to act quickly to halt the erosion of scientific talent before the vitality of the laboratories is seriously undermined.

David Packard is chairman of the board of Hewlett-Packard Company, which he found-

ed with William Hewlett in 1939. Packard received a B.A. in 1934 and an M.S. in electrical engineering in 1939, both from Stanford University. From 1969 through 1971 he served as deputy secretary of defense. In 1982 Packard chaired a White House Science Council committee to review the performance of the federal laboratories, and in 1985 President Reagan appointed him to chair the President's Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense Management.

Research and development are key to both our national security and industrial competitiveness. In the past 10 years both federal and private support for R&D in the United States have been increasing in constant dollars, and in 1985 this support reached an all-time high of \$107 billion, about 47 percent of which was federal. Ironically, with more national emphasis on R&D than ever before, the federal government's inability to attract and retain qualified scientists and engineers has become a major problem.

A significant part of the nation's R&D is performed in government-owned laboratories, a system of over 700 institutions that includes not only the National Bureau of Standards, National Institutes of Health, Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, and Naval Research Laboratory but also less familiar ones such as the National Severe Storms Laboratory, Environmental Monitoring Support Laboratory, and National Space Technology Laboratories. About one-third of the federal government's annual R&D budget is allocated to the federal laboratories; the rest goes to universities and industry. In 1985 the federal laboratories received roughly \$17 billion, or about 16 percent of total federal and private expenditures on R&D.

The accomplishments of the federal laboratories, from the development of radar to frozen orange juice to nuclear power, have had an impact on every American. Today these laboratories are tackling such challenges as AIDS research, plant and animal genetics, secure computer systems, optical fibers for telecommunications, and night vision devices.

During the past 10 years, however, the federal government has had increasing difficulty in recruiting and retaining people of the caliber needed to conduct and manage its R&D activities. These problems have generally not affected the 27 federal laboratories that are run under contract to universities and industry, such as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Jet Propulsion Laboratory and the Energy Department's Argonne, Los Alamos, and other atomic energy laboratories. Rather, the problems are concentrated in the laboratories operated by the government and thus subject to government salary and personnel regulations.

At the heart of the problem is pay, with rigidity and inertia of the personnel administration system being a less important but contributing factor. The pay disparity between government and industry began to grow with the last cycle of inflation, when increases in federal salaries failed to keep pace. The problem is particularly acute in the scientific and engineering fields, where industrial pay scales have risen faster than the rest. Congress has exacerbated the problem by insisting on linking congressional and civil service pay. Because Congress is reluctant to raise its own pay, civil service salaries have been capped for at least six years; in 1986 the salary ceiling is \$72,300. The

result is not only lower federal salaries but also severe salary compression at the senior levels, which penalizes some of the most highly trained and experienced people entrusted with critical responsibilities.

In 1984 the General Accounting Office found that federal engineers' salaries were 47 percent lower than those in the private sector at the entry level and 25 percent lower at the more experienced (GS-11) level.¹ A recent Air Force survey showed that for computer scientists, federal civilian starting salaries are 30 to 40 percent lower than those in industry. Data from other agencies tell the same story:

The National Bureau of Standards found in recent recruiting actions that the top federal salary offers to Ph.D. scientists, engineers, and mathematicians in high-technology fields averaged about \$10,000 per year less than industry and university salaries.

A recent survey of unsuccessful recruiting actions at the Naval Research Laboratory revealed that 93 of 102 candidates who turned down federal job offers did so because of low federal salaries.

The acceptance rate for NASA's offers to new engineering graduates dropped from 62 percent in 1981 to 46 percent in 1984.

The Agricultural Research Service has had difficulty recruiting and retaining Ph.D.'s in high-technology fields, where university and industry salaries are as much as 40 percent higher.

At the National Institutes of Health, salaries for senior Ph.D. scientists are 25 percent lower than those in the private sector, and salaries for clinical surgical specialists are 300 percent lower.

There has also been an alarming increase in resignations among the Air Force's civilian scientists and engineers. From 1981 through 1984 the number of resignations increased by 164 percent; resignations now constitute the major source of attrition in the technical work force. The predominant reason given for leaving government service is inadequate pay. Another disturbing trend is that resignations, which used to be most common at the junior middle management levels, are now spreading to the less experienced levels as well.

Faced with problems in recruiting, federal agencies often have to choose between accepting a less qualified candidate or leaving a position vacant. Defense Department data show that the aptitude scores of newly hired scientists and engineers are declining relative to national norms. This situation illustrates that the nation is getting only what it is willing to pay for.

Not only are federal salaries noncompetitive but fringe benefits are eroding as well. Although the federal pension plan is still relatively generous, it has been affected by recent budget cuts and is often matched or exceeded in the private sector. Federal health and life insurance provisions and annual and sick leave allowances are far less generous than those offered by many private companies and universities.

Salaries in the contractor-operated federal laboratories are more attractive than salaries in the government-operated institutions. Indeed, the government originally decided to have contractors run some of its laboratories during World War II to avoid

¹ General Accounting Office, *Federal White Collar Special Rate Program*, Report to the Subcommittee on Compensation and Benefits, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 98th Cong., March 30, 1984.

many of the difficulties inherent in government operation and the civil service. The contractors have more flexibility in salary administration, and the salaries they typically offer are competitive with those in industry and universities. Certainly, many of the problems in government-operated laboratories today, particularly in the personnel area, could be solved by converting to contractor operation. That approach, however, brings other problems. Contractors may have a lesser commitment to the sponsoring agency's mission, and they may appear to have a conflict of interest in the R&D projects they undertake. In addition, legal difficulties occasionally arise because the contractor-operated laboratories are not purely federal or private.

In 1982 I chaired a White House Science Council panel established to review the federal laboratories and recommend actions to improve their use and performance. The panel concluded that the inability of many federal laboratories—especially those under civil service restraints—to attract, retain, and motivate qualified scientists and engineers limits the productivity of the laboratories. If not corrected, this situation will seriously threaten the vitality of the institutions.²

In examining the various factors that contribute to these problems, our Federal Laboratory Review Panel compared administrative practices in government-operated laboratories with those in industrial R&D organizations. We found that industry typically places more administrative control over technical personnel in the hands of technical supervisors than do government-operated laboratories. In the federal system, personnel administration is handled by a more or less autonomous bureaucracy focused on procedures and standardization rather than on technical achievement. The federal government also commonly imposes personnel ceilings as well as budgetary controls on the laboratories, whereas the general industrial practice is to use budgetary control alone. Our panel recommended that government-operated laboratories also use budgetary control alone.

Another problem of federal personnel administration, and one that differs from customary practice in industry, is the emphasis on length of service rather than quality of performance in determining salary increases. Thus, a federal employee who has a clean service record is assured of a step increase at regular intervals regardless of productivity. Conversely, the process of rewarding high performers is administratively cumbersome, and most bonuses and promotions are difficult to get through the system. Thus, the federal system plods along for the most part, fostering mediocrity and lacking the means to attract or encourage the genius needed for technical inspiration and organizational leadership.

A greater exchange of scientists and engineers between government and academia would provide new ideas, not only to laboratories but also to federal R&D program offices. Unfortunately, the current structure and rigidity of the federal personnel system inhibit the mobility of technical personnel between government and universities. Pay comparability would do much to improve the situation, as would additional flexibility in pension accounts. There is no reason, for

example, why academics who join a federal organization should not have the option of retaining their own pension plans rather than being required to join the federal one.

The Navy is attempting to rectify some of these personnel management problems in a demonstration project started in 1980 at two of its California laboratories, the Naval Weapons Center at China Lake and the Naval Ocean Systems Center in San Diego. An alternative personnel management system has been created at each facility that, among other things, aggregates the numerous civil service grades into broad pay bands, links pay to performance, and simplifies personnel administration. The broad pay bands give supervisors more flexibility in making initial salary offers and giving subsequent in-grade raises; they also permit more generic job descriptions and greater latitude in rewarding deserving individuals without having to promote them. In contrast, the existing civil service system, with its many narrowly and rigidly defined grades, makes it difficult to match markets rates for scarce talent. This system also forces supervisors to rewrite job descriptions, thereby justifying promotion to higher grades, in order to give employees pay raises.

After visiting China Lake and reviewing the improvements these changes had made in the quality of the facility's professional staff, our panel recommended that government-operated laboratories be allowed to establish a new management system for scientific and technical personnel, patterned after the Navy's demonstration project.

A bill now pending in Congress includes the panel's recommendation. The Federal Science and Technology Revitalization Act, introduced in both the Senate (S. 1727) and the House (H.R. 3480), proposes changes in personnel management that incorporate both provisions of the Navy's personnel system at China Lake and additional features intended to alleviate the specific problems pertaining to scientists and engineers. The proposed legislation would permit federal agencies to adopt this alternative personnel system, although adoption would not be mandatory, it would base pay on performance rather than service time, create broad pay bands, and simplify job classification. It would also allow the pay cap to be waived for up to 5 percent of the covered positions, although this waiver would be limited to specially qualified scientific and technical personnel. Finally, the bill would provide greater flexibility in retirement programs and would permit agency heads to classify positions and fix compensation to make positions competitive with rates and practices outside the federal government. These changes would apply to all of an agency's scientists and engineers other than presidential appointees requiring Senate confirmation.

Aside from the obvious improvements in the compensation system, the proposed legislation would give each agency flexibility to design a personnel management system to fit its own distinct needs. It would also give more control over technical personnel to technical supervisors rather than to personnel administrators. Passage of this bill would go a long way toward improving the federal government's ability to manage and conduct R&D.

Another potential benefit of this proposed act should be recognized. Increasing the attractiveness of federal R&D jobs will improve the job market for all scientists and engineers, thereby attracting more young

people into science and engineering careers. Greater involvement of our most promising talent in R&D activities is essential if we are to retain technological leadership in an increasingly competitive international environment.

It will take some time for legislative remedies and enlightened administrative measures to restore our federal R&D capability to an acceptable level. Within today's constrained budget environment, salary reforms will have to be spread out over time. Eventually, however, these reforms should stop the talent drain and make it possible to rebuild the quality of the federal scientific and engineering work force. Now is the time to act before it is too late. It is in every American's interest to see that the quality of our federal R&D establishment not decline because of neglect of its most essential element—people.

IN HONOR OF GARY BRUTSCH

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Gary Brutsch, a city councilman in Hermosa Beach, CA, whose term will expire on April 15, 1986. As the Congressional Representative of Hermosa Beach, I have had the privilege of working with Gary throughout most of his term and it is an honor for me to share a few of his many accomplishments with my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Gary will be remembered as one local official who continually advocated improvements in the quality of life for all residents of Hermosa Beach. This included leading the city toward a planned program of replacement for its deteriorated sewers, advocacy of new storm drains for the downtown area and a nurturing of economic and commercial development in the city. During his 4 years on the city council, he was in the forefront of urging a clean up of the entire Santa Monica Bay and in addressing reduced density/traffic congestion in Hermosa Beach.

Gary and I have always shared a passion for the Santa Monica Bay and have worked together to keep the bay free from oil rigs. Last summer Gary cochaired a local group in order to rally support for an agreement I and other members of the California delegation had negotiated with Secretary Hodel. This agreement would have offered most of the bay long-term protection from offshore oil drilling until the year 2000.

Although I regret that Secretary Hodel backed away from this agreement, we have resumed negotiations with Hodel in Washington, and again Gary has organized a local effort to demonstrate additional support.

Gary authored a successful initiative, which came before voters in the April 8 elections, asking residents if they believed the Federal Government should lease for oil in the Santa Monica Bay. An overwhelming majority of Hermosa residents voted "no" for the measure, thus sending a clear message to the Interior Department that local residents in Hermosa Beach are opposed to current leasing plans.

² "Report of the White House Science Council, Federal Laboratory Review Panel" (Washington, D.C.: Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of the President, May 1983.)

As someone who has been involved in ongoing efforts to protect this precious resource, the success of Gary's initiative means a great deal to me and I appreciate all of his hard work on behalf of the bay.

A native of southern California, Gary has lived in Hermosa Beach for 14 years. He received a bachelors degree in business administration and a masters degree in communications from Pepperdine University. In addition, Gary did graduate work in management at the University of Virginia. Gary spent 20 years of outstanding service with the Los Angeles Police Department, and was appointed by the chief of police to train with the FBI National Academy. Gary retired from the police force in 1985, and has recently founded Gary Lee Brusch and Associates, a public relations and lobbying firm. Gary is married to Kena and they have a 6-year-old daughter Shanden.

Gary established an impressive record during his 4 years in office and his presence on the city council will be greatly missed. On a personal note, I want Gary to know how much I have enjoyed working with him and I hope he will continue to remain in close touch. I will always welcome his input on matters of mutual concern.

It is a pleasure to highlight Gary's fine record with my colleagues in the House of Representatives. I ask that Members of this body join me in wishing Gary the best of luck in all his future endeavors.

OUR FIRM RESPONSE TO TERRORISM

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, the actions of our Government over the last 24 hours in response to acts of terrorism that resulted in the deaths of Americans around the world deserve our support today.

I think from the comments of my colleagues here today, that support is broad and deep. It is bipartisan and it is representative of all parts of this country.

It is always difficult, when you are dealing with sensitive intelligence gathered from many sources, to publicly proclaim the source of terrorism in our world today.

But, in this case, we have the evidence linking events of recent weeks to the country of Libya. We have proof that other events were planned which would have resulted in further deaths and greater destruction.

We have reports, including this morning's column by Jack Anderson, of further links between Libya and acts of terrorism dating back several years or more.

We have deliberated and we have studied these many reports.

And, most importantly, we have acted.

Our national commitment to fight state-sponsored terrorism has been greatly strengthened by our actions yesterday.

In the past, we have tried economic force. We have tried moral force. The supporters of terrorism around the world now know that we are capable of using the type of force that they understand to answer their acts of terror.

Our actions were directed and initiated for one purpose and one purpose only—to send a clear and unmistakable message to those who would undertake state-sponsored acts of terrorism that this country will not tolerate continuous and unanswered acts of violence.

Our actions came after careful review of the evidence and a full review of our options in this case. I anticipate that the same review process will be used in the future, as well.

We will respond to protect American citizens. We will also respond to clearly documented evidence of intimidation directed at the United States or our allies by any nation using premeditated acts of random violence.

And, most importantly, we will stand by the strength of our commitments.

ON AID TO THE CONTRAS

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD two articles on aid to the Contras that I thought might be helpful as our colleagues consider their vote on this most important issue. One is a poll published in today's New York Times, which talks about the extensive opposition against Contra aid among many Americans. The other is an editorial from today's Washington Post on why we should press for negotiations rather than aid to the Contras. I hope my colleagues will find them useful.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1986]

POLL SHOWS CONFUSION ON AID TO CONTRAS

(By David K. Shieler)

Americans are uncertain about which side the United States is backing in Nicaragua and only one out of four supports President Reagan's request for \$100 million in aid to the rebels who are trying to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government, according to the latest New York Times/CBS News Poll.

With the approach of another key vote by the House of Representatives on the President's proposal, majorities of those polled accepted his argument that Nicaragua is a risk to American interests, but opposed his remedy of \$100 million in aid.

Only 38 percent knew that Washington was supporting the guerrillas and not the Government. That confusion extended to the nature of Nicaragua's Government, which is aligned with the Soviet Union; just 20 percent said it was Communist, 19 percent said it was a right-wing dictatorship and 49 percent said they didn't know.

NICARAGUAN THREAT PERCEIVED

Nevertheless, after questions about the Reagan aid plan had been asked, a more defined image of Nicaragua seemed to emerge. Fifty-nine percent of the 1,601 adults interviewed by telephone from April 6 through 10 answered yes when asked if they thought the Nicaraguan Government would provide the Soviet Union with military bases, and 56 percent agreed that Nicaragua constituted a threat to the security of other Central American countries. The survey's margin of sampling error was plus or minus three percentage points.

It therefore appeared that President Reagan had succeeded only partially in his efforts to sway the American public toward

his views on Central America. There was concern, but it failed to translate into support for action by the United States.

Citing the risk of another Vietnam, the need to address domestic problems and a conviction that the money would be wasted, only 25 percent expressed a willingness to assist the contras. Sixty-two percent opposed the aid, and 12 percent had no opinion.

A FINANCIAL DRAIN IS SEEN

"If we had some assurance that the money would do the job, that would be one thing," said Thomas Haeger of Vancouver, Wash., who described himself as a conservative Republican. "But it would just be the beginning of years of a financial drain. After Vietnam we don't need the money worry or the emotional worry."

As the example of Mr. Haeger illustrated, opposition to the aid request came even from the ranks of President Reagan's supporters. Even those who approved of the way in which Mr. Reagan was handling his job as President—a very strong 64 percent of the total—rejected aid to the contras by a margin of 52 to 35 percent. Those who described themselves as conservatives opposed it by 57 to 30 percent and Republicans by 51 to 36 percent.

The survey was done after weeks of vigorous debate in Washington over the Nicaragua issue. The Reagan Administration is seeking to end a two-year Congressional ban on military aid to the contras—\$27 million in nonlethal aid was provided during the fiscal year ending last March 31—but has encountered considerable opposition, especially in the Democratic-controlled House.

VOTE SCHEDULED FOR TUESDAY

Last month, the House narrowly defeated the Administration's request. The Republican-controlled Senate then passed a compromise, under which the aid would be withheld pending diplomatic efforts to get Nicaragua's agreement to move toward internal democratization and refrain from supporting insurgencies against its Central American neighbors. The House vote Tuesday is expected to be close.

Judging from the results of the Times/CBS News Poll, the contra aid issue appears to have tapped a deep well of ambivalence over the place of the United States in countering undemocratic, pro-American regimes.

Asked whether Washington should back a right-wing dictatorship friendly to the United States or urge free elections even if they might lead to a Communist government, those surveyed opted for the elections by a margin of 40 to 33 percent.

The public also expressed more willingness to criticize such governments than to try to change them. To the question, "Should the United States criticize governments that deny human rights to their citizens, even if those governments support us on important foreign policy issues?" 54 percent said yes and 31 percent said no. But opposite sentiments were evoked by the question "Should the United States try to change a dictatorship to a democracy where it can, or should the United States stay out of other countries' affairs?" Sixty-two percent said stay out, and 28 percent said try to change.

TERRORISM SEEN AS TOP PROBLEM

Terrorism, not Central America, was listed most frequently as the most important problem facing this country, followed by the economy, unemployment, the risk of nuclear war and the budget deficit. Only 12 of

the 1,601 persons questioned mentioned Central America as the United States' chief worry.

Few of the aid proponents accepted the idea of American military intervention, and some saw money as a way of avoiding a deeper entanglement. "If we don't help, it will turn out like Cuba—we'll be threatened from all sides," said Eva Gramm, a restaurant cook in Avon, S.D., "I have three sons—one is eligible for the draft," she continued. "I think we should send money and keep our troops out."

"I'd rather send money than troops," said Robert Thomas, an electrician from Easton, Pa. "That's where we have to draw the line: no troops, no advisers."

Indeed, when a suggestion was made to include American personnel in the aid, the survey showed support for American involvement dropping sharply. The 25 percent who favored funds to the contras fell to 16 percent when asked whether they would favor American military advisers if the money "did not work." Then, if advisers "did not work," they were asked whether they would favor sending United States combat troops. Only 10 percent said yes.

NO GROUP FAVORED AID

Opposition to aid for the contras crossed all political, ethnic and regional and socioeconomic lines. No demographic group favored it. But within that broad picture, some differences emerged. Aid was opposed by a lower percentage of men than women, whites than blacks, Republicans than Democrats and conservatives than liberals.

The higher the education and income, the less the opposition. Those earning more than \$50,000 a year were against aid by a margin of 52 to 40 percent, while those earning less than \$12,500 a year opposed it by 68 to 17 percent. Similarly, college graduates were against it by 53 to 33 percent, and those with less than a high school education by 68 to 17 percent.

The shadow of the long, losing war in Vietnam appeared to hang over the prospect of involvement in Central America. Sixty-two percent of the respondents said that they feared that the United States would get involved in Nicaragua the way it did in Vietnam, although when asked to volunteer reasons for opposing contra aid, only 2 percent mentioned "another Vietnam" and the danger of escalation.

Some proponents of aid dismissed the Vietnam analogy. "We won't have another Vietnam," said Eva Gramm. "It was a harsh lesson; it won't happen again."

The most frequent reason given against the aid, and given most often by urban residents and those with lower incomes and less education, was that problems in the United States were more important. Of those opposing assistance, 44 percent said the \$100 million should be spent on domestic problems.

In addition, follow-up interviews revealed some skepticism about the contras' abilities and a fear that money would be pocketed by corrupt rebels. Some respondents pointed to the example of Ferdinand E. Marcos, the former President of the Philippines, who has been accused of enriching himself with American Government funds.

"If we give money to the contras, we should monitor where and how it is being spent," said Mary Battle of Riveredge, N.J.

The New York Times/CBS NEWS POLL—AID TO THE CONTRAS: IGNORANCE AND OPPOSITION

	[Percent]		
	Those who know U.S. support Contras	Willing to give aid	
	Yes	No	
Total.....	38	25	62
Republicans.....	40	36	51
Democrats.....	31	16	74
Independents.....	43	26	60
Men.....	52	35	56
Women.....	25	17	68
18-44 year old.....	38	29	62
45 and older.....	38	20	64
High school graduate or less.....	51	22	65
Some college or more.....	32	31	57
Whites.....	39	26	61
Blacks.....	28	16	74
Northeast.....	43	27	61
Midwest.....	39	22	67
South.....	31	27	59
West.....	39	24	64
Those who know which side U.S. supports in Nicaragua.....	40	52	67
Don't know.....	16	69	69
Call Nicaragua a threat to security of Central America.....	36	54	62
Not a threat.....	11	82	67
Say Nicaragua will give Soviet Union bases.....	34	55	65
Will not give.....	16	75	65
Say it's important to U.S. security to eliminate communism from Latin America.....	38	51	65
Say Communist governments can exist without threatening U.S. security.....	13	79	65
Fear U.S. will get involved in Nicaragua the way it did in Vietnam.....	47	73	65
Not afraid.....	13	44	65
Approve Reagan's handling presidency.....	35	52	65
Disapprove.....	8	84	65

Based on 1,601 telephone interviews conducted April 6-10

HOW THE SURVEY WAS CONDUCTED

The latest New York Times/CBS News Poll is based on telephone interviews conducted April 6 through 10 with 1,601 adults around the United States, excluding Alaska and Hawaii.

The sample of telephone exchanges called was selected by a computer from a complete list of exchanges in the country. The exchanges were chosen so as to insure that each region of the country was represented in proportion to its population. For each exchange, the telephone numbers were formed by random digits, thus permitting access to both listed and unlisted residential numbers.

The results have been weighted to take account of household size and number of residential telephones and to adjust for variations in the sample relating to region, race, sex, age and education.

In theory, in 19 cases out of 20 the results based on such samples will differ by no more than 3 percentage points in either direction from what would have been obtained by interviewing all adult Americans. The error for smaller subgroups is larger. For example, for either Republicans or Democrats the potential error is plus or minus four percentage points.

In addition to sampling error, the practical difficulties of conducting any survey of public opinion may introduce other sources of error into the poll.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1986]

THE CONTRA AID VOTE

Two weekends ago in Panama, the would-be mediators of the Contadora group struggled to find a way to ease the gathering confrontation between the United States and Nicaragua. The Sandinistas defiantly rejected all steps the would-be mediators urged on them. Last weekend, however, they edged

back a bit, agreeing to accept a deadline of June 6 for the signing of a regional peace treaty, with two conditions: that the points of the treaty still in dispute be resolved, and that the United States halt "aggression" against Managua. Presumably this was done at least in part to assure members of the House, who are about to vote on contra aid, that there is a valid diplomatic alternative to the Reagan administration's course.

The eight Latin governments supporting the Contadora initiative believe there is. If Washington cut off the contras, they argue, a workable regional security treaty could be put in place, and in the resulting calm, Nicaragua could be induced to slow and reverse its totalitarian progress. For its part, the Reagan administration says it has no confidence in a treaty entered into by a Sandinista regime. It further insists that the Latin way of political envelopment, far from mellowing Managua, would merely let the regime consolidate power. Its call for contra aid follows.

The moral argument for contra aid—that it keeps faith with the democrats of Nicaragua—is powerful. They are worthy people, and they deserve better than to be identified, as some identify them, with that part of the Nicaraguan opposition consisting of Somoza holdovers.

The difficulty is the lack of a plausible way to help. The administration offers the contras. But in four years these forces have yet to demonstrate either military effectiveness—they have not held a town overnight—or political appeal—most leaders of the contra groups supported by Washington are Somoza holdovers and act the part. Senior retired American military officers attest to the inadequacy of the administration's military program to accomplish any realistic military objectives. The prospect that American forces might have to bail out a failing contra expedition is real. The hostility to the United States that would grow elsewhere in Latin America is a serious consideration.

Four years of pursuit of democracy in Nicaragua by military means has spurred the Sandinistas to move faster toward police rule and has helped them gather wider Latin sympathy for being targets of American power. A more zealous application of this policy, as the administration urges, would not alter these unhappy basic facts.

Rather than contra aid, the Latins propose quickly to complete a treaty limiting Nicaragua's military reach and its Soviet-Cuban ties, and then to start trying to press the Sandinistas along a better internal path. It is argued that the security talks won't work without the pressure of the contras. The record suggests to us that those talks won't work with the pressure of the contras. The Sandinistas are in the eighth year of a communist revolution. Yet Nicaragua is contiguous to its Latin neighbors and connected to them in ways that Cuba never was. Its economy is in desperate straits.

The United States, moreover, would—should—remain ready to do what is necessary, in security policy, political support and development aid, to prevent Nicaragua from undermining the security of its Central American neighbors. It must also be ready to ensure, by its own military acts if necessary, that Nicaragua does not become a strategic threat to the United States.

Finally, the United States must not stop demanding that the Contadora Latins keep pressing the Sandinistas to open to the democrats in Nicaragua. The very least Americans can do for these Nicaraguans is

to stay alert to ways of salvaging what can be salvaged by acceptable means.

**DANIEL SHAPIRO TO COMPETE
IN NATIONAL PTA CONTEST**

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress the work of Daniel Shapiro. Danny, a student at Linglestown Junior High School, and a resident of Harrisburg, PA, has been chosen to be the sole representative from Pennsylvania in the national competition of the "PTA Reflections" competition that will take place in June.

Danny, an amateur photographer for just 1 year, entered the local PTA contest after learning of the competition through a school announcement. His photograph, in accordance with the contest's theme "On Liberty's View", reveals an interesting perspective of Pennsylvania's State Capitol in Harrisburg. He photographed, developed, and printed his entry, using the darkroom at the Museum of Scientific Discovery in Harrisburg.

After winning the competition at Linglestown Junior High School, he went on to capture first place in the intermediate competition and then took another first place in Statewide competition. I would like to congratulate Danny on his accomplishments and wish him the best of luck in the national competition.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN HOY

HON. JOHN HILER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. HILER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with this body a story about an individual who has touched a great many lives.

The very special person I am referring to is John Hoy, a man with a truly remarkable talent for making friends. Mr. Hoy, a native of North Webster, IN, has dedicated himself to spreading friendship through the concept of "A Rose for Friendship."

I have been aware of Mr. Hoy's "mission of friendship" for a number of years, and I have always been impressed that one man could have such an effect on others' lives. In this fast-paced and complex modern day, it is reassuring to know that there are good friends like John Hoy among us.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an insightful newspaper article, which was written by Edith Gray, a resident of Goshen, IN.

[From the Mail-Journal (Milford and Syracuse, IN), Feb. 12, 1986]

"A ROSE FOR FRIENDSHIP"

On the shores of beautiful Tippecanoe Lake in northern Indiana in a lovely brick ranch home under great oak trees lives a sensitive man who many call friend. A native of the North Webster area, one-time

milk salesman (in the days of home deliveries and the depression), now semi-retired realtor and developer, J.B. Hoy enjoys pursuing a dream he earnestly seeks to make come true.

In many ways he has already succeeded. But when his dream is finally realized, his part in achieving his goals will probably be forgotten by those who will enjoy the fruit of his labor.

In 1963 business took Mr. Hoy, the small-town businessman, to the big city of Chicago where he called on a gentleman in a luxurious office with lovely furnishings but with one flaw. On the receptionist's desk was a faded, plastic rose. After completing his business he left the office and returned a few minutes later with one long-stemmed rose which he presented to a delighted young lady in place of the artificial one. She sent a note of thanks to his home a few days later.

Three years later J.B.'s son, Phil Hoy, a personnel director for a firm in Fort Wayne, interviewed a young woman who had recently moved from Chicago. She inquired if he might be related to a J.B. Hoy of Tippecanoe Lake and was told of the relationship. She then related the long-stemmed rose incident and said she had always considered the rose to be the emblem of friendship and a compliment.

J.B. Hoy was impressed that one single act of kindness, long forgotten by him—it was such a little thing—that of giving a rose, had meant so much to another person that she would remember it three years afterward and even remember the stranger's name who had given it. The full impact of our human need for receiving expressions of kindness, love, or concern, that intangible thing we call friendship, hit home that day for J.B. Hoy. The more he thought about it, the more he appreciated his own friends and all the little things that many people had done for him over the years. It seemed that there should be some special way to repay and show appreciation for the many benefits of friendship he had received from others. But many of those acts of kindness had been done by people he could not identify, or the whereabouts of whom he no longer knew, or who were no longer living. So he felt a debt that seemed hopeless to repay.

The solution came in the form of a resolve that from that day forward each time he met someone, he would give that person a "rose" in the form of a compliment, a kind word, or an act of kindness.

As he carried out his resolve, he began to notice how many more acts of kindness were returned to him. Kind words begat kind words, compliments yielded a return compliment, days were brightened by the smiles and appreciative words received by the giver of a "rose." Truly, "a bit of fragrance always clings to the hand that gives a 'rose.'"

The value of friendship became even more apparent to J.B. Hoy upon the death of his wife, Eunice, of 37 years. He realized we have a day to honor almost every human relationship, Mother's Day, Father's Day, Valentine's Day for lovers, birthdays for ourselves, even Children's Day, but never has there been a day set aside to recognize one of the most precious possessions we have—our friends. No governmental unit had proclaimed a special day for expressing love and concern for others. Until J.B. Hoy took his dream to the 1976 session of the Indiana Legislature.

In February of that year the Legislature passed a little-publicized resolution designating

the fourth week of June as "A Rose for Friendship Week" with the Wednesday of that week being "Friendship Day" and the then Governor Otis R. Bowen, M.D., now Director of the Department of Health and Human Services, so proclaimed it on April 2, 1976. As he did so, he mentioned to members of the press and J.B. Hoy "... carried to complete fulfillment, a Rose for Friendship could bring peace to all the world.

A resolution by the Legislature and the Proclamation by the Governor were two of the goals Mr. Hoy had set out to obtain. The third he has yet to achieve—to have a similar resolution passed by the Congress of the United States.

As I sat that day figuring my balance sheet, I was reminded of the Bible story of the rich man who built more barns to store the wheat to preserve his wealth in the form of farm production. Is it not more important to build more friendships? For fire or mold could destroy the wheat, thieves could come and steal it, or the bank could foreclose upon it. But building a balance sheet full of friends or with a few very good friends is something no one can take from you. Some of them may move away, but the friendship is still there. Its luster may tarnish with lack of use but with renewed communication the friendship becomes beautiful again just as a silver bowl with a little polish.

The exciting thing to me about J.B.'s concept of a "Rose for Friendship" is that it teaches us how to become a friend. Many people are friendless because they have never learned how to be a friend. When we give a "rose": that compliment, kind word, or act of kindness, we give of ourselves to others that precious commodity called love. And from that act, or many repetitions of it, can develop a beautiful friendship.

As a nation, at a time in our history when we are concerned with human rights and the welfare of people living in countries who do not share our concepts, what better way to demonstrate what we are trying to say about the value of the individual and the need for more acts of kindness in our world than to adopt a national day celebrating friendship—a Rose for Friendship Day. As Dr. Bowen said "a Rose for Friendship could bring peace to all the world." No nation in the history of the world has ever set aside a day to honor and recognize friendship. Shouldn't we, the United States of America, set the example? Isn't this an idea whose time has come?

Would it not be wonderful for us as a nation to send a compliment to other countries, including our enemies, on our national Rose for Friendship Day? Do a kind deed on that day for a neighboring country. Maybe the idea would catch on and we would learn to be better friends as nations of the world.

In addressing the Indiana assembly of lawmakers, J.B. Hoy said, "Rose is a key word, a symbol, for in the face of a rose the heart of God is revealed. In it you see love, tenderness, kindness, thoughtfulness. A rose is for friendship, for remembrance, for forgiveness. In its larger meaning, a Rose for Friendship can be an act of kindness, a token of remembrance, a compliment, or just a friendly word. In so doing, we lengthen our shadow, for kindness and thoughtfulness are watermarks of character."

A TRIBUTE TO HAL BOEL

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINOOF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the entire California delegation, I'd like to pay tribute to an individual who is well known and well respected by all of my colleagues in the California delegation—Hal Boel. Hal is retiring with 46 years of service for Pacific Telesis Group.

Most of us have known Hal as the "telephone company lobbyist" both in Washington recently, and for 10 years in Sacramento. Hal has been a familiar face in the California political scene—spreading good will on behalf of the 85,000 employees of Pacific Bell.

Hal's involvement in California related activities is well known. He has been a tireless supporter of the California State Society, the California Roundtable, and the Olympic fund-raising efforts. In addition, he is one of the first people my colleagues can call on to help with charitable or fund-raising efforts—Hal is always there: dependable, reliable, and helpful.

Hal has been a most effective representative of his corporation as well. Throughout his service with the telephone company, he has served in virtually every nonmanagement and management position.

While too numerous to cite in specifics, suffice to say Hal started as a lineman in Nevada in 1942 building a redundant telephone route through Nevada. He was promoted to service representative, worked as a manager in Fresno, Bakersfield, Modesto, San Francisco, and Marysville. He entered the political arena in 1967 as Pacific's lobbyist in Sacramento, and capped his career as vice president, Federal relations when the company opened its door in Washington 3 years ago.

Hal served this country well as a Navy pilot during World War II. In addition, he participated in the Executive Program at the University of California.

Hal is also a family man. He loves to spend his time hunting and fishing with his sons Neil and Mark—or in Tahoe and on the golf course with daughters Stephanie and Nan. He and his wife Jan are looking forward to settling back in California—and allocating more time to those things he loves.

Mr. Speaker, Hal Boel will be sorely missed as an active and effective participant in the California political scene. I, along with my colleagues, consider Hal a trusted lobbyist and a good friend. I know I speak for the entire delegation in wishing him the best of luck.

JUSTICE FOR MURDER VICTIMS

HON. TOM LANTOSOF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, following the approval by this House yesterday of changes to the Victims of Crime Act of 1984, it is most appropriate that I draw your attention and the

attention of my colleagues in the Congress to a special organization in my district called "Justice for Murder Victims." I first came into contact with this group through one of the members of my congressional office staff who is, through tragic circumstances, a victim of crime herself.

The purpose of this organization is to provide assistance to victims of crime and their families regardless of race, color, religion, or social status. The people who volunteer their help have themselves been targets of crime, and they well understand the feelings of pain, anger, fear, and isolation experienced by survivors of violent attacks.

The idea stems from the San Francisco Chapter of Parents of Murdered Children which was founded in 1979. Six years later, Justice for Murder Victims was organized and incorporated. Members offer assistance in the form of personal counseling, advising survivors of programs available to help them lead normal lives again, help in receiving benefits to which they may be entitled, and familiarizing them with the complicated and often confusing judicial procedure which they experience. The aim of the organization is to ensure that laws already enacted are enforced and to work within the legislative process to secure new legislation which will bring added protection for all Americans.

A group such as this is long overdue. For too long, victims of criminal attack have been neglected as we have focused attention upon the criminal. For example, criminal suspects are entitled to free legal assistance and unlimited medical care, but the victim of a crime has only minimal benefits. "Justice for Murder Victims" has taken the first important step toward rectifying these inequalities. It deserves the support of all of us, for all of us are potential victims of crime through no action or fault of our own.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to pay my own special tribute to Elizabeth and Sven Carlson, whom I have known for many years. I admire them not only for their courage, but also for their commitment and dedication to helping fellow victims of crime. My heart goes out to them as they continue their work. I invite you, Mr. Speaker, and my fellow colleagues in Congress, to join with me in saluting this much needed organization.

VALIANT EFFORTS SAVE LIFE
OF 3-YEAR-OLD CHILD**HON. GUY V. MOLINARI,**OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to pay tribute to a very special group of concerned medical and police personnel in my congressional district through whose valiant and sustained efforts the life of a trapped and drowning 3-year-old girl was saved. This remarkable group showed through example just what can be accomplished when dedicated people work to turn an almost certain tragedy into a story of inspiration.

On the night of April 9, 1986, a car plunged into the frigid waters off Stapleton, Staten

Island and 3-year-old Jacqueline Williams was trapped inside. Alerted to the emergency, members of the Emergency Medical Service and the police department quickly arrived on the scene. Their efforts to pull the child from the car were thwarted by the cold water and the high waves. By the time the child was pulled from the car by police divers she had been trapped under water for 25 minutes. At that point, Mr. Speaker, the girl's heart was not beating and she was not breathing—clinically, she was dead.

Undeterred, the EMS specialists immediately went to work administering CPR on the child while she was placed in an ambulance and taken to Bayley Seton Hospital. At Bayley Seton Hospital, a devoted team of doctors and nurses went into action working relentlessly until Jacqueline's heartbeat and breathing were restored. Once stabilized, the child was transferred to a special pediatrics unit at St. Vincent's Medical Center.

Mr. Speaker, what these exceptional people did was in no way short of a miracle. Without their dedication, concern and hope, Jacqueline Williams would not be alive today. It is for this reason that I would like to enter their names here as a record of their dedication and service.

Members of the Emergency Medical Service who assisted include Ralph Wainwright, Charles Pfefferbaum, Nicholas Catello, Rod Mauceri, Christopher Schwartz, Ray Tufaro, and William Azar. Gary Brennan and Michael Duchin, members of the Staten Island ambulance crew, also gave their services.

Those helping from the police department were Sgt. Salvatore Margarella and Police Officers Robert Higgins, Frank Hamer, George Croake, Ernest Couch, Vincent Fucci, Michael Careu, and Kevin Collins.

Finally, the fine team from Bayley Seton Hospital included Dr. Lloyd McPherson, Dr. Alberto Belalcazar, Eileen Schierenbeck, Helen Mohon, Bruce Cornish, Maria Sineri, Janet Madoro, Alice Porowski, and Franklin Rosado.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring the outstanding accomplishments of these modern heroes—and indeed they are heroes—to the attention of my colleagues in the House. I know that they join me in applauding the valiant service that led to the saving of a young child's life.

FAIR SHARE LOW-INCOME
ENERGY ASSISTANCE ACT OF
1986**HON. JOE BARTON**OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4556, the Fair Share Low-Income Energy Assistance Act of 1986. This bill ensures that Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program funds are distributed among States in a fair manner. The LIHEAP Program distributes funds to low-income families in order to help them pay home energy bills.

The Gramm-Rudman Balanced Budget Act has put our country back on the path to fiscal

health. I fully support Gramm-Rudman, and believe that the Congress can stick to the deficit reduction schedule in the law if it exercises strong leadership and a sense of fairness. Across-the-board spending reductions are one way that the Congress can demonstrate this sense of fairness.

However, this sense of fairness is threatened by certain loopholes that impose unfair shares of budget reductions on some States. The uneven budget reductions that are proposed in the LIHEAP Program are evidence of unfairness in our common fight for the fiscal health of our great country. Currently, a hold-harmless provision protects certain States from Gramm-Rudman reductions in the program, although the law provided that the program must be cut by 4.3 percent in fiscal year 1986. In order to comply with these reductions and respect the hold-harmless clause those States that do not enjoy this special protection have to shoulder an unfair share of budget reductions. My home State of Texas is one of the States that would have to bear an unfair share of future budget reductions. The LIHEAP allocations for Texas and 14 other States will suffer 11.4 percent reductions in order to achieve an across-the-board reduction of 4.3 percent.

The Department of Health and Human Services has announced that reductions in the LIHEAP Program will range from 0 percent to 4.3 percent to 11.4 percent. I believe that the wide range in these reductions is an example of the unfairness that will spoil congressional efforts to control Federal spending and reduce the deficit. The Members from the unlucky States that shoulder an unfair share of reductions in this program will push for special consideration in other areas.

The Fair Share Low-Income Energy Assistance Act of 1986 presents us with the opportunity to retain the sense of fairness that is essential to our duty to balance the budget and comply with the provisions of Gramm-Rudman. Under H.R. 4556, reductions in the LIHEAP Program will be made on a pro rata basis in every State. Under the bill, the States will shoulder the same reduction, and there would be no favorites. I believe that Congress must maintain a sense of fairness on budget reductions if we are to succeed in our difficult task.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4556 and the effort to establish fair standards for reductions in the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

RESPONSIBILITY

HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, today, millions of taxpayers across the United States are hustling to meet the April 15th income tax filing deadline. Meeting this deadline, or at least filing for an extension of time to file, is expected of all responsible U.S. taxpayers.

The important point here is that we expect the taxpaying public to act responsibly in handling their affairs, yet the same expectations

do not seem to apply to many of the actions of this body.

Today, Mr. Speaker, also marks another deadline important to the livelihood of U.S. taxpayers. The Congress, in accordance with Federal law, was to have come up with a budget resolution for fiscal year 1987 by April 15. Regrettably, such action is not yet complete.

The Members of the other body have lived up to their end of this congressional commitment. However, the House Democratic leadership has done little, other than playing partisan politics with the administration budget proposals, to move this body toward action on a budget resolution.

I guess it's a good thing that there aren't agents like those of the IRS to enforce our budgetary commitments, Mr. Speaker, because their hands would be full in this institution.

The sequestration process of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 will be upon us, if we allow the budget process to falter in this manner. That will clearly mark the leadership of the majority in this House as irresponsible. We must act on a budget resolution without further delay.

On behalf of taxpayers throughout the Nation, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to consider the seriousness of this situation and the ridicule to which you will be subject, and to allow the membership of this body an opportunity to vote on a budget.

Today, millions of taxpayers are living up to their obligations under the U.S. Internal Revenue Code. Don't we owe it to these responsible citizens to live up to our obligations and responsibilities as their representatives?

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO DR. MARION L. PLIES

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Dr. Marion LaVona Plies, who will be celebrating the 45th year of her pastorate at the Harbor City Foursquare Church in Harbor City, CA, on April 27, 1986.

Born in Fort Worth, TX, in 1910, Dr. Plies and her family moved to San Francisco, CA, when she was 7 years old. Her family later moved to Los Angeles, CA, where Dr. Plies attended Huntington Park Union High School by day, and LIFE Bible College at night. In January of 1930, she graduated from LIFE Bible College. She had married George Plies in 1929, and following her graduation she worked with a number of ministers and ran a mission on San Pedro Street.

After a number of years, she was asked to take over the pastorate at the Harbor City Foursquare Church. She officially took over the pastorate in 1941. In September of 1948, Dr. Plies opened the Harbor City Christian School. The school has been relocated since to a new site, and has opened up a high school. The church itself has been relocated, and in all, Dr. Plies has been responsible for the acquisition, on behalf of the church, of over \$5.7 million worth of developed property.

In addition to her outstanding work with the Harbor City Foursquare Church, and the Harbor City Christian School, Dr. Plies has been a leader in a number of other areas of Christian work. Dr. Plies has served on the International Education Committee of the International Church of Foursquare Gospel, and is the founder of the Foursquare Association of Christian Schools. She is also the author of a book entitled, "To God Be the Glory," and the recipient of an honorary doctorate for her work in Pentecostal Christian Day Schools.

It is with great pride that my wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Dr. Plies on her 45th year as the pastor of the Harbor City Foursquare Church, and in wishing Dr. Marion L. Plies, her son Vic and his wife Mary—continued success, and all the best in the years ahead.

SUPPORT PRESIDENT REAGAN MILITARY ACTION VERSUS LIBYA

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to convey my support for the President's decision of last night to launch a limited but purposeful military attack on selected targets in two cities in Libya. I believe the response was entirely appropriate considering the repeated patterns of provocations by Libyan leader Qadhafi including "irrefutable" evidence linking Libya to the West German club bombing which killed an American soldier.

It is obvious that Qadhafi poses a menace to the United States and to the free world. It is obvious that Qadhafi feels he could operate his reign of terror with impunity and without fear of response. Such an assumption on his part was wrong.

The use of military force is justified by the United States when it is operating as in last night's action in self-defense. Unlike Libyan terrorism which seeks out innocent civilians for its victims, every effort was made in the United States mission to minimize damage and harm to civilians.

A total of 33 United States F-111's and A6 and A7 attack planes were involved in last night's action. We pray for the recovery of the one missing F-111 and its two-member crew. We commend the skill and bravery of our Armed Forces in conducting this action so successfully. The message that was sent to Libya had to be sent. It was a message their leader asked for and got.

JAMES G. McCANN, DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEEMAN

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. James G. McCann, for more than a

half century of loyal service to the Philadelphia Democratic Party.

Mr. McCann has been a Democratic Party committeeman in 33d ward, 13th division, since shortly after he graduated from high school. In that time he has helped his party rise in power and influence in city government and he has seen Philadelphia grow and renew itself. The 33d ward, including parts of Kensington and Juniata, has been a stronghold for the Democratic Party, due in no small part to the dedicated efforts of people like Jim McCann. These people have helped maintain a 3-to-1 voter registration edge and a strong and effective party organization.

Mr. McCann is a lifelong Philadelphian, and a graduate of North Catholic High School. He worked for over 20 years at Liberty Bell Race-track and in the city's department of revenue. He and his wife Dorothy have raised 5 children and are now proud grandparents to 15 grandchildren and 1 great-grandchild.

Jim McCann stands for what is best in our political system, and for what is best in our party. He has set an example through a lifetime of service and dedication that should be an inspiration to all of us. I am happy to join with the Democrats of the 33d ward and throughout Philadelphia in saluting James McCann as he leaves the 13th division to enjoy a well-deserved retirement from our party's activities.

NEO-PROTECTIONISM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a recent article, "Neo-Protectionism, a Growing Threat to World Trade," by Charles R. Allen, executive vice president and chief executive officer TRW, Inc. The article appeared in the February addition of the Financial Executives Institute publication FE. Mr. Allen's article points out why protectionism is a self-defeating approach for the U.S. trade deficit.

As the ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee in the House of Representatives, I find the growing call for protectionism alarming. Traditionally, the United States has always supported free trade with other nations and it is only recently, in the light of growing U.S. trade deficits, that the trend toward protectionism is spreading.

One of the best historical examples of the failure of trade protection is the Smoot-Hawley Act, implemented by President Hoover to protect trade in the late 1920's. Instead of developing a strategy to improve the competitive capabilities of American goods and continuing the tax reductions begun by President Coolidge, Hoover isolated the United States with trade protection and tariffs. Once implemented, Smoot-Hawley was met with retaliation by other nations who reacted by raising their import tariffs against U.S. products. High trade tariffs worldwide caused an international slump in trade. The United States, unable to meet the high cost of exporting goods to foreign countries, decreased production resulting

in higher unemployment. It is clear that the Smoot-Hawley Act only aggravated the Depression and did not accomplish its goal of protecting U.S. goods and creating employment opportunities.

Today the United States is faced with a similar fate. If we pursue the course of protectionism and isolation we will lose the vitality and innovation of our domestic economy. Protectionism only locks industry and labor into inefficient methods which stifle modernization and the response to changing technology and consumer demands.

Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I urge you to read Mr. Allen's article and consider the effects that protectionism will have on our future. We do not want to repeat the same mistakes of our past.

NEO-PROTECTIONISM A GROWING THREAT TO WORLD TRADE

(By Charles R. Allen)

The major trading countries must get serious—very soon—about supporting an open, fair, and expanding world trade system, or suffer the consequences of their inaction.

The drive for open trade is a constant struggle between long-term universal values and short-term, narrow nationalistic fears, distrust, or simple greed. It's like the nuclear peace that we all so desire, yet find so hard to achieve because of human frailty. And though the problem is coming to a head in the U.S., the solution is one that must involve the whole trading community.

Let's start with a look at some recent developments in the United States. Beginning late last spring, the U.S. Congress has been caught up in a legislative frenzy. More than 300 specific trade measures have been introduced: trade protection bills, trade expansion bills, and trade reform bills. The underlying theme of many of these bills is labeled as "fair trade" but is, in fact, an appeal to some form of protectionism.

Of all the private interest groups in the U.S., the large multinational companies are almost alone in trying to slow a runaway protectionist freight train speeding toward disaster. Most labor unions and trade associations are urging it on with all their energy. Small businessmen, farmers, and industries most affected by growing imports are lobbying furiously, as they sense a growing protectionist sentiment throughout the country. The trade deficit is looming as a major issue in the 1986 Congressional campaign.

This protectionist thrust must be stopped before it has gone too far. Preventive action is needed, not just by the United States, but also by all the major trading nations. All of them should be as concerned as we to avoid a trade war, for many have even more to lose. What a trade war would do to the debt-laden economies of Latin America, not to mention the world banking and credit systems, is too awful to contemplate.

We must all understand that the economic and political posture of the United States in the world community is in a process of change.

For the first time in memory, the U.S. standard of living is going down, both in absolute terms and compared with other countries. The telling evidence of the U.S. decline appears in our balance of trade. We have changed almost overnight from a net exporter, running trade surpluses with the rest of the world, to a net importer with huge negative trade balances in merchandise, as much as \$150 billion in 1985.

The trade deficit has led to large-scale job displacement and industrial unemployment, upheavals in major industries and communities, and a depression in U.S. agriculture, with epidemic bankruptcy in small family farms, low commodity prices, and loss of export markets.

U.S. government policies have been slow to respond to changes in trading patterns, and now we face a serious problem of orderly adjustment. The result is intense—perhaps irresistible—pressure on politicians to protect U.S. industry and agriculture.

The causes of the U.S. decline most often mentioned include:

First, the loss of competitive advantage to a number of emerging industrial powers that have outperformed us in the excellence of their marketing strategies, products, quality, and productivity. This is probably the major problem we face. Responsible business leaders in the U.S. have come at last to realize that competing for global markets is a matter of some urgency, even survival.

Next is the too-huge U.S. budget deficit, which begins a vicious cycle leading to higher interest rates, which, in turn attracts foreign investors to U.S. government securities. This flow of funds then drives up the value of the dollar, making our exports uncompetitive and whetting consumer appetites for imports. Most of us were taught that trade imbalances were self-correcting; a country's worsening trade deficit would weaken its currency. So much for conventional wisdom. For in today's environment of global interdependence, it is capital flows, not trade flows, that produce an overvalued dollar, all made possible by the emergence of international money and capital markets. While one can applaud the efforts of the Group of Five (Japan, England, U.S., Germany, and France) to lower the value of the dollar, intervention in the currency markets cannot produce lasting effects. The ultimate solution to the overvalued dollar is to be found only in reduced budget deficits.

Third, we should not be surprised by the sharp decline of U.S. exports to countries, particularly in Latin America, burdened with foreign debt.

Finally, there has been a slow but steady increase in restrictive and aggressive trade practices that are nullifying past efforts to promote expanding world trade through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and other multilateral negotiations. I refer to such well-known practices as:

Rebates of European value-added taxes on export items, creating a competitive cost advantage.

Quotas against selected products, designed to protect the domestic producers. So-called voluntary agreements are much in vogue. In the U.S., limitations on imports of Japanese cars and limitations on imports of European steel are prime examples.

Bureaucratic barriers to unwanted imports—harrassing inspections, absurd product standards, unwarranted paperwork—all justified as national prerogatives, and evasions of past commitments.

Aggressive government-aided strategies, including direct export subsidies, subsidized shipping, insurance, and financing arrangements that virtually insure exporters against risk.

The list goes on. Whatever the strategies used, no country can claim that it always plays fair. We are all sinners, some more than others. But right or wrong, it is perceived in Washington that the U.S. is a net

loser in the game of restrictive trade practices. And while such actions may account for only a small part of the U.S. trade deficit, they lend moral support to the argument of our protectionists. Like the small tail wagging a big dog, they are an irritant that arouses a disproportionate reaction in Congress.

One cannot review the U.S. trade deficit without noting the special role of Japan. Certainly the powerful economic advance of Japan is an important cause of the world trade imbalance and the drift toward protectionism. Still, the popular and long-standing pastime of blaming Japan for all our problems is overdone and counterproductive, as it leads to negative rather than positive solutions.

I mention "long-standing" because of an astonishing prophecy, made 35 years ago, by Joseph Stalin. He predicted that one day the Western Alliance, no longer able to absorb the export capabilities of Japan, would fall apart in a naked struggle for markets. There was just enough truth in that prediction to make one stop and think.

Today, both Europe and the United States are suffering from the combination of massive Japanese exports and exclusionary practices against imports. Our growing deficit with Japan alone—\$19 billion in 1983, \$38 billion, in 1984, \$50 billion-plus in 1985—shows no signs of turning around.

There's considerable feeling, justified or not, that Japanese industry and government have been ganging up on us in ways that we are not permitted to use under our rules of fair play. There is anger not only about Japan's aggressive assault on our markets, but also about what's seen as extreme resistance to our exports to Japan, even where we have a decided advantage in cost or technology.

In fairness, there is much truth to the countercharge that many U.S. firms have not been very effective in marketing their products in Japan. However, it's clear that the recent surge of trade bills in the Congress was triggered largely by frustration over the failure of trade negotiations to gain improved acceptance of U.S. telecommunications equipment. In contrast, the breakup of AT&T enabled a major Japanese invasion of our domestic telecommunications market.

By now, that militancy is being directed not just toward Japan and other Far Eastern countries but toward some of our trading partners in Europe and Latin America as well.

I mentioned earlier the fundamental change that has altered the U.S. economic posture in the world community. In days past, the U.S. has been viewed as an invulnerable economic giant. That may once have been true, but it doesn't look that way to us now. We look east to the European Community, an economy at least as large, modern, and advanced in technology as ours. We look south to the state-of-the-art factories and low wages of Mexico and Brazil, and west across the Pacific to the new industrial revolution launched by Japan and joined by Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore.

And we begin to realize that those comfortable days in which U.S. firms competed mainly with each other in a market that all understood, under accepted rules of the game, are gone forever.

Gone, too, are the days when the unchallenged might of U.S. mass production bought the machinery that enabled us to pay the world's highest wages and still enjoy the world's lowest unit labor costs.

Now, for the first time, we face tough foreign competition in a world market, under terms that we do not control. To some of our competitors, the only rule seems to be "export or die."

Since the end of World War II, it's fair to say the U.S. has been a strong advocate of trade liberalization and open markets. For motives both selfish and broad-gauged, it has fostered common markets in Europe, Asia, and Latin America, and supported a stronger GATT and healthy private-enterprise economies in Japan and throughout the free world.

Following the war, it was not difficult for the U.S., as the world's dominant economic power, to open its gates to foreign imports, to help allies by trade, not aid. Those efforts helped create not only an explosion of world trade and growing wealth but also the emergence of two new economic superstars—Japan and the European Community. The fact that some European nations still see themselves as separate national economic units does not alter the reality of the combined economic power of the European trading bloc.

The world responsibilities of a great industrial power have not changed from 1950, when there was one, to today, when there are three—the U.S., Europe, and Japan.

A country in a position of having a profound impact on the world economy has two choices:

To deal positively with problems created by its successes, assume its full share of the task of leadership, and moderate the demands of its constituencies; or

To continue to seek maximum advantage for narrow national interests until overwhelming opposition and hostility arise and destroy the fragile web of economic cooperation.

What seems to be happening today is that Western Europe is seeking to protect itself against U.S. and Japanese exports, and evasions of the intent of the GATT have been increasing, both in number and ingenuity. Meanwhile, Japan continues to exclude U.S. and European exports, and to step up its assault upon foreign markets.

U.S. leaders are led to conclude that we can no longer carry the main responsibility for open markets, that the time has come for others to bear an equal burden in supporting trade. Those are the realities of the present trade environment. Because the seductions of protectionism are ever present, politically tempting, and easy to rationalize, the situation is dangerous. The step from where we are now to serious protectionism is a short one.

Let me stress that the real and official U.S. position is still strongly pro-free trade. The President, as a committed free trader, but a political pragmatist as well, is trying to avoid a hard confrontation with Congress and the protectionist lobby, where a defeat on any one trade bill could unleash an avalanche. He has warned that the United States—while shunning protectionism—will insist upon full parity of treatment for its exports, the same as that granted by the U.S. to imports in its home markets, asserting that there can be "no free trade that is not fair." Those words should be taken seriously.

As financial executives, we know that when business competes against on equal terms under an orderly set of rules, the market can be trusted to diffuse power, and comparative advantage can work its begin magic to the benefit of all. But when societies and governments compete, cut deals,

each seeking the greatest national advantage, we have a prescription for economic war.

To sum up: The time has come when all industrially advanced nations will have to make significant changes in order to maintain a world trade environment in which we all can live and prosper together. The United States is under greater pressure to deal with its domestic economic problems and to compete more effectively in the world without falling prey to protectionism. The major trading nations are under equal pressure to recognize that the era of the United States playing big brother to the free world economy has been brought to an end by inexorable forces of history and economics.

Looking at the present situation, there are a range of possible outcomes.

One is that key trading nations will evade their leadership responsibilities to the international community and will insist upon playing by their own rules. The next round of GATT negotiations will fizzle. A firmer response by the United States to what it views as unfair trade practices will meet with hostility and retaliation. The European Economic Community will break out in internal bickering and advantage seeking. Japan will keep talking and keep shipping. And all together, we will pull the roof down upon ourselves.

That dreary outcome is the worst-case scenario and, though unlikely, it's by no means impossible.

A far happier outcome results if all the major trading nations can agree that a strong and open world trade system should be a primary goal of every national policy and approach the next GATT negotiations in that spirit. In seeking such a positive outcome, there is a special role for the international business community.

Business knows what is at stake. It will be the first to suffer if the trade system is blown apart. Business has the resources and the credibility to encourage our governments to do what they must do to avoid a fight that no one can win.

And we, as financial executives, are in a special position to appreciate the benefits of world trade and fear the perils of protectionism. Today, the world trade system is in danger. It must be preserved and strengthened at all costs. Such are the dues every nation must pay for sharing in the benefits of a world economy. For to help that economy survive and grow, we must all truly support open markets and fair competition.

TRIBUTE TO BROCKTON HOSPITAL SCHOOL OF NURSING

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to rise today in recognition of the Brockton Hospital School of Nursing. The Brockton Hospital School of Nursing, founded in 1897, is celebrating 90 years of excellent service to the Greater Brockton Metropolitan Community. It is the only hospital-based school within the area that offers its students field training while simultaneously setting high standards of nursing education with a curriculum based on both the humanities and health

and nursing. The students receive a wide variety of educational benefits through their learning experience. As a result, 90 percent of the graduating students pass their RN qualifying examinations on the first attempt.

The school is a private nonprofit institution that is funded directly through the Brockton Hospital and the Federal Government through Medicare grants. Students who enroll in the Brockton Hospital School of Nursing may also receive additional assistance in meeting the costs of tuition through the many financial programs offered by the Federal Government. The school of nursing enjoys full accreditation while its student enjoy small classroom settings with excellent facilities.

Recently, the Brockton Hospital School of Nursing has collaborated with Stonehill College, a 4-year accredited liberal arts college located in North Easton, MA. Students who graduate from the nursing school in high standing, may now continue on with their studies at Stonehill, receiving their baccalaureate in nursing.

On behalf of the citizens of Massachusetts, I wish to congratulate the Brockton Hospital School of Nursing for its 90 years of dedicated service to the Brockton metropolitan community.

HOW NATURAL GAS USE CAN REDUCE ACID RAIN

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan and Canadian Prime Minister Mulroney in their recent Washington summit issued a statement that acid rain is a common environmental problem for both countries, and recommended a coal technology program as the answer to acid rain. Last week, legislation was introduced in the House that would establish an expensive control program to reduce the sulfate emissions that some say are the source of acid deposition.

I believe that a very important means of sulfate emissions reduction has been overlooked: the select use of natural gas. The select use of natural gas is probably the most painless way to reduce sulfate emissions. As such, it is an appropriate approach to an acid rain control program.

Natural gas is the cleanest burning fossil fuel, producing virtually no sulfur oxides or particulate matter, and only a small fraction of the nitrogen oxides produced by coal or high sulfur residual fuel oil. Natural gas could substitute for coal or high-sulfur fuel oil in some circumstances. A partial substitution of natural gas for coal would also minimize the impact on local coal industries compared to other alternatives such as coal switching.

One of the most attractive features of increased use of natural gas for environmental purposes is its low cost. Natural gas is a very cost-effective fuel for electric generation, and because of its clean burning characteristics its operation and maintenance costs are much lower than other fuels. The low cost of sulfur dioxide removed should be compared with

other control methods. Natural gas use with coal or oil can remove sulfur dioxide at costs of \$200 to \$400 per ton removed. In comparison, control technology such as "scrubbers" can cost as much as \$2,000 per ton of sulfur dioxide removed.

In new plants, the cost advantage of select use of natural gas is even more marked. A new combined-cycle gas turbine powerplant can be installed at a capital cost of \$500 per kilowatt, about one-third the cost of a new coal-fired unit. Further, a natural gas plant will produce less than 0.003 percent of the sulfur dioxide produced by a comparable coal powerplant with pollution control technology. Gas has advantages based on both cost and environmental factors.

Natural gas is both cheap and plentiful, and an increased demand for gas for environmental purposes would shrink the "bubble" that troubles natural gas producers. Gas supplies far exceed current demand. An increase in gas use of 1 trillion cubic feet, about 6 percent of consumption, would decrease annual sulfate emissions by 2 to 3 million tons. This would be a very substantial reduction, especially in the context of a 5 million ton reduction program such as proposed by President Reagan and Prime Minister Mulroney.

Incredibly, the United States discourages the use of natural gas through certain regulations and provisions of law. These regulations and laws were added at a time when natural gas supplies had been eroded through Government price controls and supplies were scarce. However, these natural gas-shortages have disappeared since the partial decontrol of gas, and supplies are ample. The legal impediments to select use of natural gas, such as the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act and incremental pricing provisions of the 1978 Natural Gas Policy Act, must be repealed. Repeal of these restrictive provisions can enable industrial customers and utilities to use more natural gas.

There is legislation before Congress to repeal the Fuel Use Act and the incremental pricing provisions of the Natural Gas Policy Act. I encourage my House colleagues to seriously consider supporting this legislation.

I have not been convinced that acid deposition is a serious environmental problem that deserves an expensive control program. However, I have outlined some of the benefits of select use of natural gas for my House colleagues who support an acid rain control program. Gas has clear environmental benefits.

THE ISSUE OF EMPLOYER SANCTIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION UNDER IMMIGRATION REFORM BILLS

HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a statement by Richard L. Leshner of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce which addresses the issue of employer sanctions and their implementation under the immigration reform bills pres-

ently under consideration by the House. I believe his statement suggests an alternative that would make such legislation much more palatable to business interests while at the same time maintaining the kind of protection necessary for enforcement purposes.

Mr. Leshner's statement follows:

It's a tribute to America that while around the world people literally are dying to get out of countries limiting freedom and opportunity, they're falling all over each other to get in here.

But the ability of an estimated 3 million to 6 million foreigners to reside illegally within our borders weakens the very system that attracts them.

America's freedoms are based on our system of laws. We cannot allow these laws to be broken with impunity during nearly two million border crossings every day, nor can we encourage creating an entire class of people whose very presence mocks those laws.

We must prevent this destabilization. The question is how. Congress has struggled with that one for ages, in part because they've been unable to resist making business the fall guy.

Immigration control proposals over the years have invariably included sanctions against employers who hire illegals. Now no one wants to protect employers who knowingly hire illegals. But most sanction proposals have included onerous record-keeping requirements and criminal penalties against employers who may have been duped into hiring illegals—provisions bound to cause employers to avoid hiring Hispanics, not out of discriminatory intent but out of self-defense.

Fortunately, Sen. ALAN SIMPSON, R-Wyo., this year introduced reform legislation with less burdensome—and optional—record-keeping requirements and no criminal sanctions. Limited criminal sanctions were added in committee but Simpson's bill remains a tough and fair attempt to regain control of our borders—one business can live with.

But the House of Representatives seems determined to hang the immigration control millstone around business' neck. Legislation introduced by Rep. PETER RODINO, D-N.J., takes those onerous record-keeping requirements off the trash heap and puts them back on the table—and imposes criminal penalties for mere paperwork violations.

Congress would do well to enact legislation closer to the Simpson version. It isn't perfect, but unlike Rodino's bill, it represents a fair compromise. However, Congress would do even better to go beyond these limited efforts to address the full range of issues surrounding immigration control.

Maybe we could take a hint from that old saying "If you can't bring Mohammed to the mountain, bring the mountain to Mohammed" by addressing the desperate political and economic straits illegal immigrants are fleeing. And I'm not talking about foreign aid giveaways. We should be in the position of providing the fishing poles and the lessons, not the fish.

We should establish free trade zones with our neighbors and encourage them to copy our recent tax and budget cuts and regulatory reforms—policies based on a return to the freedoms that historically have produced unprecedented prosperity.

Instead of importing foreign workers, perhaps the best solution is to export the best features of the system that attracts foreigners to our shores in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, the sentiments expressed by Mr. Leshar should provide ample food for thought as we address the critical issue of immigration control. Certainly there is not enough room for all who would like to come to the United States and our efforts should realize the burdens that American businesses already bear.

EAGLE SCOUT AWARD TO MARC DORMAN

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to express my congratulations to Marc Dorman of Harrisburg, PA, who will receive the Boy Scout Eagle Award on Monday, April 21, 1986. This event is always a special time for the family and friends of a man who receives such an award because it is a recognition of his dedication to his community and country.

Marc, a freshman honor student at Susquehanna Township Senior High School, is a member of Boy Scout Troop 256. He began the scouting program as a Cub Scout in Troop 38 and has worked his way through Webelos and Boy Scouts. At Susquehanna High School he is the freshman class president, a member of the baseball team, and a violinist in the school orchestra.

As part of the scouting program, Marc is involved with the Medical Explorer Post at Polyclinic Medical Center in Harrisburg. Since joining Troop 256 he has served as a patrol leader, chaplain's aid, and quartermaster. He is also an ordeal member of the Order of the Arrow.

Marc Dorman has shown excellent service and leadership capabilities in his work with the Scouts and should be congratulated for earning this very distinguished achievement. I wish him good luck and great success in his future endeavors.

CONGRESS SHOULD START MEETING ITS DEADLINES

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, is today just the first of a series of deadlines this House will miss under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Reduction Act of 1985?

Congress was to have completed action on a binding budget resolution for fiscal year 1987 by today. The majority side of the House Budget Committee has not even produced such a resolution to date.

Before we know it, June 10, the deadline for all appropriations bills to be through the Appropriations Committee, will be past. Then June 15, when the Congress is to have completed action on budget reconciliation, will be gone. June 30, when all appropriations bills are to have cleared the House, may slip by. If we miss those last deadlines, we may miss an

extended Independence Day district work period, because technically we cannot adjourn for more than 3 days until we have cleared all reconciliation and appropriations legislation.

The purpose of the accelerated deadlines for consideration of budget legislation this year was to insure that everything was done by mid-August, when the economic agencies are to take the economic snapshot that will show whether we are within the required deficit reduction target and can avoid sequestration on necessary programs.

Every deadline we miss brings us closer to the sequestration we wish to avoid. Let us start meeting the deadlines instead of ignoring them.

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO DR. H. CLAUDE HUDSON

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1986, the distinguished son of a former slave and Louisiana sharecropper, Dr. H. Claude Hudson, shares his 100th anniversary with four generations of relatives, community associates, and friends from all walks of life.

The phenomenal career of this libertarian, successful dentist, civil rights leader, and president of a \$50 million savings and loan institution exemplifies the finest tradition of American life.

Dr. Hudson was elected to the presidency of the Shreveport, LA, branch of the NAACP in 1921 at a time when being president of the NAACP in the South was not only unfashionable, but suicidal. Whenever referring to his membership in the NAACP, he identified it as a citizens' committee. He was so active in fighting segregation and police abuses that in June 1923 he was "called on the carpet" by the power structure. Immediately, he went to the office of the chief of police and found him with the sheriff discussing what to do with Dr. Hudson. Dr. Hudson argued the situation with them and they finally admonished him to, "Go home, be a good boy, and don't give us any more trouble."

That visit to the chief of police and sheriff saved his life. Having already obtained a license to practice dentistry in California, he moved his family to Los Angeles without causing further disturbance. That incident gave rise to the rumor that he had been run out of Shreveport. He never denied it because it was a good story and gave everyone who heard it a good laugh.

In November 1924, due to this record of service during his 2 years with the Shreveport branch of the NAACP, he was elected to the presidency of the Los Angeles branch. Even though he had changed his residency, he didn't miss a year of service with the NAACP.

During his second term as president of the Los Angeles branch, Dr. Hudson faced a serious civil rights problem. At this time the Pacific Ocean was segregated: Black people, with one minor exception, could not go to the beach without being molested. So in 1925, he and seven other members of the NAACP

waded in the ocean at Manhattan Beach, were arrested and fined \$500 for defying the no-swimming ordinance. He immediately appealed the decision, and thereupon the Manhattan Beach court called him in and wanted to throw the case out of court. He agreed, but asked what was going to be done about the parking ordinance which allowed only 15 minutes for bathers to undress, swim, and return to their cars. The court reminded him that it would take about 90 days to repeal the ordinance. Dr. Hudson informed him that he was aware of that, as well as the fact that the ordinance was not being enforced against anyone else. The court responded that if he dropped the case they would not enforce the ordinance against black people. On the following day Dr. Hudson took a little black boy with him to swim on the beach to see if they would be arrested, but they were not and from that day on the beaches have been open to everyone.

Dr. Hudson served 10 consecutive years as president of the NAACP Los Angeles branch, which he developed into one of the largest and most effective in the Nation. Since 1934, Dr. Hudson has served the local branch as either vice president or as a member of the executive board. In 1950, he was elected to the national board of directors of the NAACP and has served continuously since that date. He is at present a member of the executive committee of the national board of directors.

In 1927, Dr. Hudson enrolled in the Loyola University School of Law and was awarded the LL.B. degree in 1931. His interest in the study of law was to broaden his education to better enable him to carry on the work of the civil rights organization.

Dr. Hudson assumed the presidency of Broadway Federal Savings & Loan Association in 1949 when the association had assets of less than \$3 million. The association, with Dr. Hudson as its leader, broke the stranglehold of white savings and loan associations in Los Angeles, who refused to lend money on property located in neighborhoods where they felt black people should not live. Broadway made so many loans until the white associations reversed their position and began making loans to people under better terms.

Under Dr. Hudson's leadership, Broadway Federal Savings grew into a \$57 million company. During his tenure as president of the association, he enrolled in the American Savings and Loan Institute evening school and obtained a graduate diploma in the operation and management of savings and loan associations. Dr. Hudson is now president emeritus of Broadway Federal Savings and Loan Association of Los Angeles, having retired from the presidency in 1972.

In 1962, at charter day exercises, Dr. Hudson received the Distinguished Alumnus Award from his alma mater, Howard University, for distinguished service as a dentist, businessman, and civil rights advocate.

He serves as a member of the Los Angeles County Real Estate Advisory Commission and as a member of the board of trustees of the Martin Luther King Memorial Hospital. The auditorium of King Hospital was named in honor of Dr. H. Claude Hudson. Loyola University,

Los Angeles, CA, established a scholarship in honor of Dr. H. Claude Hudson in June 1974.

In 1974, Dr. Hudson was awarded the Humanitarian of the Year Award of the Aid United Givers of the Biltmore Bowl of the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles. Upon his introduction as guest speaker, the audience of several thousand gave him a standing ovation. After the audience was reseated, Dr. Hudson began his acceptance speech by saying, "The ovation that you have just given me amazes me when I think of the fact that when I arrived in Los Angeles in 1923 I was not allowed to enter this hotel, and now to be the guest of honor shows me how far you have come." The audience at his request then stood and gave themselves a big round of applause.

At the Wiley College baccalaureate commencement convocation held on the campus of the college in Marshall, TX, on May 6, 1976, Dr. Hudson was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of humanities.

In mid-winter of 1976, Dr. Hudson received the honorary degree of doctor of laws from the University of Southern California, being the second citizen of black ancestry to be so honored by this great university.

The Distinguished Service Medal was awarded to Dr. Hudson on April 19, 1976, by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, which is the highest honor the board of supervisors can bestow upon one of its citizens.

In 1976, the Commission on Human Relations of Los Angeles County awarded Dr. Hudson the John Anson Ford Award in human relations. In 1976, at the age of 90, he surprised his many friends and acquaintances by taking unto himself a bride, the former Lena Brown Work, a retired mathematics teacher and college adviser in the Los Angeles school system.

In 1977, Dr. Hudson was presented the Civil Rights Award of the National Dentist Association. In 1978, the Senate of the State of California presented an Outstanding Service Award, to his community, to Dr. H. Claude Hudson.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hudson epitomizes in so many ways the best our country can produce. His commitment to civil rights and dedication to the community are truly an inspiration to all who know him. I would like all my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. H. Claude Hudson, who on April 19, 1986, will be 100 years young.

INTRODUCTION OF FOUR BILLS TO DEVELOP AND DEREGULATE THE U.S. LINER FLEET

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in behalf of the leadership of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to introduce by request, four bills to amend the 1936 Merchant Marine Act. The 1936 act established a complex system of financial assistance to aid the U.S. merchant marine. Congress recognized the important role of the merchant marine in times of national emer-

gency and that a U.S.-flag maritime fleet was necessary if our Nation was to develop as a major trade and military power.

It is ironic that in recent years as we have devoted tremendous attention to the military needs of our Nation, we have ignored, neglected, and disregarded what continues to be the essential fourth arm of defense—our merchant marine.

The problems of the 1980's unfortunately cannot always be satisfactorily solved with solutions fashioned in the 1930's. The impact of our attempts to resolve the budget deficit crisis on essential activities such as our merchant marine has been devastating, and we must address our urgent attention to answers that will address the needs of the merchant marine not only today but for the balance of this century.

The industry most immediately affected has been engaged in efforts to present the Congress with a unified position on a solution to the crisis facing the merchant marine. Unfortunately, time is running short and rather than a single unified industry position, we have been presented with four approaches. In order to move the process along, I together with Messrs. LENT, BIAGGI, and SNYDER have agreed to introduce all four bills at the request of their proponents. These bills together with other concepts already before the committee will serve as the basis for legislative distillation.

It is the committee's goal to present to the Congress a single bill that will be responsive to the needs of the Nation, the industry, and the budget.

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLIE HALLECK

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Speaker, long will I remember how impressed I was with Representative Charlie Halleck when I arrived as a brand new Member of the House in 1965 to be sworn-in for the 89th Congress.

To a young fellow from the Texas Legislature, I was interested in being within the same quarters as those about whom I had read in the papers and seen on television for such a long time.

Certainly Congressman Halleck set a record of some kind, having served as both majority and minority leader—that is an accomplishment that doesn't happen to many.

His family can always live with the realization that their father was one of the Nation's greats—a man who won respect and the admiration of all in this body.

A POET LAUREATE FOR THE UNITED STATES

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, following an act of Congress creating the post of Poet Laureate, the Librarian of Congress, Daniel Boorstin, installed writer Robert Penn Warren as Poet Laureate of the United States. At first blush this appeared a curious if not questionable act. After all, the role of poet laureate is a British tradition embodying all the trappings of an aristocracy which our society purports to reject.

The poet laureate tradition dates from early 17th century England. There is seem disagreement about the first appointee but most authorities identify John Dryden. His responsibilities as laureate were to celebrate in verse major state events and other weight occasions such as birthdays of the monarch. Not surprisingly, such a tradition held little charm for Americans.

In the American context the appointment creates a concrete, tangible symbol to make explicit a solid but diffuse notion that art is truly important among our national priorities. Moreover, it affirms the role of government as an active collaborator with the private sector in supporting and encouraging excellence in the arts. There is nothing new in this. Historically, our Government, with widespread popular backing, has always vigorously promoted artistic expression. Importantly, the form of this support has recognized the artist and his work as far more than a dispensable luxury to be patronized in times of plenty. In the depths of the Great Depression, among the major New Deal programs were the Federal artists and writers projects which ensured that our society would emerge from that dark period intact in soul as well as body. What is new is the crystallization of this tradition represented by the Poet Laureate appointment.

Reflecting on this appointment and its antecedent tradition reinforces the principle that art not only enhances civilized life but sustains it; that art is a uniquely human endeavor and lacking outlets for creativity we would not be fully alive.

This appointment also invites us to consider the functions of art in society.

Often the artist and his work serve as mirrors and preservers capturing the prevailing beliefs and values of a society in a concrete, tangible form. Inevitably, the serious student of our own or another culture, past or present, will look to its major artistic works as a source of understanding.

Ironically, the artistic enterprise is often both conservator and iconoclast. Frequently the artist as social critic both symbolizes and stimulates the emergence of a new order. By its very nature the expressive essence of art is fertile ground for the growth of new ideas.

Functions of reflection and criticism are not contradictions, for any society is a dynamic relationship between pressures for change in several directions. In this dynamic process the artist plays the vital role of creating compre-

hensible forms out of the often bewildering flux of ideas and beliefs. His work gives concrete shape and texture to abstract and elusive notions which pulse like currents through our complex world.

But more vital than flash freezing the waves of change, the artists, especially the great artists, give definition and form to enduring abstractions such as good and evil, love and hate, beauty and trust. It is for this reason that the classic artist can speak with equal veracity to the 14th century cobbler and today's systems analyst.

In the process of articulating ideals and values, the artist creates models readily identifiable by anyone in our vast and multitiered society. Heroes, villains, and fools exemplify for appropriate response our ideals, failings and foibles. For example, I suspect that Pinocchio's nose is a far more powerful force in shaping children's values than abstract discussions of truth and falsity.

Serious accomplished artists are merely a fraction of our population yet their impact involves literally millions. One consequence of this mass impact is the opportunity for vast numbers of people to share concurrently in the ideas and emotions contained in artistic creations. In this phenomenon we have a form of public dialog at an unprecedented scale on complex but vital moral, spiritual, and esthetic issues.

If this brief and fragmented list is even partially valid it confirms my belief in the aptness of establishing a position to symbolize and enshrine artistic excellence. The choice of the first incumbent, Robert Penn Warren, is especially appropriate.

His record of excellence as poet, novelist, essayist, and critic is awesome. But equally impressive are certain qualities of the man and his work. To that special forum of public discussion which is modern literature, Mr. Warren has contributed abundantly and significantly. As simultaneous critic and observer he has reminded us of our own roots with vivid evocations of the virtues of our agrarian past. In two of his best novels, "At Heaven's Gate" (1943) and "All the King's Men" (1946), he incisively examines the dark side of public life—corruption, demagoguery, and the abuse of power. His own personal response to the appointment exemplifies the independence of thought and expression cherished in our society and demonstrated by the roles of the artist in it. He rejects the historic regal trappings of the position and even denies its value as an encouragement to aspiring young artists. In short, his appointment confirms the assertion of Mr. Warren's wife that in creating this position, contrary to British tradition, the Government honors the artist.

**WELCOME TO VENTURA
COUNTY GULLS**

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 11, 1986, pro baseball returned to Ventura County. The Ventura County Gulls, a

class A affiliate of the Toronto Blue Jays, opened their California league regular schedule against the Reno Padres.

This marks the first time in 31 years that Ventura County has had professional baseball and the red carpet has been rolled out for the Gulls. Thanks for bringing this team to Ventura County go to Jim Biby and former ball-player Ken McMullen.

I urge my colleagues to join me in welcoming the Gulls and wishing them a winning season. Play ball!

**IS AID SERIOUS ABOUT PRIVATE
SECTOR DEVELOPMENT?**

HON. MATTHEW F. MCHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the Reagan administration took office in 1981, the Agency for International Development [AID] established a new Bureau for Private Enterprise. Its purpose was to stimulate the private sector within developing countries.

Since the economies of most developing countries are agriculturally based, a top priority for the new Bureau was to stimulate the flow of capital and technology from the private agribusiness sector in the United States to counterparts in developing nations.

One of the first efforts of the Bureau was to fund the Joint Agricultural Consultative Corporation [JACC], a private nonprofit corporation headed by former Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman. Secretary Freeman had pioneered the JACC effort in Nigeria under a bilateral agreement signed by the United States and Nigerian Governments in 1980.

Under the AID/JACC funding agreement signed in 1982, JACC was asked to expand its efforts beyond Nigeria to several additional countries over the following 3 years. Eventually, the total number of countries covered under the agreement reached 11: Belize, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Nigeria, Panama, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Thailand.

The JACC program has stimulated the creation of broad-based, affiliated agribusiness committees in those countries. In addition, professionally staffed offices have been established in eight of them, with funding provided almost entirely from local resources. Here in the United States, the JACC has created individual country committees, consisting of 65 U.S. agribusiness companies having an investment interest in these 11 countries.

Over the course of the last 3 years, the JACC, in cooperation with its overseas affiliates, has provided help for hundreds of private agribusiness firms in those countries, linking them with private companies in the United States. More than 30 joint ventures have already been formed, valued at over \$140 million, with several hundred million dollars worth of projects still in the pipeline. Total cost to the U.S. Government: \$1.5 million over the entire 3 years.

Despite this phenomenal success story, AID suddenly decided late in 1985 to terminate funding for JACC. This decision was apparent-

ly made by the Bureau's new Assistant Administrator, Ms. Neal Peden, in spite of a commitment in May, 1985, to continue funding for at least another 3 years and in spite of a recommendation for continued funding from the President's Task Force on International Private Enterprise.

Opposition to the decision to terminate funding was immediate, both overseas and in the United States. Among those opposing the decision were our Ambassadors to Nigeria and the Ivory Coast. As a result, Ms. Peden agreed to take another look. She commissioned three private contracting firms to visit overseas JACC affiliate offices, committees and companies. All of the reports she received from these contractors were apparently positive toward the JACC program. Yet, no new funding agreement has been reached.

Mr. Speaker, I am including an editorial about the JACC program at the conclusion of my remarks. It states the case for continuing the JACC very well.

It is my hope that AID will seriously consider continued funding for this worthwhile program, and won't seek to create new mechanisms to perform services that the JACC is already providing. Congress has generously funded the activities of the Private Enterprise Bureau over the years, and this episode raises troubling questions.

In particular, if the Bureau cannot appreciate a success story like this, one has to wonder whether it is up to the task with which it has been charged.

**IS AID SERIOUS ABOUT PRIVATE SECTOR
DEVELOPMENT?**

Since its incorporation as a nonprofit organization in 1982, the Joint Agricultural Consultative Corporation (JACC) has helped to expand the agricultural horizons of developing nations in Africa, Southeast Asia, Central America and the Caribbean. Begun with the help of a grant from the U.S. Agency for International Development, through the Bureau of Private Enterprise, JACC's mission is the establishment of an informational network between private industry's agribusiness firms in the United States and agribusiness entrepreneurs in foreign developing countries. The goal is to provide direct help to foreign agribusiness companies who are looking for U.S. joint venture partners, to provide technical assistance in their development of specific agricultural resources and the transferral of technologies that will expand the agricultural bases of these foreign countries and help them to reduce their dependency on imports, and at the same time, increase their exports.

The lack of agricultural technology systems in developing countries is having the most severe consequences to the citizens of these nations. This lack of technology and support coupled with these countries' fragile economies, makes the development of a strong and viable agricultural base within these countries an arduous task.

In 1985, the citizens of the world witnessed the struggle for life in Ethiopia. The ferocity of the drought in Africa made clear the fact that unexpected natural disasters can greatly undermine a nation's ability to provide adequate food for its countrymen. And as the agricultural technologies in these developing countries are at best only rudimentary, under these conditions even the most dedicated and conscientious efforts

on the part of the citizens of the world to bring relief to those victims of the famine still come too late for many.

Since man first began communicating with signs and symbols, through the development of the spoken and written word, through the stages of agrarian societies and on into the industrial revolution, we now have come to experience the informational revolution. We have the technology, experience and knowledge to prevent starvation, and at the same time, establish strong agricultural bases within developing countries and help them to become economically and nutritionally independent.

We see JACC as an instrument capable of transmitting that information and expertise to developing nations beset by antiquated farming and agricultural techniques. We see JACC's efforts to include private industry in this endeavour as a way for U.S. firms to, at the same time, take advantage of the excellent trade and investment opportunities inherent in this challenge. In its December 2, 1985 newsletter, an update of JACC's activities states that in the past three years, private agribusiness committees have been established in eleven developing nations. In eight of these countries, local affiliate offices and professional staff have been established, funded almost entirely with local funds. This indicates that JACC has been successful in the establishment of long-term foreign investment contracts with these countries while effectively leveraging local funds to help finance these efforts.

In the past three years, JACC has directly assisted the formation of over thirty joint venture enterprises involving U.S. and foreign agribusiness firms, the total estimated value of which exceeds \$140 million. Also, as of September 1985, another twenty projects were in the "advanced stages of negotiation," partners had been identified for another thirty projects, and an additional eighty were in the U.S. "search" phase of development. Should all of these ventures make it to the "established enterprise stage," the total project value would exceed one billion U.S. dollars.

Under the chairmanship of former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, the Joint Agricultural Consultative Corporation has expanded its activities into the countries of Belize, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Sri Lanka and Thailand. JACC has established a Washington, D.C. office, organized U.S. JACC Country Committees, introduced the JACC concept and structure to targeted countries, provided assistance to JACC countries in organizing and financing their in-country JACC committees, offices and staffs, processed requests for joint ventures and technology transfers to JACC targeted countries, sponsored and participated in conferences to promote the socio-economic interests inherent in the mission of JACC, engaged in some limited activities related to the review of foreign government policies affecting private enterprise and direct foreign investment, promoted private source revenues to reduce future financial dependence on AID, and hosted numerous individual office meetings to explain the JACC organization and operating structure.

Through these endeavours, JACC and its private industry members retain the capability to help developing nations meet their increased food and fiber needs and helps bring focus to future development of the infrastructure necessary to store, transport, market and export increase commodity production.

The U.S. Agency for International Development has announced that assessments are being completed on the decision to terminate US JACC/AID funding agreement. Should this funding be terminated, JACC will probably have no other option than to convert the JACC into a "for profit" investor-owned company. Through the years of its operation, JACC has steadfastly held to its original purpose to facilitate the technology transfer process and attract private U.S. investment in developing country agribusiness. JACC represents a number of medium-sized U.S. companies which, without JACC assistance, would probably not be involved in developing country agribusiness projects. JACC committees, set up in key developing countries, have both U.S. and Third World agribusiness participants, who exchange information and pursue joint ventures.

In its December 1984 report to the President of the United States, The President's Task Force on International Private Enterprise stated: "The Joint Agricultural Consultative Corporation (JACC) should receive continued and expanded support from the Agency for International Development." The report goes on to mention that the AID should support organizations and programs that serve as brokers between the U.S. private sector and the Less Developed Countries (LDC) private sector. Many times, because they lack sufficient information about international markets, U.S. firms ignore opportunities to go overseas because of what appears to them unknown, high-risk markets, too undefined and "unattainable" to be worth the effort.

JACC helps to bridge the gap and provide informational services between the U.S. private sector and the LDC private sector. Through its sponsorship of feasibility studies of foreign countries' agricultural potential and in providing assistance to obtain loan capital to finance these enterprises, the JACC helps to ensure the environment the agribusiness community needs in order to negotiate mutually advantageous business agreements.

We at INFOS recognize the accomplishments of JACC and its overseas affiliates and strongly support its mission and goals to sustain and enrich the lives of all residents of this planet. Beyond the differences of race and creed and economic status remains the common need for sustenance. As individual members of the human race, we are bound by a brotherhood of instinct—an instinct to be physically, emotionally and spiritually whole. We must work together to help sustain physical life on this planet. Although we here in the United States are blessed with advanced technology and an abundance of things necessary to enrich our lives, in the spirit of international brotherhood we must, for the future of our planet, see to it that all of our brothers and sisters and their children have at least the basic foods and nutritional elements required to sustain life. The Joint Agricultural Consultative Corporation promotes and encourages world food productivity through private enterprise.

We at INFOS suggest to our readers that they do all in their power to help assure continued funding of the JACC program. The challenge to those of us living in the informational revolution is to experience the freedom and benefits inherent to our ability to share the technologies and information we have with all of our fellow human beings within the global community.

FISHERMEN DESERVE OPPORTUNITY TO COMPETE FAIRLY IN THEIR OWN MARKET

HON. JOHN R. MCKERNAN, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. MCKERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1986, the International Trade Administration in the Department of Commerce announced that it had determined that imports of fresh Atlantic groundfish from Canada were being subsidized. The ITA noted that a total of 55 programs administered by the Canadian Federal Government and the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, and Quebec provided subsidies to the Canadian fresh fish industry. Unfortunately, however, the Department of Commerce did not consider all programs—particularly the off-season payments made directly to unemployed fishermen by the Canadian Government—to constitute a countervailable subsidy.

In its determination, the Department of Commerce did not dispute the fact that the unemployment compensation provided to Canada's self-employed fishermen is governed by a special statutory provision and directed at a specific type of industry. The Department stated, however, that fishermen who received unemployment insurance through this program did not receive benefits on more preferential terms than those who received benefits under other Canadian unemployment programs.

One key criterion that can be used to establish whether or not preferential treatment has been afforded is the ratio of benefits provided to premiums paid. It has been clearly established by the North Atlantic Fisheries Task Force, in their petition on behalf of United States fishermen, that the level of benefits paid by the Canadian Government to the premiums paid by Canadian fishermen is at least 12 to 1. Such a ratio is, in my view, substantially disproportionate and, I believe, prima facie evidence of the type of subsidy that has contributed to the injury of U.S. fishermen.

I have introduced legislation today which clarifies the definition of subsidy to include unemployment insurance programs if the benefit recipient is allowed to draw a substantially disproportionate amount of benefits relative to the costs incurred in participating in the program. The purpose of this legislation is to discourage foreign countries from providing direct financial assistance to specific industries under the guise of social welfare that function as a direct granting of funds to aid in the manufacture, production or export of any product. This legislation is in response to the Department of Commerce's final determination in its countervailing duty investigation of fresh Atlantic groundfish from Canada. It is my intention, however, that the changes made by this legislation would apply in all investigations where unemployment compensation is an alleged subsidy.

Mr. Speaker, in the existing trading environment, our fishing industry lacks both the market power and the Government support to

stand up to the Canadian industry. I believe, however, that given the chance to compete fairly, our fishing industry can hold its own. Our fishermen have proven their case—they deserve an opportunity to compete fairly in their own market, and I urge my colleagues to support me in this effort to provide the tools necessary to bring about a sense of equity.

CONGRATULATIONS TO COACH JODY CONRADT AND THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM, AND COACH RICHARD QUICK AND THE TEXAS WOMEN'S SWIM TEAM, NCAA NATIONAL CHAMPIONS

HON. J.J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, if you had been in Austin, TX, last week, you could not have failed to notice the University of Texas tower which was lit twice to honor University of Texas national championships in women's basketball and swimming.

The University of Texas Lady Longhorns' basketball team who won their first national basketball championship by defeating the University of Southern California, 97-81.

The University of Texas women's swim team also won the national championship, their third in 3 years, by outpointing the University of Florida, 633-586, in Fayetteville.

Our hats are off to both teams for their accomplishments.

The Lady Longhorns are, without a doubt, one of the most powerful and one of the winningest basketball teams in the history of women's college basketball. They were ranked No. 1 in the country the entire year and compiled a remarkable 34-0 undefeated season. They may very well be the best women's basketball team ever assembled.

The Lady Longhorns' victory was especially sweet for the seniors of the team who had been to the playoffs before but had come up short. Over the last 4 years, the Lady Longhorns have had one of the winningest programs in the country, but the seniors on the team saved their best for last—a national championship. What a way to top off their collegiate careers.

And we can't help but share Coach Conradt's enthusiasm for the performance of the Lady Longhorns that came off the bench to help seal the victory. Indeed, if Coach Conradt is right, and I'm taking her at her word, that it doesn't matter who starts on this team, then I'm planning to be standing in the well of the House this time next year complimenting them on their second national championship.

And what about the Texas Women's Swim Team? This is the third national title for the women's swim team in 3 years and most of our swimmers from this year's team will be returning, so I may very well find myself back here next year congratulating them on their fourth national championship.

Coach Richard Quick, who, I might add, is the 1988 Olympic swimming coach, has put

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

together one of the strongest swimming programs in the country. I think this bodes well for our 1988 Olympic Swim Team, which I assume will be represented by Texas swimmers.

This particular championship was a total team effort as evidenced by the fact that the Texas team only won four of the 22 total events, yet still managed to win the championship. Teamwork and team depth were the key.

To Coach Conradt and the Lady Longhorns, and to Coach Richard Quick and the Texas Women's Swim Team, I simply want to say, well done, you make us proud, and "Hook Em Horns!"

SALUTE TO THE COPE-O'BRIEN CENTER

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a center dedicated to helping youths in need.

The Washtenaw County O'Brien Center for Youth Development/Center for Occupational and Personalized Education, Inc.—referred to as the COPE-O'Brien Center—is celebrating its 15th anniversary.

Founded in March 1971, the COPE-O'Brien Center has been instrumental in offering essential individualized therapeutic and alternative educational services for behaviorally troubled and needy adolescents aged 13 to 21, living in Michigan's Washtenaw County.

The COPE-O'Brien Center works with one philosophy: that, given the opportunity to receive critical skill training and specialized treatment with regard to both vocation and education, the quality of these young people's lives and their chances for becoming productive and responsible adults will improve significantly.

Annually, more than 200 youths are served at the center. Totally, some 2,500 have benefited from its services during the last 15 years. The center has been considered a valuable asset to the community and has been given consistent public funding support at the local, State, and Federal level.

COPE-O'Brien Center represents a unique resource sharing model which integrates a public/private partnership in the delivery of youth services, and has been recognized as a model youth service program by the Michigan Department of Social Services, and the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

I think it only fitting, Mr. Speaker, that I ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting the COPE-O'Brien Center for its outstanding work and wish them another 15 years of success.

A TAX POLICY FOR TODAY AND THE FUTURE—HOW TO SAVE TAX REFORM

HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, today, April 15, is a day that is foremost in the minds of American taxpayers. This April 15, taxpayers again face filing Federal tax returns after months of work and confusion. Congress also faces confusion in sorting out months of work on reforming our Internal Revenue Code. Unfortunately, it has become apparent that proposals under consideration fail to address the role of tax policy in competing in our world economy. It is for this reason I am introducing legislation to address the ills of current tax reform proposals before Congress. Legislation to enact a strong and broad-based business alternative minimum tax or BAMT.

The BAMT would more nearly harmonize our tax system with those of our major trading partners, would help to level the playing field with foreign competition, and it would ensure that corporations which currently pay little or no income tax would pay a substantial amount of tax. Most importantly, the BAMT would pay for a capital formation system nearly as generous as current law and would replace either the current minimum tax or the onerous and loophole-filled minimum tax proposals under consideration by Congress.

Currently, our major trading partners utilize value-added taxes to raise the majority of their revenues. These VAT's tax imported goods raising substantial revenues from American exports. This is one more example of our Nation's inability to utilize our Tax Code to level the playing field with our foreign competition. Japan is now considering implementing a VAT to enhance their trading position. The time has come for America to move toward harmonizing our tax system with our trading partners and the business alternative minimum tax does just that.

Let me emphasize that the BAMT is not a VAT. It acts as an alternative minimum tax to the Federal income tax and places a 7-percent tax on the net business receipts of trade or business. The BAMT also taxes all imports and exempts all exports as is allowed under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]. Credits are allowed against the Federal income tax, FICA liability, and the BAMT also includes a small business exemption of \$10 million to avoid hindering new business growth. The BAMT is not an add-on tax easily increased as a VAT could be; it is instead an alternative tax and includes specific language limiting any increase to a ratio directly corresponding with the income tax. In addition, a two-thirds vote by both Houses of Congress is needed to increase the rate. As an alternative tax, the BAMT is not a regressive tax as a VAT would be.

Finally, the BAMT raises \$205 billion over five years, 68 percent from imports, and would pay for a tax reform bill American business could live with. Doesn't it make sense that we subsidize our economy with revenues from our

trading partners as they do from us? I urge my colleagues in the Congress to join me in addressing both a short-term goal of keeping our Nation's economy healthy and a long-term goal of implementing a tax policy to harmonize our system for competing effectively and efficiently in our future world economy. The BMT generates the revenue necessary to lower tax rates for all Americans while maintaining a strong economy and a more equitable playing field in the international trade arena.

PROTECT SATELLITE DISH OWNERS

HON. BILL SCHUETTE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3989 has rightly been called the Rural Satellite Dish Owners Protection Act. Many of the satellite dish owners throughout our country, and especially in Michigan's 10th District which I represent, live in rural areas where Earth-based satellite technology brings them a variety of television programming that would not otherwise be available to them.

The cable TV industry has legitimate concerns over the effects of satellite dish use for its business. But what they have proposed to do about this puts unfair penalties on satellite dish owners. The cable programmers want to scramble their signal—and in some areas they have already begun to do so—before insuring that decoding devices for wisely available and at a reasonable cost. Furthermore, cable programmers have come to no agreement on a uniform method for scrambling their programs, and different scrambling techniques would render one decoder useless for unscrambling other programs. Finally, cable programmers have even considered providing service to dish owners at a higher subscription rate than regular cable subscribers. These solutions that the cable programmers have offered can only be described as punitive against the satellite dish owners.

Mr. Speaker, I have agreed to cosponsor H.R. 3989 because it offers a solution to the conflict between satellite dish owners and cable programmers that is fair to both and punitive toward neither. This legislation permits cable programmers to scramble, but in accordance with uniform standards and after a 30-day moratorium which will allow time for decoders to become more widely available at more reasonable prices. This legislation allows cable programmers to charge satellite owners a subscription fee, but not at a rate that exceeds the fee charged regular cable subscribers.

Mr. Speaker, satellite dish owners are willing to pay their fair share for the programming they now enjoy, and no less. But also, no more. Previously, I have given my support to H.R. 1769 and H.R. 1840, Legislation also designed to achieve an equitable solution to this problem. Rural residents throughout our country, and especially in the district I represent, have turned to us in Congress to help them arrive at a reasonable compromise with cable

programmers, one that will allow them to continue to enjoy the programming now available to them. I am committed to achieving such a compromise which is a fair deal for all parties involved in this problem. H.R. 3989 gives us the opportunity to achieve such a compromise, and this is why I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

A TRIBUTE TO GORDON CARRINGTON

HON. JOHN G. ROWLAND

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to mark the passing of one of my district's finest citizens, Gordon Carrington of Bethany.

Gordon has spent his life trying to make his hometown of Bethany a better place for all of its citizens. He was born in Bethany 64 years ago and from the day he became an adult he began a career of public service, becoming town assessor. For 6 years he served on the board of assessors and later served on the town's first zoning board. On July 23, 1963, Gordon became first selectman of Bethany, a post his neighbors reelected him to in every election since. At the time of his untimely death Gordon had served as first selectman for 22 years—longer than any other first selectman in Connecticut.

Gordon Carrington's service to the community of Bethany was not restricted to political service. He was both a successful farmer and businessman, as co-owner of the Cherry Tree Farm and owner of an Agway dealership. He was an active member of the Congregational Church, the Bethany Lions Club, and a number of masonic lodges. Perhaps most important of all, Gordon Carrington was a devoted husband and father.

I am sorry to see Gordon Carrington pass away. He will be greatly missed by all who knew him. We can rest easier in the knowledge that Gordon's accomplishments in making Bethany a better place to live will long outlive him.

TRIBUTE TO FRANKLIN A. POLK

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, 1986, a distinguished constituent of mine, Franklin A. Polk, will be honored by the Cuyahoga County Bar Association. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the numerous contributions made by the "Grand Old Man" of the Cleveland legal community.

Mr. Speaker, Franklin Polk is a 1939 graduate of Cleveland State University Law School, who has maintained offices as an individual, general practitioner at 5725 Broadway, Cleveland, OH, for 44 years. In 1948, he was elected president of the Cuyahoga County Bar Association. For 39 years, he has chaired its annual Public Servants Merit Awards commit-

tee luncheon in which each year five of the county's most deserving court employees are honored. For 35 years he has been an elected delegate to the Ohio State Bar Association House of Delegates. For 12 years, from 1971 to 1983, Mr. Polk represented the Cuyahoga County Bar Association in the American Bar House of Delegates. These years of devoted service, however, have not gone unrecognized. Mr. Polk is the recipient of numerous awards and honors.

Mr. Speaker, in May 1983, Mr. Polk was awarded the Ohio State Bar Association Medal for his exceptional contributions to furthering the administration of justice. In May 1984, he received the American Judicature Society's Herbert J. Harley Award for his lifetime efforts toward improving the functioning of the Nation's legal system.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Polk has introduced 108 lawyers into the full-time practice of law since 1947. They have memorialized his assistance to them by naming the No. 1 carrel at the Cleveland State University Law School Library after him. Mr. Polk has also served as the National Alumni Association President of John Carroll University, from which he graduated in 1935 after earning an A.B. degree. In 1951, Mr. Polk served as dean of Delta Theta Phi Cleveland Alumni Senate. He has been named as an outstanding alumnus of Cleveland State University Law School, John Carroll University and Delta Theta Phi. In addition, Mr. Polk currently serves on the editorial committee of the Cleveland Bar Association.

Mr. Speaker, Franklin A. Polk has made immeasurable contributions to every bar association, civic organization and fraternal brotherhood he has ever been involved with, and I am extremely honored to join in the salute to him. He has unselfishly served the Cleveland community for more than 40 years, and I join with the Cuyahoga County Bar Association in paying tribute to him.

TRADE TALKS WITH KOREA

HON. DAN MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the significance of the talks being held between representatives of the United States and the Republic of Korea, one of our key trading partners. Leaders from business and government in seven Southeastern States will be meeting April 20-22 in Miami Beach with a Korean delegation, headed by Minister of Trade and Industry Jin-Ho Kum, to discuss opportunities for establishing new economic ties between our two regions.

We are proud that Florida is hosting this conference. We believe the whole Southeastern United States is rich in potential for increased exports to Korea.

Korea is a key ally for us in the Pacific. We have a vital security interest in seeing that it maintains a strong economy to support its heavy defense burden. Koreans have the fourth largest international debt among the developed countries.

The backbone of the Korean economy is trade. Already, Korea is the eighth largest purchaser of United States goods. Expanded economic relationships with the United States are key to Korea's continued stability.

We are heartened by Korea's apparent desire to engage in international trade on a good-faith basis. Unlike other countries, Korea is not committed to a program of industrial self-sufficiency. Its leaders seem to recognize that restricting imports could trigger retaliatory trade actions that would devastate its economy.

The current discussions with the Koreans could furnish a blueprint for working with our other trading partners. This approach provides us with an alternative to instituting restrictive, protectionist policies. We stand to gain more from adopting an international trading policy grounded in cooperation rather than confrontation.

CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL FOR SOVIET JEWS

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of participating in the Call to Conscience Vigil since it was first organized in 1976. I would like to commend this year's sponsor, our distinguished colleague, Representative TOM KINDNESS, for organizing this ongoing manifestation of congressional support for Soviet Jewry. As always, I am glad to do my part in demonstrating Congress' concern for the plight of the Jewish minority in the U.S.S.R.

I regret, however, Mr. Speaker, that today also marks the 10th year that I have taken the floor to draw our colleagues' attention to the case of Vladimir and Maria Slepak. For a decade now, I have spoken on behalf of the Slepak family of Moscow, a family that has been attempting to emigrate to Israel since 1970. Vladimir and Maria's two sons were allowed to emigrate to Israel in the late 1970's and Maria's mother and sister also live there. Vladimir, a radio and television engineer and member of the Moscow Helsinki Group, and Maria, a physician, spent 5 years in remote Siberian exile for protesting against the Soviet refusal to grant them exit visas. Since December 1982, when they returned to Moscow from exile, the Slepaks have renewed their efforts to be reunited with their children and the grandchildren they have never seen.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, I had the honor of meeting Maria and Vladimir Slepak in Moscow. Along with one distinguished colleague, Representative BROOMFIELD, I met with many of the Moscow Jewish community's long-term refuseniks. We told them of the Congress' commitment to their freedom and pledged ourselves to do all that we could to achieve that goal. And, in all our meetings with Soviet officials, including General Secretary Gorbachev, we raised the issue of Jewish emigration and highlighted specific cases. While we received no assurances, we were told that the cases were raised—including, of

course, the Slepaks—would be reviewed and decisions reconsidered. I am, therefore, very hopeful that I will not be compelled to take the floor again next year, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Slepaks but that they will, after a 16-year-long wait, be reunited with relatives in Israel.

Mr. Speaker, today the 35 nations that signed the Helsinki final act are meeting in Bern, Switzerland, to open the Experts Meeting on Human Contacts. This 6-week-long meeting will cover the issue of family reunification, family visits, travel, and emigration. Specific cases of divided families, such as the Slepaks, will be raised and discussed. Let the Soviet Union use the occasion of the Bern meeting to demonstrate their professed fidelity to the final act with concrete actions and allow the emigration of the Slepak family.

IN HONOR OF JACK WOOD

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Jack Wood who will leave public office in Hermosa Beach on April 15, 1986.

Jack has served on the Hermosa Beach City Council for 4 years and most recently served as mayor. He has been a resident of Hermosa Beach for 16 years.

He was educated at Norwich University where he received his bachelors degree in civil engineering. He earned a masters in business administration from Cal State University in 1975. He has worked as a private consulting engineer in Hermosa Beach and has been active in both the Hermosa Beach Rotary Club and Hermosa Beach Chamber of Commerce.

He served his country in the U.S. Army as a combat engineer during the Vietnam war and was made an officer.

To mark Jack's departure from public office, I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing him the best of luck in all of his future endeavors.

ACTION BY ADMINISTRATION MAY LEAD TO SELLING OF TVA

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1986

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the administration recently announced their intention to sell the five Federal Power Marketing Administrations (PMAs) to the private sector. I am deeply concerned that this action could eventually lead to the selling of the Tennessee Valley Authority [TVA]. I wish to bring to my colleagues' attention a study which I hope will help inform them as to the impact such a move would have on ratepayers in the Tennessee Valley.

THE RATE IMPACT IMPLICIT IN THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION STUDY OF SELLING THE FIVE FEDERAL POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS AND THE TVA POWER SYSTEM

The Heritage Foundation study by Senior Policy Analyst Milton Copulos concludes that selling the five PMAs and the TVA power system would:

1. Yield significant long-term benefits to the consumers of PMA- and TVA-generated power through greater efficiency and accountability.

2. Help solve the deficit problem by raising \$100 billion—even after all debts from revenue bonds were repaid.

An initial review of the study as it relates to TVA indicates both these conclusions are false. The \$62 billion price tag for the TVA power system meets neither the test of financial common sense nor of protecting the public interest. Determining the market value of TVA involves not only complex financial and accounting questions, but fundamental legislative and regulatory uncertainties. There is no way to value TVA's power assets without knowing how the output produced by those assets would be priced, i.e., how rates for a "privatized" TVA would be set. Thus, the amount that the Treasury would realize is problematical at best, and in any event would be a one-shot affair that would not change the basic economic problems caused by the Federal deficit in a beneficial way.

In this paper, we deal primarily with the interrelated issues of whether the sale price for the TVA power system established in the Heritage study makes financial sense and the magnitude of the rate impact on TVA's customers that is implicit in it.

1. The rate impact of the sale of the TVA power system for \$62 billion would be cataclysmic:

In order to yield \$62 billion to the Government under a typical 60 percent debt and 40 percent equity financing arrangement, annual power system revenue requirements would have to increase by \$7.18 billion in order to complete the transaction. (Based on average returns on utility debt and equity.)

An increase in revenue requirements of \$7.18 billion would imply a rate increase of 158 percent.

An increase in revenue requirements of that magnitude would increase the monthly residential electric bill for 1,000 kWh from the current level of about \$50 to \$115.

With average annual residential use in the TVA service area at about 14,418 kWh per year (residential average use in 1984), the annual bill would increase from \$720 to \$1,645—an increase of \$925 for the average residential customer.

This proposal would give the Tennessee Valley the highest electric rates in the Southeast by a large margin (they are now among the lowest). Of the major U.S. cities only New York City would have higher electric rates.

Moreover, as their contracts with TVA expired, TVA's customers would leave the system in order to buy the now much cheaper power available from contiguous utility systems. In turn this would drive up TVA's rates even further as the higher revenue requirements were spread over fewer and fewer ratepayers.

The derivation of this rate impact is shown in table 1. We have used very conservative assumptions as to interest rates and required rates of return. In reality, a substantial "risk premium" would be de-

manded by the financial markets for the sort of transaction outlined in the study—increasing the impact substantially.

Table 1.—Rate impact if TVA were sold: 60 percent financing by debt, 40 percent by equity

Assumptions:	Billion
Sale price of	\$62.0
Financed by long-term bonds at 9.5 percent.....	37.2
New shares earning the average rate of return for the utility industry of 15.6 percent.....	24.8
<i>Major changes in TVA's revenue requirements</i>	
[In billions]	
Decreases:	
Long-term interest	\$1.55
Repayment to U.S. Treasury	0.12
Increase in retained earnings.....	0.33
Total decrease	2.00
Increases:	
Interest on new debt.....	3.53
Return on equity.....	3.87
Increase in depreciation.....	1.78
Total increase	9.18
Net change	7.18
Current revenue payments.....	4.55
Percent increase	158

2. The structure of the sale as proposed in the Heritage Foundation study is all equity financing scheduled in two phases: an initial offering of 51 percent of the value of the agency's assets with the Government retaining a 49 percent share to be sold at a later date.

This arrangement would increase the revenue requirements and rate impact substantially above the 158 percent increase implicit in the 60 percent debt and 40 percent equity arrangement described previously.

The net increase in revenue requirements that would follow the initial 51 percent offering would be \$4.71 billion, approximately a 104 percent increase. This assumes, of course, that the Government would be willing to forego any dividends on its 49 percent equity.

This would raise the current monthly residential bill of about \$50 for 1,000 kWh to about \$95.

As the second phase of the proposed offering went into effect, revenue requirements

would increase another \$4.74 billion. This also assumes that the first issue maintained its initial value, keeping in mind that in order for the shares in the first issue to retain their value, rates would have had to more than double, and that TVA's customers would not have left the system to obtain cheaper power elsewhere.

The combined impact for the two phases of the sale as proposed by the Heritage Foundation would be to raise revenue requirements by \$9.45 billion, leading to a 208 percent increase.

Translating this into an increase in the average annual residential bill means the current \$720 per year would almost triple to about \$1,950 per year.

(The derivation of the rate impact is shown in table 2.)

Table 2.—Revenue requirement impact of TVA sale: Heritage Foundation plan

Assumptions:	Billions
Sale price	\$62
Financed in two stages by new shares earning the average rate of return in utility industry of 15.6 percent	
<i>Major Changes in TVA's Revenue Requirements</i>	
[In billions]	
PHASE I:	
Decreases:	
Long-term interest	\$1.55
Repayment to Treasury	0.12
Increase in retained earnings.....	0.33
Phase I decreases	2.00
Increases:	
Return on equity (51 percent of \$62 billion at 15.6 percent).....	\$4.93
Increase in depreciation.....	1.78
Phase I increases.....	6.71
Net increase Phase I	4.71
Current revenue requirement	4.55
Percent change	104
PHASE II:	
Total decrease Phases I and II	2.00
Return on equity (49 percent of \$62 billion at 15.6 percent).....	4.74
Total increase Phases I and II.....	11.45
Net increase Phases I and II.....	9.45
Current revenue requirements.....	4.55

Percent change 208

3. Aside from the rate implications, the sheer magnitude of the proposed stock offering is so much larger than any previous sale that it makes any prediction of its yield an exercise in conjecture.

The largest previous stock offering was British Telecom in 1984—about \$6 billion, but this offering was spread through Europe and Japan as well as the United States.

The largest stock offering made in the U.S. was a \$1.17 billion sale of AT&T shares in 1983.

The proposed sale would also yield a very significant fee for the investment bankers underwriting the sale. Assuming a typical fee spread of 1 percent of the face value of the debt and 5 percent of the aggregate proceeds for stock offerings:

The 60/40 "buy out" would yield underwriters fees of \$1.6 billion.

The all equity approach advocated by the Heritage Foundation would result in underwriting fees of \$3.1 billion.

To put this in perspective, under the Heritage Foundation plan the fees paid to the bankers handling the transaction would exceed the Federal Government's current equity investment in the TVA power system.

The Heritage Foundation also recommends that the proceeds from the proposed sale of Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) be used to pay off the bonds issued to build units four and five of the Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS). BPA did not guarantee the bonds issued to build those units, and recent litigation has established BPA has no liability for them. Thus, the arrangement proposed in the study would amount to a very substantial Federal subsidy to the WPPSS bondholders.

Numbers and rate impacts of this magnitude may seem unrealistically large—and in our opinion clearly they are—however, they are also logically implicit in the study's claim that TVA could be sold for \$62 billion.

Another way to say the same thing is, that in order for rational investors to be willing to pay \$62 billion for TVA, they would have to be assured that whoever would have the authority to set rates in the event of such a sale would be willing and able to triple the rates paid by TVA's customers.

Thus it appears that the Heritage Foundation's basic conclusions fail rather badly a basic test of financial and political reductio ad absurdum.