

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HOWARD AND SHERYLE ISAACS
HONORED AS FLORIDA SMALL
BUSINESS PERSONS OF THE
YEAR

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 14 million small businesses form the backbone of our Nation's economy and it is appropriate that this week has been proclaimed "Small Business Week" in their honor.

In recognition of this salute, outstanding small business persons from throughout the United States are being honored in Washington this week. Howard and Sheryle Isaacs, constituents I represent from St. Petersburg, FL, have been selected as Florida's Small Business Persons of the Year for which they are being recognized this week in numerous programs and activities that includes a congressional salute to small business leaders tomorrow.

Mrs. Isaacs is president and Mr. Isaacs is chief executive officer of Good Buy Sportswear in St. Petersburg. The contribution they have made and the example they have set for our community is representative of the entrepreneurial spirit and enthusiasm that has shaped our Nation's economy and established the United States as the world leader in business and industry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to take part in the events to honor America's outstanding small business leaders, such as the Isaacs, who are assembled here this week.

INSURANCE INFORMATION ACT
OF 1986

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, a fog of confusion envelops the liability insurance debate. Today I am introducing the Insurance Information Act of 1986, which is intended to shine some facts through that fog.

Mr. Speaker, I serve as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, the panel with jurisdiction over changes in the Nation's tort law and over modifications in the McCarran-Ferguson Act, which limits the Federal Government's role in regulating the insurance industry. For months now, I have been urged by representatives of the insurance industry and many business groups to back tort reform legislation. And I have been urged by trial lawyers, consumer groups, and some business groups to resist tort reform and to back in-

stead changes in the McCarran-Ferguson Act in order to permit the Federal Government to enter into the regulation of the insurance industry.

My reaction to both sides was sympathetic. I have long been concerned with problems in the Nation's tort system—such as with the inefficient way it distributes awards. Of the money paid out by insurance companies in asbestos cases, only 40 percent ended up with victims. Clearly, there are also problems in the way tort law deals with products that are inherently risky but whose benefits outweigh the potential harm. Despite near unanimous agreement that the Sabin vaccine would prevent thousands of deaths each year, for example, producers have found that the handful of annual victims are so tragically attractive to juries as to make Sabin vaccine production unprofitable.

Tort reformers may indeed be right that the country's tort system has produced huge and unpredictable damage judgments, awards that have left many risks uninsurable.

On the other side, I found merit to the argument that insurance regulations should be broadened. The insurance industry, like the banking industry, is a national utility. Insurance companies, like banks, provide the grease that keeps the gears of the Nation's economy moving smoothly. As the current liability insurance crisis attests, problems in the insurance industry—perhaps even more so than in the banking industry—tend to be national in scope. The need for direct Federal oversight of the banking industry is widely accepted; is it worth the risk to shield the insurance industry from the same scrutiny?

Still, the legislation urged by both sides represent drastic changes. Tort law today provides an important means of compensating unnecessarily injured people. And the open-ended threat of huge awards deters harmful behavior; meanwhile, the primacy of the States in regulating the insurance industry has a long, established history, enshrined for the last 40 years in law.

Tampering in this area carries no small risk, and as I began to review the cases made by both sides, I found that the information presented did not prove the case for major adjustments in tort law; nor did it prove the need for Federal regulation of the insurance industry. In fact, the evidence presented proved nothing at all. Full of half-true anecdotes, misleading statistics, and counterintuitive reasoning, the information presented has been long on exclamation points and short on conclusive evidence.

Tort reformers, for example, have relied heavily on anecdotes. These tall tales about plaintiffs who win huge judgments for ridiculous reasons are compelling—but tend to be no more than half true. One widely told story, for example, describes an "overweight man with a history of heart disease" who successfully sues the manufacturer of a lawnmower

after suffering a heart attack while trying to start the machine. In fact, however, it was a 32-year-old doctor with no history of heart disease who collapsed while vainly yanking at an engine that was defective when it left the factory. Another anecdote tells of a suit that resulted from the death of a woman whose car rammed a horse that flipped and fell through the car's roof. Left out is the case's most significant fact, that the car's roof could withstand significantly less than the 5,000 pounds of impact the national transportation safety board requires for passenger protection if a car rolls over during an accident.

The statistics tort reformers cite are not much better. To pick one example, the average product liability award is said to have increased from \$345,000 to over \$1 million in the last decade—figures that, first of all, ignore the fact that inflation alone would have increased the \$345,000 figure to over \$700,000. Still \$1 million seems like a lot of money to be shelling out per award—until you look at it closely.

First, the average award figure does not take into account the majority of product liability plaintiffs who lose, the 95 percent of filed lawsuits that are dropped or settled before trial, or the many injured people who never bring a suit. If it did, compensation per victim or per lawsuit would be much lower. Second, the average was most likely stretched higher by a very small number of huge awards. A respected Rand Corp. study of San Francisco jury awards between 1960 and 1979 found that the largest two awards accounted for 38 percent of the total amount of awards in the late 1970's. Without those two awards—which may well have gone to people paralyzed or worse because of the gross negligence of some company—the average product liability award in those years would be just marginally higher than in the late 1960's.

Last, the huge awards in this example—and in almost all statistics cited to prove the need for tort reform—are not final judgments, but jury awards—which are frequently reversed or reduced on appeal. In fact, a recent Yale Law School study indicates that appeals courts overturn as many as half of all jury verdicts.

What about the statistics on the other side of the debate? Not much better. Tort defenders have latched on to a new, widely publicized study by the national center for State courts which found that tort filings jumped only slightly between 1978 to 1981 and then actually decreased between 1981 and 1984. Under "Tort Filings," though, the National Center Study includes everything from product liability suits to auto accident cases, the latter of which are so frequent by comparison that they mask any changes in other areas.

Tort defenders blame the current crisis on the insurance industry itself, accusing insurance executives of manufacturing a crisis to create pressure for tort reform. However, in

● 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.

statistics released to prove that the industry made money in recent years—when the industry maintains it has lost money—tort defenders add to the industry's loss figures a huge number for capital gains. However, capital gains—money made when a company sells off assets—can be made only once. And businesses tend to sell stocks and other assets only when they have to compensate for large losses in the regular course of business.

Plus, last year a frighteningly large number of insurance companies were forced into insolvency. Were these companies made to die so that the remaining insurance companies can have their tort reform? It just doesn't seem likely. Nor does it seem likely that large insurance companies would cancel policies or drop entire lines if there was a reasonable change to make some money.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the available evidence proves just one thing: That the current system for collecting data about the insurance industry and about the industry's interplay with the civil justice system is woefully inadequate.

We cannot legislate without the facts, Mr. Speaker, and for one reason or another the insurance industry has been less than forthcoming with the necessary data. Though they have almost gleefully released broad numbers on operating losses, they have been mysteriously tightlipped about how much they have paid out in claims for specific classes of businesses, like day care centers, and how that has changed over time. And about how the premium slashing of a few years back relates to the current insurance crunch.

Some respected industry leaders share in this criticism. The CEO of the Nation's second largest insurance brokerage—who supports tort reform—told a recent meeting of the National Association of Insurance Brokers that "more complete disclosure of claims data and the positive impact various tort reforms might produce must be forthcoming—and soon." He added, quite rightfully, "policy makers need hard data—good solid reliable data—if they are to take up the civil justice reform cause in earnest."

The CEO concludes, "without the basic data, we won't win even the most basic reforms."

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing today will provide that basic data. By requiring insurance companies to report a wide range of information annually to the Secretary of Commerce, the Insurance Information Act of 1986 will create a base of independently verified and independently analyzed statistics, data that should be a prerequisite to any major reform. Specifically, the act will provide information on claims paid during the regular course of business, claims paid as a result of court judgments and as a result of out-of-court settlements, money paid for legal costs and other payouts—all for specific classes of business, from municipalities to ice skating rinks. Also, it will provide data on investment income and reserves, on premium changes and coverage limits.

The act provides that the Secretary of Commerce compile a report with an analysis and send it to the States, to Members of Congress and to the President. The numbers in the annual report will provide answers to some

very important questions. Has there been a litigation explosion in recent years? The data will tell us. Have court awards and out-of-court settlements been skyrocketing? The data will tell us. Have insurance companies been forced to funnel large sums to lawyers defending against frivolous suits? Does the loss experience of, say, nurse/midwives justify cancellation of coverage? Is there a some sort of collusion among insurance companies? Why have so many insurance companies gone under recently? The data will tell us.

And State and Federal legislators will have the information to ground any legislative reforms in statistics and substance, not catchy anecdotes.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the Insurance Information Act is designed to assist the States in their role as primary regulators of the insurance industry, helping them respond more swiftly than they can now to the wide-swinging insurance cycles. Currently, State regulators are restricted by their resources to general data collected chiefly to monitor potential insolvencies. Almost all the businesses, professionals and municipalities suffering from the current liability insurance drought are tucked away in one line in the State reporting form under "other liability." That information is unverified and provided only at the discretion of insurance companies to the States, about half of which don't even have accredited actuaries to analyze the numbers.

This program is not new. In recent congressional testimony, the General Accounting Office's Chief Economist described a 1979 GAO study which found that "insurance departments lacked sufficient information to regulate effectively."

The current crisis confirms that the insurance industry is cyclical in nature, and that the information available to State regulators was not sufficient to prevent insurance companies from drastic premium cutting several years ago when high interest rates sparked a desire for investment money. It is also generally accepted that that rate cutting has played a role in the current insurance shortfall.

State regulators have said that if they had earlier access to information on significant rate slashing or coverage expansion they would have been able to soften the blow of the current crisis. The Insurance Information Act will provide State regulators with that important information.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make one more point about the bill I am introducing today. Although the legislation is now loaded with specific reporting requirements, legislators might find on reflection that some necessary information is not now in the bill, or that the bill requires some information that is not necessary. Indeed, legislators might conclude that a reporting requirement should apply not just to insurance companies, but to cities and large companies that self-insure, or even to the court system, or to all litigants themselves. Perhaps we will be convinced that what we need is some kind of national center of litigation statistics. That is all fine with me. What I am wedded to is the idea behind the bill—that State and Federal legislators need reliable and comprehensive information before considering major legislative reform. I am certainly willing to work with all

interested parties to produce a bill that will produce that data.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we face today not only an insurance crisis, but an information crisis—a crisis, because the momentum of conventional wisdom and saturation lobbying may force the enactment of radical legislation that time and hard data may prove counterproductive or worse.

I am ready to support measures that will help businesses, professionals, and municipalities in the short run. For the long haul, I urge my colleagues to resist proposals for major change and to support something along the lines of the sunshine legislation I am introducing today.

I insert the text of the bill at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. —

A bill to provide for the collection of independently verified data regarding certain insurance matters, to make such data available to certain State and Federal officials for use in making policy decisions and determinations with respect to the insurance industry, and for other purposes

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Insurance Information Act of 1986".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) no independent data-gathering body exists within the Federal government or elsewhere—

(A) to compile and analyze insurance statistics, and

(B) to analyze the relationship between insurance premiums and the civil justice system,

in order to assist the States, Congress, and the President in formulating policy relating to the insurance industry;

(2) the States presently lack sufficient data on insurance-related trends in their own States and in other States in order to act in their capacity as the primary regulators of the insurance industry.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to assure the availability of independently verified insurance data by requiring insurance companies which issue commercial insurance policies to report information relating to such policies to the Secretary; and

(2) to aid the President, Congress, and the States by requiring the Secretary—

(A) to analyze the data reported,

(B) to provide such data and analysis to the States for use in their capacity as the primary regulators of the insurance industry, and

(C) to provide such data to the States, Congress, and the President for use in monitoring the relationship between the civil justice system and the cost of obtaining commercial insurance coverage.

SEC. 4. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) An insurance company which issues a commercial insurance policy shall report to the Secretary the information described in subsection (b) after January 1, but not later than March 31, of each year.

(2) Each report under paragraph (1) shall contain such information for the calendar

year preceding the calendar year in which such report is filed.

(b) **INFORMATION TO BE REPORTED.**—The information required to be reported by an insurance company under subsection (a) is the following:

(1) For each class of business insured by a commercial insurance policy issued by such company, listed within each State in which such company issues any such policy—

(A) the sum of the value of—

- (i) premiums written, and
- (ii) premiums earned,

(B) the total number of units of exposure, as prescribed by the Secretary in regulations;

(C) the lowest and highest premiums charged per unit of exposure;

(D) exclusive of legal costs incurred, the sum of the value of claims paid, and a distribution by size of claims paid—

(i) in the regular course of business under terms of coverage,

(ii) as awards in judicial proceedings arising out of terms of coverage, and

(iii) in out of court settlements relating to and completed after institution of judicial proceedings arising out of terms of coverage;

(E) the sum of the value of claims paid, and a distribution by size of claims paid, as awards in judicial proceedings arising out of terms of coverage, listed according to various categories of such payments, including compensation for economic loss, punitive, damages, and damages for pain and suffering, as prescribed by the Secretary in regulations as necessary and appropriate to the purposes of this Act;

(F) the total value of administrative expenses;

(G) the total value of reserves, and the value of reserves per unit of exposure;

(H) the sum of the value of legal costs incurred while settling claims, broken down by attorneys' fees and other legal costs as prescribed by the Secretary in regulations—

(i) in judicial proceedings arising out of terms of coverage,

(ii) in out of court settlements relating to and completed after institution of judicial proceedings arising out of terms of coverage, and

(iii) in the regular course of business under terms of coverage

which resulted in awards of payments of money to an insured;

(K) the sum of the value of legal costs incurred, broken down by attorneys' fees and other legal costs as prescribed by the Secretary in regulations—

(i) in judicial proceedings arising out of terms of coverage,

(ii) in out of court settlements relating to and completed after institution of judicial proceedings arising out of terms of coverage, and

(iii) in the regular course of business under terms of coverage

which did not result in awards or payments of money to an insured.

(L) the sum of the value of actual economic loss caused by any business, non-profit or governmental entity insured by any such policy, and a distribution by size of such economic loss, as estimated by the insuring company.

(M) the percentage of all such policies—

(i) which were cancelled by such company, and

(ii) which expired and were not renewed by such company.

(4) A list of classes of business for which the average premium per unit of exposure, upon renewal, was—

(A) increased by at least 25 percent, or

(B) decreased by at least 15 percent, from the premium that was charged for such policy or for a similar policy for the same customer during the year preceding the year for which the information is reported, specifying the percentage and total amount of change of the premium for each such policy.

(5) A list of classes of business for which the average coverage limit per unit of exposure was—

(A) increased by at least 25 percent,

(B) decreased by at least 15 percent, from the coverage limits under such policy or under a similar policy for the same customer during the year preceding the year for which information is reported.

(6) The value of all investment income received by such company, and, listed separately, the value of all other income received by such company, as determined by the Secretary to be necessary to calculate equity by class of business.

(7) The percentage of investment income received by such company allocated to its commercial operations, and the method of allocation.

(8) Such other information as the Secretary considers necessary and appropriate to the purposes of this Act.

(c) **CERTIFICATION OF REPORT.**—(1) A report required for this section shall be accompanied by a certificate of an independent public accountant verifying the accuracy of such report.

(2) Such certificate shall be based upon an audit of such scope and procedure and containing such information as the Secretary considers appropriate to the purposes of this Act.

(d) **EXEMPTION FROM REPORTING.**—The Secretary may exempt an insurance company from the reporting requirements of this Act upon a determination by the Secretary that reporting by such company—

(1) would be unnecessary to the purposes of this Act, and

(2) would impose an unreasonable burden on such company.

SEC. 5. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—(1) The Secretary shall, not later than September 30 of each year, issue a report which summarizes the information reported under section 4 as compiled and analyzed in accordance with subsection (b).

(2) A copy of such report shall be sent to—

(A) the Governor of each State, for transmittal to the State officer of employee in charge of insurance regulation;

(B) each Member of Congress;

(C) the President;

(D) the Comptroller General; and

(E) the Director of the Congressional Research Service.

(3) Copies of such report shall be available for distribution to the public upon request.

(b) **PREPARATION OF REPORT.**—In preparing a report under subsection (a), the Secretary shall compile and analyze, for each State and for all States, the data reported under section 4, as follows:

(1) Compile such data for each class of business within each State.

(2) Analyze such data—

(A) for any differences—

(i) among States, and

(ii) among insurance companies, in coverage of similar classes of business;

(B) for any relationship between claims paid and fluctuations in premiums charged and coverage limits;

(C) for any relationship between payments made as a result of judicial proceedings, payments made as a result of out-of-court settlements, payments made in the regular course of business, and insurance premiums; and

(D) any other information the Secretary deems necessary and appropriate to the purposes of this Act.

(c) **RESTRICTION ON DISCLOSURE.**—(1) Information required to be reported by an insurance company under Section 4 shall not be disclosed other than in a report prepared by the Secretary under this section.

(2) A report under this section shall not identify such information as having been reported by a particular insurance company except as explicitly authorized by this Act.

(3) Section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to an officer or employee of the United States who discloses such information other than as provided in this Act.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act.

(1) the term "class business" means a category of business, non-profit, or governmental entity characterized by a similarity of purpose, activity, and associated risks (such as day care centers, nurse/midwives, architects, and municipalities), as prescribed by the Secretary in regulations;

(2) the term "commercial insurance policy" means an insurance policy issued to a business, non-profit, or governmental entity, which insures against damage or injury occurring—

(A) as a result of the commercial non-profit, or governmental activities of such entity,

(B) on the property of such entity, or

(C) to the property of such entity.

(3) the term "insurance company" means an entity engaged in the business of insurance or administration of any commercial insurance policy in any State, and includes risk retention groups (as that term is defined in section 2(a)(1) of the Product Liability Risk Retention Act of 1981);

(4) the term "legal costs" means attorney fees, court costs, and associated expenses;

(5) the term "premiums charged" means money or other value paid to an insurance company in return for a contractual obligation to insure against certain risks;

(6) the term "reserve" means money or other value set aside for payment of a claim;

(7) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce;

(8) the term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the territories and possessions of the United States; and

(9) the term "unit of exposure" means the basic unit for measuring risk in a class of business (such as payroll, or number of children in a day care center), as prescribed by the Secretary in regulations;

SEC. 7. PENALTY.

Any person who—

(1) fails to file a report in accordance with the requirements of this Act and regulations promulgated under this Act, or

(2) knowingly makes any false statement or omission of fact in such a report,

shall upon conviction be fined not more than \$100,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

SEC. 8. REGULATIONS.

(1) Within 90 days following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(A) issue such regulations as may be necessary to implement this Act,

(B) issue a list of standard classes of business and of standard units of exposure for which any commercial insurance company must report data under the terms of this Act,

(C) work with all interested parties including Congress and issue a reporting form to be used by commercial insurance companies to carry out the purposes of this Act.

WOO FETED BY LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEMOCRATS

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention and the attention of our colleagues some of the achievements of the distinguished Los Angeles City Councilman, the Honorable Michael Woo.

Councilman Michael Woo is one of the best prepared individuals ever to hold a public leadership post in the city of Los Angeles. He is the first urban planner to serve on the City Council. Councilman Woo holds a master's degree in city planning from one of the Nation's top universities, the University of California, Berkeley.

Michael Woo is not only the first city planner to sit on the Los Angeles Council, he is also the first Asian-American to serve in this capacity. This is particularly significant in view of the burgeoning Asian and Asian-American population in southern California.

Michael Woo represents not only a large Asian community, his district also includes such varied constituencies as Hispanics, Armenians, Jews, and a very substantial number of members of Hollywood's famed creative community. The district is also distinguished by large populations of gays and senior citizens. Councilman Woo is widely respected for his sensitivity to the varied needs of his constituents.

On May 29, 1986, the Los Angeles County Democratic Central Committee will hold its annual John F. Kennedy Memorial Dinner. Councilman Michael Woo has been designated, "Countywide Democrat of the Year." I ask my fellow Members of the House of Representatives to join me in a bipartisan salute to this outstanding young government official.

DEMOCRACY ON THE MOVE

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy challenges which confront our country in today's world are many and varied. With the global order reeling from acts of terror, it is more important than ever to vigorously pursue a course that preserves the freedoms inherent in democracy.

Although the 1980's continues to be a time of turbulence and misunderstanding in the international community it has also presented this Nation with an opportunity to offer hope to all our friends who espouse the principles of democracy.

Recent trends in global affairs have made it necessary for our Nation to adopt a bold and imaginative foreign policy which will help shape events in accordance with our vision of a safer and more peaceful world community.

Throughout the world we have begun to see a democratic renaissance; one where the basic principles of liberty are taking hold in country after country, demonstrating a desire for and appeal to the framework of our ideals.

Although our system of democracy is a powerful incentive to developing nations we are still hard pressed to face the challenges of communism and terrorism which plague this planet at epidemic levels.

In meeting these challenges one fact remains undeniable—the yearning for political freedom continues to be the most desirable goal for most members of the international forum. As the strongest democracy on Earth we play an integral role in the support of peoples who aspire to the basic freedoms that we as U.S. citizens enjoy today.

The clearest example of this whirlwind of democracy has been in Latin America, where Guatemala has been the latest to join the ranks of countries who have opted for civilian government in lieu of the oppressive military regimes of the past. As Secretary of State George Shultz recently stated: "In the last 6 years, elected civilian governments have replaced authoritarian regimes in Argentina, Guatemala, Honduras, Peru, and Uruguay. Over 90 percent of all people in Latin America and the Caribbean now enjoy democracy as opposed to less than one-third in the early 1980's." It is clear that the peoples of these countries have realized that the basic freedoms offered by democracy, such as the right to vote, to worship and to speak openly, provide a wider range of opportunities for themselves and their children than the false promises offered by the past regimes.

Undoubtedly, our moral economic and security assistance can make the difference between the success and failure of these fledgling democracies. Our commitment to human rights, social and economic progress place us in a leadership role that must continue to be a source of inspiration to all young democratic nations.

The Soviet Union continues to pose a serious challenge not only to this Nation but to the interests of the free world as well. Though our countries represent philosophies that are at opposite ends of the spectrum, the spiraling arms race has encouraged us to pursue a constructive dialog with the Soviet Union whenever we can without abandoning our basic principles.

Successful negotiations with the Soviets in the future will remain contingent upon American strength. In dealing with the Soviet Union, American diplomacy and strength serve similar purposes. Our defense preparedness along with a continued commitment to the strategic defense initiative remain crucial to the idea of international stability. Our defensive posture in nuclear weaponry makes our negotiating posi-

tion much more viable in realizing the universal goal of a safer world.

Perhaps the most important challenge facing our Nation continues to be international terrorism. The attacks at the West Berlin nightclub and the Rome Airport which were supported by the Libyan regime solidify our resolve to track down and punish the perpetrators and sponsors of these unconscionable acts.

Terrorism is simply international warfare conducted and aided by a handful of radical governments which follow an archaic philosophy seeking to undermine democracies throughout the world. The growing sentiment from the international community is that apathy and appeasement offer no solution to the problem of terrorism. We must continue to improve our intelligence efforts and develop closer cooperation and coordination with other governments to combat this problem.

One point that must be made clear is that the U.S. Government will act swiftly and effectively against terrorist activities and that those governments which aid these international criminals will be held accountable in the strictest terms. The lives of Americans abroad must and will be protected.

As we move forward to meet the challenges of the future, we as a nation must continue to advocate and support the ideals and principles of democracy for young developing nations to emulate. America must remain a beacon of hope and a model of democracy if we are to preserve and advance peace, freedom, and security in the world community.

A TRIBUTE TO THE C.J. FOLGER HOOK AND LADDER COMPANY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the C.J. Folger Hook and Ladder Co. of Geneva, NY, with an excerpt from the 100th anniversary book by A.M. Learned.

One hundred years ago in the spring of 1886, 27 Geneva men signed the charter of the newly organized company of the Geneva Fire Department and chose the name of Charles J. Folger Hook and Ladder Co. No. 1.

In choosing the name, they honored a former fireman and company foreman who had contributed generously to the company's equipment fund. They also memorialized one who perhaps could be called Geneva's highest ranking citizen. Judge Folger, former chief justice of the Court of Appeals of New York State, was, at the time of his death, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States in the cabinet of President Chester A. Arthur.

Folger's death made Geneva the capital of the Nation for the day of his funeral in 1884. Everyone, from President Arthur, Governor Grover Cleveland, and thousands of others came to the city to attend the funeral. Statisticians of that day said 40,000 were there for the rites.

The Folger Hook and Ladder Co. has progressed from its hand-drawn equipment to its present day aerialscope that reaches the tall-

est building in Geneva. Its present day membership of nearly 100 faithfully attend meetings and drills for acquiring the newest skills in firemanship. Geneva continues to be well-served by the hook and ladder company which last year answered 195 fire calls. The members are to be congratulated on keeping prepared for the next 100 years as they mark their first century.

**KANSAS CITY, KANSAS, HONORS
THREE SMALL BUSINESSES**

HON. JAN MEYERS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today the Kansas City Kansas Chamber of Commerce honors three of its small business members for their achievements and contributions to the Kansas City, KS economy and community as a whole.

Riverview Greenhouse and Nursery, owned by Bob Johnson and Mike Murray, has been selected the "Small Business of the Year." Opening for business in 1983, Riverview Greenhouses have averaged a 100-percent growth rate each year. Riverview has been an active participant in the renewed spirit of Kansas City, KS and has contributed greatly to the beautification of the entire community.

Having been in operation for nearly 1 year, M&M Discovery House, an educational day care center, is recognized as the "New Small Business of the Year." Owners Betty and Ann Moninger, a mother-daughter team, have tried to gear their program to meet both the mental and physical abilities of each child's age group with respect to meals, exercise, rest and outdoor activities. The University of Missouri at Kansas City has sent students to observe its operation.

Receiving the Chamber's award as the "Small Business with Outstanding Civic Contribution and Involvement" is Plastic Packaging Corp. In addition to providing a livelihood for 32 families, its President, David T. Raden, has shown what corporate citizenship is all about with his active personal and company support and involvement in People Helping People, Junior Achievement, the Cerebral Palsy Foundation, and the Cystic Fibrosis Association, to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the public service and generosity of these fine Kansas people who embody the spirit of the Kansas Motto "Ad Astra Per aspera" . . . "To the Stars Through Difficulties."

AMERICANISM AWARD

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Rev. Dr. Grant E. Harrity and Anne Harrity, citizens of Allentown the Lehigh Valley. On June 3, the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith

presents its Americanism Award with great pride to these inspired leaders and warm, compassionate human beings.

Dr. Harrity, the president of Phoebe-Devitt Homes, is a UCC minister who has served in the parish ministry for 35 years in Hagerstown, Coopersburg, Sunbury and Allentown. Dr. Harrity's commitment to the health, spiritual and educational needs of his community has involved him in a wide array of activities. Board chairman of HealthEast, Inc., he was elected to two terms on the Allentown School Board and 4 years as its president. He was an organizer and the first president of the Planned Parenthood Association of Lehigh County and has served on the board of numerous other organizations.

He is a trustee of Cedar Crest College and a director of Park & Shop Inc. His activities in church affairs include serving on the board of directors of the Penn Northeast Conference and its executive committees. He was a member of the Board for World Ministries for 8 years and has been a delegate to two general Synods.

Anne Markley Harrity, the recipient of the 1984 Allentown Human Relations Award, is as committed to serving her community as her husband. She serves on the boards of organizations dedicated to improving the quality of life for all citizens, regardless of race, religion, class or ethnic background. Among her past and present board associations are the Pennsylvania Stage Col.; Lehigh County United Fund; Lehigh County Office of Children and Youth; Cedar Crest College Board of Associates; and Women's Advisory Board of the Allentown Center City Association. She is the past president of the Allentown YWCA and the Board of Trustee of the Allentown YM-YWCA. She served as a director of Allentown Hospital and for two years as Allentown chairperson of the Channel 39 auction, to mention but a few of her activities.

Mr. Speaker, the Harritys have combined an extraordinary ability to fulfill the high expectations of parenthood with an exceptional devotion to their community. The young as well as the Harritys' peers may look to them for inspiration.

My wife, Edie, and I have had the distinct pleasure to be the Harritys' personal friends and we both feel that our lives and the lives of the citizens of the Lehigh Valley are enriched by Grant and Anne Harrity.

**PROTECTING OUR
SUPERCOMPUTERS**

HON. TERRY L. BRUCE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Science and Technology held a Joint Hearing on International Science and Technology Policy. One of the areas that the committees are particularly concerned with is the establishment of a new executive branch interagency Committee for International Science, Engineering and Technology. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this new commit-

tee will quickly move to consider the question of who will be allowed access to one particularly valuable yet vulnerable technology—our Nation's supercomputers.

These new supercomputers are the crown jewels of U.S. high technology. We call them supercomputers because they can make an amazing 100 million calculations per second. These machines are used in the Nation's most complicated research on everything from subatomic physics to Star Wars. Our national security demands that we develop a comprehensive policy which will guard this technology while maximizing its use in vital scientific research.

Currently, we have no such policy.

The technology required to build a supercomputer is an extremely complex and closely guarded secret. There are only about 150 supercomputers in the world, including a few on U.S. university campuses. We don't export this technology to unfriendly countries, and the Soviets haven't been able to develop an equivalent computer.

The Department of Defense has been outspoken in expressing its fear that permitting unrestricted access to our supercomputers would allow unfriendly nations to develop a supercomputer of their own. According to the Pentagon, if the Soviets succeed in such an effort, they could leapfrog several generations of computer technology. As a result, we could lose much of the economic and military advantage this technology offers.

Last year, officials from several scientific and defense agencies began working on ways to protect this technology against unauthorized acquisition. Unfortunately, they have focused almost entirely on developing a policy to deny all Eastern bloc scholars access to our university supercomputers. They have ignored the greatest security risk—the fact that Eastern bloc researchers can gain access to a supercomputer simply by buying time through the private sector.

While it is important to protect university supercomputers, it is imperative to develop a policy regarding access through the private sector. Indeed, without a policy for private access, controls for universities become superfluous.

It is already extremely difficult to get time on a university supercomputer. Each application is submitted to the National Science Foundation to be evaluated by no less than 10 experts through the scientific peer review process. Eastern bloc researchers receive special scrutiny. If there are any unusual applications, such as requests for very large amounts of time, the review is even more stringent. In addition, university researchers must publish their results. This provides a responsible before and after check that makes sure our technology is not being misused by foreign researchers.

The Pentagon's plan of imposing a blanket prohibition against Eastern bloc scholars using university supercomputers is not only unnecessary, it is counterproductive. Scientists from unfriendly nations have historically been of significant assistance to our country on important technological and military projects. Any access policy we develop must be flexible

enough to allow us to use friendly scientists from unfriendly nations.

Perhaps the best example of the national security benefits of scientists from unfriendly nations working with the United States is Enrico Fermi. Fermi was a native of Mussolini's Italy, but during World War II he spearheaded the Manhattan project that enabled the United States to become the first Nation to develop atomic weapons. One shudders to think of the implications of denying Fermi, or Werner von Braun, access to our best facilities because they born in nations which were unfriendly to us at a particular point in history. The Government should guard against KGB agents masquerading as students to get at our supercomputers, through visa controls, but a blanket prohibition based on birthplace would be a crude and foolhardy solution.

The Pentagon's plan also wouldn't solve the problem. The most vulnerable supercomputers are those in the private sector. A recent advertisement for Boeing Computer Services specifically invites researchers to use Boeing's supercomputer available now via our international teleprocessing network. Why would the Russians bother to go through the complicated peer review process at a university when it's possible simply to pick up a phone and dial a supercomputer from their lab in the Eastern bloc?

We need to stop concentrating on university supercomputers and develop a comprehensive policy that includes the private sector. Commercial time-sharing companies should be required to exercise the same, or greater degree of caution as practiced by universities. Commercial vendors must not be allowed to sell supercomputer time to just anyone who can afford the \$1,000 an hour tab.

The new interagency Committee on International Science, Engineering and Technology should move to consider this issue in a timely fashion. It is important for our Nation's defense and technology security.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

USER FEES—COAST GUARD SEARCH AND RESCUE

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a constituent of mine—an upstanding member of the Phoenix community—Stephen C. Shadegg—regarding proposed user fees to support Coast Guard search and rescue programs. A boat owner himself, who would be subject to such fees, Mr. Shadegg eloquently states the case in favor of their imposition to cover the specialized services which benefit only ocean boaters.

His comments make eminently good sense, and I commend them to my colleagues:

STEPHEN SHADEGG ASSOCIATES, INC.,
Phoenix, AZ, May 12, 1986.

Hon. ELDON RUDD,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RUDD: For more than 25 years I have owned a small pleasure power boat. In the course of a year we take

our boat to Lake Powell for a couple of weeks and then to the Pacific Ocean for three or four weeks. The rest of the time we keep it in a slip at Saguaro Lake not far from the city of Phoenix.

When we are on the Pacific Ocean, berthed in Newport Harbor, we keep our marine radios tuned to the emergency channel. Hardly a day goes by without our overhearing some boater frantically calling on the Coast Guard for assistance.

Sometimes these troubled boaters have run out of fuel. Sometimes they are lost. Sometimes they have power plant trouble. The Coast Guard is always there, reassuring, prompt to respond, offering a solution to the difficulty. That Coast Guard emergency radio is the boater's lifeline.

About a year ago, Congressman Rudd, I joined a national boat owners' association. Some months ago I was shocked when I received an urgent communication from the association begging me to write my congressman and oppose a measure they said was coming before the Congress of the United States. i.e., a measure which would require pleasure boat owners to pay a small annual fee to help support the Coast Guard's Search and Rescue missions.

The communication did not specify what the fee would be, but I gathered it would be perhaps as much as \$100 for owners of boats under 30 feet.

That letter outraged me. Most of the pleasure boats in the Newport Harbor represent an investment of at least \$50,000 and some of the boats are worth more than a million.

Owning a pleasure boat is not an inexpensive hobby. Insurance runs about \$1,000 a year. Maintenance is probably \$15 an hour for every hour of operation, and when you are not using the boat, you still have to maintain it. A slip rents for from \$4 per foot upwards per month.

Cruising around Newport Harbor, I concluded that most of the boat owners who enjoy that area spend from \$10,000 to \$50,000 a year on their hobby.

The boat owners' association selfishly wants to enlist us to oppose a very reasonable fee for a vital service.

Anyone who can afford a power boat capable of use on the oceans could certainly afford to spend \$100 a year to keep the Coast Guard Search and Rescue phase alive and working.

To demand that the taxpayers of the United States subsidize this specialized service which benefits only ocean boaters is an unworthy, greedy action.

I will admit, Congressman, that many boaters get into trouble because of their own folly. They run out of fuel. They have not maintained their engines properly. They never bother to learn enough about navigation to keep from getting lost.

I have never had to call the Coast Guard for search and rescue, and I pray to God I never will. But if that time comes, I want them to be there and I am willing to pay my share for their cost of operation.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN C. SHADEGG.

P.S. We now own a 28-foot Bertram fly-bridge cruiser. We have two engines, an automatic Fire-quench system, two compasses, two marine radios. We have never run out of fuel or water. But for that unexpected emergency, the Coast Guard Search and Rescue is our lifeline.

MONEY AND POLITICS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, May 21, 1986, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MONEY AND POLITICS

Money has come to be a strong, sometimes even dominant, influence in American politics. Million-dollar congressional campaigns are no longer unusual, and many candidates receive hundreds of thousands of dollars from special interest political action committees (PAC's). The torrent of money threatens the basic idea of representative government.

The problem stems largely from the soaring costs of campaigning. Successful campaigns increasingly involve greater television advertising, expanded direct mail operations, sophisticated public opinion polling, and the like, but these costs have risen sharply. In less than 10 years, the cost of the average winning House campaign has more than tripled, to almost \$300,000, while the average winning Senate candidate in 1984 spent almost \$3 million. The importance of money in winning an election is clear. Of the 435 House races in 1984, 401 were won by the candidate who spent the most.

The high cost of campaigning has caused several problems. Candidates, whether challengers or incumbents, must spend an enormous amount of their time fundraising; some pile up huge campaign debts; many dip into personal fortunes; and most must rely heavily upon campaign contributions from special interest groups. With an eye to campaign costs, Members often choose committee assignments with the best money-raising potential. The current financing system also heavily favors incumbents. Almost three-fourths of all PAC money flows to current officeholders whose multi-million dollar war chests often scare off potential challengers. It is becoming increasingly the case that "moderate income persons need not apply."

Perhaps the greatest threat of the growing importance of money in politics is the possibility of special interests buying influence in Congress. This is a serious concern, though it is sometimes overstated. PACs usually give money to Members whose voting records they like, so it is not surprising that Members following their past voting records will often vote the PAC line. Moreover, the recent worries, for example, of huge amounts of PAC money going to members of the taxwriting committees turned out to be largely unfounded as they voted to gut several major special interest tax breaks. Members of Congress recognize that their voting records are much more important to their getting re-elected than are PAC contributions. Yet it would be a mistake to think that the recent explosion in special interest campaign money is totally healthy. It is an unusual Member who can take thousands of dollars from a group and not be affected by it. I have the uneasy feeling that the present system—where politicians need lots of money to get elected, where decisions may be made on the basis of money, and where money, at the very least, buys timely access to politicians—leaves us

some distance from the way the democratic system is supposed to work. Politicians have a more difficult time focusing on the key question in any public policy debate: what is the national interest.

My sense is that most of my constituents think that something is wrong with the system. They believe that the moneyed interests have a prior claim on their representatives. They sense that representative government is threatened by too much money in the system, especially special interest money, and they are prepared to support some tough measures to correct it. Campaign financing reforms currently being considered by Congress include capping the total amount of money a candidate could accept from PACs, increasing the amounts political parties may give to candidates, setting up a national commission to recommend campaign finance changes, providing public financing for congressional campaigns, and expanding the tax credits for individual political contributions.

Yet we must recognize the limits of reform. Past overhauls of campaign financing have often caused as many problems as they have solved. For example, the 1970s reforms contributed to the explosion of PAC contributions. Reforms should not curtail freedom of political expression or prohibit groups with a stake in the issues from contributing to candidates. Moreover, the cost of many campaigns is not that large, and the total spent on all House and Senate campaigns in 1984 combined was still only half of what one soap company spent on advertising that year.

I do not think that there is one simple solution to the growing importance of money in politics. We must make various changes in the campaign financing law, such as trying to increase the importance of individual contributors and the political parties to counterbalance the influence of special interest PAC's. We must also stress public disclosure of campaign finances. The voters can do much to lessen the need for campaign financing reform by reacting negatively to excessive campaign spending and excessive PAC contributions. The effectiveness of public disclosure could be increased if Congress would pass a clear, nonbinding statement of what kinds of campaign spending levels Congress itself considers to be clearly excessive. Finally, we must go after the root cause of the explosion in campaign spending: the sharply increasing costs of campaigning. We might consider following the lead of most other industrial democracies and provide free television time to candidates. We should also consider public financing of congressional races, similar to the current mechanism for funding presidential campaigns. My view is that the ultimate solution—difficult to obtain now—would involve some sort of public financing of congressional campaigns, with limits on the amounts that can be spent, limits on political advertising, and limits on the total amount candidates may accept from PAC's.

A decade of congressional inaction on the influences of money on politics has undermined confidence in our representative system. I would like to see a deep commitment by both parties to making significant changes in the campaign financing law. There may be legitimate disagreement about how best to achieve that goal, but should be no disagreement about the need to act now to protect the integrity of the

system and to allow our democratic system to function competitively.

TO COMMEND ERIC LING FOR HIS ACHIEVEMENT IN READING

HON. H. JAMES SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend my constituent, Eric Ling, for his achievement in reading.

The Six Flags Corp. is celebrating its 25th anniversary this year. In honor of this event, Six Flags developed "Read to Succeed," a reading motivation program designed to encourage leisure-time reading among children in grades three through eight. As part of the "Read to Succeed" program, Six Flags introduced a national reading contest. Each contestant had to design an advertisement, written or drawn, of a favorite book. Over 4,000 entries were received from students all over the country.

Eric Ling, of Medford, NJ, submitted an advertisement for the book, "Ribsy," by Beverly Cleary. Eric's advertisement was chosen as regional fourth grade winner out of 214 entries from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York. Eric was then selected as the national fourth grade winner from the nine regional winners, representing the nine amusement parks operated by Six Flags Corp.

Eric's entry shows his dedication to and understanding of the importance of leisure-time reading. His intelligence and perception are reflected in the talented advertisement he submitted to the contest. His success, and that of the other five winners, should stand as an example to us all, that only through reading and learning will the children of today become the leaders of tomorrow. I am proud to have such a potential leader in the 13th Congressional District of New Jersey.

Therefore, I am certain that the other Members of the House will join me in congratulating Eric Ling and his parents on this important occasion.

THE YEAR 2061

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, on May 30, 1986, the Planetarium Assistants Club of Central Dauphin High School will commemorate the passage of Halley's Comet by interring a time capsule in Harrisburg, PA. The time capsule will be reopened in the year 2061, the year Halley's Comet is scheduled to reappear in our section of the solar system.

Today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be included among the items preserved for the future. Each page of today's record is a piece of history as are the events that are occurring in the world around us from the news of the

nuclear disaster at the Chernobyl power plant near Kiev, U.S.S.R., which has had an adverse affect on thousands of Soviet citizens and has once again brought before the international community the questions of the safety of nuclear power; to the contest between two Canadian teams, the Calgary Flames and Montreal Canadiens, for Hockey's Stanley Cup. Every event will be made a part of history from the national events such as the reelection of Teamster Union President Jackie Presser in light of his recent indictment of Federal racketeering and embezzlement of union funds to local events such as the nominations of Republican William Scranton, III, and Democrat Robert Casey for Governor of Pennsylvania and Senator ARLEN SPECTER and U.S. Representative ROBERT EDGAR for U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, no one knows what the future holds for our world, country, or neighborhoods. We can only hope that the actions we take today and in the days, weeks and years to come will allow future generations to share the freedom and happiness we have been privileged to experience and that the items contained in this time capsule will give our progeny a better understanding of our lives in 1986.

A TRIBUTE TO J. GARFIELD DEMARCO

HON. H. JAMES SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to J. Garfield DeMarco, the chairman of the Burlington County Republican Party, whose record of success and public achievement has brought him recognition throughout the State of New Jersey.

Garfield's tenure as chairman of the GOP in Burlington County, NJ, is longer than any of the other 20 Republican county chairmen in our great State. Yet Garfield's contribution to the formation of public policy and the quest for sound government transcends partisan politics.

Those who attempt to analyze the interests and activities of Garfield DeMarco find him very much an enigma. Yet he emerges as an individual with a very basic philosophy in his approach to government at all levels. He seeks candidates who represent more than a philosophy—they must be capable of holding office in a responsible manner, or making intelligent decisions, and of safeguarding the taxpayers' dollars and trust.

In a recent interview in the Burlington County Times, NJ, newspaper, reporter Betsy Anderson recorded Garfield as saying: "We must have candidates who believe in individual freedom, individual rights and home rule, and who will see to it that the great powers in Trenton and Washington are limited and, if possible, cut back."

From this basic premise, Garfield has accomplished much. His history of leadership

will long be reflected in both personal substance and election statistics.

It is also of interest, Mr. Speaker, that the personal background of J. Garfield DeMarco and his family is akin to other stories which mark the growth of this country through dedication to hard work and enterprises. His paternal grandfather came to this country in the early 1880's, settled in the Pinelands' region of southern New Jersey, and began a trucking and produce business which has given rise to one of the largest cranberry farming operations in the State. Today, it is Garfield who keeps watch over the family business.

Garfield's own leadership qualities surfaced early. From being president of his high school class, he graduated cum laude with honors from Dartmouth and was chosen to join Phi Beta Kappa. He received a Fulbright scholarship to study in Italy in 1959, and graduated from Yale Law School in 1964. He continues to build upon his education, and his strong intelligence and intellect mark his character.

Mr. Speaker, this evening a large gathering of personal friends and acquaintances of J. Garfield DeMarco will pay tribute to him at a testimonial dinner being held in his honor. It is, without dispute, a most fitting and certainly well-deserved tribute.

It is individuals of J. Garfield DeMarco's caliber who nurture the political process and system of elected government which is so important to this Nation and its people. For this reason, I ask my fellow colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating and commending Garfield on this most memorable occasion.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN D. ISAACS ON HIS FORTY-FIRST BIRTHDAY

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, a great American turned 41 years old, and as he continues his travels throughout the Capitol and into middle age, I would like to pay tribute to his long service to the cause of arms control.

John D. Isaacs' dedicated and arduous battle in the cause of arms control has had its own modest beginnings. Having earned his first political badges of honor at Dartmouth College, John came in from the cold of Hanover, New Hampshire, and served our Nation honorably in the Foreign Service in Southeast Asia.

After returning home, and spending little time in White Plains, New York, John came to Washington, DC, where he entered into the service of our esteemed colleague from New York, Representative STEVEN SOLARZ. Here, John again distinguished himself in learning the ropes and gaining an understanding of our laws are made.

From here, John made his way to Ameri-

cans for Democratic Action, where he served as Legislative Representative for Foreign Policy. From there, he moved on to his current position as legislative director for the Council for a Livable World, where he presides as a key strategist for the public interest in developing and implementing better, long-term U.S. arms control policies.

John's contributions and assistance in securing passage of congressionally sponsored arms control initiatives is indeed noteworthy. His efforts and support for congressional bans on the production and deployment of binary chemical munitions, and the testing of antisatellite weapons are well known, as are his efforts in behalf of securing passage of a congressional endorsement for a resumption of comprehensive nuclear test ban negotiations.

In working with John, I am constantly impressed with his tireless commitment to getting the job done well, and on time. Oftentimes, it is John's cooler head that prevails in keeping our efforts on course and for that we owe him a debt of gratitude. Though short of stature and thin of hair, John casts a long shadow in the halls of the Methodist Building and over our efforts to secure a more stable and safe world which to live. While I shall be leaving Congress at the end of my present term of office, I must tell you that it has been both a pleasure and privilege to work with John, and for each of these reasons, I would like to wish him well as he passes yet another milestone in a life and career dedicated to the pursuit of arms control.

A TRIBUTE TO MS. FLORENCE BILLUPS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues in Congress the news about two outstanding educators who are retiring from service to the St. Louis Public Schools. On May 31, 1986, Florence Billups and Lilyan Russell retire from their assignments at Clark Elementary School.

Ms. Florence Billups was educated in the St. Louis Public Schools. She is a graduate of Stowe Teachers College and holds a master of arts degree from Northwestern University. She also pursued advanced studies at St. Louis University, Washington University, and the University of Illinois, Edwardsville. She is the mother of four children and the grandmother of seven.

Currently, Ms. Billups serves as the writing enrichment teacher at Clark School. Throughout her career she has sponsored a number of special school programs, and broadened the artistic awareness of her students by bringing cultural and musical groups to visit. The students of Clark School have greatly benefited from Florence Billups outstanding dedication to her work. Her accomplishments have been recognized by many organizations

and Ms. Billups has received the following awards: Top Ladies of Distinction; National Association of Negro Musicians; Clarence Wilson—Music Guild; Sigma Gamma Rho—Carver Award; West End Community Conference Service Award; Soror of the Year—Iota Phi Lambda; St. Louis Sentinel Award; Jack and Jill of America—President's Award; and the 1974 Globe-Democrat Woman of Achievement Award.

Ms. Lilyan Russell was born and educated in the State of Connecticut. Coming from a musical family, Lilyan became an accomplished pianist and played with the Junior Symphony Orchestra in Bridgeport, CT. She received a dual degree in education and music from Fisk University in Nashville.

Lilyan Russell moved to the St. Louis community when her husband, Dr. Harold Russell, accepted an internship assignment. She is the mother of three children and it was after their formative years that Ms. Russell enrolled at Harris-Stowe Teachers. After qualifying for a teaching certificate, Lilyan received an appointment to the Clark School where she stayed for 20 years.

During her early years at Clark, Lilyan Russell was very involved in the sponsorship of musical programs. As kindergarten teacher, she broadened the horizons of her young students by sponsoring a symphonic rhythm Band.

More recently, Ms. Russell worked in the Chapter I Reading Program. For many years she sponsored the Reading is Fundamental Program and brought new dimension to the program by inviting professional storytellers and encouraging staff and students to dress as storybook characters. Her students learned to consider reading an amusement instead of just another school subject.

Currently, Ms. Russell serves as secretary for the Mound City Medical Auxiliary and Russell Enterprises.

I am happy to join with the Clark School staff and the St. Louis community in honoring these outstanding educators. These ladies are celebrated today for their exceptional records of achievement. Both Ms. Russell and Ms. Billups have demonstrated a lifelong commitment to the education of our young people. Congratulations to each for having maintained a standard of excellence.

AAL RECEIVES PRESIDENT'S VOLUNTARISM AWARD

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to recognize a unique Wisconsin organization which has been chosen from more than 2,300 nominees to receive a 1986 Presidential Volunteer Action Award. This award will be given to Aid Association for Lutherans [AAL], Appleton, WI, in

recognition of the mobilization of its volunteers to conduct humanitarian, service, social and education programs in communities across the country.

As a fraternal benefit society, AAL provides its 1.4 million members in 6,400 local branches with insurance and fraternal benefits, including opportunities for volunteer service in their local communities.

In 1985, the number of volunteer hours donated by members and others involved in AAL activities exceeded 1.8 million. These volunteer efforts included fund raising for people and institutions in need, such as the young cancer patient in Strausburg, IL, who was helped by branch 679. This is but one example of the more than 10,000 fundraising activities conducted by AAL members last year.

AAL voluntarism also represents the hard work and dedication of people involved in service and educational activities, as exemplified by the efforts of 30 branches in West Virginia last year which helped people who were wiped out by extensive flooding. During 1985, AAL members were involved in more than 4,000 service and 7,500 education and health activities.

AAL's fundamental purpose is to enable Lutherans and their families to aid themselves and others. This mission frequently occurs through small, yet vitally important, service activities; but it also includes major national activities such as AAL's pledge of \$1 million to help restore the Statue of Liberty. Taken together, they represent one of the most important parts of America's heritage of voluntarism, that of neighbor helping neighbor, and they reinforce AAL's motto: "Common Concern for Human Worth."

The President will present the fifth annual Volunteer Action Award at a White House ceremony on June 2. The award categories include arts and humanities, education, the environment, health, human services, international volunteering, mobilization of volunteers, public safety, youth and the workplace. I am delighted that AAL is one of the 19 recipients of this prestigious award.

This award program is a unique cooperative effort between the private sector and Government. The program is cosponsored by VOLUNTEER—The National Center, a private, nonprofit volunteer support organization, and ACTION, the Federal agency for voluntarism. Funding for the program is provided by private-sector corporations and foundations.

H.R. 4567—CHANGED AND IMPROVED, BUT STILL TROUBLESOME FOR MICHIGAN AND MANY STATES

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Chairman WAXMAN and the Health Subcommittee in ordering reported H.R. 4567, by a vote of 16 to 9, with the amendment adopted by the subcommittee. Many of the changes reflected in the amendment improve title I of the bill in important ways. They correct several of the concerns identified by witnesses at the hearings on the bill and by communications between this committee and the Environmental Protection Agency and others. In particular, changing the calculation of sulfur emissions from an "average monthly" to an "average annual" basis to meet the 2- and 1.2-pound-per-million Btu of heat input for 1933 and 1997 is an extremely important change for all States, including Michigan.

Nevertheless, there are several matters still of concern to me that caused me to vote against the bill yesterday in subcommittee.

The new fee and subsidy provisions, for example, removed a flaw noted by the Office of Technology Assessment and others, but create new uncertainties about the adequacy and workability of the subsidy program under which Michigan ratepayers would contribute more than \$44 million annually beginning in 1989. I can reluctantly support such a contribution, in order to encourage use of efficient and effective control technology so as to preserve jobs of the Nation's coal miners, a stated purpose of the bill. But the amended version would allow a subsidy to cover all control costs, not just attributed to technology—even including costs arising from fuel switching. That could result in a great loss of jobs in such states as Alabama, Indiana, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and Kentucky, and that is highly objectionable.

I am also concerned about the impact of the bill on electricity consumers in Michigan and other States, including industrial, commercial, and agricultural ratepayers. The bill seeks to keep rates low for residential customers. While this sounds laudable, it ignores the substantial increases that would be imposed on

the other ratepayer groups. Eventually, these rate increases will affect all consumers. Michigan firms are dependent on other States for industrial products and services, such as aluminum and textiles and farm equipment. In some cases, even slight increases can determine whether a business can remain operational and competitive or shut down.

Title II of the bill, which imposes new and more stringent standards on new autos and trucks, unfortunately remains largely unchanged from the introduced bill. The new mobile source standards are not justified on health grounds, nor are they required for acid rain control reasons. Our national standards for NOx are already the most stringent of any nation of the world—including Canada and Europe—and in California, where NOx has long been regarded as more of a problem, the standards are even more stringent. It is worth noting that, according to the EPA, California applies a carbon monoxide standard that is weaker than the Federal standard, in order to make it easier to meet the NOx standard. H.R. 4567 has no such compensating feature.

According to EPA's "preliminary estimates," just one of the bill's new NOx standards could raise the cost of a light-duty vehicle by \$18 to \$43 in 1990; assuming 11.2 million sales, this would amount to \$200 to \$480 million per year, a very hefty sum. These costs would be over and above costs which will result from other regulatory changes required for model years 1987 to 1991 for safety and emissions, as shown in the EPA tables that follow these remarks, those figures may be conservative.

These mobile source provisions of the bill alone were sufficiently troublesome to cause me to vote against the bill at this stage of its process.

I remain concerned that Congress should not rush ahead of the science in developing acid rain legislation, but I am prepared to support a fair and reasonable bill. Acceptable legislation must, however, protect jobs, provide equity for all economic segments in ratemaking, and avoid pitting region against region. It also must not adversely or unnecessarily affect one of Michigan's major industries, its suppliers, and its workers, namely, the auto-truck industry. In the weeks to come, I look forward to working with the members of the committee toward that end.

The EPA tables of May 9, 1986 follow:

TABLE 20-1.—ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF PROMULGATED CHANGES IN EMISSION STANDARDS FOR MODEL YEARS 1987-1991

Implementation date	Vehicle class	Pollutant	Emission Standard		Incremental fleet average vehicle cost
			From	To	
1987	LDDV	Particulate	0.60 g/mi	0.20 g/mi	\$110 to \$130 (2).
1987	LDDT	do	0.60 g/mi	0.26 g/mi	\$130 to \$140 (2).
1988	LDT1	NOx	2.3 g/mi	1.2 g/mi	\$30(3).
1988	LDT2	NOx	2.3 g/mi	1.7 g/mi	\$25 (3).
1988	HDE	NOx	10.6 g/BHP-hr	6.0 g/BHP-hr	\$35 to \$370 (3)(4).
1988	HDDE	Particulate	Uncontrolled	0.60 g/BHP-hr	\$45 (2).
1991	HDE	NOx	6.0g/BHP-hr	5.0 g/BHP-hr	\$10 to \$210 (3)(4).
1991	HDDE	Particulate	0.60 g/BHP-hr	0.25g/BHP-hr	\$630 to \$840 (3)(5).
1991	HDDE (bus)	do	0.60 g/BHP-hr	0.10 g/BHP-hr	\$1,710 (3).
1990 earliest	LDGV, LDDT HDGE	Refueling vapor	Uncontrolled	Controlled	\$15 to \$25 (6).

¹ These figures are expressed in various "year dollars" and have not been updated to reflect 1985 prices.

² "Diesel Particulate Study," U.S. EPA, Office of Air and Radiation, Office of Mobile Sources, March 1985.

³ "Regulatory Impact Analysis, Oxides of Nitrogen Pollutant Specific Study and Summary and Analysis of Comments," U.S. EPA, Office of Air and Radiation, Office of Mobile Sources, March 1985.

⁴ Upper limit includes a short-term fuel economy penalty.

⁵ Upper limit includes a short-term used of greater percentage of the traps on the HDDE fleet.

⁶ "Evaluation of Air Pollution Regulatory Strategies for Gasoline Marketing Industry," U.S. EPA, Office of Air and Radiation, EPA-450/3-84-012, July 1984.

TABLE 20-2.—ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF NHTSA REGULATIONS FOR MODEL YEARS 1987-91

Effective model year	Vehicle class	Standard	Average cost per vehicle
1987	LDV	Fuel economy standard proposed at 26-27.5 MPG (1986 models = 26.0 MPG)	TBD.
1987	LDV	FMVSS 208—requires 10 percent passive protection	\$4 to \$32.
1987	LDV	Theft standard—requires parts labeling (on about half of all cars)	\$2 to \$6.
1987	LDT	Fuel economy standard set at 20.5 MPG (1986 models = 20.0 MPG)	\$130.
1988	LDV	Fuel economy standard proposed at 26-27.5 MPG (1986 models = 26.0 MPG)	TBD.
1988	LDV	FMVSS 208—requires 25 percent passive protection	\$10 to \$80.
1988	LDT	Fuel economy standard set at 20.5 MPG (1986 models = 20.0 MPG)	\$0.
1988	LDT	FMVSS 204—proposed extension to 5,500 lbs. (currently effective for vehicles up to 4,000 lbs.)	\$6 to \$8.
1989	LDV	Fuel economy standard—TBD.	TBD.
1989	LDV	FMVSS 208—requires 40 percent passive protection	\$16 to \$128.
1989	LDT	Fuel economy standard = TBD.	TBD.
1990	LDV	do	TBD.
1990	LDV	FMVSS 208—requires 100 percent passive protection	\$40 to \$320.
1990	LDT	Fuel economy standard = TBD.	TBD.
1990	LDT	FMVSS 208—proposed dynamic safety belt test.	TBD.
1991	LDV	Fuel economy standard = TBD.	TBD.
1991	LDT	do	TBD.

SOVIET JEWRY

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that I was unable to take part in the special order commemorating Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry on May 7, 1986. I feel very strongly on this subject and would like to take this opportunity to speak out now against the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union has signed the Helsinki Final Act and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, both of which uphold basic human rights. Yet, the Government still openly persecutes its Jewish citizens and other minorities. Even though the right of emigration is guaranteed by the Soviet constitution, the thousands of refuseniks are subject to harassment, arbitrary arrest, and physical abuse as a matter of official policy.

The Soviet Union has the third largest Jewish population in the world. Jews have formed a vital part of Russian society for centuries. Still, they are denied the right to practice their religion and to live in accordance with their own beliefs. Moscow has engaged in a calculated effort to destroy Jewish culture. Those that attempt to leave in the manner prescribed by Soviet law, must undergo long periods of uncertain waiting, during which they are refused employment and proper housing. Worst of all, they may be inhumanly separated from their families in a manner reminiscent of slavery in our own country.

Anatoly Shcharansky endured the full extent of this persecution and survived. His story is a testimony to all freedom loving people. He survived because of his faith and the certainty that he was not alone. He knew that his wife, his family, the Jewish community, and freedom loving people throughout the world stood with him. This is why we in the United States must never shirk our responsibility to freedom. We must demand fair treatment for Jews and other minorities in the Soviet Union. We must demand it constantly and loudly; so loud that it will be heard inside the cages of the Gulag and within the walls of the Kremlin.

As a black woman I have felt discrimination at a very personal level. I abhor all injustice

and all bigotry, wherever it is found. Mr. Gorbachev came to office promising a new openness in Soviet society. I call on him now to back up his promise with action. End the persecution of the Jewish people, release those falsely arrested, provide them the rights of other citizens, and allow them to join their waiting families that wait for them. Do this Mr. Gorbachev, so that we who sincerely want peace in the world can know that you truly share a belief in justice.

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

HON. JOHN McCAIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to be here as a member of the congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus to celebrate National Tourism Week, May 19-25.

Appropriately, "Tourism Work\$ for America" is the slogan for National Tourism Week. Tourism is big business in all 50 States, generating over \$25 billion annually in Federal, State, and local tax revenues. The benefits to our Nation are expected to increase still further this year as tourism turns inward as a result of terrorist incidents abroad and the recent drop in oil prices.

However, the importance of the travel industry is easily underestimated. It is comprised of so many diverse elements that the public often has difficulty comprehending the full scope and significance of travel. Many people are surprised to find that tourism is an export. It is in fact our second largest export industry, and is the largest earner of export receipts among tradeable services.

Tourism is the No. 1 employer in my home State of Arizona, and the second largest industry. The industry contributed \$175.9 million in Federal tax revenues, and nearly \$27,000 per day in State taxes. Foreign visitors alone spend as much as \$350 million annually.

"Arizona Evergrand" has the good fortune to contain one of the most beautiful and popular tourist sites in the United States, the Grand Canyon. Our spectacular scenery draws recordbreaking numbers of both domestic and foreign travelers each year. The natural wonders found in Arizona include the unusual beauty of the Sonora Desert, the striking red

rocks of Sedona, and the towering spires of Monument Valley.

These stunning gifts of God are complemented by our equally popular manmade attractions. Man and nature meet at Roosevelt Dam, one of the first Federal reclamation projects, and at Kitt Peak National Observatory. In addition, visitors can capture the historic flavor of the old West in Tombstone, or, alternatively, visit the experimental "City of the Future," Arcosanti.

Arizona's vast Indian reservations also draw visitors from all over the world. The unique lifestyles of the traditional native Americans tribes are fascinating to observe. Each offers a variety of intricate handicrafts, and many of their entrancing tribal ceremonies, such as the Hopi Snake Dance, are open to the public.

This year, the 18th annual Discover America International Pow Wow is being held in Phoenix. The pow wow is the single largest and most important gathering of international travel industry executives and journalists. A grand total of over 2,500 international delegates and U.S. suppliers are expected. It is estimated that the pow wow will generate nearly \$600 million in business for the United States as a whole, and direct benefits to the Phoenix area of 10 percent of the international tourism receipts.

For the travel industry, 1986 is expected to be a banner year, and represents an excellent opportunity for us to turn the tragic events of the past year to our advantage. The travel industry plays an important role in advancing the goal of international peace and understanding. Through tourism, Americans can display to foreign visitors all the best of our great Nation. Relations cannot help but be bettered as communications between nations are improved and foreigners gain a greater understanding of our culture.

Not only does tourism promote a spirit of good will internationally. It also contributes positively to the balance of trade. For these reasons, I believe that we must support the continued funding of the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration. This agency is energetically and aggressively competing in the foreign tourism market.

Efforts have been made to target USTTA for elimination in the name of deficit reduction. Yet this agency is working for us to reduce the deficit by encouraging travel to the United States. Over 175 other countries have equiva-

lent organizations to promote their nations, and the average funding among competitive countries is over three times greater than funding for USTTA. To eliminate USTTA at a time when the trade deficit is on the rise would be self-defeating.

During this week, I encourage all of my colleagues and their constituents to take a moment to reflect on the importance of the travel and tourism industry to our Nation. National Tourism Week was initiated 3 years ago to pay tribute to this vital segment of our economy, and I am proud to have the opportunity to honor the travel and tourism industry today.

A BILL TO PROVIDE OPTIONS FOR LAND EXCHANGES INVOLVING LANDS ON ADMIRALTY ISLAND, AK AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today seeks to resolve a longstanding dispute concerning a village corporation in southeast Alaska whose lands have been denied them through lengthy legal challenges by national environmental organizations. The controversy results from the location of the village corporation's lands on Admiralty Island, AK. Although Congress has affirmed the right of Shee Atika, Inc., to own their native settlement lands on Admiralty Island, the location of their lands adjacent to a national monument has created a controversy which threatens the financial future of natives promised their lands in 1971.

This bill is a balanced compromise which would offer substitute lands and other considerations to the Native Alaskans of Shee Atika, Inc., in exchange for the lands on Admiralty Island. It is their option to accept this offer. In addition, this legislation would assist in the diversification of the economy of southeast Alaska by allowing the continued development of a major mineral deposit at Greens Creek, AK. Over the years, this mine will produce untold millions of tax dollars for the State and Federal treasuries, and provide jobs for many in southeast Alaska. Further, it would preserve for future generations the lands owned by Shee Atika on Admiralty Island, should they choose to accept this offer.

This bill is the outgrowth of hearings held last year, and extensive meetings held by members and staff of the Interior Committee. I believe it is a hard-fought compromise which seeks admirable goals. Hearings will be held soon, and I believe it deserves the support of this body.

ACTION NEEDED ON GOOD PRODUCT LIABILITY LEGISLATION

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, 5½ years of inaction on product liability legislation have brought us face to face with a crisis situation that demands action by the Congress in this session.

This issue has already been debated intensively and at length in the limited forum of the Senate Commerce Committee, and action there seems likely within the next 3 weeks. Our own constituents are pounding on the doors to say that the time has come to act as a Congress to do something to correct the fundamental causes of their liability problems.

The administration itself has recognized the seriousness of the present situation and proposed legislation to deal with several of the most fundamental common concerns, while recognizing that Congress will amend these suggestions to reflect the real-world problems that land on our doorstep every day.

I am pleased to join my colleague, Mr. FISH, as a cosponsor of the administration's bill, H.R. 4766. It is a very valuable vehicle, along with its companion measure in the Senate, for allowing each body to begin full and serious discussion of the best action agenda on liability. I would mention, however, that I have a major concern with one provision of this bill, the limitation on attorney contingency fees, which I hope will be amended in committee.

I think that a limitation on attorneys' fees is, like the legislating of insurance prices, an attack on the symptoms of the liability crisis rather than the causes. It is a basic violation of free market principles and is likely to limit access to the justice system by the poor. The ways in which the contingency fee system serve the interests of justice and efficiency were clearly outlined in an article in the Wall Street Journal of May 15, 1986 by James L. Gattuso of the Heritage Foundation. I share these perceptions and encourage my colleagues to read the appended article and consider these views.

Finally, I would like to reiterate that it is imperative that we pass substantive product liability legislation immediately in order to restore balance to our liability system. We will not have a dynamic economy, municipal services, medical care, or community volunteers if individuals and organizations engaged in these activities must gamble their future net worth in an uninsurable liability lottery every time they do their job.

Product liability problems have been so disruptive to interstate commerce that there is clear justification for a federal role in this limited area. States must take action in the other areas of liability such as medical malpractice if they do not want the Federal Government to step in where it should not go. If some States choose to ignore the need for substantive reforms in State tort law such as those proposed in H.R. 4766, that is their right. However, Federal programs should not be asked to subsidize the resulting costs of State inaction

on liability matters in the medical field or any other field.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 15, 1986]

DON'T RUSH TO CONDEMN CONTINGENCY FEES

(By James L. Gattuso)

Nobody likes lawyers these days. They are usually depicted, sometimes accurately, as opportunistic and overpaid. Still, it was surprising to learn of the Reagan administration's recent proposal to limit the amount of money attorneys can receive in contingency fees—and surprising, too, to hear other conservatives argue that the practice should be outlawed altogether.

Opposition to price controls has always been one of the basic tenets of free-market conservatism, and, at least since the demise of Richard Nixon, a point of agreement among Republicans generally. As evidenced by results of scrapping oil-price controls and the continuing decay of New York City's rent-controlled apartments, this opposition is well taken. Yet the principle is apparently abandoned by some conservatives when the subjects are Shakespeare's least favorite people: lawyers.

BASED ON RESULTS

While the contingency-fee system is often misunderstood by the general public, it is actually very simple. Under the system, rather than receiving a set fee for each hour worked, a lawyer is paid according to the results achieved, receiving a percentage of the eventual award to his client. No money is paid before the award is made, and if the plaintiff does not win, no money is paid at all.

This system acts to provide the services of attorneys to injured people who may not be able to otherwise afford legal representation, at no cost to the taxpayer. Imagine that someone has been badly injured in an auto accident by a drunken driver. Although the accident was not his fault, and it is clear that he should be compensated by the other driver, he doesn't have the money to hire a lawyer. How can he press his claim? One solution would be to set up some mammoth government program to pay for the representation of him and others like him—an undesirable prospect. If contingency fees are available, this is unnecessary. The victim can pursue his case regardless of the amount of money he has.

There are three general criticisms usually leveled at the contingency-fee system. First, it is often said that it creates conflicts of interest between a client and his lawyer, because the lawyer is encouraged to hold out for a large award, rather than settle out of court. Second, it is said that it encourages lawyers to file meritless lawsuits. Lastly, it is argued that the fees provide a windfall to lawyers, since they may receive large fees even when they spend little time on a particular case. None of these criticisms have merit.

It is difficult to see how a contingency fee creates any sort of conflict between attorneys and their clients. Since the attorney shares proportionately in any award, and receives nothing if the case is lost, the contingent fee ensures that the attorney will have the same interest in the case as the plaintiff. Of course, there will always be times when the attorney will want to proceed to trial rather than settle out of court, or vice versa—disagreement is inevitable. Yet, on the basic object of litigation, receiving the

maximum award possible, the interests of lawyer and client are identical.

By contrast, paying lawyers by the hour creates an enormous conflict of interest between lawyers and their clients. For the hourly fee lawyer, the longer the case goes on, the more money he will get. Every pleading, motion, deposition and delay will mean more money for him, regardless of whether it leads to a better result for the client. Thus, from the standpoint of the client, as well as general court efficiency, reformers should actually be trying to encourage the contingent fee, not limit it.

Yet, there is no incentive for a lawyer to file a losing case—he gets paid only if he wins. It is consequently difficult to persuade a lawyer to risk his time and resources on what seems a losing cause. Thus, rather than encourage baseless lawsuits, the contingent fee actually helps screen them out of the system. Certainly, the screening process isn't perfect, and courts and legislatures should take steps to penalize those who bring baseless suits. The problem exists, however, despite, and not because of, contingent fees.

The most persistent criticism of the system is that it provides a windfall to lawyers who can win big fees even when they do very little work. The fees are high—usually plaintiffs' lawyers take about a third of the award. But these lawyers make no windfall profits. Just like owners of small businesses, their incomes are not tied to the amount of time they put in—they depend on the results they produce. While very often these attorneys do receive huge fees for very little work, they also at times perform substantial work on cases resulting in small fees. For cases that are lost, there is no fee at all.

On the whole, it seems contingent-fee lawyers are no better off financially than their colleagues who work on an hourly basis. According to figures recently compiled by the Rand Corporation's Institute for Civil Justice, fees and cost paid plaintiffs' attorneys nationwide total about \$7 billion to \$9 billion each year; defense lawyers make a total of about \$6 billion to \$9 billion working on hourly fees. These figures are large—lawyers certainly aren't underpaid—but show no windfall accruing to the plaintiffs' bar from contingent fees. In fact, if plaintiffs' lawyers were making significantly more than defense attorneys, one would expect to see a flood of lawyers moving from defense to the more lucrative plaintiffs' practice. There has been no evidence of such a shift.

More important, even if it seemed that contingent-fee attorneys were making too much money, placing price controls on them, as proposed by the Reagan administration, would not be in order. First, there is simply no reason to believe that consumers of legal services are inherently unable to intelligently choose how and how much to pay an attorney. While locating and hiring a lawyer can be a complex and difficult task, consumers make complex and difficult choices every day, ranging from the purchase of cars and houses to choosing, albeit with the advice of Cliff Robertson or Joan Rivers, a long-distance telephone company. In the absence of fraud or misrepresentation, there is no reason to override these decisions.

Further, as with other products, an attempt to control legal prices will not help the consumer, but simply make the product unavailable. Just as rent control makes apartments a scarce commodity, caps on contingency fees will make it harder to get a

lawyer to file a case. Plaintiffs, like renters, will find themselves worse off.

That, of course, may be the reason for the recent interest in limiting fees. Clamping down on fees is a quick and easy way of quelling the current liability explosion. By cutting down on the number of cases brought by lawyers, lawmakers can avoid the burdensome and difficult chore of reexamining the ill-conceived rules of law that have brought tort law to the condition it is in today. Unfortunately, in the process, many people who really have been wronged will find themselves without access to the legal system.

ABOLISH PUBLIC SUBSIDY

This is not to say that nothing should be done to reduce fees. Lawyers, whether working on contingency or by the hour, are much too expensive. To help reduce this cost, lawmakers should eliminate the remaining barriers to advertising and competition among lawyers. Further, the real cost of litigation can be reduced by encouraging use of alternative dispute-resolution systems, such as arbitration and mediation.

In addition, legislators should reduce the incentives for excessive litigation by more fairly distributing the costs of the judicial system. The public subsidy for litigation should be abolished. Currently, most courts charge only nominal fees for their services, shielding litigants from the real costs of their actions, and leaving taxpayers with the bill. The losing party should also be forced to pay the other party's attorneys fees in certain cases, especially where a litigant has a meritless claim or defense. Only by reforms such as these can the problem of excessive litigation be resolved. Imposing price controls is not the answer.

RURAL TRANSPORTATION

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce legislation which will increase the proportion of the Urban Mass Transportation Act [UMTA] allocated for rural transportation. This legislation will increase the funding formula for section 18 of UMTA from 2.93 to 5 percent. This will be done by reducing the percentage for each of the two urban categories by about 1 percent.

For too long, rural areas have been relying on a disproportionately low percentage of funding for transportation. While 39 percent of the national population live in rural areas, they receive less than 3 percent of the transportation funds. Thus, it is only a small step toward equity to increase the rural formula allocation to 5 percent.

Although transportation under section 18, the section which sets aside funding for rural transportation, is not specifically targeted to the elderly and handicapped, these people benefit significantly from section 18 projects. For many such individuals, public transportation is of vital importance for maintaining independence in the community. Not only is it essential to have regular access to banks, food and drugstores, but also it is necessary to have a link to community-based services such as senior centers, health services, adult day

care centers, churches, nutritional and educational programs.

Furthermore, transportation plays a crucial role in combating loneliness among the elderly. Those with access to transportation can maintain relationships with their family and friends or attend social and cultural events in the community.

In addition to the elderly and handicapped, children, too, depend on public transportation in rural areas. Many Head Start and nursery school programs do not provide transportation and must depend on public systems for transporting children to and from the programs.

I recognize that all UMTA programs have been reduced, a fact which challenges all public transportation systems, rural as well as urban, to become increasingly efficient and creative in stretching the Federal dollar. Although urban transportation is more costly to operate than rural transportation—mostly because of labor costs—funding is currently very skewed. UMTA spends \$28 per capita for transportation in large urbanized areas and only \$1 per capita in nonurbanized areas. It is, therefore, time that the rural population received a larger share of the pie.

In a recent hearing on "Transportation and the Elderly," conducted by the Select Committee on Aging's Subcommittee on Human Services, it was pointed out by several witnesses that large commercial bus companies are reducing the number of rural stops because they are losing money due to the low number of riders. This is another reason why specialized and more economical types of public transportation are increasingly necessary in rural areas. Currently, there are 2.5 million nonurban households with no car, and 10.2 million households with only one car. Without access to commercial bus routes, those living in rural areas may find themselves isolated from public transportation and without access to other systems, such as taxi service.

Mr. Speaker, the current 2.93 percent set-aside was established in 1982, and simply reflects a historic breakdown between urban and rural transportation. It does not reflect need or equity. I, therefore, introduce this legislation in the hope that my colleagues, including my distinguished colleagues representing urban areas, will see the fairness of this issue and lend it their full support.

MEMORIAL GARDEN IS DEDICATED

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on the tenth of June of this year, a garden will be dedicated to the seven astronauts who died while participating in the noble pursuit of space exploration aboard the space shuttle Challenger.

The members of the Barstow Community College chapter of the Circle K Club conceived the idea of a memorial garden and with their own funds and the donations of several businesses from the area, made a reality of this fitting tribute.

This outstanding group of students has contributed over 7,000 hours of community service hours during this school year alone. This particular chapter of Circle K was founded 10 years ago, and already has the largest membership of all the chapters of Circle K world wide.

Located in the center of campus, the garden will be source of enjoyment and inspiration for all. Seven plaques placed in front of seven rosebushes will name each of the astronauts and their position on the mission. Also on view will be uniform patches for that particular mission and those that were to be worn after the mission was completed, and a photograph of the brave explorers.

The members of the Circle K Club have generously donated their spare time and energy in order to complete the garden in time for the graduation ceremonies to be held this evening. I applaud the efforts of these students not only for their contribution to the school, but by demonstrating the heartfelt sorrow at the loss of fellow Americans; they have set an example for us all. This memorial should make us proud, not only of those we mourn, but also of those dedicated students in whom our Nation's future lies.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to ask my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the Circle K Club of Barstow Community College for this tremendous display of generosity and patriotism.

PRAISE FOR OUTSTANDING CITIZENS

HON. JOSEPH J. DiOGUARDI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. DiOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to have been invited by the Mamaroneck Public Schools to a testimonial dinner for Joseph Aiello and Dorothy Porterfield, two outstanding individuals who have contributed to the quality of life of the youth of the community of Mamaroneck and Larchmont.

This tribute which is being rendered at this time is being held at the Orsenta Beach Club and is intended to be a fitting expression of gratitude for years of dedicated service and commitment to the fostering of ideals of physical health and moral stamina by our young people.

The Hommocks School's teachers and faculty and other members of the community are participating in this event because they recognize the contributions which Joe and Dorothy gave to their roles in their respective capacities. The students, too, keenly appreciate and understand that they have been the recipients of unusual commitment and zealous endeavors by these individuals.

They have fulfilled their duties as shining examples of average everyday citizens who performed their jobs in an outstanding fashion. In order for our youth to assume their proper roles in society, it is necessary for them to identify with strong and responsible role models such as Joe and Dorothy.

Joe and Dorothy have played a truly vital part in the lives of all the youth whom they

taught and assisted. They gave unselfishly of their time and they will never be forgotten for their willingness to serve.

I salute not only their accomplishments but I also wish to extend my congratulations to all who participate in the operation of the Hommocks School—an institution which continues to foster leadership qualities in their students.

SLOANE-STANLEY MUSEUM

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce Friday's opening of the Eric Sloane wing of the Sloane-Stanley Museum, in Kent, CT. It is truly fitting that a replication of the studio of this great American author, artist and patriot be included as a major attraction in his home State of Connecticut.

Eric Sloane shared his life with his community, Connecticut, the United States and the world. In 1968, to help celebrate the 125th anniversary of The Stanley Works, a major American tool supplier, he helped conceive the idea of the Sloane-Stanley Museum. Eric donated his collection of early American tools and implements, and supervised the presentation of his collection. When completed, the museum was turned over to the State of Connecticut and has become an outstanding attraction to the residents and visitors to our State.

Mr. Sloane was a gifted and giving artist. Perhaps his largest, most outstanding and universally recognized piece is on display in the main lobby of the Smithsonian Institution's National Air and Space Museum. His paintings depict all of America from the rolling hills of New England to the open spaces of the Southwest and are a tribute to our freedom, independence, and liberty. His beautiful skies, stone walls, and bells, rolling hills and plains portray our great Nation in all its variety and remind us of all those values that we as Americans hold dear.

Eric Sloane was an author and teacher. Many of our World War II pilots are familiar with the instruction manuals on weather which he not only authored, but illustrated as well. A true expert on the weather, Eric was the first television meteorologist.

Mr. Sloane was a patriot and a diplomat. He successfully revived the American tradition of ringing bells throughout the Nation on each Independence Day. His contribution to international understanding of American life is significant and I am confident that the many Soviet citizens who visited Eric Sloane's exhibit "I Remember America" when it toured Moscow left with a greater understanding of America and her people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me in petitioning the White House to award the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Eric Sloane. I appreciate this opportunity to recognize Eric Sloane's achievements and announce the opening of this exciting museum. It is only fitting that we honor this exceptional man whose contribution to our lives is great and indeed lived by his words, "We believe

that the moral strength of the Nation is only as strong as the moral strength of its individuals. We therefore commit ourselves to the pursuit of labor, respect, independence, thrift, excellence and peace."

HONORING A FIRE CHIEF

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today before the House of Representatives to honor a constituent of my Fourth District of Pennsylvania: Paul A. Rupert of Elderton in Armstrong County, who has been fire chief of the Elderton Volunteer Fire Department for 25 years.

A charter member of the fire department, Mr. Rupert has been an active and primary force in filling the department's equipment needs, manpower requirements, and necessary fundraising. He helped institute, develop, and organize the department.

An employee of the People's Natural Gas Co. from 1948 to 1985—and now retired—Mr. Rupert is also a past president of the Armstrong County Fire Association and an instructor at the Armstrong County Fire School.

Mr. Rupert, who served in the U.S. Navy in the Philippines and the Pacific from 1944 to 1946, has been a deacon and elder in the Elderton Presbyterian Church, has served on the Elderton Cemetery Committee and has been active in the Boy Scouts and the American Legion.

A charter member of the 1951 formation of the fire department, Mr. Rupert was married August 19, 1949, to his wife, Louise, and the couple have two children, Steve and Amy.

Because of his dedicated service to his family and his community—and especially today—to his fire department, I salute Paul Rupert before the full U.S. House of Representatives.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. WALTER WALKER

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to an excellent educator and citizen of my district, Dr. Walter Walker, the president of LeMoyne-Owen College in Memphis, TN. Dr. Walker moved to Memphis 12 years ago, giving up his post as a vice president at the University of Chicago to become president of LeMoyne-Owen. His years at LeMoyne-Owen have been marked by significant accomplishments in the areas of cooperative education, academic standards, and fundraising. I believe I speak for the entire Memphis community when I say that although his enthusiasm and energy will be sorely missed at the college, we look forward to and applaud his plans to educate our community in another capacity. The following articles illustrate the career of this notable educator,

and I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be made a part of the RECORD.

[From the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, TN, May 3, 1986]

WALKER RESIGNING POST AS LEMOYNE-OWEN HEAD

(By Leroy Williams, Jr.)

Slowed by a bout with multiple sclerosis, Dr. Walter L. Walker yesterday said he will resign as president of LeMoyné-Owen College next month to teach others about the disease.

Dr. Walker, 51, became the college's third president in 1974. His resignation is effective June 30. Peter R. Formanek, board of trustees chairman, said an interim president would be named while a search committee conducts a nationwide hunt for a successor.

Doctors first diagnosed Dr. Walker's illness 10 years ago, two years after he moved here from the University of Chicago, where he was vice president of planning. He said the first symptoms apparently appeared 30 years ago.

"If I had been perfectly rational, I would have made this decision 10 years ago. But it would have been without the benefit of success," he said, "I feel that my new mission will be to open the door of the closet so that many people will look realistically at their physical problems."

Dr. Walker said he does not have a job commitment and that he will work to create a market for his services. He prefers Memphis as a market "because I love it."

The decision to resign was made about 10 days ago, but Dr. Walker said, "I changed my mind many times as to the degree that I would separate myself. I thought about a consulting kind of thing . . . I came to the realization last night (Thursday) that it had to be complete."

Formanek said a search committee would be formed in time for a meeting next Friday. He was unsure whether the committee would look outside the college for an interim replacement. Formanek, who is executive vice president at Malone & Hyde Inc., praised Dr. Walker as "a truly innovative educator," and cited his introduction of the cooperative education program as an example.

Like many other historically black colleges, LeMoyné-Owen has been beset with financial and enrollment problems in recent years. "Those were the most difficult and yet the most rewarding times psychologically. Physically, they were the toughest," Dr. Walker said.

LeMoyné-Owen's enrollment is about 900 and Formanek said that is a slight increase over last year. He said the school's \$5 million budget registered a small surplus and that the \$3.3 million endowment was a record.

Dr. Walker said his goal was a \$10 million endowment and that the next president will be faced with at least doubling the current level. Besides the cooperative education program, Dr. Walker said he was proud that 75 percent of the college's athletes graduate. For 11 years, LeMoyné-Owen athletes have had the option of pursuing their degrees free of charge after their athletic eligibility ends.

LeMoyné-Owen operates on a trimester system, with students and faculty now on break. Classes resume Monday.

Ronald Thompson, incoming student government association president, said Dr. Walker's resignation will surprise most students. "We heard some rumors, but I didn't pay much attention to that."

Of the faculty members on campus yesterday, most—including the vice president of the faculty organization—refused to comment on Dr. Walker's resignation.

In December, faculty members had registered concerns about the college in a letter. Among concerns was the desire for more faculty participation and more money for academic programs.

However, Dr. Delphia Hamill, a chemistry teacher, said, "On every campus the faculty is concerned with that. . . . When administrations change in a city or on a college campus, there is always uncertainty. The college is strong. So we look to the future."

[From the Commercial Appeal, Monday, May 5, 1986]

ANOTHER DOOR TO OPEN

Why would a vice president at the University of Chicago, one of the nation's most prestigious universities, move to Memphis to head a small black college struggling for its very existence?

Dr. Walter L. Walker did it 12 years ago, even though, by his own admission, he had a low regard for the South and for this city.

LeMoyné-Owen and Memphis were a challenge. Maybe that was part of the reason.

Facing up to challenges has been a theme of his presidency. And when he steps down next month because of ill health, that will be one of the contributions he leaves with the college.

Dr. Walker's opinion about Memphis changed.

In an interview two years ago, he said, "I used to believe that this city had a massive inferiority complex, and therefore anything from outside was better than what we had here. Now from my point of view a community that is great is one that says, 'Hey we're going to do it, and if someone else wants to follow us, fine. But we're not going to wait until someone else does it.' And I think there's been a change. . . . Memphis needs the audacity to do what we feel is sound and the willingness to invest our own substance in it. . . . I'm very optimistic."

Dr. Walker has had that audacity. He introduced an innovative cooperative education program at LeMoyné-Owen to prepare students for careers. He demanded that students perform up to his expectations of them, requiring, for instance, that athletes maintain a 'C' average to be eligible for inter-collegiate competition. He presided over fund-raising campaigns that have given the college a record endowment of \$3.3 million.

He has also invested more of his own substance in the college and in the city than most Memphians who knew him through mutual professional and civic interests realized.

Dr. Walker has multiple sclerosis. The disease was diagnosed two years after he came to Memphis.

"If I had been perfectly rational," he said last week, "I would have made this decision (to resign as president) 10 years ago. But it would have been without the benefit of success (the success he has achieved as a college president). I feel that my new mission will be to open the door of the closet so that many people will look realistically at their physical problems."

He plans to develop a project of teaching others about multiple sclerosis. If initiative and substance can make the difference, that too will be a success.

ROBERT W. MARTINO REMEMBERED

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, Robert W. Martino, a 39-year-old resident of my Brooklyn district, died this February. That, however, was merely a technicality. For all practical purposes Bobby's life ended 18 years ago, just days after the young 18-year-old landed in Vietnam.

On patrol, as a member of Company A, 2d Battalion, of the 28th Infantry Division, Bobby learned a lesson in the meaning of war, when the shrapnel from an exploding land mine pierced his body. And as he lay there on the ground, injured, Bobby learned another lesson about war, as the mine field exploded again injuring him further. Bobby's body and mind never fully recovered. Eighteen pain-filled years later Bobby's suffering finally ended.

Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day of this year, the Good Shepherd Church in my district will be holding a special commemorative service to honor all those who gave their lives to fight for our freedom, especially Bobby Martino. I join the church in remembering and honoring our war dead. For it is because of them that the freedom that we have come to take for granted have been secured. I also join the church's parishioners in hoping that the governments of all nations learn the lesson Bobby learned, and that Bobby Martino will be the last young Brooklyn man that war takes from us.

DIE LAUGHING WITH FEMA

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to macabre humor, the script writers at the Federal Emergency Management Administration should get a Pulitzer Prize.

You recall their earlier battle plan for nuclear disaster management. It called for people to send change-of-address cards to local post offices before leaving on designated odd- or even-numbered license plate routes to the ultimate gridlock.

For good measure the early FEMA comics instructed readers who choose to stay home, rather than flee a nuclear attack, that they need only dig a hole, climb out, cover with a door and dirt, and climb back in. They left out the part on how to climb back in after the door was covered by dirt.

The twin clouds of Gramm-Rudman and Chernobyl have apparently unleashed new creative juices over at FEMA. They want to dream away budget reality by proposing a \$1.5 billion plan to closet public officials in radiation-free bunkers. Not to worry if you have to fend for yourself as an ordinary citizen, FEMA will take the deed to your house to a

special property records shelter. Then you can reclaim your crater after the war.

This stuff makes good bedtime reading, but bad budget and national security policy. We have much more pressing disasters like annual floods and tornado damage—let alone the persistent farm crisis—on which we need to husband the taxpayers' emergency relief dollars. We also need to reject FEMA's continuing delusion that we can actually survive a nuclear attack, in which the radiation from one nuclear warhead would make the catastrophe at Chernobyl seem like teapot steam. A much better investment would pay the air fare for our negotiators to hammer out a nuclear crisis prevention plan with the Soviets.

I recently wrote FEMA to urge that its planners shelve costly and far-fetched proposals for nuclear disaster management. I insert a copy of my letter for the record.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 1986.

MR. SAMUEL W. SPECK,
Associate Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPECK: Recent press reports indicate that FEMA has developed a new \$1.5 billion plan to set up special command posts in the event of a nuclear attack. I am writing to oppose the kinds of proposals being considered.

Let me first say that I do not oppose any sensible planning which we might undertake to prepare for a wide array of national emergencies. My concern is that we take into account the scientific studies which show the virtual futility of civil defense in the case of nuclear war.

Your current proposal also disturbs me by seeming to give preferential treatment to public officials, while letting ordinary citizens fend for themselves. Why does FEMA envision this elitist protection policy when, in emergencies, all people will face the same problems and have the same needs?

I also find it alarming that FEMA's \$1.5 billion plan places so much emphasis on saving post-attack property records as opposed to saving people—to the extent that either make sense, since a nuclear attack would render much of the nation useless or uninhabitable anyway.

It seems more prudent to me to invest in such things as nuclear crisis prevention than in worthless plans to combat nuclear winter. I hope that your agency will immediately table these present plans and focus on the kind of disaster aid which FEMA does well and which really helps people. Our current budget requirements simply don't allow for extravagant planning activities which offer little real hope of serving a useful purpose.

Thank you in advance for your attention and cooperation.

Sincerely,

BYRON L. DORGAN,
Member of Congress.

**MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION
TO HONOR ESTHER D. MALLACH**

HON. JOSEPH J. DiOGUARDI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. DiOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 28, 1986 the Mental Health Association

of Westchester County, Inc. [MHA] will honor Mrs. Esther D. Mallach during the MHA's gala 40th anniversary dinner dance celebration at the Tarrytown Hilton. It is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to this remarkable woman, Mrs. Mallach.

For 25 years, Mrs. Mallach has unselfishly vested her energies in the MHA. And under her helmship the MHA has blossomed into one of Westchester County's most prominent and respected mental health resource centers. Upon graduating from the Columbia School of Social Work, Mrs. Mallach worked with the National Refugee Service—now NYANA. In 1960, Mrs. Mallach began with the MHA as a field consultant. She was appointed executive director 2 years later. Since then, Mrs. Mallach has directed the introduction of numerous programs including a day program, community residences, and social clubs for mentally ill patients, the suicide prevention service, and the Child Abuse Prevention Program to name just a few.

Appropriately, Mrs. Mallach's talents have not gone unnoticed. Gov. Mario Cuomo appointed Mrs. Mallach a member of the Harlem Valley Psychiatric Center Board of Visitors in 1979, where she is currently president of the board. In addition, she is chairperson of the advisory board of the Westchester Community College Human Resources Department. If that is not enough, Mrs. Mallach also serves as a member of the Westchester Community Mental Health Services Board, the Department of Social Services Advisory Board, the Westchester Health Planning Council, and the executive committee of the Mental Health Association in New York State.

Formerly, Mrs. Mallach was president for the Westchester chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, and chairperson of the Mid-Hudson Region for Statewide Planning for Vocational Rehabilitation Services.

Mrs. Mallach has provided the MHA with indefatigable zeal and dedication. Her efforts are apparent and appreciated throughout Westchester. We wish Mrs. Mallach well in her endeavors. She will certainly be missed at the Mental Health Association of Westchester County, Inc.

**SANTA ROSA PUBLIC HIGH
SCHOOL COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS**

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I will soon have the honor of addressing the graduating class of Santa Rosa Public High School in my congressional district. I am inserting a copy of my text for the benefit of my colleagues.

SANTA ROSA PUBLIC SCHOOL COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS, MAY 30, 1986

Superintendent Murphy, members of the board, faculty, distinguished guests, graduating class of 1986, ladies and gentlemen:

It is with great pride that I participate in this commencement ceremony of the Santa Rosa Public High School. Today, more than ever, education is an essential component for a successful career. No matter what

anyone tells you, no matter how many others have made it in the past without an education, the future still belongs to the educated.

Our technology has grown so rapidly in the last 50 years, that President Franklin Roosevelt would not recognize this country if he were to come back today. In fact, President John Kennedy would hardly recognize today's society. It is for those reasons that Santa Rosa has succeeded in challenging you to become scholars, citizens, and intellectuals.

Art Buchwald, the noted syndicated humorist, once told a graduating class that he could say something very profound, but the students would have forgotten it in 20 minutes. Instead, he chose to recite anecdotes so that, 20 years later, when their children asked them what they did on graduation day, they could proudly say, "I laughed." Today, when I finish speaking to you, I hope you will have laughed also. But when your children ask what you did on graduation day, I hope you will say, "I thought."

First, let me say that we, the older generation, have given you a perfect world. And we don't want you to do anything to louse it up.

I have not come here today to bring you a message of doom. Sometimes the tendency in Washington is to wring your hands and say that everything is rotten. But I don't feel this way. I am basically an optimist—otherwise, I would never have flown Metro Airlines.

I don't know if this is the best of times or the worst of times, but I can assure you that this is the only time you've got! You can either be concerned only about yourself, or you can go out and make life better for everyone around you.

Education, whether it is college, technical school, or on-the-job training, is the primary key to your future. But I urge you to go beyond your own personal goals. Find time to sit and talk to a senior citizen. Make time to take the hand of a child. Show a student what your company is about. Explain how your career satisfies you. And don't forget to sit under the stars some night with someone you love.

Now I know you're also worried about jobs. But I can assure you that out of this class, at least 10 of you are going to find work. And I know who you are. But unfortunately, I'm not at liberty to tell you.

Seriously though, you need not be overly worried about your careers. Most of you and I come from the same ancestry. We are Hispanic, and at times we face situations others do not. But regardless of what you encounter, I can assure you that you are going to make it in life.

You are fortunate to have experienced an education in the United States. You are special people in your community, because it is your shoulders upon which rests the future of your neighbors. Your younger brothers and sisters, cousins and neighbors will look up to you and want to follow your footsteps. If you seek more education and a better life, so will they. Remember, the founders of the American Constitution were also the founders of American scholarship. Books were their tools, not their enemies. Those same books are your keys to success as well.

Professor, and President Woodrow Wilson once said that every man sent out from a university should be a man of his nation as well as a man of his time. I am confident that the young men and women who carry the honor of graduating today will soon give from their lives, from their talents, a high

measure of public service and community concern.

John Masefield, in his tribute to the European educational system, wrote that an educational facility was "a place where those who hate ignorance may strive to know, where those who perceive truth may strive to make others see."

I could suggest many courses of action for you to take. I could tell you how I struggled at times or about others I saw fail. But you would have to experience much of the same before you learned. It seems that young people just do not listen much to older generations. And believe me, I know. I still have trouble getting my own children to turn down their stereoes!

You young graduates must decide how far you want to go in life. Today, only about a third of all Hispanic youths expect to graduate from college. If you decide that you want an education, you can obtain one. If you push forward, others will follow. What will result is a day in the not so distant future when Hispanic youths will not think twice about higher education—they will plan and expect college degrees.

Whatever you do in life, let me suggest that it is noble to pursue any career—regardless of the power, glamour, or money involved. But above all, remember from where you have come. Remember the difficulties you encountered. Then extend your hand to those who follow you. You will learn that God has placed us on this Earth to share with others. And you will learn that when we share, we all live better lives.

What we need are more graduates who can ride easily over broad fields of knowledge and recognize the needs of their neighbors and friends. Recognizing the needs of others means being interested in others, but more importantly, trying to understand others.

Earlier I said that I hoped you could look back on today and say, "I thought." Let me conclude today by telling you of a king who never got along with his son. One day, after both had disagreed with each other for years, the son left home.

After many months, the king finally sent a message to his son asking him to come home. The son replied that he could not. So, the king sent back another message. It simply read, "come as far as you can, and I will carry you the rest of the way."

I am convinced that if we all were willing to either go as far as we could, or to carry others the rest of the way, the world would be a better place in which to live on this Commencement Day of 1986. I extend my sincerest congratulations to you. My thoughts and prayers are with you, and may your luck in life be guided by a heavenly star.

THE ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE OF GREAT BRITAIN

HON. MARILYN LLOYD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the Environment Committee of the House of Commons of the British Parliament published a comprehensive report on their findings concerning radioactive wastes in Great Britain. That report was forwarded to me as a courtesy since they visited the United States during July 1985, met with members of our subcommittee, and received

a briefing from the staff. Their report was quite complimentary of the programs carried out in the United States relative to high-level radioactive waste disposal and the West Valley Demonstration Project. The report is also instructive because it answers the question "What should the United Kingdom do with radioactive waste?"

LOW-LEVEL WASTES

The Environment Committee noted that the French use a definition of low-level waste "incorporating both half-life and alpha content as well as activity." They observed that the French system also leads to the exclusion of very toxic radionuclides from a low-level waste disposal facility. The committee, therefore, recommended that low-level waste be redefined so that it may have a half-life no greater than 30 years, that it may contain "no alpha-bearing waste" or "particularly toxic radionuclides."

SEABED DISPOSAL

The committee reports that the British Government appears quite eager to resume sea dumping of low-level radioactive wastes regardless of the London Dumping Convention Resolutions opposing such dumping. The British Government, however, is postponing its decision on the sea dump until the results of the various international reviews are published and their Department of Energy conducts a detailed study of the best practicable environmental option for each kind of waste. The Environment Committee made a specific recommendation that any disposal methods chosen by the Government of Great Britain should reduce the dilute and disperse element of their design to be as small as technically possible. They, therefore, conclude that it might be unwise to regard sea dumping as a possible disposal option.

HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE

The Environment Committee is worried that the United Kingdom is lagging far behind those other countries involved with high-level radioactive waste disposal. Committee members visited the near surface test facility in Washington State and made the observation that all of the countries that they visited have constructed underground facilities which are used for research alone and not intended to be developed as full operational disposal sites. They commend this approach to the British Government recommending that research on a fully constructed deep geological site in their country is urgently needed and such a site should be designated as an experimental facility, explicitly excluded from being a potential operating disposal facility.

RADIOACTIVE DISCHARGES TO THE ENVIRONMENT

The committee was highly critical of the amount of radioactivity that the United Kingdom discharges into the sea principally from its reprocessing activities. It noted that the United Kingdom discharges more radioactivity into the sea than any other nation, and as a result the Irish Sea is the most radioactive sea in the world. Although the concentrations of the discharges are not in themselves harmful, the committee is worried that certain organisms will concentrate the radioactive elements and ultimately reach the human environment through food consumption. In this regard, they are highly critical of disposal op-

tions which dilute and disperse radioactivity. They recommend that the Sellafield reprocessing facility be required to reduce discharges to extremely low levels so that they are as low as technically achievable, not just within international limits.

DOSE LIMITATION

The committee noted that the average doses of radioactivity received by the general public as a result of the United Kingdom nuclear industry are extremely low. In fact, they noted that they are far below international standards for radiological protection. Since the actual discharges are so far below the levels fixed by the international community, the committee recommends that the regulatory permits should set the discharge limits at much lower levels to more closely reflect routine discharge requirements of the industry. They believe that lower discharge limits will render the operators more open to prosecution in the event of serious incidents which result in releases which are below international community standards, but are significantly above normal operating conditions. (I seriously question the technical justification for this since international standards are now purposefully set at a conservative level to protect health and safety.)

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Environment Committee fully endorsed a greater public participation in the monitoring and operation of disposal sites for radioactive waste. They believe that local authorities should be given a far greater role in monitoring the performance of the disposal sites for all levels of radioactive waste. The committee recommends that the nuclear industry be more open and forthright in all its affairs and takes. It further recommends that they embrace a concept of the Rolls-Royce solution to convince the public in actions as well as words. They cite the U.S. program for high-level waste disposal as this type of Rolls-Royce solution.

REPROCESSING

The Environment Committee was not convinced that reprocessing was either economic or appropriate for continuation in the United Kingdom. They recommended that new studies be conducted to evaluate the need for reprocessing Magnox spent fuel, which cannot be stored in water for a long period of time as can LWR spent fuel in the United States. Magnox refers to the British gas reactor technology. However, they note that dry storage is a potential option for this fuel, and they therefore recommend that full analyses of the problems of storage and disposal of Magnox fuel be carried out in order to be "absolutely certain" that there is no alternative to reprocessing this fuel.

RESEARCH

The committee recommends that the current monetary commitment to radioactive waste research commitment in the United Kingdom not be allowed to fall in real terms, since important and pressing problems remain unresolved. The committee further recommends that its Department of Energy retain the lead responsibility for radioactive waste policy and be more alert in important gaps in the research program, such as for land and

subseabed disposal of high-level radioactive wastes, and in the appraisal of reprocessing and fuel cycle alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, many will be able to criticize this report as superficial and some suggestions may be impractical and lack a firm scientific basis. However, it raises many of the concerns addressed in the United States regarding the nuclear waste issue. I personally welcome other countries' evaluations of the entire nuclear waste issue because it is possible that we can learn from their independent assessments of the problems and solutions concerning this potential barrier to energy development. I thank the Environment Committee of the Parliament of the United Kingdom for sharing their report with me and the United States Congress.

THE SANTA ANA OMNIBUS LAND BILL

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to introduce for myself, Mr. LUJAN and Mr. SKEEN, the Santa Ana omnibus land bill. This bill, for the people of Santa Ana Pueblo in New Mexico, is the result of a collaborative effort by the entire New Mexico congressional delegation. It is also being introduced today in the Senate by Mr. DOMENICI and Mr. BINGAMAN.

This bill is one that the Santa Ana people and the New Mexico congressional delegation have been working together on for several years. The bill has provisions to:

One, convey to Santa Ana Pueblo Mineral Interests in a 57-acre tract of land which the pueblo purchased from private landowners. This 57-acre tract contains good quality gravel, which when restored to Santa Ana would enable them to resume their gravel enterprise, an important economic development endeavor for the tribe.

Two, clarify pueblo boundary descriptions discovered to be in error. These corrections were confirmed by the Southern Pueblo Agency of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, who assisted in preparing the technical amendments addressing them.

Three, authorize an exchange of lands between the Santa Ana Pueblo and the University of New Mexico in order to resolve a long-standing trespass problem. The settlement states that the pueblo would relinquish 26.57 acres along the east side of Coronado Park and Monument to the University of New Mexico, in exchange for the university giving to them 120 acres west of the park and monument and two 4-year tuition scholarships each year for a total of 5 years to qualified Santa Ana students.

This provision solves several problems at the same time—it clears up previous troubles with trespass, which caused a strain between the pueblo, Coronado Park and Monument and the university; it also ensures that 10 deserving qualified Santa Ana students would get much needed educational assistance. Congressional action is necessary to authorize

this exchange agreement, which has already been signed by the Governor's office, the Natural Resources Department of New Mexico; the U.S. attorney's office, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Pueblo of Santa Ana, the University of New Mexico, and the Museum of New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the members of the New Mexico congressional delegation were able to work together to develop and to introduce the Santa Ana omnibus land bill for the benefit of the people of Santa Ana Pueblo. This bill addresses a number of the problems experienced by Santa Ana, as they strive for economic self-sufficiency and self-determination. I look forward to action on this bill and its eventual passage. Thank you.

AFRICA FAMINE, RECOVERY, AND DEVELOPMENT FUND ACT

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with several of my colleagues today in introducing the Africa Famine, Recovery, and Development Fund Act, legislation which proposes a reorganization of U.S. development assistance programs for the countries of sub-Saharan Africa.

In introducing this measure, I note that the conceptual framework for the proposal owes a great deal to the efforts of Interaction, a coalition of private voluntary organizations which have recommended changes in U.S. assistance programs for Africa, and to Committee on African Development Strategies, a joint project of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Overseas Development Council, co-chaired by Lawrence S. Eagleburger and Donald F. McHenry.

The crisis facing the 46 nations of sub-Saharan Africa extends far beyond the drought which has afflicted many of these countries in recent years. Africa's myriad problems result both from the impact of outside forces and from mistakes made by Africans themselves. Today, many of the African nations and many industrialized nations have reached a consensus on the nature of these problems and on possible solutions. This is an important first step in what must be a joint effort if Africa is to deal with its problems and move toward a better life for its citizens.

The legislation we are introducing recognizes that because this consensus has developed, new approaches to African development have emerged. It is appropriate that we undertake a serious and thoughtful review of U.S. contributions to African development efforts. This legislation represents a first step in that process. As sponsors of this legislation, we offer no commitment that the measures proposed represent a magic solution to African problems. Rather, they provide a basis for shaping a U.S. response. The legislation provides no funds at this time, although we make no pretense that financial resources, through aid, trade, and debt relief, are crucial for Africa.

The proposal provides basically for increased flexibility in the administration of as-

sistance programs in Africa, by establishing a separate Africa Famine, Recovery and Development Fund. The purposes for which this Fund would be available include increasing agricultural production, maintaining and restoring the region's natural resource base, improving health conditions and providing increased access to voluntary family planning services and developing small-scale income-generating opportunities. By moving away from the present system of delimiting assistance by functional accounts, the proposal recognizes that the current system may contribute to overburdening administrative capabilities. Because functional accounts permit somewhat greater advance accountability, it may make sense to consider initial implementation of the new Fund in a few countries.

I look forward to working with the Foreign Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on Africa which already has underway a review of African development, with other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and with the other cosponsors of this legislation as we review this and other proposals carefully. Africa's needs are great but they did not develop overnight. Solutions can be found but they will not be developed overnight. If we are to avoid compounding errors of the past, we must take the time for a detailed review of Africa's needs and how the world community should act to address them. What we report back to the full House will probably not look like the measure we are introducing today, but this proposal provides a vital basis for our undertaking.

CONGRESSIONAL CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL FOR SOVIET JEWS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in the congressional call to conscience vigil for Soviet Jews to appeal to the Soviet Government to uphold its pledge as a signatory of the Helsinki Final Act ratified by the Soviets in 1975. As the Members of this body know, emigration statistics remain unacceptably low as the Soviet authorities continue their stringent restrictions on accessibility to emigration visas. The current Soviet emigration laws force a Soviet Jew to undergo a lengthy procedure which usually must be repeated and places the Soviet Jew in a no-win cycle.

I am particularly concerned about Mr. Vladimir Lifshitz, a Leningrad mathematician who was convicted of circulating anti-Soviet slander on March 19, 1986, and received a 3-year sentence. Mr. Lifshitz is the first Soviet Jew to be sentenced to imprisonment since the November 1985 summit held in Switzerland.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly denied Vladimir Lifshitz permission to emigrate to Israel with his family since 1981. As a result of his application for emigration, he lost his job as head of a division in a research institute. His wife Anna, a construction engineer, also lost her job and is unable to find a new job in

accordance with her profession and qualifications, despite the great demand for such professionals.

To protest official harassment and the denial of permission to emigrate to Israel, Mr. Lifshitz has gone on two separate hunger strikes, one of which lasted 22 days. Recently Anna Lifshitz wrote to the prison's medical department requesting immediate hospitalization for her husband for examination and diagnosis for his constant headaches and nausea after an unexplained 10-day stay in the investigation prison hospital.

I urge the Soviet Government to release Mr. Vladimir Lifshitz and allow him to join his family in Israel as an example of the Soviet commitment made in 1975. Finally, I am honored to participate in the call to conscience vigil and hope that our continued efforts to defend and uphold basic human rights—rights guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution—will soon result in the reunification of refusenik families like the Lifshitz'.

AMERICAN HOSTAGES IN AMERICA

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a most special tribute today. On December 9 in my New Castle District office in Lawrence County in the 4th District of Pennsylvania, an armed man held an elderly couple at knifepoint during a 90-minute siege.

Joseph P. Frazier and his wife Margaret of New Castle had walked into my office for assistance with senior citizen matters when the armed man seized control of the office, also holding an aide of mine hostage, while I was alerted on the floor of the House.

The hostage-taker was promoting his pro-war stance and the Frazier's were innocent bystanders.

Because of dedicated efforts by police in D.C. at the Capitol and in Lawrence County, the Fraziers escaped without physical injury.

Now, Joseph—a member of the New Castle chapter of the National Association of Federal Employee—and Margaret, are celebrating their 27th wedding anniversary.

Today, before the U.S. House of Representatives, I pay deep tribute to this couple. By no choice of their own, there are example to the plight of the senior citizen in America today who fall prey to such actions.

Let this incident leave us vigilant. The retired person deserves the protection of society, both financially and in terms of security.

But I also salute this couple—Mr. and Mrs. Joseph F. Frazier—for the courageous personal way they handled themselves and the situation that evening, and for their spirit in continuing to be undaunted by such actions.

Before my colleagues, I say their names with honor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR GEORGE J. FELDMAN

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador George J. Feldman has distinguished himself in politics, the law, and in public service. He has been a very special friend of the O'Neill family for many years.

Ambassador Feldman was born in Boston and received his law degree from Boston University. From 1926 to 1930 he served as Administrative Assistant to U.S. Senator David I. Walsh of Massachusetts. He then became counsel at the Federal Trade Commission and later was council for the National Recovery Administration. In 1942, he entered the U.S. Air Force as a captain and, after serving in the 355th Fighter Group, he was released as a major in 1945.

He established his law practice in New York City but was always available when called upon to serve the Government. In 1958, the House of Representatives established the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration. This was done in response to the Soviet Union's successful launch of Sputnik. Speaker Rayburn appointed Majority Leader McCormack as chairman of the select committee and the two leaders agreed that the membership of the committee and its staff should be comprised of the very cream of the crop. So it was then John McCormack turned to his friend and adviser, George Feldman, who agreed to return to Washington as chief counsel and director of the committee.

George Feldman assisted Chairman McCormack in putting together a superior staff and immediately the committee began to hold the landmark hearings and issue the special reports which helped shape the course of the Nation's space program. Before the year was over, the Congress had passed the Space Act, which set up the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA] and had chartered the permanent House Committee on Science and Technology, with expanded jurisdiction covering science as well as space. The select committee had also produced a "Survey of Space Law", which included a comprehensive study of the political and legal programs associated with the exploration of outer space. When the United Nations set up a Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, George Feldman was appointed to the U.S. Delegation to the U.N. General Assembly—his brilliant contributions and his unsurpassed expertise in the area now well established and recognized.

In 1960, he was appointed to serve as part of the U.S. Delegation to the U.N. Conference on the Law of the Sea. He was a member of the U.S. NATO Citizens Committee 1961-62. In 1965, President Johnson appointed his U.S. Ambassador to Malta, where he served for 2 years. In 1967, Johnson appointed him U.S. Ambassador to Luxembourg. His service in these important posts was, of course, of the highest caliber—his extraordinary skill and talent seemingly limitless.

A complete list of this unique man's contributions would be awesome; these are just some examples.

Throughout his distinguished career Ambassador Feldman has found time to lecture at Boston University Law School and in New York; to publish "The Reluctant Space Farers", and several other important works; and to give selflessly on behalf of his country whenever and wherever called upon. He has received honorary degrees from both Holy Cross College and Boston University in recognition of his outstanding contributions.

His late wife, Marion, was a lovely and talented woman. Their's was a wonderful partnership and it was a joy to associate with such a beautiful team.

Ambassador Feldman and I see each other often and recently he shared a letter with me that he had written to Pope John Paul II regarding the Pontiff's historic visit to the synagogue in Rome. Ambassador Feldman is himself a man who has devoted his life, above all else, to the quest for peace and the dignity of all people.

It is with pleasure that I share a copy of Ambassador Feldman's letter with my colleagues. I know you will find in it the expression of deep love for mankind and the gracious appreciation of a most exceptional gentleman.

APRIL 24, 1986.

Supreme Pontiff
Pope JOHN PAUL II
Vatican City State 00120
Europe

YOUR HOLINESS: I am especially grateful that I have lived to witness, albeit remotely, the magnanimous gesture of your April 13 visit to the main synagogue in Rome. For me, already well past my allotted three score and ten, as well as for my fellow Jews the world over, your visit validated "Nostra Aetate" in the unique and sincere fashion which the world has come to recognize as the hallmark of your pontificate. In one historical step you have overcome a schism spanning two thousand years and have given new substance and meaning to the words of St. Paul when he spoke of "... my brethren, my kinsmen, the Israelites. To them belong the sonship, the glory, the covenant, the worship and the promises. To them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Messiah."

I have been fortunate to have had a long, close and cherished relationship with some of the finest of your flock. From my earliest youth in Boston to the later honor of a Doctorate of Laws conferred on me by Holy Cross College, my contacts with Roman Catholics were invariably marked by a spirit of mutual respect, affection and fellowship. On this level of personal experience, the tension between Christians and Jews has always been, for me, simply an enigma. Yet Judaism, like the Church itself, has a sense of history which reflects a collective experience quite unlike my own. But I refuse to ruminate on past grievances, however well founded. One yearns for a turning of the page—a prospect significantly enhanced by your exemplary action. Christ was, after all, no stranger to the synagogues. In the firm conviction that, finally, we shall all be gathered to the bosom of the same God, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for your opening to charity—the central message of Christ, whose Vicar you are.

With my dear late wife, Marion, I had the pleasure of meeting your predecessor, Paul, VI in a private audience during my embassy to Malta. My fondest hope now is for the honor of an audience with you whom, by your grace, have addressed me and all Jews as brothers.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE J. FELDMAN.

JAPAN AGREES TO TALKS ON U.S. AUTO PARTS

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago today we learned that the Japanese Government had communicated to the United States its agreement to a new round of market-oriented, sector-specific [MOSS] negotiations focusing on transportation equipment, including auto parts. This agreement represents a significant accomplishment for several of my colleagues and the Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition.

Representatives SANDER LEVIN and MARCY KAPTUR, with the aid and assistance of Representatives NANCY JOHNSON and LYNN MARTIN, have spearheaded a coalition drive to make auto parts the primary subject of the next round of MOSS talks. This effort began last July, when Representatives LEVIN, KAPTUR, and JOHNSON were part of a delegation of coalition members who visited Japan for discussions on trade issues. Their meetings included talks with parts buyers and executives from Japanese auto manufacturers concerning the meager level of purchases of American auto parts.

The imbalanced trade in auto parts represents a significant portion of our overall trade deficit with Japan. Although Japanese firms produced 7.6 million passenger cars in 1985 and exported 2.3 million to the United States, representing sales of \$14 billion, they purchased only \$200 million in original equipment and replacement parts from American manufacturers.

In the months since that trip, Representatives LEVIN, KAPTUR, JOHNSON, and MARTIN have sought persistently to bring pressure on the Japanese Government to negotiate on auto parts. To this end they worked closely with officials in the executive branch in a welcome display of cooperation in the national interest.

Among other things, Representatives LEVIN and KAPTUR hosted a coalition-sponsored conference in Michigan at which almost 200 American auto parts manufacturers met face to face with representatives of Japanese auto companies to learn how they could sell to the Japanese market.

They also sought and gained the support of the House leadership from both parties in their effort, and just prior to the Tokyo economic summit introduced a joint resolution favoring inclusion of auto parts in the MOSS talks that gathered almost 80 cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues should be congratulated for this achievement. A story in the business section of the Washington Post on

Thursday, May 8, reported the Japanese Government's agreement and provided some excellent background on the issue. I ask that the article be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in its entirety.

The article follows:

JAPAN AGREES TO NEW TRADE TALKS WITH UNITED STATES—USE OF AMERICAN-MADE AUTO PARTS IN JAPANESE PLANTS TO BE KEY ISSUE IN DISCUSSIONS

(By Stuart Auerbach)

Japan has agreed to a new series of trade talks with the United States on transportation equipment, including the use of American-made auto parts in Japanese assembly plants in both countries, administration officials said yesterday.

Nobuo Matsunaga, Japanese ambassador to the United States, informed President Reagan of the agreement yesterday as the president was boarding Air Force One to return to Washington from the economic summit in Tokyo, the State Department said.

Secretary of State George P. Shultz and Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe agreed in January to hold the new series of trade negotiations. But until this week, officials were unable to agree on what products should be covered in the talks. The State Department originally proposed market-opening talks for four other areas—processed foods, wine and liquor, chemicals and emerging technologies. All were rejected by the Japanese. Reagan brought up transportation equipment as a substitute during his meeting in Washington last month with Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone.

The Japanese government has been under great pressure from Congress and the Reagan administration to press its auto makers to buy more American parts for their home market as well as their factories in the United States.

The Commerce Department said that U.S. auto parts account for less than 1 percent of cars produced in Japan and 20 percent of the cars made in Japanese assembly plants in this country.

The combined trade deficit for autos and parts totaled \$24 billion last year, about half of the total U.S. deficit with Japan.

Japan's agreement to make auto parts a major element of trade talks was hailed by Reps. Sander M. Levin (D-Mich.) and Marcy Kaptur (D-Ohio), who had mobilized congressional pressure on the issue. They promised "continued congressional involvement" to "reinforce the importance of reducing the U.S. trade deficit in auto parts."

Sen. Pete Wilson (R-Calif.), who held hearings last month on the auto parts issue, said he wants the trade talks to assure U.S. parts makers of access to all Japanese auto plants, whether they are in Japan or in this country.

Commerce Undersecretary Bruce Smart, who called auto parts "the key" to the new trade talks, said getting Japanese auto makers to buy more American parts for cars they make in Japan should help U.S. manufacturers crack the Japanese factories in this country. Smart will be the lead negotiator for the United States in the new round of talks.

The traditional parts suppliers, who often have close ties with Japanese auto makers, are now clustering around the newly opened assembly plants here, cutting their American competitors out of this market as well as the one in Japan.

"Japanese car makers who lock quality American suppliers out of their vast \$26 bil-

lion home market are bringing the same tactics to their transplanted assembly plants here," complained Robert W. McMinn, senior vice president of the Automotive Parts and Accessories Association (APAA), at the Wilson hearing.

Left unchecked, he said, the traditional suppliers to the Japanese auto makers could control half the contents of all cars sold in this country by 1989.

Assistant Secretary of Commerce H.P. Goldfield agreed that the traditional relationship deprived American makers of an equal shake in the Japanese market. "We don't believe we are being given an equal opportunity to compete with Japanese auto parts suppliers," he said three weeks ago after returning from leading an auto parts trade mission to Japan.

APAA Chairman Denis J. Healy said "deeply entrenched barriers . . . ranging from elusive parts specifications to bid lots so small that competitive pricing is impossible" have prevented American companies from selling in Japan.

He added that, if a company can't crack the market to sell original parts, "a tall wall" keeps it from supplying spare parts. "It's no wonder we have less than 1 percent of their home market."

State Department officials said auto parts will be "the major component" of the new trade talks. There are some concerns, however that the Japanese will use the generic name of transportation equipment to defuse the U.S. thrust for added sales in auto parts.

Other areas to be covered are still up in the air, though U.S. officials said they are willing to include a variety of products under the title of transportation equipment.

Among them are railroad engines and equipment for Japan's heavily subsidized national railroad, which is being turned into a private business and equipment for the Kansai International Airport now under construction. Japan has refused to let foreign companies bid on the construction contract, which has drawn complaints from U.S. officials.

FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE AMENDMENT OF 1986

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation with my colleagues Congressman Bill Carney that reasserts the original goals of the Fire Island National Seashore Act of 1964. This legislation is identical to a bill being introduced in the other body by Senators ALPHONSE D'AMATO and DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN.

Fire Island is one of a series of fragile barrier beaches that parallel the south shore of Long Island. It is an island of many faces. It is a place of great natural beauty with several unique beach forests and wilderness areas yet it also supports nearly 20 communities. Finally, Fire Island provides protection to Long Island and its marine resources from the Atlantic Ocean and the many storms and hurricanes that strike northeast coastal areas such as Long Island. The preservation of this resource is critical to those who live on Fire Island, enjoy its beaches and lands, and the

millions of residents who reside on the south shore of Long Island.

Congress created the Fire Island National Seashore in 1964 to ensure that these three faces of Fire Island would not be disfigured by a New York State proposal to build a highway along the length of the island. If the highway had been built it would have destroyed the Fire Island communities and upset the fragile ecology of the island.

As it did with Cape Cod, Congress created the Fire Island National Seashore around existing communities which were incorporated within the external park boundary. This formula, called the "Cape Cod Formula," is a mechanism that assures the protection of public park resources from adverse development on adjacent private property and maintains the continuity of the communities within the park.

Under this formula, the Secretary of Interior, pursuant to his trust authority to protect park resources, develops guidelines which the local towns follow in their enactment of zoning regulations. The Secretary must then determine whether local zoning conforms with the guidelines and will preserve the fragile ecology of Fire Island. Once approved, as long as private use complies with local zoning and the rules are enforced, the Secretary's use of eminent domain is suspended.

In 1984 Congress enacted legislation that I authored to strengthen Federal enforcement of local zoning within the Seashore. The 1984 amendment was aimed at limiting development occurring on Fire Island that threatened the welfare and future of the barrier island.

The legislation I am introducing today comes in direct response to actions that New York State is taking that preempt the trust relationship for Fire Island between the Federal Government and local Fire Island towns. In response to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, the New York State Legislature enacted the Coastal Erosion Hazards Act of 1981 aimed at preserving New York's coastal areas including Fire Island. Under the State act, New York has begun identifying erosion hazard zones and developing specific restrictions on the use of private property in those zones. These State regulations conflict with Federal regulations for the Seashore.

However, the Coastal Zone Management Act, the basis for the New York State act, was intended to exclude Federal lands from State coastal zones. The act permits a State to regulate and protect its coastal zone but: "Excluded from the coastal zone are lands the use of which is by law subject solely to the discretion of or which is held in trust by the Federal Government, its officers or agents."

Clearly, a potential conflict between the State and Federal standards is looming. The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs made specific reference to this point in its report accompanying the 1984 Fire Island amendment. The committee noted that:

It prefers to carry out the intent of Congress in 1964, entrusting the Fire Island National Seashore to the joint regulation of the Federal Government and the towns, rather than to add an intervening level of State regulation in this Federal enclave, as envisaged for coastal areas in general by the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972.

New York State, however, persists in proceeding with the development of its own regulations which apply to areas already regulated by the Federal Government. Homeowners on Fire Island are faced with the uncertainty and inequity of dual and conflicting regulation.

The Fire Island National Seashore Act and all of its amendments have been designed to achieve the same goals as the State act. Congress has recognized the importance of Fire Island to the mainland. It understands that reckless development on Fire Island presents nearly as great a danger to Fire Island and Long Island as natural disaster does. That is why my 1984 amendment was developed. We realized the original Fire Island Act was not adequately controlling illegal development. So Congress strengthened the enforcement powers of the Federal Government. The intent of Congress has been to preserve Fire Island communities while ensuring that Fire Island itself is not harmed from haphazard development.

It is not my intention with this legislation to preclude New York from carrying out its responsibilities on Fire Island. I would like to give the amendments enacted in 1984 a chance to work. The legislation I am introducing today affirms that in the case of conflicting regulations, those developed through the Federal-town government mechanism, the Cape Cod formula, will prevail. This bill will preserve the natural beauty of Fire Island, the communities on the beach and the island that is so important to the protection of long Island's south shore.

SECTION. 1. AMENDMENT OF FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE LEGISLATION.

Section 3 of the Act of September 11, 1984 (78 Stat. 928; 16 U.S.C. 459e-2) is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(h) Within the boundaries of the seashore, notwithstanding any other authority of Federal or State law, any matter that is covered by regulations of the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be governed exclusively by the ordinances approved in accordance with subsection (c)."

ENOUGH MEXICO-BASHING

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, The enclosed article from today's New York Times, written by the eminent scholar Dr. Jorge Castenada of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, says it all: Enough Mexico-bashing.

Dr. Castenada reiterates the point I have been making since I first came to Congress, which is that this administration has no Mexico policy, only a fragmented crisis-by-crisis approach in which each U.S. agency is allowed to formulate its own policy toward Mexico.

I have introduced an amendment to the omnibus trade bill that could change this present incoherence by establishing a comprehensive framework within which to conduct relations with Mexico, beginning with an economic summit and creating a Cabinet-level U.S.-

Mexico Commission to bring continuity to our relations with Mexico instead of institutionalized crisis, which the present approach encourages.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge all of my colleagues in this House to study carefully the attached article, "Enough Mexico-Bashing."

The article follows:

ENOUGH MEXICO-BASHING

(By Jorge G. Castaneda)

WASHINGTON.—It's Mexico-bashing time in Washington again. On this occasion, though, the consequences of the United States' public browbeating of its southern neighbor could get out of hand. Recent Administration statements and actions directed against Mexico go beyond anything seen in the past, and Mexico is far more vulnerable than ever before to American swipes at its officials and institutions.

Mexico's economic crisis has worsened over the past months. The price of oil has plummeted, and the country's foreign earnings, as well as its Government income, have shrunk dramatically. The service on its \$97 billion foreign debt has become an unbearable burden: it now eats up nearly 75 percent of Mexico's foreign exchange and condemns its economy to permanent stagnation. This means, among other things, that the one million new jobs that are necessary this year to keep up with population growth will not be created.

President Miguel de la Madrid Hurtado is under mounting pressure to take unilateral steps—a moratorium on interest payments or an outright default—on the debt front. On Feb. 21, he announced to the nation that things could not continue as they were and that he expected the international financial community to show some understanding of Mexico's plight. It has shown nothing of the sort; yet Mexico has not burned its bridges or resorted to drastic unilateral action.

Like all Mexicans, President de la Madrid is only too aware that a major confrontation with the United States and American bankers would have grave consequences for Mexico. In addition to the obvious economic consequences of a Mexican default, there would surely be political retaliation as well. In order to protect his country from such American reprisals, President de la Madrid has bent over backward searching for ways to lighten Mexico's debt burden, without confronting Washington or the banks.

In fact, the United States is already acting as if it were retaliating against a Mexican moratorium. For nearly a month, for example, the visa section in the United States Embassy in Mexico City has been closed because of alleged inadequate security guarantees. For many Mexicans, the effects of this restriction are devastating.

But all other problems pale in comparison to the Reagan Administration's behavior last week during a hearing on Mexico in the Senate Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs. Officials from the State Department and United States Customs Bureau blasted Mexico and its Government for everything from alleged drug trafficking to its Central American policy. Conservative Republicans, including Senator Jesse Helms, had a field day, accusing Mexico of every vice under the sun.

Granted, these were Senate hearings, and they do not necessarily reflect an initiative by the Administration. But attacks on Mexico, and on its highest officials—including its President—by Administration offi-

cials such as the customs commissioner, William Von Raab, are another matter. Either they are United States policy, or they are not.

In truth, the Reagan Administration has no Mexican policy. Either it is only able to focus on one issue at a time—drugs, Central America, immigration issues. Or it is unable to unify separate Federal agencies' policies into a coherent whole. It would seem that every agency and department in Washington has its own Mexican agenda and its own Mexican axe to grind; yet no one is organizing issues, defining priorities or making the necessary hard choices.

The consequences for Mexico and for Mexican-American relations are clear. If Mexico is indeed suffering the equivalent of retaliation for what it has not done, then it might as well go ahead and do it—suspend interest payments on its debt until a new agreement is reached. President de la Madrid is under considerable pressure to do just that—angry, nationalist pressures that Senator Helms and his colleagues have only encouraged. The Administration, through the irresponsible statements of some officials and the inexplicable passivity of others, only makes things worse.

If this incoherence and irresponsibility persist in Washington, the damage to United States-Mexican relations could be serious. To avoid this, the Reagan Administration must formulate a more coherent policy toward Mexico—and it must begin by either substantiating its accusations, or publicly withdrawing them. Only then will Mexico be able to respond adequately to American concerns. In this week's bitter climate, no Mexican politician can begin to acknowledge, much less address them.

LEGISLATION IS INTRODUCED IN HOUSE TO STIMULATE COMPETITION AMONG FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARIES

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, the congressional stalemate over how best to shape our Nation's banking laws threatens to further deteriorate the viability of the financial services industry, and the consumer confidence that is essential to its continued well-being. Today, a vast segment of that industry must operate within the confines of an antiquated legal system, created over a half century ago in an economic and financial services environment that has since been abandoned.

In an effort to promote the development of an efficient financial services industry and enhance the stability of the banking system, I am today introducing legislation that will stimulate competition among financial intermediaries and contribute to the development of a financial marketplace that responds to the needs of consumers.

My bill, entitled the Consumer Products and Financial Services Equity Act, would allow financial institution holding companies to offer expanded consumer products and services. In addition, the bill contains provisions to close the so-called nonbank bank loophole and allow for the creation and regulation of a new type of bank, to be known as a consumer

bank. More important, Mr. Speaker, the legislation will strengthen the banking system, thereby enhancing the safety and soundness of the industry.

Specifically, this legislation would allow bank holding companies, and multiple savings and loan holding companies, to establish subsidiaries which may engage in securities transactions as a broker, dealer, or underwriter with respect to mortgage-backed securities, municipal securities, commercial paper issued by any entity, and mutual funds. These are relatively low-risk activities that banking organizations are already familiar with.

The bill would require a bank or multiple savings and loan securities affiliate to be a holding company subsidiary rather than a bank subsidiary. As a result of the affiliate's separate capitalization, any losses it incurred would not impair the capital of the bank. An affiliate would also have to maintain sufficient capital in relation to the nature of the volume of its securities activities to comply with the net capital requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

In addition, the bill gives the Federal Reserve Board authority to disapprove a holding company's proposed investment in an affiliate if the Board determined that the capital resources or the management of the holding company and the proposed affiliate were insufficient to support the anticipated business activities.

Beyond these capital requirements and the constraints imposed by the marketplace, securities affiliates would be subject to the International Lending Supervision Act of 1983, which strengthened the powers of the Federal banking agencies to establish minimum levels of capital for banks. Failure to comply with the minimum capital requirements would result in severe financial and civil penalties.

Section 23A of the Federal Reserve Act would also apply. It requires that loans and related transactions with holding company affiliates be fully collateralized and subject to limitations on amount. No more than 10 percent of a bank's capital may be lent to a single affiliate and no more than 20 percent may be lent to all affiliates. These limitations have been effective since their enactment in 1933. Furthermore, Congress revised Section 23A in 1982 to include restrictions against the purchase by a bank from its affiliate of assets whose value is impaired.

With respect to the non-bank bank loophole, my legislation would amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 [BHCA] to redefine a "bank" to include any institution which is insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) or which accepts demand deposits or other deposits withdrawable by check or similar means for payment to third parties, and makes commercial loans.

Excluded from the definition of a "bank" would be: First, any foreign bank having an insured or uninsured branch in the U.S.; second, mutual savings banks, savings banks, credit unions, thrifts, savings and loan associations which are federally insured or eligible to apply for such insurance, consumer banks, industrial banks, Morris Plan banks, and industrial loan companies; third, certain credit card banks which engage only in credit card operations and maintain only one office; and, fourth, cer-

tain trust companies, the FDIC-insured deposits of which are not marketed through an affiliated company and which do not obtain payment or payment-related services from any Federal Reserve bank or exercise Federal Reserve discount or borrowing privileges.

As I said, this legislation would exclude consumer banks from the definition of a bank. However, they will be subject to strict requirements, which include: First, a prohibition against making commercial loans; second, a requirement to maintain investments in specified types of consumer loans; and third, a requirement to make available in a State an aggregate amount of loans equal to 65 percent of the consumer deposits held by such institution which were received from consumers residing in such State.

Antitaking provisions and the Community Reinvestment Act would also apply to consumer banks and consumer bank holding companies. Consumer banks would be fully regulated and insured, and would be restricted in the types of loans and financial services they could provide. They would be subject to normal capitalization requirements, a higher community reinvestment standard, and all consumer protection measures that are required of full-service banks.

Consumer banks will be subject to the same laws and regulations as other banks. These include the National Banking Act, the Federal Reserve Act, the FDIC Act, the Monetary Control Act, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, and the Consumer Credit Protection Act, which includes the Truth in Lending Act. In addition, consumer banks will be subject to antitrust and securities laws, and examination by State and Federal regulatory agencies.

Without doubt, Mr. Speaker, the process of revamping our banking laws must be deliberate. But it is important that we start the process now. The integration of the financial services business has already arrived, but commercial banking organizations are restricted in their ability to compete.

For some, the answer is to turn back the clock and reverse the technological advances and progressive economic developments of recent years. This is clearly a mistaken approach which would have dangerous implications on the safety and soundness of the banking system. The results would be fewer investors of capital in banks and thrifts, less competition, less businesses, and less innovation in the development of consumer products and services. Moreover, prohibiting the ownership of a depository institution by commercial, industrial, and financial firms would require major divestitures, and could create additional instability in the system.

The limited-service banks that exist today have stimulated competition among financial institutions and contributed to the development of a financial marketplace that is much more responsive to consumer preferences. My legislation will take these developments a step further.

Banking organizations would be able to diversify by offering integrated financial planning for its current customers, as well as small investors who cannot afford expensive brokers. At the same time, consumer banks would be

able to meet the needs of consumers that are not being adequately served by the existing banking system.

The benefits of consumer banks would be vast. First, they would fill a void that currently exists in the types of financial products and services available to low-income families, minorities and women who are heads of households, and will provide greater access to banking institutions. Second, well-managed, highly profitable and diversified commercial firms can provide needed capital to an ailing depository institution, particularly failing thrifts.

More important, consumer banks would not pose any safety and soundness threats or regulatory problems. As evidence, it is important to note that today's limited-purpose banks are not endangering or abusing any laws. None face insolvency or have become insolvent, and there is no evidence of abuse to the payments system by commercial firms that own limited-purpose banks or thrifts.

Likewise, bank and multiple savings and loan holding company ownership of securities subsidiaries would not threaten the safety of the banking system. Instead, the opportunity to add new sources of revenue at relatively low risk will strengthen the system. In fact, the declining financial performance of banks in recent years can, in many ways, be attributed to limitations on the products and services banks can provide. These limitations make it difficult for banks to seek alternative sources of income as they watch their traditional activities erode at the hands of large commercial firms and investment banking organizations. The result has been greater reliance on more risky lending, both domestic and international, while top-quality borrowers increasingly turn to the commercial paper market for their credit needs.

The expanded range of permissible holding company activities that I am proposing are a natural extension of banking. Banks consistently report favorable results from underwriting and dealing in U.S. Government, municipal, and Eurobond securities. They have demonstrated competence in these activities, and there is no rational reason why they should not be allowed to do at home what they can do abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I am not proposing a radical restructuring of our banking laws. To the contrary, my legislation attempts to channel the radical developments that have already taken place in a prudent and productive manner. If we continue to do nothing but merely react to changing developments in the financial services marketplace, we will miss the opportunity to structure the system to meet the growing and complex needs of consumers, while insuring a strong and competitive financial services industry well into the next century.

This legislation, I believe, will start us in the right direction, and I urge the support of my colleagues for this proposal. It will bring about constructive and progressive changes in our Nation's banking laws that are necessary to the continued viability of the industry.

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO
THE 1986 RECIPIENTS OF THE
DISTINGUISHED SERVICE
AWARDS OF THE PASSAIC
HEART FOUNDATION, INC. OF
PASSAIC, NJ

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 28 the people of my congressional district and the State of New Jersey will join together at the annual awards dinner of the Passaic Heart Foundation, Inc. of Passaic, NJ to honor four outstanding citizens of New Jersey who have given unselfishly and willingly of their time in service to their fellowman.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our heartiest congratulations and deepest appreciation to the Passaic Heart Foundation's honorees—a roster of exemplary community leaders and highly reputable citizens of New Jersey, as follows:

The Honorable: Steven Alexander, M.D., F.A.C.S.; Salvatore Cannata; Daniel P. Conroy, Jr., M.D., F.A.C.C.; Jack DiPiazza; and Philip J. Jasper, M.D., F.A.C.S.

Mr. Speaker, the Passaic Heart Foundation is a highly prestigious eleemosynary organization in my congressional district dedicated to charitable and fundraising endeavors on behalf of victims of heart disease. Their strong commitment to seeking research and quality health care for those suffering organic or functional abnormalities of the heart is applauded by all of us. For example, in 1985 the Passaic Heart Foundation donated \$2,000 to the Scleroderma Society in order to help with research. Scleroderma is the hardening of the skin and affects different parts of the body including the heart and other vital organs. Another donation of \$1,800 in new equipment was given to the Passaic Volunteer First Aid and Rescue Squad, which consisted of a recorder Annie, a resusci-child, and a resusci-baby.

May I also commend to you the officers and board of trustees of the Passaic Heart Foundation, as follows:

The Honorable: J.R. Russo, chairman; Harry Antman, cochairman; John Lacquaniti, treasurer; Charlotte Antman, secretary; Josephine Lo Re, coordinator; Robert Abramowitz, Esquire, Counsel; Bonnie Abramowitz; Phil Birnbaum; Virginia Castiglia; Mel Currier; Millie Gatto; Dennis Gero; Esta Hymovitz; and Morris Werbin.

Mr. Speaker, our honorees have truly distinguished themselves in their career pursuits—all highly admired and respected for their outstanding accomplishments in their sphere of expertise. During the testimonial dinner on May 28 they will also be cited for their extracurricular activities, their strong personal commitment and sincerity of purpose in helping all our people—young and adults alike—suffering from diseases of the heart. There is much that can be said of their exemplary skills in their all-consuming professions which have enabled them to attain the highest regard and esteem

of all who have the good fortune to know them.

Mr. Speaker, D. Steven Alexander has assisted the Passaic Heart Foundation financially and devoted many hours of his valuable time in their noble cause on behalf of victims of heart disease. He was born in Passaic, NJ, educated in the Passaic school system and a graduate of Passaic High School. His undergraduate college studies were attained at Cornell University and he received his medical degree from the New York University School of Medicine.

He served his medical internship at the Cincinnati General Hospital and University of Cincinnati Medical Center. He completed his residency in surgery and urology at the Mount Sinai Hospital in New York City. He entered the practice of urology in Passaic in association with the late Dr. Bernard D. Pinck and has been attending urologist at the Beth Israel Hospital, the Passaic General Hospital and St. Mary's Hospital.

Among his medical school appointments, we are proud of his service as assistant clinical professor of urology at the Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York City. He is a member of the American Urological Association, the American Medical Association, and a fellow of the American College of Surgeons.

Dr. Alexander served our people and our country with distinction in Korea as a captain in the U.S. Army Medical Corps.

Mr. Speaker, Salvatore Cannata, director of the Passaic County Department of Consumer Affairs, was selected because he expends himself beyond the duties of his office and is actively involved with the United Way and other charitable organizations in Passaic County. He was born in Passaic, NJ, and educated in the Passaic school system. He obtained his G.E. degree from William Peterson College and attended Rutgers, the State university where he received the State meat inspector's license in meat processing, inspecting, and slaughtering. He operated Cannata's Superette in Passaic until 1974.

In January 1975 he was appointed deputy director of consumer affairs and in 1978 was elevated to his current office of public trust as director of consumer affairs. He also served on the advisory committee of the State citizens consumer affairs.

Consumer affairs helps our people on consumer-oriented issues to prevent fraud and provide the necessary consumer and economic information for all of our citizens to make well thought-out choices in the marketplace. Sal Cannata has made a major contribution to this nationwide effort.

Sal Cannata is a past commander of the American Legion Post 200 of Passaic, 1961-62 and has been Passaic County employees chairman of United Way since 1978. He is an active member of Passaic UNICO and was named their Man of the Year in 1983. He is county committeeman, Clifton Democratic Club, 34th District; member, Chrysler Customer Satisfaction Arbitration Board; former Clifton constable and member, Chief of Police Association of New Jersey.

He is a member, New Jersey State Organization for Cystic Fibrosis; Beth Israel Hospital Association, Passaic; notary public, Passaic

County; and North Jersey-Essex County Blood Bank. He is active in Mount Carmel Church Passaic affairs and is a member of the Holy Name Society.

Among his many citations, he received the Presidential National Award for Community Service (1984); Humanitarian Award for U.S.A., Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands, 1984; and the Passaic and Bergen County Retarded Children A.R.P. Humanitarian Award, 1985.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Daniel Conroy is one of the most outstanding cardiologists in our country and has helped many people. He was born in Brooklyn, NY, and received his bachelor of science degree from St. Peter's College, Jersey City, NJ. He attained his medical degree from the Universidad Autonoma de Guadalajara, 1975. For his postgraduate medical training he participated in the Fifth Channel Program at United Hospital Medical Center, Newark, NJ, 1975-76.

He fulfilled his straight medical internship, 1976-77, completed his residency in internal medicine, 1977-78, and was a fellow in cardiology, 1978-80, at St. Michael's Medical Center, Newark, NJ. He is certified by the Medical Board of Examiners as a physician in internal medicine and cardiovascular diseases having achieved diplomate, American Board of Internal Medicine, 1979, and diplomate, cardiovascular diseases, 1981.

Dr. Conroy is a member, American College of Physicians, and a fellow, American College of Cardiology. Since 1980 he has been an associate attending, the General Hospital Center at Passaic, NJ, and associate attending, St. Mary's Hospital, Passaic, NJ. He is a physician on the courtesy staff at St. Michael's Medical Center, Newark, NJ and conducts a private practice in Lyndhurst, NJ and in Clifton, NJ.

Mr. Speaker, Jack DiPiazza, proprietor of Leonard Bakery, who services area restaurants and airlines, was selected for his humanitarian involvement with charities. He was born and raised in Bolognetta, Sicily where as a young boy he began his early learnings and developed his business acumen in his family's macaroni factory.

The pleasure of great personal dedication and always working to the peak of one's ability with sincerity of purpose and determination to fulfill a life's dream—that's the success of the opportunity of America—and the mark of distinction in our society of the selfmade man. The aspirations and successes of Jack DiPiazza in the mainstream of America's business enterprises does indeed portray a great American success story.

Jack DiPiazza came to our country in 1955 and settled in Lodi, NJ. He began working full time for Scheps Cheese and part-time for Marcal Paper Mill, both in East Paterson, NJ. He was always looking for better ways to support himself and his growing family. The opportunity came in 1960, when he was able to purchase shares in what was then a small retail store known as Leonard's Pizzeria. Through hard work and determination he began to add other products to sell such as Italian pastries, breads, cakes and cookies. His ambition did not stop there. Jack, who was now sole owner of Leonard's Bakery, felt his products were good enough for him to expand into the wholesale market. He began

selling to restaurants, caterers, hotels, and other bakeries. He now distributes his products as far as California and Florida and is proud to be one of the many successful Italian-American businessmen in our country today.

He has been involved in many civic and charitable organizations. He is a member of the St. Anthony Society, Garfield, NJ, where he donated his time and money in building their clubhouse. He has received awards from the Kiwanis and Veterans of Foreign Wars of Lodi for his outstanding contributions to their noble goals and objectives. He is a member of the Passaic Chamber of Commerce and a major donor to the city's hospitals and churches. In 1978, Jack was one of the founders of the Italian American Forum of Lodi and was the club's 1981 president. He is also on the club's board of directors. His many activities as a member of the Italian American Forum include being cochairman of the committee for Boys Town of Italy where \$40,000 was presented to the Right Reverend Monsignor Carroll-Abbing to aid him in his work with orphaned children. He was also active in raising funds to help the earthquake victims of Italy and the building of a school in Cosensa, Italy. In 1984, he was honored by his native Italy who bestowed upon him the high honor of being named a cavaliere and later a commendatore.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Philip Jasper was selected for his concern and care for the citizens of Passaic, his outstanding work at St. Mary's Hospital and his support of many charities within Passaic County. Like all Passaic Heart Foundation's honorees, he has shown a warm feeling and understanding for his fellowman. He was born in South Amboy, NJ, and is a graduate of St. Mary's grammar and high schools in South Amboy. He completed his undergraduate college studies at Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, MD in 1952 and earned his M.D. degree in 1958 from the University of Rome, Italy.

Dr. Jasper served as an intern at Marland Medical Center, Newark, NJ, 1958-59, completed his surgical residency, 1959-60, and his urology residency, 1960-63. He is certified by the Medical Board of Examiners as a physician in urology having attained Diplomate of the American Board of Urology, 1966 and is a fellow of the American College of Surgery, 1967.

He was a clinical instructor of urology at Newark City hospital for 14 years before accepting his current assignment as clinical instructor at Mount Sinai Medical Center, New York City. He has served on the executive committees of all three hospitals and is president of the St. Mary's Hospital at the present time. He also is the director of urology at St. Mary's.

Dr. Jasper serves on the Passaic County Medical Society as trustee and is delegate to the New Jersey State Medical Society. He is State delegate to the JEMPAC (Political Action Committee). He is fluent in the Italian language and has lectured before the Italian Urological Society on several occasions. From 1965 to 1968 he served as commissioner on the Passaic County Mental Health Board.

He has a well-established practice with offices in the cities of Passaic and Clifton, NJ.

He has served as past president, the Passaic County Medical Society; past president, the medical staff of the Beth Israel Hospital; and is a former member of the board of trustees of the Beth Israel Hospital. He has authored 15 articles published in urological and medical journals and presented scientific papers at meetings of major urological societies—both in the United States and abroad.

During the period 1946 to 1948, Dr. Jasper served our people and country with distinction as a member of the USMC.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed appropriate that we reflect on the deeds and achievements of our people who have contributed to the quality of life and way of life here in America. As we gather together on May 28 in tribute to our honorees' leadership endeavors and personal commitments dedicated to caring and sharing in service to people, I know you will want to join with me in extending heartiest congratulations and deepest appreciation for all of their good works. We do indeed salute the 1986 recipients of the Distinguished Service Awards of the Passaic Heart Foundation, Inc. of Passaic, NJ.

THE CRUCIAL LINK BETWEEN EDUCATION AND COMPETITIVENESS

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about our trade crisis and the need to take strong steps to achieve a genuinely open and fair world market. I will not repeat those arguments today. My colleagues know that I am a strong supporter of the Trade and International Economic Policy Reform Act.

Today I want to talk about an especially important title of the bill: the education and training title. The very presence of an education and training component in trade legislation is tremendously significant. It shows that we have recognized that America will not be strong unless the American people are strong.

The administration and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem not to have recognized this obvious fact. The administration continues to propose crippling cuts in our education budget, and the substitute trade bill contains no provisions for education and training. This is a mistake.

The education and training programs in H.R. 4800 are programs for people, programs specifically aimed at enabling our people to acquire the knowledge and skills they will need to compete effectively in a highly competitive and rapidly changing world market.

The other components of the trade bill are designed to ensure that the rules of international trade are fair, and that all our trading partners observe them. As important as trade laws are, we must have the ability to make use of them. We must establish a level playing field, but we must also ensure that our people are in prime condition to play on that field.

In order to compete successfully, our workers and researchers must be able to read,

write, and calculate at advanced levels. They must have the ability to function in the languages of our major competitors. They must be able to develop the world's most advanced industrial techniques and processes and the world's most innovative software. They must have the skills necessary to function at high levels in cutting edge industries.

My colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee have designed a set of measures that will address these needs. The measures are responsible and creative; they are targeted at the real needs of our present and future workers, while at the same time allowing the flexibility necessary to respond to local conditions.

I commend Chairman HAWKINS and the other members of the Education and Labor Committee for their excellent work. I urge my colleagues to recognize the importance of their contribution by voting for H.R. 4800, the trade legislation that would strengthen our people as well as our market access, in the international competition that will determine our standard of living for decades to come.

A SOLID FOUNDATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, in 1965, Morris County, NJ became the location of a great educational experiment. The County College of Morris, which stands today as a model for quality higher education, is a tribute to the commitment and dedication of those people who have undertaken the challenge of transforming this promising idea into a solid educational opportunity for thousands of students since 1965.

At the center of this effort is a man who has guided the growth and development of the County College of Morris for all of those years.

As the first president of this growing institution of higher education, Dr. Sherman H. Masten has worked with the college trustees, faculty and staff to build a county college of the finest reputation from its very inception.

With Dr. Masten's expert guidance, we in Morris County have developed a county college that is the envy of similar institutions across the Nation.

Dr. Masten's continuing interest and concern in development of quality curricula has been the major contributing factor in our county college's high academic standards. The CCM curricula and its program of community support services are widely recognized among educators as models for other schools to follow.

As a former trustee who was involved with the campus expansion program, I know from first-hand experience that Dr. Masten is a strong advocate for an inspirational campus setting.

Using his earlier experience as a driving force behind the development of a new campus at the Ulster County Community College in Kingston, NY, Dr. Masten was instru-

mental in guiding the college expansion program.

Because of his efforts, we are blessed with a campus that is both beautiful and functional.

In all areas of leadership, both academic and administrative leadership, Dr. Masten's unique talent for motivating people has built a solid foundation upon which we can continue to build for many years to come.

The people of Morris County and the State of New Jersey owe Dr. Sherman H. Masten a debt of thanks for his efforts to build an institution of quality education for our young people.

As a Member of Congress who is concerned with the future of higher education, I applaud my good friend Dr. Sherman Masten for the example he has set for future generations of educators to follow.

I hope that, for the sake of quality education, he continues to follow his dreams where they may lead him.

JOINT RESOLUTION TO COMMEMORATE THE LAST VOYAGE OF THE "PRIDE OF BALTIMORE"

HON. HELEN DELICH BENTLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution to commemorate the last voyage of the *Pride of Baltimore*. Just last week, the vessel, the *Pride of Baltimore* sailed the Caribbean Sea. On May 13, 1986 the *Pride of Baltimore* departed St. John's in the Virgin Islands bound for the Port of Norfolk.

Later in the same day, the clipper was overcome by a tempestuous storm and high winds and waves. Eight of the crew members survived the sinking clipper. They were on a raft in the Caribbean Sea for 4½ days until the eight crew members were rescued by the *Toro Horton*, a Norwegian freighter on May 19, 1986. It is believed that two of the crew members were drowned in the sinking of the *Pride of Baltimore*.

Mr. Speaker, the heroic lives and death of the crew members of the clipper provide an opportunity to commemorate the last voyage of the *Pride of Baltimore*. In commemorating the vessel we also pay tribute to the ongoing tradition of sailors taking the risk of high seas.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues both in the Senate and the House of Representatives to join me in designating the day of June 1, 1986 as the "Pride of Baltimore Day." It is only fitting that June 1 be designated because this was the day that the *Pride of Baltimore* was scheduled to berth at the Baltimore Inner Harbor after a tour of goodwill. We must not let the heroic lives and death of crew members of the clipper vessel, the *Pride of Baltimore* go without proper congressional commemoration and recognition.

S. 2416

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2416, a bill to raise the ceiling on the VA Home Loan-Guaranty Programs from \$30.9 billion to \$40 billion. In addition, the bill provides \$2.4 million for additional staff to handle the processing of the large number of financing applications due to the recent decline in interest rates.

It is with great pleasure that I rise to support this bill which provides our Nation's veterans with the ability to obtain a good credit rating upon their return from military service. The VA Home-Loan Guaranty was established to reward our servicemen and women by allowing them to obtain credit extensions on favorable terms for home purchases, construction, repairs, and improvements. This bill guarantees the continued solvency of the VA Home Loan-Guaranty Program and serves to recognize the invaluable and dedicated service of our Nation's veterans.

As elected representatives, and more importantly, as American citizens, we have an obligation to repay our veterans for the countless hours of sacrifice and service which they have provided protecting our towns, our homes, and our loved ones. Insuring the solvency of the VA Home Loan-Guaranty Program is a very small way to say thank you. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize the need for this legislation and to provide their wholehearted support.

MAY 18-24 IS NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the President for proclaiming this Small Business Week. As our country salutes the small business owners of America, I think the theme is most appropriate because it is true "Small Business is Big in the U.S.A." It is a time to pause and recognize the contributions that small business makes to our economy.

As President Reagan has said, "Nothing characterizes the American economy better than our 14 million small businesses. They should be a source of pride for all Americans." Small businesses employ more than half of the private sector labor force and generate the vast majority of all new jobs. Small business plays an essential role in our economy in producing and marketing new products.

This year small business owners from all over the country will attend the White House Conference on Small Business. Many of the recommendations from the 1980 Conference on Small Business have already become law. I am looking forward to seeing what the 1986 Conference recommendations will be. These

recommendations will help in forming a small business agenda for the next Congress. It is in the best interest of our Nation for small businesses to continue to grow and prosper in our economy.

The men and women who will be honored this week for their achievements best exemplify America's entrepreneurial spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join with me in celebrating Small Business week, congratulating all the award winners and wishing future success to all small business owners.

A SALUTE TO REV. JOSEPH D. FORGOTCH

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, 1986, Rev. Joseph D. Forgotch will be honored on the 45th anniversary of his service in the priesthood. On this special occasion, a testimonial dinner will be held for Father Forgotch in Mahanoy City, PA.

Reverend Forgotch is a life-long resident of Schuylkill County. He was born in Mahanoy City to Anthony and Kathryn Krohn Forgotch on August 30, 1914. He attended Mahanoy City Public Schools and graduated from Mahanoy City High School in 1932. After graduation, Father Forgotch entered St. Charles College in Catonsville, MD, and then attended St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook. On June 7, 1941, he was ordained into the priesthood by the late Dennis Cardinal Dougherty in Sts. Peter and Paul Cathedral in Philadelphia.

In keeping with his longstanding commitment to our area, Father Forgotch returned to Schuylkill County and celebrated his first Mass on June 8, 1941 in St. Mary's Church in Mahanoy City. His first appointment was on loan to the Harrisburg Diocese and to St. Mary's Church in Shamokin. In later years, he served in Frackville and Philadelphia and, in February 1958, he was made pastor of St. Mary's Church in Ringtown, PA, where he continues to serve today. In 1966, in recognition of his dedication to the priesthood Father Forgotch was appointed by Bishop McShea as a member of the Diocesan Liturgical Committee.

In addition to his service at St. Mary's Church in Ringtown, Father Forgotch is active in a number of community organizations in the area. He is a member of the Ringtown Lions Club and the Fountain Springs Country Club. He was also an instrumental force in the development of the area's CYO basketball program which has been hugely successful. For 45 years, Father Forgotch has dedicated his life to helping his fellow citizens through his commitment to the priesthood as well as his dedication to numerous community organizations. He is being justifiably honored for his dedication, hard work and service. I know that my colleagues will want to join me in saluting Father Forgotch and in wishing him continued success and good fortune in the years to come.

REPUBLICANS LAUNCH ATTACK ON LOAN POLICIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND WORLD BANK

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker. Some confusion persists in the press between the Joint Economic Committee staff study, "The Impact of the Latin American Debt Crisis on the U.S. Economy," and an attack being launched by some Republicans in the U.S. Senate on loan policies of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Those international lending institutions have been a favorite target of conservatives and protectionists for years. They are not, however, the target of the JEC study.

The staff study, which the committee released 2 weeks ago, examines administration policy, not the institutions which are the tools to implement that policy. It is clear that the Third World debt policy emanated from the U.S. Treasury and the Reagan White House. The international lending institutions seldom act without the concurrence of the United States. In fact, the United States holds more than 20 percent of the voting shares in the IMF and is thereby the only nation in the world with outright veto power over any proposals before the institutions. In this instance, however, the policies were adopted not only with the concurrence of the United States but at its urging.

In meeting the Latin American debt crisis, the policy asked repayment to the money center banks at a pace that could only be achieved by dramatic cuts in the Third World purchase of U.S. manufactured and agricultural products and by rapid production of Third World commodities almost all of which were already in surplus on world markets. The policy asked too little of the banks, which under the arrangement not only had their capital protected but were able to maintain high profit margins on the loan in question. The result was a further drop in commodity prices, a \$17 billion shift in the United States balance of trade with Latin America and serious damage to U.S. agricultural and export manufacturers. By some estimates, the debt crisis policy has cost the U.S. economy a million jobs.

No legislation is needed to correct this problem. The administration needs only to face up to the consequences of its policy. It has the executive authority to change a policy that favors the banks to one that treats the various economic sectors with greater balance. The IMF and other multilateral institutions provide the administration with the tools needed to implement a fair and balanced policy. The only thing that is missing is the wisdom and sense of fairness to make such a use of these institutions possible.

ABC UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT HONORS EMPLOYEES WITH OVER 25 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House to join me honoring the employees of the ABC Unified School District.

On June 4 the school district will honor the service and devotion of their employees at a special reception. The employees being honored have given over 25 years of service to the students and people of the ABC Unified School District.

These individuals are being honored for their commitment and dedication to education. They are to be commended for their contributions to the needs of the students in the school district. The welfare and future of our young are well cared for and safely secured by these outstanding employees. It takes special people to take care of and educate our Nation's students. I am proud that these fine people have chosen to work in my community for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, the ABC Unified School District is one of the finest school districts in the State of California. The loyalty of the people being honored today reflects the district's outstanding relationship with its employees. I want to recognize two individuals for exceptional service. Virginia P. Dilley has been a teacher in the district for 38 years and Deputy Superintendent Charles C. Vernon served the district for 27 years. I want to congratulate and thank them for adding something special to education.

THE MEDICARE VISION AND OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY BENEFIT IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill designed to provide Medicare beneficiaries with necessary services. The bill would authorize Medicare reimbursement to optometrists for vision-care services and expand reimbursement under Medicare for occupational therapy services.

Many beneficiaries are being forced to forego covered eye-care services or are paying for eye services furnished by optometrists out of their own pockets because they do not have ready access to an ophthalmologist. This bill provides beneficiaries with protection against these expenses when the services would already be covered under the program if performed by an ophthalmologist. The bill does not expand or change the current coverage rules for eye-care services under Medicare.

Furthermore, the bill would modestly expand Medicare's occupational therapy benefit. With patients being discharged from the

hospital sooner, occupational therapy services are needed to enable beneficiaries to function independently.

EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS

Vision Care

Currently Medicare covers eye-care services when furnished by a physician (a medical doctor or doctor of osteopathy) to a beneficiary with a complaint or symptom of eye disease or injury. Reimbursement for eyeglasses or for eye examinations for the purpose of prescribing, fitting, or changing eyeglasses or contact lenses is denied except for prosthetic lenses for aphakic patients, that is those patients without the natural lens of the eye. Under current law, an optometrist, legally authorized by the State to practice optometry, is reimbursed under Medicare only for the purpose of furnishing services related to the treatment of aphakic patients.

The bill would authorize Medicare reimbursement for vision care services furnished by optometrists, if the services are among those already covered by Medicare when furnished by a physician and if the optometrist is authorized by State law to provide the services.

Occupational Therapy

Occupational therapy is a medically prescribed treatment that is concerned with the restoration or improvement of functions that have been impaired by illness or injury, or when functions have been permanently lost or reduced due to illness or injury. Occupational therapy improves the individual's ability to perform those tasks necessary to ensure independent functioning.

Medicare currently covers medically necessary occupational therapy services under part A when provided as a part of covered inpatient or post-hospital extended care services or as a part of home health services or hospice care.

Part B coverage of occupational therapy services is limited to treatment in a hospital outpatient department, comprehensive outpatient rehabilitation facility, home health agency, or when provided as incident to the services of a physician.

The bill would extend reimbursement under part B of Medicare for occupational therapy services. The bill would authorize part B reimbursement for occupational therapy services provided in a skilled nursing facility (after part A coverage has been exhausted), in a clinic or rehabilitation agency. Payment would be based on Medicare's reasonable cost basis.

Furthermore, the bill would provide for coverage of occupational therapy services when furnished in a therapist's office or a beneficiary's home. No more than \$500 in incurred expenses would be eligible for coverage in a calendar year per beneficiary. Payment would be based on Medicare's reasonable charge rules.

In general, this bill would make coverage of occupational therapy services comparable to the existing coverage of physical therapy services.

VETERANS DESERVE HOME LOANS

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 4775, a bill to raise the Veterans' Administration Home Loan Guarantee Program ceiling from \$18.2 billion to \$40 billion and to free additional funds for the program's operation.

This program deserves our support. In these days of falling interest rates, home buying has become more and more attractive. Many veterans are now able to consider buying a home or refinancing a present mortgage. We are seeing a great increase in the number of veterans who need financing assistance. More than 400,000 mortgage loans will be guaranteed by the VA this year. This type of economic activity is good for the country and good for our veterans.

With this increased activity we see a greater need than ever for personnel to staff this program. This legislation would provide for that need.

This bill will result in \$15 million in savings this year and will cost only \$27 million for the next 2 years. This is a relatively small investment considering our budget of almost \$1 trillion.

Without this legislation this program will be without funding. This would be a mistake of great proportions and an abdication of the debt we owe to those who served our Nation. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting it.

PREAPPRENTICESHIP TRAINING PROGRAM

HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the students and staff of the Women's Employment Resource Center of New Haven on the occasion of the graduation of the first 15 students from the Center's Preapprenticeship Training Program. The purpose of this program is to train low-income women for careers in fields traditionally filled by men, such as construction, manufacturing, and high technology.

The Preapprenticeship Training Program is funded by the New Haven Private Industry Council and began its first set of training sessions on March 3, 1986. The current graduates learned about all aspects of building construction, including carpentry, plumbing, and electrical work, by constructing a small building under the supervision of an instructor from West Haven High School. They also learned about safety and first aid, physical fitness, and basic industrial arts, as well as ways to deal effectively with the pressures of the work world.

I am very proud of the accomplishments of 15 women who have completed their preap-

prenticeship training. The 15 graduates are Aquanetta Carreira, Dolores Costin, Linda Covington, Deirdre Ford, Terri Gatling, Tonya Gonsalves, Karen Harrington, Beverly Harrison, Germaine Holland, Cynthia Humphrey, Charlene Maselli, Rita Natale, Marcie Staffa, Patricia Van Seyst, and Joann Williams. They will be placed in entry-level jobs or apprenticeship programs where they will begin their careers. I congratulate them on their achievements and wish them the best of luck in the future.

The Preapprenticeship Training Program enables women to increase their earning capacity by placing them in higher paying occupational and career categories than would be otherwise open to them. But the program does more than help the individual women who participate. Such programs are great opportunities for the city of New Haven, the seventh poorest city in the country, because they contribute to the economic health of the city through increasing the tax base and expanding the numbers of skilled workers.

The Preapprenticeship Training Program stands as a promising example that equal opportunity in our economic system can be turned into reality. I know my colleagues join me in congratulating the students and staff of the program and wish them many years of continued success.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK, 1986

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday, my subcommittee held a hearing in Detroit, MI, to review the role of the small business sector in our economy, and how our Government can better assist small firms.

This hearing was particularly timely since it kicked off the start of Small Business Week, 1986. As President Reagan stated when announcing this special week, "The business of America begins with small business—millions of men and women, bold and imaginative starters, seizing opportunities and providing jobs that help to ensure that our Nation will remain economically strong and free."

Small Business Week is an appropriate time to reflect on the importance of small firms to the Nation's economy. Today, small businesses employ over 58 percent of all private sector employees. Small firms produce over half of the Nation's gross national product. Perhaps more importantly, a vast majority of all net new jobs and innovations in the United States are being created by our smaller enterprises. Small businesses are deeply involved in their communities, providing employment and services, and contributing to the overall well-being of an area.

During the past year, thousands of small business owners have been meeting at small business conferences throughout most of the 50 States, in preparation for this August's White House Conference on Small Business. The recommendations presented by the delegates to this national conference will help us in Congress to formulate a small business

agenda designed to make sure our small firms have a definite role to play in advancing the Nation's prosperity.

Small Business Week is also a time to reflect on how much we as a nation can or should do to help small businesses. I must take this opportunity, therefore, to express my concern over the recent actions of the new Acting Administrator for the Small Business Administration. Mr. Charles Heatherly has stated that he fully supports the President's latest proposal to transfer some of the SBA's responsibilities to the Department of Commerce, while eliminating many other functions. He is actively pursuing this agenda although the Congress has clearly shown its support for an independent SBA. I am afraid that such actions could undermine the effectiveness of the agency.

As Members of Congress, our mission is not to guarantee the success of every small business venture. Rather we seek to ensure that our small businesses are playing on a level field, receiving the same opportunities and Government support as large business. An independent SBA has a definite role to play in this arena. Therefore, I believe that the essential assistance and credit avenues provided by the Small Business Administration must remain available to the American small business person.

THE "J" CURVE, THE G-5 AND THE DEFICIT

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, a new curve has gained popularity with economists: the "J" curve. This curve explains why, after a 20-percent devaluation in the U.S. dollar following the G-5 intervention, the trade deficit has continued to rise.

The reason is simple: changes in trade flows lag behind changes in currency value. American consumers take time to change their import buying habits while American exports—primarily large capital goods—do not rise in volume until new contracts are completed for future delivery at a lower price.

The G-5 intervention could, in the coming year, contribute to a solution to our trade imbalance. But many in Congress prefer to downplay this effort while forgetting that the responsibility of instituting the most important element of any comprehensive trade program lies with this body. I am speaking of cutting the Federal budget deficit which has made international debtors of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, to reduce our trade deficit we must maintain long-term cooperation with G-5 members. Unfortunately, supporters of today's trade bill abandon such cooperation and replace it with political pandering and protectionism.

BRUCE GREENFIELD TO BE HONORED FOR YOUTH WORK

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, the friends and colleagues of Mr. Bruce Greenfield of North Bellmore, NY, will honor him for 15 years of dedicated work with the youth of our communities. A constituent of mine, Mr. Greenfield is director of youth activities for the United Synagogue of America. Today, I am pleased to recognize this fine American for his outstanding contributions to the betterment of the young people of the New York metropolitan area.

During the past 15 years that Mr. Greenfield has been youth activities director, the organization's programs have flourished. Today, more than 6,500 youngsters from over 100 conservative congregations across the New York metropolitan area participate in a variety of activities.

Young people have boundless energy and enthusiasm. However, as adults, our biggest challenge is helping them direct that tireless energy into productive and worthwhile efforts. Mr. Greenfield has devoted his career to providing our young people with this kind of opportunity, to encouraging them to pursue stimulating interests, and to helping them become responsible, active citizens.

His hard work and commitment has earned him the respect and admiration of many. As director, he coordinates and directs the teen and preteen programs, the summer camp program, as well as the Alumni and Friends Association. He administers the organization's scholarship program, which has raised over \$250,000 for educational assistance to deserving students.

Active in many other community efforts, Mr. Greenfield has expended considerable time and energy on behalf of Soviet Jewry, the State of Israel, and most recently, the forgotten and oppressed Jews in Arab lands, most notably, Ethiopia.

In closing, I'd like to express my most sincere appreciation to Mr. Greenfield for all his many years of dedicated work, and wish him many years of health and happiness.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

HON. THOMAS A. LUKEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to salute the small business men and women of America during National Small Business Week, 1986. From May 16 through May 24 the Nation's 15 million small businesses will be recognized and honored at ceremonies across America. Here in Washington we will host the 50 winners from each State chosen by SBA's small business advisory councils.

Small entrepreneurs have consistently led the Nation in job creation, technology innovation, and improved opportunities for women, minorities, and veterans. The Congress, the Federal Government, and State governments must encourage the efforts of small business in order to ensure that their successes continue.

There are many ways that the Congress can help. Particularly, the Congress needs to keep a close eye on regulations that hinder more than help these businesses. We must provide a stable environment that encourages growth and innovation for small business.

The area of taxation is of great importance to small business. Capital formation has always been one of the key problems to starting a business. We must make sure that our tax laws do not take away money that is vitally needed from these companies. Tax reform should be fair and simple to help both small and large businesses.

A major concern to small companies recently is the cost of insurance. This monumental problem needs to be addressed both locally and nationally. It is important to allow businesses to operate without prohibitive liability insurance costs.

This year an important event, the White House Conference on Small Business, will take place in August. This meeting will allow small business persons the chance to present the Congress and the Federal Government with an agenda for action. The previous conference, held in 1980, produced 60 recommendations. Over two-thirds have been acted on either legislatively or administratively.

Mr. Speaker, let us start this week, National Small Business Week, and begin to study some of these problems mentioned here. Let's help the millions of entrepreneurs to continue to provide Americans with valuable jobs and services.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MORTGAGE PROGRAM BENEFITS

HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2416 which would raise the current \$18.2 billion ceiling on the Veterans Administration Home Loan Guaranty Program to \$40 billion.

On February 25, the Congress passed legislation which corrected an estimating error of the VA's fiscal 1986 guarantee activity. Last summer, the Veterans Administration estimated its home loan guarantees would total only about \$12 billion in fiscal 1986, but due to the sharp decline in interest rates and the healthy state of the economy, many more veterans than expected have been seeking new homes or refinancing old ones.

However, the 9½-percent interest rate has encouraged further unprecedented refinancing and new loan activity. It is estimated that more than 400,000 mortgage loans will be guaranteed by the VA this year. This is more

than double the number of loans guaranteed last year.

As a strong supporter of the VA Home Loan Guaranty Program, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in taking quick action so that we send a clear signal to many veterans that this particular benefit will remain viable and available to them.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN MANLY

HON. BUTLER DERRICK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1986

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor one of South Carolina's most respected educators, Dr. John W. Manly, upon his retirement as executive vice president of Tri-County Technical College, Dr. Manly has served in this capacity since 1971 and will be sorely missed by the school's administration, faculty, students and friends of the college.

In the early days of his tenure at Tri-County Technical College, Dr. Manly established the Child Development Department, a program that has had statewide implications. Working with Clemson University, he planned, implemented, and directed a special training program for vocational and technical education teachers. This program provided teaching skills to South Carolina vocational teachers.

Through his leadership and service, Dr. Manly has helped shape not only Tri-County Technical College, but our entire State tech system. In South Carolina, we look to the technical education system as a means to economic development. The contributions of individuals like Dr. Manly make this goal a reality.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to recognize today Dr. Manly's achievements and commend him for his distinguished service. I wish him many years of happy retirement.

ADMIRALTY ISLAND LAND EXCHANGE

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I joined with Chairman UDALL of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and with the committee's ranking Republican member, Representative YOUNG of Alaska, in introducing a bill, H.R. 4833, intended to provide a framework for land exchanges involving lands on Admiralty Island, in southeastern Alaska.

BACKGROUND

Introduction of H.R. 4833 is the latest chapter in a very long story.

Proposals for the protection of Admiralty Island date back at least to 1901, when President Theodore Roosevelt recommended that it be made a brown bear refuge. In subsequent years, Admiralty was proposed several times for national park status, for wilderness, for a national sanctuary, and for recreation use. Although the island has been frequently

studied, no special protective status was granted until 1978.

For years before that, Admiralty Island was under threat of massive clearcutting operations. The threat did not materialize only because the first timber purchaser went bankrupt and two subsequent purchasers forfeited their contracts. In 1969, Admiralty Island was included in the largest single timber sale in U.S. history. The Forest Service awarded a 50-year contract to United States (Plywood) Champion International to cut 8.75 billion board feet of timber. The company's initial plan called for clearcutting a section on the west side of Admiralty near the village of Angoon. That threat was stayed by a lawsuit which resulted in the cancellation of the contract by mutual consent of the company and the Forest Service in 1975.

However, another controversy arose over withdrawals of land on Admiralty Island announced that same year by the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of two "urban" Native corporations. The corporations, Goldbelt, Inc., and Shee Atika, Inc., were formed under section 14(h)(3) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act [ANCSA] to represent Natives living in the urban centers of Juneau and Sitka respectively.

Native peoples residing in the traditional villages in southeast Alaska formed village corporations under section 16 of ANCSA. These villages were entitled to select 23,040 acres of public lands encompassing their villages. The "urban" Native corporations, including those for Kenai and Kodiak as well as for Juneau and Sitka, were treated differently under ANCSA because their shareholders were living in municipalities or "urban" centers that were predominantly non-Native and where land was in private ownership. Therefore, they could not receive the immediately local township of public land, or so-called core township, which all other villages were granted. The controversy over the urban Native land withdrawals on Admiralty arose largely from an interpretation given to section 14(h)(3) of ANCSA by the Secretary in promulgating regulations to implement it. That interpretation, as applied to Admiralty Island, became the subject of litigation.

When the 95th Congress began consideration of proposed Alaska lands bills, the litigation was on inactive status. The parties to the suit were encouraged by the Interior Committee to try to reach agreement on a voluntary resolution of the land selection problem. The Forest Service at that time indicated it could find sufficient land to meet the selective requirements of the urban corporations if given guidelines for determining values. Both the Juneau and Sitka corporations indicated their willingness to accept alternate land off Admiralty Island, if their economic interests were protected.

ALASKA LANDS DEBATES

In 1978, the House passed H.R. 39, a bill entitled "The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act." Final action on similar legislation was blocked in the Senate by the threat of a filibuster, and the 95th Congress adjourned without completing action on Alaska lands legislation.

On December 1, 1978, President Carter, employing his powers under the Antiquities

Act of 1906, issued a proclamation designating most of Admiralty Island as a national monument to be managed by the U.S. Forest Service—the island has been part of the Tongass National Forest since that forest was created.

The House-passed Alaska lands bill of the 95th Congress included provisions addressing the status of the Native selections on Admiralty Island.

In general, the bill authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to designate alternative lands of equal or greater timber values in southeast Alaska but off Admiralty Island which would be made available to the Native corporations in exchange for their on-island selections.

In April 1979, Goldbelt, Inc., concluded an exchange agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture whereby Goldbelt agreed to relinquish its selections on the northwestern coast of the island in exchange for other lands in the Tongass National Forest. That exchange was ratified in the House passed bill of the following—96th Congress.

Final congressional action on Alaska lands legislation came in the 96th Congress. The House had passed its version—the Udall-Anderson bill—in May 1979. The Senate passed a bill in August 1980.

The Senate version, like the House bill, confirmed the Goldbelt exchange. It also included a specific land exchange between the United States and Kootznoowoo, Inc., the corporation for Angoon—the only village actually located on the island—whereby Kootznoowoo received lands off Admiralty. And the Senate bill included provisions granting Shee Atika, Inc., the surface estate in the lands on Admiralty Island which had been relinquished by Goldbelt. The subsurface estate in those lands was conveyed to Sealaska, Inc., the regional corporation formed pursuant to ANCSA whose shareholders are Natives in southeastern Alaska.

We in the House who had been involved with this matter anticipated that there would be a conference, in accordance with the normal course of business, to reconcile differences between the House and Senate bills. The concerned Senators, however, would not agree to such conference and made it clear that they intended to leave the House a "take it or leave it" choice; that is, the Senate bill or no bill.

On November 12, 1980, the House acquiesced in the Senate version, and the act was signed into law by President Carter on December 2, 1980.

The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act designated most of Admiralty Island as a national monument (a legislative designation replacing the similar designation under the Presidential Proclamation of 1978). Within the monument boundaries there is an area (the Greens Creek area at the north end of the monument) which was excluded from wilderness designation so as to permit continued, limited exploration and development of minerals by a joint venture which had claims in the area. Also within the outer boundaries of the monument, as a private inholding, are the lands conveyed to Shee Atika and Sealaska. These are commonly referred to as the "Cube Cove lands."

SINCE 1980

Enactment of the Alaska Lands Act did not end controversy over Admiralty Island.

Since 1980, the status of Shee Atika's lands at Cube Cove and the corporation's attempts to subject them to timbering have been the subject of protracted litigation which is still ongoing.

Additional controversy has resulted from administration proposals regarding mineral development in the Greens Creek area.

Section 504 of the Alaska Lands Act has facilitated mineral exploration in the Greens Creek area. As was the case under the Presidential Proclamation of December 1, 1978, the area, as part of the national monument, remains withdrawn from mineral entry. However, the act provided that holders of unperfected claims properly located, recorded, and maintained as of November 30, 1978, could receive exploration permits for such of those unperfected claims as were located within three-fourths of a mile of a patented or perfected—core—claim. Recipients of the exploration permits were authorized to explore the relevant unperfected claims and to apply for patents to the minerals therein. Issuance of such mineral patents would require the showing of a valuable discovery, under the general mining laws.

Section 504(c)(2)(A) of the Alaska Lands Act provided that, absent special circumstances (which did not occur), all exploration permits for claims within the Admiralty Island National Monument would expire December 2, 1985. Section 504(e)(2) provided that, absent a prior assertion of a valid discovery, an unperfected claim within the Admiralty Island National Monument "shall be conclusively presumed to be abandoned and shall be void" upon expiration of an exploration permit for such claim.

Since enactment of the Alaska Lands Act, a joint venture, known as the Greens Creek Joint Venture, has carried out exploration activities in the Greens Creek area under permits issued pursuant to the relevant provision of the act. As the deadline for expiration of the permits approached, the joint venture sought to avoid the consequent voiding of any claims that remained unperfected when the permits expired.

The joint venture first approached the U.S. Forest Service, requesting administrative action to remove the Greens Creek area from the Admiralty Island National Monument and thus from the ambit of section 504 of the Alaska Lands Act.

After favorable consideration of this request at lower levels within the Department of Agriculture, the Acting Secretary of Agriculture informed Chairman UDALL and the Interior Committee, by a letter dated December 24, 1984, that the administration intended to utilize the authority provided by section 103(b) of the Alaska Lands Act to make minor adjustments in the boundaries of conservation system units so as to exclude the Greens Creek area from the Admiralty Island National Monument while adding a nearby area known as Young Bay or VCU 133 to the monument.

On January 29, 1985, Chairman UDALL wrote to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture regarding this and other matters. In that letter, the chairman ex-

pressed strong opposition to the proposed change in the boundary of Admiralty Island National Monument, and concluded that "For the Department of Agriculture to attempt to overturn these legislative arrangements" with regard to mineral exploration in the Greens Creek area "is clearly beyond the proper scope" of the boundary-adjustment provisions of section 103(b).

PUBLIC LAW 99-235

During 1985, the Greens Creek joint venture sought legislative action to extend its ability to carry out exploration activities in the Greens Creek area. In response, the Interior Committee reported a bill which was enacted as Public Law 99-235. That public law provides that no claim will be voided by operation of section 504(e)(2) of the Alaska Lands Act until midnight, December 2, 1986.

Public Law 99-235 also addresses other matters affecting Admiralty Island which were dealt with in the Alaska Lands Act, and in particular the status of the Cube Cove lands.

On November 7, 1985, Shee Atika testified that it believed that recent decisions in the trial courts enabled it to "pursue resource development that will result in the harvesting of timber on our Admiralty Island properties." We were told that Shee Atika had already advertised a stumpage sale in order to produce immediate income. Testimony was given that Shee Atika intended that by March 1986 the necessary contracts would be finalized so as to provide for harvesting on the Cube Cove lands.

While both Shee Atika and Sealaska have testified that they are amenable to steps which would avoid development of the Cube Cove lands, Shee Atika has made it clear that its financial situation is such that an indispensable element in any such alternative arrangements is expeditious receipt by Shee Atika of needed funding to enable it to meet certain outstanding obligations and business expenses.

For its part, Sealaska has testified that it has entered into an agreement in principle with the Greens Creek Joint Venture, contingent upon Sealaska's exchange of its subsurface estate in the Cube Cove lands for Federal lands in the Greens Creek area.

As an interim measure intended to assist in efforts to further resolve the status of the Cube Cove lands, Congress provided in Public Law 99-235 that the Secretary of Agriculture should seek to negotiate an agreement with Shee Atika under which Shee Atika would agree, in return for agreed compensation, not to allow timber harvest or other activities on its Admiralty Island lands that would be inconsistent with their possible future inclusion in the Admiralty Islands National Monument Wilderness. The law's language is mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture, but not mandatory in any way upon Shee Atika. Such negotiations in fact have taken place, but no agreement has been reached.

Enactment of Public Law 99-235 came during the final days of the first session of the present Congress. Since Congress reconvened earlier this year, efforts have continued to try to develop legislation which would address Admiralty Island questions in a more conclusive manner. Those efforts have produced the bill H.R. 4833, which Chairman

UDALL, Representative YOUNG, and I introduced yesterday.

THE NEW BILL

H.R. 4833 would authorize an exchange offer which Shee Atika—or both Shee Atika and Sealaska—could accept or reject.

If Shee Atika and Sealaska both accept the bill's offer, the two corporations would relinquish and convey to the United States their right, title, and interest to the Cube Cove lands. In return, the United States would give to the corporations lands and other things of value as follows:

Shee Atika would receive both the surface and subsurface estate in certain lands on Baranof Island, near Sitka, and the United States would be contractually obligated to build a road to connect those lands to the existing road network; Shee Atika would also receive the surface estate in certain lands on Kuiu Island. In addition, conveyance of the Cube Cove lands would be deemed to be complete satisfaction of certain outstanding obligations of Shee Atika to the United States.

Further, Shee Atika would receive title to 40 percent of the subsurface estate of certain lands in the Greens Creek area, would receive two payments from the United States—in successive fiscal years—totaling \$15 million, and could harvest some of the timber on the Cube Cove lands, under terms and conditions designed to protect environmental values of those lands.

If both corporations accept, Sealaska would, for its part, receive the subsurface estate in some of the lands whose surface would go to Shee Atika; certain other subsurface interests in southeast Alaska; 60 percent of the subsurface estate in the Greens Creek lands; and a long-term lease to the surface of some of the Greens Creek lands.

Should Sealaska decline the bill's offer, Shee Atika would receive all—not just 40 percent—of the Greens Creek subsurface, and timber harvesting on the Cube Cove lands would be reduced accordingly. Should Shee Atika reject the bill's offer, there would be no exchanges, regardless of Sealaska's acceptance or refusal.

None of the exchanges authorized by the bill would adversely affect the ability of the Forest Service to manage the Tongass National Forest in accordance with the Alaska Lands Act or other applicable law now in effect.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4833 represents a good-faith effort to make possible a resolution of disputes which have dragged on for many years.

No doubt, there are features of the bill which some may find difficult to unreservedly endorse. I would not claim that it is a perfect bill. In particular, I regret that practical, political difficulties apparently preclude—at least in this Congress—a solution which would prevent any further harvesting of the timber on the Cube Cove lands.

As things stand, however, I believe that H.R. 4833 is as good a legislative proposal as can be fashioned which has any chance at all of enactment and acceptance by the concerned corporations and that would eliminate the Cube Cove inholding from the Admiralty

Island National Monument and, at the same time, enable the Greens Creek mineral development project to go forward. It is on this basis that the coauthors of the bill have gone forward with it.

**THE MERCHANT SEAMAN'S
BENEFIT ACT**

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation on this National Maritime Day, which is set aside each year to recognize the American merchant marine and the seamen who serve on our vessels. The Merchant Seaman's Benefit Act recognizes those remaining merchant seamen who served the Nation well during the hostilities of World War II by providing them with veterans' status and benefits.

May 22 actually marks the day in 1819 when a fledgling U.S.-flag merchant marine saw the SS *Savannah* commence what was to be the first successful crossing of the Atlantic Ocean by a vessel using steam propulsion and the beginning of a new era in shipping.

May 22 also marks the day we recognize those merchant seamen who gave their lives in the defense of this great Nation. During World War II alone, more than 700 merchant vessels and nearly 6,000 merchant seamen were lost due to enemy action. This group has the highest casualty rate of any of our armed services other than the Marine Corps.

I can recall those days in 1942 and 1943 when our shipping was being brutalized by enemy submarines operating close to our shores. I can recall the battle of the Atlantic in our efforts to resupply our European allies—and the relief convoys that traveled the treacherous Murmansk route to resupply our Russian allies. I can recall the Pacific campaigns and the support missions that were conducted by a proud and ever-present merchant marine. I can remember seeing hundreds of vessels anchored off City Island, NY—an area I presently represent—preparing for convoy duty for the crossing of the Atlantic. West coast ports and many gulf coast ports were likewise crammed with merchant vessels and merchant seamen ready to risk their lives in the war effort.

We must never forget those dedicated individuals who sailed into the darkness of the unknown with little or no protection. It is now most fitting for a grateful nation to recognize the valiant efforts of those veteran merchant seamen who are still with us.

Merchant seamen have manned our ships since the creation of our Nation. They have sailed in peace and in war. Today, we have merchant seamen manning our prepositioned supply fleet in the Indian Ocean, our specialized Military Sealift Command vessels, and our privately owned, deep-draft fleet of merchant vessels. Today, as before, they stand ready to help this Nation in its time of need.

My legislation would provide veterans' benefits to those merchant seamen who served on merchant vessels during the period of hostilities from December 6, 1941 to and includ-

ing August 15, 1945. This includes service as a civilian or civil service member of the merchant marine on vessels of the United States on ocean, coastwise, or intercoastal voyages.

To qualify, a seaman must have sailed for a total period equal to at least 18 months during the 45 months of hostilities. This service must be verifiable by entries noted in a continuous discharge book, a certificate of discharge, or other appropriate documentation. Many of these records, if lost and not in the possession of the seaman, can be obtained from the Coast Guard for a reasonable search and duplicate fee. In those cases where service was on civil service manned vessels—such as the old Army Transportation Service which might not have issued appropriate Coast Guard documentation—the process of verification might be more difficult—but certainly not impossible.

One might ask why so many years after the termination of World War II are we interested in this type of legislation. For one thing, the United States is the only major maritime nation that has not recognized those merchant seamen who contributed greatly to the war effort. To understand why, we must review some history.

After World War II, the issue of veterans' status was reviewed by the Congress, but no action was taken. This was primarily due to the mistaken assumption that merchant seamen were highly paid for the risk they took in the form of war-zone bonuses. When one does an analysis of pay scales, military dependent allowances, certain surtax and victory tax exclusions, the actual incomes after taxes of a merchant seaman and a naval seaman were fairly comparable. This, of course, does not include the veterans' benefits a naval seaman received such as mortgage, educational, and reemployment assistance—to name only a few.

Another inequity was the amount of assistance the dependents of a merchant seaman killed in action received compared to dependents of a naval gun crew seaman. The dependents of a merchant seaman received a lump sum payment of \$5,000. Dependents of a naval seaman killed in action received 6 months' base pay, an annuity for life, and coverage for dependent children until age 18. Based on life expectancy tables and the number of dependents, these benefits are from three to six times as much as a merchant seaman's dependents received. The same compensation ratio prevailed for those seamen who received disabling injuries.

Some argue that merchant seamen were free to stop sailing whenever they desired and were not subject to the degree of control exercised over a member of the armed services—and that, therefore, they should not be entitled to veterans' status. While this argument appears valid on its face, the realities of manning merchant vessels during the war leads one to a different conclusion.

A merchant seaman was only paid for the time he was attached to a merchant vessel and received no pay between voyages while awaiting assignment to another vessel. When he took leave, he was not paid—while the naval seaman was paid 12 months a year with 30 days of paid annual leave. I might add that, except for a few senior licensed officers, every merchant seaman aboard a merchant

vessel could have earned more money ashore in defense-related work without taking the risk of being killed or incapacitated by bombs or torpedos.

It is true that in some instances merchant seamen made one or two voyages and then decided to seek safe shoreside employment. My bill recognizes this fact and only provides benefits to those whose actual sailing time—from signing on shipping articles to signing off shipping articles—equals 18 months.

The issue of veterans' status for merchant seamen was reopened in 1977 with the enactment of Public Law 95-202. This law requires the Secretary of Defense to designate as veterans the Women's Air Force service pilots and other "similarly situated groups" if the Secretary finds that the service constituted active military service and the members were discharged honorably.

Recently, the Department of Defense Civilian/Military Service Review Board granted veterans' status to merchant seamen who were requisitioned by the Army to serve on "blockships" in support of "Operation Mulberry" during the landings of Normandy. This decision has, in my opinion, raised questions of fairness and reasonableness.

Sunken blockships were a part of the artificial harbors that provided a sheltered area for tugs, barges, landing craft, and antiaircraft platforms. These artificial harbors were called "mulberries" and were used to discharge enormous amounts of supplies and equipment until a major port facility could be captured.

It is inconceivable to me that those who served in this one operation were granted veterans' status while the men who served in the wartime merchant marine for months and years are denied that status. These seamen chose to accept risks in the defense of our Nation, and it is about time we recognize their contributions.

I am sure that reasonableness and fairness will prevail and that the limited number of remaining merchant seamen veterans will be recognized by a grateful nation. This bill attempts to clarify obvious inequities, and I hope it will be enacted quickly.

**JUDGE CLAIBORNE SHOULD
RESIGN**

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 1986 U.S. District Judge Harry E. Claiborne of Nevada became the first sitting Federal judge to go to prison. He is also the first Federal judge in history to be incarcerated for offenses committed while serving on the bench.

Chief Judge Claiborne was convicted by a jury in August 1984 for failing to report \$106,000 income from his law practice on Federal tax returns in 1979 and 1980. He was sentenced to 2 years in prison and a fine of \$10,000. The Federal Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed the conviction and the U.S. Supreme Court declined to grant certiorari.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Claiborne has refused to resign from his lifetime position and will continue to draw his \$78,000 annual salary unless he is removed by the impeachment process. An impeachment proceeding must be originated in the House of Representatives. At this time, there appears to be no activity to get the impeachment process started.

Judge Claiborne is a convicted felon and should resign immediately. His presence on the bench mocks the honor and integrity the public expects in the judiciary. Even Otto Kerner, the first Federal judge ever convicted of a criminal offense while still holding office, resigned his judgeship before serving his prison term. Halsted L. Ritter, the last Federal judge to be impeached and removed from office, was charged with failing to report certain income on his Federal tax return—the very same offense on which Judge Claiborne was convicted by a jury.

Therefore, in order to uphold the integrity of the judiciary and prevent erosion in public confidence in judges, I am requesting that Judge Claiborne immediately resign from his position as U.S. district judge. If he does not submit his resignation by June 4, 1986, I will introduce a resolution calling for his impeachment.

Institutions thrive, and survive, only when they are trusted by the general public and understood. The time has come for Judge Claiborne to realize that while he occupies a seat in the Federal judiciary, he does not own it.

Mr. Speaker, please insert into the RECORD my letter to Judge Claiborne requesting his resignation and a National Law Journal editorial calling for Judge Claiborne's resignation.

The material follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 22, 1986.

Judge HARRY E. CLAIBORNE,
Federal Prison Camp, Maxwell Air Force
Base, Montgomery, AL.

DEAR JUDGE CLAIBORNE: I hereby request that you resign immediately from your position as judge for the U.S. District Court of Nevada.

If you do not submit your resignation by June 4, 1986, I will exercise my privilege as a U.S. Representative to introduce a resolution to begin proceedings for your impeachment.

Sincerely,

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

TIME TO RESIGN

It is not surprising that U.S. District Judge Harry E. Claiborne is insisting he will never resign from the bench. After all, during the lengthy criminal investigation of his conduct—and since his conviction and sentence on federal tax evasion charges—he has continued to maintain his innocence and has continued to claim that he is the subject of a "vendetta" by the U.S. Justice Department.

He has filed his notice of appeal, and we can understand why he would not want to take any final action on his status as a judge until his appeals are exhausted. However, if those appeals are unsuccessful we believe he should reconsider his plan to fight his removal from the judiciary.

The impeachment process is unwieldy and would be nothing more than a forum for Judge Claiborne to restate his defenses in the criminal case against him.

Judge Claiborne is a convicted felon. If an unfavorable final judgment comes from the courts, there is no good reason for him to impugn the integrity of the federal judiciary by remaining on the bench. He should resign immediately; it would be rather absurd to do otherwise.

"OPEN LETTER" OF PASCO COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, the Pasco County Medical Society printed an open letter to President Reagan in the Florida newspapers. This letter, in essence, expresses the concern of the Pasco County medical community over current policies of the Health Care Financing Administration [HCFA] in administering the Medicare/Medicaid Programs which may well contribute toward the deterioration of the high-quality health care to which we, in our society, have become accustomed. I would like to share the letter in its entirety with my colleagues below:

[An advertisement from the Times, Pasco County, FL, Apr. 6, 1986]

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT REAGAN

PASCO COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY,
New Port Richey, FL., April 6, 1986.

RONALD W. REAGAN,
President, United States of America, The
White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As the nation's leading conservative, and spokesman for less government, we wonder if you are aware of the activities of the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA)?

As you know, HCFA is responsible for the administration of Medicare funds, and is currently dispersing these funds for Medicare/Medicaid patients via the prospective payment system to hospitals and other health care facilities across the nation. As a direct consequence of regulations and directives of HCFA to PRO's—Peer Review Organizations (a misnomer)—throughout the country, Medicare/Medicaid patients:

(1) are often being forced to leave the hospital before their physicians feel they should;

(2) often must go to nursing homes where care is sometimes substandard, and almost always less than ideal in quality, and the cost of which depletes them of their life savings;

(3) have been given letters of discontinuation of benefits, even as they lay dying;

(4) if admitted to a hospital as an emergency, cannot, except under unusual circumstances, be transferred to the hospital of their choice where their records are and where their personal physicians practice;

(5) must have certain surgeries performed as out-patients (e.g., cataracts, cystoscopies, etc.) even though as very elderly people they are frail, infirm and with chronic illnesses, and often have either no one to care for them at home or have only an equally elderly spouse to rely upon;

(6) must undergo uncomfortable and tiring tests as out-patients—such as those that you, Mister President, had as an inpatient;

(7) who are cancer patients in chronic pain, and even paraplegics, must come and

go daily as out-patients for radiation treatments.

Do you realize, Mister President, that under the current system, an 85-year-old woman who lives alone, with multiple but uncomplicated rib fractures, cannot be admitted to a hospital for care while a 45 year-old man with the same injuries can?

Have you been informed, Mister President, that HCFA decides who is to be admitted to, and how long a patient is to stay in a hospital; that these functions no longer belong to those who are training, experience and knowledge are best suited to make such judgments—the physicians?

Are you aware, too, that a patient whose hospitalization has been retroactively and arbitrarily denied is told in writing that he/she is under no obligation to pay the hospital bill, thus depriving the hospital totally or partially of payment for services rendered in good faith?

From these facts several questions arise:

(1) Is this "less" government?
(2) Does such activity differ from that of Socialist countries, e.g., the Soviet Union? Some of us have been told by a representative of a federally designated peer review organization that we have a "duty to State" above our duty to God and our patients.

(3) Is this the way a great nation treats its sick poor and sick elderly? Is the budget to be balanced on their backs?

(4) Are those who have served their country and contributed to its greatness, prosperity and glory to be so shabbily treated?

We are still the wealthiest nation in the world. No one has yet shown that we cannot pay for the care of our elderly. We give billions away to other nations; we pay the interest on debts other nations owe us to satisfy bank shareholders, yet we cannot render quality care to our sick elderly and sick poor! The prospective payment system of HCFA, and the law upon which it is based, TEFRA, and which you approved, is unjust, unfair, discriminatory, and morally wrong.

Will you correct it?

Respectfully,

HARVEY O. KAISER, M.D.,
President.

MICHAEL MYERS, M.D.,
President elect.

VINCENT COTRONEO, M.D.,
Vice president.

KRISHNA RAVI, M.D.,
Secretary/Treasurer.

As you can well see, these physicians, concerned about the health and well-being of their patients and in a position to know, first-hand, the adverse impact of current policies, point to problem areas such as: Early discharge of patients, surgeries, and testing that are done on an out-patient basis when the condition of the patient warrants hospitalization, et cetera.

The problems which these physicians outline are, of course, the same ones which I and my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee's Health and Environment Subcommittee have been examining for some time.

As a fiscal conservative, I, of course, am very concerned about the large budget deficits that are facing our country, and I am doing everything I can to see that Government spending is brought under control. However, as you may know, I have always made every effort to see that the budget is not balanced on the backs of the elderly and poor in our society,

especially when it comes to their health care. As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee's Health and Environment Subcommittee, I am actively pursuing appropriate remedies for the current ailments or our Medicare/Medicaid policies which, while controlling waste and misuse of Government money, will enhance, not detract from, the excellent health care for which our society is known.

The prospective payment system [PPS], diagnosis related groups [DRG's], et cetera, are all relatively new concepts. It is to be expected, therefore, that, while well-intentioned, new initiatives such as these will not be perfect. The key, however, is to pinpoint the weak and inadequate policies and act to correct them, while simultaneously acting to preserve and enhance those which have proven beneficial—for the patient, health care provider, as well as for the Government.

I am pleased to report that I am cosponsoring legislation, H.R. 4638, also known as the Medicare Quality Protection Act of 1986, which attempts to do precisely this. This legislation makes numerous recommendations for correction of present failings in the system, such as requiring refinement of the prospective payment system for hospitals to better account for variations in severity of illness, ensuring access to appropriate post-hospital care, guaranteeing the beneficiary's right to appeal a continued stay denial, et cetera.

I am pleased to report that I am also currently drafting legislation of my own, to be introduced shortly after the return from the Memorial Day district work period, which will make further revisions in current law in order to better protect the health care of our citizens, for I, too, share the goal and desire of the Pasco County Medical Society—seeing that adequate, quality health care is available at affordable and attainable levels for everyone in our society who needs it.

Mr. Speaker, I commend all the members of the Pasco County Medical Society for their timely initiative, and I pledge my continued commitment to working to achieve our mutual goal.

THE FINANCIAL FRAUD DETECTION AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1986

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill H.R. 4886 designed to both require and enable independent auditors to detect and disclose illegal and fraudulent activities at publicly held corporations. This would be done pursuant to an auditor's review of corporate documents and certification of financial statements required by Federal securities laws.

The Financial Fraud Detection and Disclosure Act is a product of 16 months of hearings in the Energy and Commerce Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee. Six of my colleagues on the subcommittee—Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. ECKART, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. SHELBY, as well as the distinguished

chairman of both the subcommittee and the full committee, Mr. DINGELL—have joined me as original cosponsors of this bill.

The regulatory system established under the Federal securities laws is based on the concept of full and fair disclosure of all pertinent information to investors and other users of corporate financial reports. This legislation is designed to provide assurances to Congress and the public that illegal and irregular activities at publicly held corporations will be discovered and reported to the proper regulatory authorities by those in the best position to perform this vital function—independent auditors.

All too often in recent years, independent auditors either have failed to detect or to report fraudulent activities at a number of major corporations and financial institutions in this country. In one financial disaster after another, including E.F. Hutton, United American Bank, Penn Square Bank, E.S.M. Government Securities, Home State Savings and Loan of Ohio, American Savings and Loan of Florida, Drysdale Government Securities, Saxon Industries, and others, the disaster struck virtually on the heels of a stipulation by audit firms that the companies were financially sound. The result? Hundreds of thousands of investors and creditors were out hundreds of million of dollars.

The accounting profession—from the Cohen Commission to the Treadway Commission—has been studying this issue for 10 years, but has taken no effective action. The Securities and Exchange Commission also has failed to take the steps necessary to correct this deficiency—even though both it and the accounting profession have the authority to do so.

It is clear to us that the regulatory system is deficient in this critical area. Because the regulators and the profession have abdicated their responsibility, we feel it is time for Congress to step in.

In the 1984 case of *United States versus Arthur Young & Co.*, the U.S. Supreme Court—in a unanimous decision—eloquently described the "public watchdog" role of independent auditors and the accounting profession. In that case, the Court declared that:

By certifying the public reports that collectively depict a corporation's financial status, the independent auditor assumes a public responsibility transcending any employment relationship with the client. The independent public accountant performing this special function owes ultimate allegiance to the corporation's creditors and stockholders, as well as to the investing public. This "public watchdog" function demands that the accountant maintain total independence from the client at all times and requires complete fidelity to the public trust.

I fully agree with the Court's assessment. Unfortunately, because audit firms must compete fiercely for lucrative corporate accounts, this emphasis on independence and fidelity to the public trust can sometimes get lost in the shuffle—and independent auditors often seem to feel that their primary loyalty is to the corporate managers who hire them.

This is particularly troubling where detection and disclosure of illegal or irregular activities at the audited firm is concerned. Because the standards used by independent auditors are

fundamentally deficient in the area of detecting and disclosing illegal activities and financial irregularities, the accuracy of financial reports filed with the SEC for the protection of shareholders, depositors, creditors, and the public at large can be seriously distorted.

Under the Generally Accepted Auditing Standards of the American Association of Certified Public Accountants [AICPA] an independent auditor discovering fraud is only required to inform the client firm's management and consider resigning from the audit account. Although a unanimous Senate subcommittee report stated 10 years ago that auditors should report illegal acts to Government authorities, the AICPA has done little but study the issue ever since.

The wholly inadequate fraud reporting standards that were on the AICPA books 10 years ago are still there—and make a mockery of the Supreme Court's clear and eloquent statement on the independent auditor's public responsibility. As Chairman DINGELL has repeatedly pointed out during the course of the subcommittee's investigation, existing audit standards in this area are tantamount to telling the canine variety of a watchdog that his only duty, upon discovering a burglar in his house, is to leave the house.

Our subcommittee has examined a number of massive, well-publicized financial disasters where independent auditors have failed to detect or report blatantly fraudulent activity. For example, an intricate and blatantly illegal shell game at ESM Government Securities that ultimately brought down the entire State-insured savings and loan industry in Ohio was unraveled in a matter of hours by the receiver appointed by the court to sort through the rubble.

In other instances, such as the Beverly Hills Savings & Loan Association in California, internal corporate controls designed to make it possible for independent auditors to detect irregularities were virtually nonexistent. A separate section of our bill would upgrade the presently inadequate audit standards in this area by requiring independent auditors to thoroughly evaluate internal control mechanisms established by corporate management.

Mr. Speaker, all available evidence points to the conclusion that the impact and cost—financially as well as in terms of public confidence—of financial fraud at publicly held corporations is increasing dramatically. A better early warning system to protect the public is clearly needed—and independent auditors are in the best position to provide that safeguard.

It is our hope that the accounting profession will quickly embrace this proposal. Our bill does not apply to small independent businesses or any auditing activities not required by Federal securities laws. And it provides full legal immunity for auditors who report known or suspected illegal or irregular acts to the SEC or other appropriate authorities—a protection that is both necessary and one that only Congress can provide.

All audit firms certifying documents filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission will be affected alike by this legislation—in terms of both their duties and the protections provided for fulfilling these duties. This should enable auditors to protect the public and fully

comply with their public watchdog responsibilities free from any fear that blowing the whistle will cause them to lose business to a competing firm.

The clear and specific standards we have drafted for detecting and reporting financial fraud will go a long way toward meeting the legitimate concerns of both the Congress and the public in this area. This legislation will be fully aired at upcoming subcommittee hearings and Chairman DINGELL has pledged to see to it that a bill is quickly reported out by the full committee. We urge all our colleagues in the House to support this important initiative.

FLORIO CALLS ATTENTION TO IMPACT OF TERRORISM ON TOURISM INDUSTRY

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct the attention of my colleagues to a recent article appearing in the April 7, 1986, edition of *Travel Trade* that was authored by Congressman JAMES J. FLORIO, the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Commerce, Transportation and Tourism. The article highlights JIM FLORIO's concern about the impact increased terrorist incidents have had on the international tourism industry, and the need for an accountable allocation of funding for airport security improvements at the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA].

Last year, 6.5 million Americans made reservations to travel abroad. Because of an increase in terrorist incidents involving Americans, 1.4 million canceled their plans. Of these, 850,000 canceled their trips outright, 150,000 changed their reservation for another foreign destination, and 220,000 chose to travel within the United States. This loss in travel reservations has translated into a loss for our tour operators, our travel agents, and our airlines as well as the economies of our allies.

Mr. FLORIO has put forth a useful plan for establishing a clearinghouse of information that could offer potential travelers centralized and timely facts regarding security risks in other nations. Often, the lack of knowledge about the security of a particular nation has led to unfounded fears of traveling to that particular nation. Mr. FLORIO also deplores the use of most of the funds in FAA's ADAP program for administrative costs at FAA rather than the airport improvements that this program, which is funded by a tax on airline tickets, was meant to accomplish.

As a member of the House Subcommittee on Commerce, Transportation, and Tourism, I would like to commend the chairman's initiative in holding hearings on this particular situation recently and in addressing a problem that is detrimental to world tourism. Mr. FLORIO's article follows:

REP. FLORIO URGES FAA BAILOUT IN LONG- TERM ANTITERROR FIGHT

(By Rep. James J. Florio)

The highly publicized terrorist attacks on U.S. travelers abroad have caused many

Americans to re-schedule their trips to other countries. Yet, little concern has been voiced over our own government's plans to severely cut back funding for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the agency which has responsibility for providing security at U.S. domestic airports. Likewise, efforts which other countries have made to increase security at airports and other tourist locations have received relatively little attention.

According to the U.S. Travel Data Center, 6.5 million Americans had made reservations to travel abroad in July of last year. After the TWA hijacking, 1.4 million of these people (22%) changed their reservation.

Of this 1.4 million who changed their reservations, 850,000 cancelled their trips outright. Another 150,000 changed their reservation to another foreign destination; 220,000 chose a domestic U.S. destination.

Over 8,000 incidents of international terrorism have occurred since 1968 when statistics first began to be compiled. Over 50% of this number have been directed against U.S. interests. In 1985 alone, the number of international terrorist incidents were up 36%, and casualties jumped 70%. U.S. casualties during 1985 actually quadrupled, going from 42 in 1984 to 162 in 1985.

NEW FUNDING OKAYED

In an effort to aggressively deal with the problem of terrorism, Congress last year enacted legislation that provided new funding for sky marshals, air traffic controllers, airline inspectors and research and development for new devices to detect explosives. This legislation also gave the Department of Transportation new responsibility for evaluating airport security at home and abroad and established new guidelines for the Department of State to implement travel advisories.

The positive benefits of this legislation are now in danger of being undone by the Administration's budget cutting plans. The FAA administrator has said he does not know how he will be able to continue running his agency if the second round of budget cuts are implemented later this year as scheduled. The agency has already had to request an additional \$80 million to get it through the rest of this budget year.

Clearly, we must not mindlessly cut programs like the FAA. Such cuts directly affect that agency's ability to carry out its responsibilities.

We also need to give tourists better information about security conditions abroad. I believe the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration should serve as a "clearinghouse" for information regarding security risks. It could also help travel agents and tour operators get the information they need from government agencies to answer questions that tourists have. The goal should always be to provide the traveling public with sufficient information to make what ultimately must be a personal decision about the risk involved in foreign travel.

The travel and tourism industry must become active on these matters that affect our ability to combat terrorism. Otherwise, terrorism will continue to cause hundreds of thousands of Americans to cancel their foreign travel plans.

EDWARD J. FLICKINGER

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, one of the really nice people I know, Edward J. Flickinger, is retiring from the Ada S. McKinley Community Services after 15 years of distinguished service. He is to be honored at a testimonial dinner at the Chicago Marriott Hotel on June 27, 1986.

Ed joined Ada S. McKinley Community Services, Inc. as its business manager in 1971; shortly thereafter was appointed controller; and in September 1980 appointed associate director. He holds a Master's degree in business administration from the University of Chicago, and before joining McKinley, held executive and managerial positions in several companies engaged in commerce and industry. He and his wife, Mary, reside in Hinsdale, IL and are the parents of two children.

Ed is a member of the Joint Committee of Community Service Providers, a statewide organization of agency executives and senior staff of the Illinois Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. He has been the agency's representative at innumerable meetings locally and statewide; and has been a leading member of a McKinley task force whose members work with administrators and legislators in matters affecting the regulation and/or funding of the agency's program. He has been instrumental in securing the passage of legislation favorable to the more cost effective performance of community service provider agencies; and from year to year has been in the forefront of efforts to increase the amounts of funding made available by the State for community services for the mentally retarded and other developmentally disabled children and adults.

At its 1985 convention, the Illinois Association of Rehabilitation Facilities presented him with a special appreciation award citing him for "Special dedication to the field of rehabilitation during his career."

Ed is a world traveler, an accomplished photographer, and he has lobbied long and effectively for developmentally disabled people, and on behalf of excellence in education.

As he retires from his present position, I am sure he will not become less active but will redirect his considerable energies and talent in different and equally useful directions.

I am proud to call him a friend.

TERROR VERSUS THE THIRD WORLD

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared recently in the *New York Times*. This op ed piece presents one of the most lucid arguments I have read concerning

why it is in the interest of Third World nations to join in the fight against terrorism.

The article follows:

TERROR VS. THE THIRD WORLD

(By Pranay Gupte)

In the fight against terrorism, there can be no such thing as nonalignment. Terrorism is a cancer that has afflicted developing countries as much as it has hurt the West.

Even as the leaders of the industrial democracies were meeting in Tokyo last week to discuss terrorism, bombs went off in Sri Lanka, killing some 15 people in Colombo. The authorities blamed Tamil separatists—Marxist-led terrorists who have long been financed by Libya. Terrorist violence cropped up again last week in India's strategic Punjab state, where Sikh separatists—also reportedly helped by Libya and others—want their own nation. In virtually every region of the third world, there is evidence of meddling by Libya or by the other major patrons of terrorism, Syria and Iran, who particularly target governments that do not subscribe in their brand of radicalism or who are sympathetic to democracy and Washington.

It is time for the leading industrial nations most concerned with terrorism to join hands with like-minded governments in the third world. The fight against terrorism has to be a global fight, not merely one designed to protect Western interests. The consensus on terrorism reached in Tokyo may tacitly encourage some third world states to stiffen their own approach against terrorism, but it will need a fresh infusion of resources from the West to encourage hesitant governments to accelerate their own domestic efforts against foreign-supported terrorism.

Westerners are often puzzled as to why third world governments do not speak out more forcefully against international terrorism. In the aftermath of the American bombing of Libya, for instance, third world leaders predictably rallied behind Col. Mu'ammarr Qadhafi and excoriated the United States. Their rhetoric reflected the third world's obsession with two shibboleths—solidarity and nationalism. The rhetoric was also partly explained by the fear that Colonel Qadhafi evokes and by the wish not to be seen as siding with the Reagan Administration.

Yet third world leaders now must choose. They can remain victims of their own timorousness, or they can band together against the kind of revolutionary terrorism that Colonel Qadhafi and others have foisted on the world's poor countries.

The consequences of Libyan, Syrian and Iranian interference in third world states go beyond the violence that it generates. Such support of terrorist groups forces many third world governments to be more authoritarian with their populations. In Sri Lanka, for example, the freely elected, pro-Western Government has had to assume stern emergency powers to counter Tamil terrorism.

Moreover, fighting terrorism requires stepped-up expenditures for military and paramilitary forces—monies that most poor third world countries can ill afford. And because combating terrorism requires increased reliance on military measures, the center of political gravity often moves toward the armed forces.

It may be unrealistic to assume that the third world's leaders will suddenly isolate Colonel Qaddafi and other sponsors of terrorism, but that is exactly what they must attempt to do if they are to protect themselves and the fragile stability of their na-

tions. A strong stand against terrorism need not imply jettisoning the notions of third world solidarity and nationalism. These leaders must remember that their backyards will continue to be the bloodstained battle zone for terrorist activities, even if those activities are largely aimed at Western interests. Moreover, third world countries that do not cooperate more forthrightly in the fight against international terrorism may well find that the much-needed capital and technology they get from the West will shrink as a result.

The nonaligned movement, whose leaders will soon hold a summit meeting in Zimbabwe, can lead the way in issuing an unqualified call against terrorism. The industrialized countries should encourage this effort, with more money, better exchanges of intelligence and stronger political support. But in the end, it is up to the nonaligned leaders to mobilize third world support for international law-enforcement agencies cracking down on terrorist networks that find havens in their own backyards.

TRIBUTE TO ESTHER D. MALLACH

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the next few days, members of the medical and mental health community in Westchester County, NY, are gathering to pay tribute to the woman who has become known as "Mrs. Mental Health Association."

Esther D. Mallach joined the Westchester MHA as a field assistant in 1960. Her dynamism and dedication were so outstanding that she became executive director of the organization 2 years later. Now, after nearly a quarter century of outstanding service to our communities, Esther D. Mallach is preparing to retire. Although her many friends will be honoring her, any efforts to truly show our gratitude will be feeble when compared to her many accomplishments.

Esther Mallach is a graduate of the Columbia School of Social Work. She went to work for the highly respected National Refugee Service, but soon thereafter left to raise a family with her husband Aubrey—who enjoys a distinguished career of his own in the mental health field.

A person of Esther's energy cannot be kept at home forever. As soon as she deemed it appropriate, she resumed her career by working with the Westchester Mental Health Association [MHA].

When Esther Mallach began her long association with the Westchester MHA, it was a hard-working but small and little-recognized organization. Almost single-handedly, Esther turned the organization around to make it one of the most respected groups in its field in the Nation. A full list of Esther's accomplishments during her 25 years as executive director would fill many pages. She initiated the day program and established community residences. She initiated a suicide prevention service long before suicide became a nationally recognized crisis, and, to this day, her

service remains the only one of its kind in Westchester. She initiated programs for abused spouses as well as for victims of child abuse.

Under Esther Mallach's leadership, which the Gannett Westchester newspapers have categorized as "astute and insightful," the Westchester Mental Health Association became a model for other mental health associations from Maine to Hawaii.

Seven persons of diverse backgrounds and temperaments served as president of the Westchester MHA during Esther's quarter century of leadership—Charles I. Rostov, Wirth H. Koenig, Ira S. Stevens, Hattie L. Goodbody, George R. Farnham, Larua M. Holland, and Hon. Alvin M. Suchin. The fact that each of these differing personalities share respect, admiration, and love for Esther is in itself a rare tribute to a special individual.

It was in recognition of her significance accomplishments that the Governor of New York State appointed Esther to the Harlem Valley Psychiatric Association Board of Visitors in 1979. In further recognition of her leadership, her colleagues elected her as that body's president, a position she still holds today. She is also a member of the Westchester County Community Mental Health Board.

I first met Esther Mallach in 1982, after redistricting included part of Westchester within my 22d Congressional District. I was immediately struck by her intimate knowledge of, and genuine concern for, mental health issues. She subsequently has become a frequent visitor to and correspondent with my Washington and district offices. My staff and I have come to appreciate that here is a person not merely "going through the motions," but a person who demands responsiveness and excellence to a concern that she has made the central focus of her life.

The upcoming 40th anniversary celebration of the Mental Health Association of Westchester will be a tribute to Esther Mallach. Later this year, she and Aubrey will enjoy a well-deserved and long-delayed retirement. Although her shoes will be difficult to fill, we agree that the time is long past due for Esther and Aubrey to take a rest from doing for others.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation would be a much better place for us all if we had more dedicated citizens such as Esther Mallach. I invite my colleagues to join with me in thanking Esther Mallach for a lifetime of public service.

To Esther and Aubrey, to their children and grandchildren, we extend our thanks and say "well done."

DISTRICT HEIGHTS—50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this year District Heights, MD, is celebrating its 50th anniversary. District Heights is one of the earliest suburbs of Washington, DC, and one of the closest, as it lies near the District line. Since 1926, when 25 homes were constructed by the Dis-

tract Heights Co., District Heights has evolved into an active, family-oriented community. There is no place in all of Prince Georges County that has greater spirit. As suburbs and developments have sprung up around it, District Heights has retained much of its small-town flavor. It has attracted scores of people moving from the city to find quite and contentment.

Evidence of the importance of family and education in District Heights is the fact that by 1936, when there were about 40 homes in the community, a school was there as well. The year 1936 also marked the incorporation of the Town of District Heights, approved by the votes of 68 citizens.

The municipal government of District Heights was dominated for years by one man, Mayor Mike Roll. In the State of Maryland, there was no municipal official of higher ability and integrity, and there was no elected official more beloved by his constituents. He served as mayor so successfully, that he was elected to 13 consecutive terms. At the time of his death in 1981, he was the senior municipal official in Maryland.

The spirit and character of Mike roll is indicative of the type of citizens who live in District Heights. As Shakespeare said, "The people are the City." There are no finer people, and there is, thus, no finer city, than District Heights. Truly, this place represents what is best about America from the spirit of volunteerism to the respect of family.

Mr. Speaker, you can judge that District Heights has a special place in my heart, I am proud to call it home, as it has been for the last 30 years of my life. And, it is with special pride that I ask you to join in sending the congratulations of this House to District Heights on its 50th anniversary.

**"FATHER AL" CELEBRATES HIS
50TH ANNIVERSARY**

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we encounter religious leaders whose dedication to the betterment of humankind transcends denominational boundaries. Such a leader is Msgr. Alexander Markowski, who is affectionately known throughout Orange County, NY, as "Father Al."

On June 8th, Father Al will be celebrating the 50th anniversary of his ordination into the priesthood. Let me recount for our colleagues just some of this outstanding clergyman's accomplishments.

Father Al was born in Poughkeepsie, NY, in 1909. After an education at St. Joseph Parochial School in Poughkeepsie, Don Bosco Prep School in Ramsey, NJ, and at St. Mary's College in Orchard Lake, MI, Father Al knew that he had been called to the religious life. He studied for the priesthood at St. Joseph's Seminary in Yonkers, NY, and was ordained on June 6, 1936, by the late Cardinal Patrick Hayes at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City.

His first assignments were to parishes in the Bronx and in Ossining, but it was after his as-

signment to St. Francis of Assisi Parish in Newburgh in 1951 that we in the mid-Hudson region came to know, respect, and love Father Al. His devotion to his flock, and especially to the children, earned him a place in the hearts of young and old. He became a source of spiritual guidance for the entire community. Father Al was appointed chaplain to the city of Newburgh Police Department and to the town of New Windsor Fire Department, as well as to the Elks. All of Orange County was broken-hearted when Father Al was reassigned to St. Augustine's Parish in New York City, NY, in 1958, but when he was returned to St. Francis of Assisi as pastor 4 years later, Father Al was welcomed as if he had never been away.

Father Al made his top priority the construction of the badly needed new parochial school. Through his skillful leadership and dedication, this beautiful new building opened in September 1965. At the formal dedication ceremony on April 23, 1966, the late Cardinal Francis Spellman announced the elevation of Father Al to the rank of monsignor.

Father Al is known to public officials of all faiths throughout Orange County, NY, due to his willingness to participate and offer his blessings at political dinners and events. Although Father Al is popularly sought for this task due to his well-known fairness and impartiality, it has been an inspiration to all of us in politics to know that Father Al is looking over our shoulders.

On Sunday, June 8, Msgr. Alexander Markowski will celebrate a Mass of Thanksgiving marking his 50th anniversary in the priesthood, which will be followed by an outpouring of love and thanks from his many admirers. I invite our colleagues to join with us in thanking this dedicated man of God for a job well done for the past half century.

**ROBERT L. HADDAD: NATIONAL
SMALL BUSINESS ACCOUNTANT
ADVOCATE OF THE YEAR**

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Robert L. Haddad, certified public accountant with the Boston Office of Price Waterhouse, on being named the 1986 National U.S. Small Business Administration Accountant Advocate of the Year by the National Small Business Advisory Council.

Robert Haddad was chosen as the Massachusetts 1986 Small Business Accountant Advocate of the Year from nominations received from various banks, trade associations, and chambers of commerce. It is a great distinction that Mr. Haddad has also been selected as the first National Small Business Award winner from New England.

Maintaining the highest standards of excellence throughout his career, Mr. Haddad has committed himself to helping small businesses improve their financial climate. He is a nationally recognized authority on small business tax issues and devotes considerable time to advising various governmental groups about the

impact of changes in tax regulations on small business. Mr. Haddad has actively participated in several councils that have developed national legislative agendas for small business, including as a member of an Issue Development Task Force for the White House Conference on Small Business. He has also served as an advisor to both the Internal Revenue Service Commissioner and the Massachusetts Special Commission on Taxation, and as director of the Smaller Business Association of New England. I am especially proud and appreciative of Bob's diligent efforts as chairman of my own task force on small business.

Mr. Speaker, both on the local and national levels, Robert Haddad is helping to sharpen the awareness of accountants, attorneys, and small business people of taxation problems. For his exemplary leadership and hard work in behalf of small business in Massachusetts and across the Nation, Robert Haddad deserves our warm congratulations.

**PRIVATIZATION SHOULDN'T
COME AT TAXPAYER EXPENSE**

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the House adopted a fiscal year 1987 budget. It is this body's responsibility to determine how best to allocate Federal funds while reducing the Federal deficit.

It is ironic that despite all the talk we hear about the need for deficit reduction from the Reagan administration, it has proposed privatizing three of its largest transportation assets at fire sale prices.

The administration wanted to sell Conrail to Norfolk Southern at a price most credible financial analysts consider a giveaway. Only until it became clear that \$1.2 billion for Conrail was unacceptable to the House did they even begin to reconsider raising the asking price.

At the same time, the administration wants to lease National and Dulles Airports, property worth as much as \$2 billion, for a 50-year period for a total of \$47 million.

While privatizing these assets is not a bad idea, the terms of any privatization should maximize, not minimize, the return to the American taxpayer. Despite all the rhetoric about the need to reduce the deficit, the administration's proposals on Conrail and National and Dulles Airports fall far short of being fiscally responsible.

The taxpayers of this country deserve better in both deals. A recent Baltimore Sun editorial, entitled "Federal Giveaways", describes these short-sighted proposals best.

[From the Baltimore Sun, May 7, 1986]

FEDERAL GIVEAWAYS

Why should the federal government own and operate two major passenger airports and one of the largest freight railroads in the country? The answer is, it shouldn't. But the Reagan administration has not been able to muster much of a case to justify its proposed alternatives.

The U.S. government never should have put itself in the business of running two Washington airports, Dulles and National. State or regional authorities are much better positioned to do that job properly. Yet when it came time to dispose of the airports, the administration championed a sweetheart arrangement pushed by Virginia officials. Sen. Barry Goldwater, who has never minced words, called this deal "stupid." A \$47-million lease for 50 years is all that a Virginia-dominated authority would have to pay the nation for property worth as much as \$2 billion. That's an absolute steal.

From the federal perspective, this could rank among the top giveaways of the century. With monumental deficits staring the White House and Congress in the face, there is no rational reason to support this plan. Yes, get Uncle Sam out of the airport-management business. But how about demanding the best deal possible for the taxpayers?

The same question should be asked the administration of its efforts to sell Conrail to the Norfolk Southern railroad. Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Dole wants to give NS the Conrail freight line for \$1.2 billion, even though two other bidders are willing to pay up to 50 percent more. For its \$1.2 billion, Norfolk Southern would get \$6 billion in assets that are among the most modern in the railroad industry, \$1.6 billion in cash and equivalents, \$1.4 billion in tax benefits, surplus real estate worth \$200 million and a profit last year of \$440 million. Chalk up another prime candidate for giveaway of the century.

The logical option would be to spin off Conrail—for top dollar—as a private, independent railroad. The company no longer needs federal assistance to survive. It is a well-managed, profitable railroad that is proving to be far more durable and viable than critics expected. Yet Mrs. Dole refuses to consider the more lucrative proposals that would avoid anti-trust complications.

No wonder so many congressmen are leery of these measures. The Republican Senate gave grudging approval to both the Conrail and airport bills this year, but the opposition was much stronger than expected. Both bills face uphill battles in the Democratic House, and well they should. The administration's proposed deals are bad bargains.

REMARKS OF ELLIOT RICHARDSON AT ANN ARBOR

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to attention some comments made by Ambassador Elliot Richardson when he spoke in my district at the Fourth Presidential Library Conference at the Gerald R. Ford Library in Ann Arbor:

STATEMENT BY ELLIOT RICHARDSON

Thank you very much Mr. White, President Ford, President Shapiro, ladies and gentlemen. Those were very kind words, Tim, but perhaps the kindest thing of all is that you refrained at the last moment from saying, "And I now present the former Elliot Richardson."

I am in many ways delighted to be here, not only for the sake of the honor and

pleasure of being in the company of President Ford but also that of seeing colleagues with whom I have worked in his administration. I am grateful to President Ford for relieving me of a period of comparative unemployment, at least I was not in public office, in late 1974 when he asked me to go to the United Kingdom. As it happened I was at that time engaged in a study of questions relevant to the very undertaking that has brought you here this evening.

I was then a Fellow of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars at the Smithsonian. My main interest at that time was to try to dig out of the records leading up to the Declaration of Independence and the framing of the Constitution of the United States, the framers' view of the role of the citizen. It was to me an eye-opening experience, an inspiring experience. I had not up until then fully grasped the degree to which the founders of this Republic were truly creative in the approach they took to things that we take all too much for granted.

I won't undertake now to try to review in any depth the things that I learned from that experience, but I do want to stress the most important one, and that is the profound implications of the manner in which we created the government of the United States. We the people literally came together and decided what powers we wanted government to have and then in a sense we delegated those powers upward. This began, I am always proud to say, in Massachusetts, where the world's oldest written constitution still survives, and perhaps more important to the invention of this process than any other single individual was Massachusetts' own John Adams.

The citizens of Massachusetts came together first in their towns, and in each town they debated the question of what powers should be conferred on the new government of the state of Massachusetts. The towns then chose delegates and sent them to a convention where differences were hammered out. The delegates then asked John Adams to put the results in draft form for them, and he sent back a draft which the towns rejected. A new round of debate led to the selection of new delegates and a second convention, and out of that came a new draft, also by John Adams, and a constitution at last emerged. Other states soon followed suit.

It wasn't clear at first whether or not these new constitutions were really the supreme law of the states. In a few instances legislatures, somewhat unreflectingly, undertook to pass laws inconsistent with their constitutions. And in each case the state supreme courts struck down this legislation. For the first time in the history of the world, citizens had come together and delegated powers to a government which could not be enlarged upon by action of any government officer in any manner inconsistent with the powers conferred by the citizens. And, of course, as you all know, when the Constitution of the United States was submitted to the states for ratification, many states held out as a condition to their acceptance of it that there would be adopted a Bill of Rights, based on the Bill of Rights of the Massachusetts Constitution, which would operate as a further constraint because it would spell out things that the government could not do in derogation of the rights of the individuals.

We still carry out the business of government under that framework. It works, and to an extraordinary degree. I am not among

those who believe that the system would work any better if we somehow adapted it to look more like a parliamentary system. Part of the credit, certainly, is attributable to the ingenuity of the systems of checks and balances written into the Constitution. But to my mind it is due even more to the fact that it was and remains understood that, although we the people have delegated limited responsibilities to those who hold public office in the interest of all of us, we, nevertheless, retain ultimate responsibility. We cannot delegate it; it belongs to us. We may fulfill it well or poorly, but nevertheless we have it.

And, I think, despite what sometimes looks like apathy, we do value it. I see no other way of accounting for the long fight to expand the franchise, first by the elimination of property qualifications, then gradually to include Indians and the freed slaves and, belatedly, women. But there were fights at each stage on behalf of those who had not yet been given the right to vote. I have seen no happier explanation of why this was so than in an article in the *Kettering Review* by Hannah Arendt that I read the other day, in which, referring to the citizen's right of access to the public realm, she quotes Jefferson's telling phrase about the "public happiness" to be found in being "a participator in the government of affairs."

We value being participators because this is how we gain the opportunity as individuals to be heard, to have an impact, to make a difference. I am absolutely convinced that individuals who have that feeling of participation possess a larger sense of what it is to be a free human being. It is, I think, fundamentally because of this that, despite the differences among the factions foreseen by Madison, we have not only survived and prospered, but have prevailed in extreme difficulty, including internal struggle.

We are now beset by difficulties that derive from an enormous increase in the sheer scale of the problems that we have to address and somehow to resolve, and by their concurrent increase in complexity. The founding fathers could hardly have foreseen that there would develop such a daunting array of issues that we as citizens are somehow expected to have some kind of an opinion about: the toxic waste superfund, acid rain, the Middle East, Nicaragua, arms control, health care cost containment—a very, very long list. And yet, if we are to remain a responsible self-governing society, we cannot abdicate, we cannot accept the abandonment of responsibility for trying somehow to have an individual impact on these issues, we cannot give up and turn them over to a group of nameless bureaucrats or non-elected experts.

Can we continue despite this complexity to succeed as we have? I suppose no one can give an ultimately confident answer. But I am convinced that the very existence of the Domestic Policy Association and the National Issues Forum, in which so many people here tonight have participated, does represent a constructive response to the problem of how to involve citizens in a deeper understanding of the issues that concern them. Just in talking with some of you here this evening, I was given a new lift of confidence by what I could see of your very evident qualities of concern and caring and intelligence. I have no doubt that so long as there are people who will participate as you have been doing, so long as there are organizations like the Domestic Policy Association and institutions like the Kettering Founda-

tion to support their activities, that we shall find our way through this maze of complexity. We shall succeed in what Daniel Yankelevich calls "working through" these problems.

I think the distinction he has made in this context between public opinion and public judgment is profoundly important. To be effectively self-governing, to feel the sense that our opinions matter, it is not enough, as Dan has pointed out, that our views simply be recorded at the moment in time reflected in a public opinion poll, but rather that we engage our minds and imaginations, as he has said, in a continuing process of working the problem through.

Now here, I think, it is important also to emphasize—I am sure President Ford would agree with this—that, although we the people have delegated to some among us responsibilities for things that concern us in common and we cannot ultimately abdicate our own responsibility, there is nevertheless an important role for leadership. To say that we have ultimate power is not to say that we should be oblivious to or try to shut off a process in which those who do have delegated responsibility, whether they hold it through election or by appointment, seek to create a continuing dialogue with and among us. And, I think, the very fact of complexity increases the burden of responsibility on the role of leadership. I think this is true in two respects.

The first involves priorities. You could list perhaps a hundred very tough problems like those I ticked off a few moments ago, adding things like the utility of diagnostic related groups, the competing considerations involved in tax reform, and on and on and on.

To the extent, then, that it may not as a practical matter be possible for us to be adequately informed on all of these things, our President and other national leaders can, nevertheless, in communication with us and through continuing dialogue with us help to bring about the recognition that there are certain priorities that should be addressed now—today, tomorrow, this year. By focusing on these priorities and not trying to do everything at once, we the people can still play a meaningful part in bringing about sensible resolutions of our problems. I see this process as one in which the role of the citizen and the role of political leadership are mutually indispensable and mutually reinforcing.

There is another respect in which I think the role of leadership is also vital, and that is in the formulation and communication of strategies. Here I would use the word strategy in two quite different senses. One is the straight-forward application of the word to the formulation of a plan, the identification of goals, the mapping out of the routes to achieve these goals, and the establishment of milestones to determine progress along those routes. But a strategy can also be a framework for dialogue, a way of making complex issues intelligible, and I believe that a critical responsibility of leadership is to articulate strategies in order to illuminate the choices among competing alternatives.

And finally, when it comes to making such choices, we the people must always keep steadily in view the fact that the ultimate function of the political process is to resolve conflicts among competing values, not simply to compare objective, quantifiable measures of costs and benefits. To the extent that we can, through better analysis, narrow down the range of sensible options

as far as possible, this is all to the good; but in the end it is only how we feel about what is enduringly important that can determine the outcome of difficult choice.

And so, it is essential in the end, that the political process invite and bring to bear a sense of enduring values, and that in choosing directions we pursue the ultimate objective of consensus. We have an unfortunate tendency, perhaps because we select leaders by voting and resolve issues in the Congress by votes, to give inadequate recognition to the fact that the fundamental strength of our society rests on the solidity and the breadth of a consensus which is more than an expression of the majority will. It is the outcome of a process that engages us all in reaching the conclusion that, well, on the whole this is probably right. And especially in a world as complex as this and in a world that is in so many respects dangerous, it is vital that we the people see it as our responsibility to participate with our political leaders in the development of the kind of consensus that can assure the soundness and continuity of our policies in the years ahead.

And I believe that what has brought all of you here tonight and what will continue, I hope, for a long time to inspire the work of the Domestic Policy Association and the National Issues Forum will be this kind of vision of the real significance of what you are doing. For all of these reasons I feel very proud and honored to have had a part in this evening's program.

Thank you very much.

CARL E. STOTZ, RECOGNIZED

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to recognize the founder of an American institution which has been enjoyed by America's youth and parents alike since 1939. The man I am referring to is Mr. Carl Stotz of Williamsport, PA and the institution is the world of Little League Baseball.

In 1939, Carl Stotz was playing catch with his two young nephews and reflected back on his days as a youth and his desire to play on an organized team with bats, balls, coaches and uniforms. A few days later, Stotz loaded some neighborhood kids in a car and went to Memorial Park, the site of the present-day Carl E. Stotz Field where they played an experimental game. It was then that the idea of Little League Baseball was born, but organizing the league remained a major task.

Dedicated to the success of this league, Carl Stotz and a few of his buddies worked tirelessly arranging for sponsorships, organizing teams and schedules, engineering a field, and establishing rules and regulations. Stotz had to make 57 personal visits to local businesses before he finally was able to obtain a sponsor. His commitment paid off as he watched the number of players grow from 54 in 1940 to 216 players in 1943 and to 900 in 1947. Today the program includes 2.5 million young players on 150,000 teams located in 24 foreign countries in addition to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues in the U.S. Congress to join me in recognizing a

man whose enthusiasm for the game of baseball has touched so many lives. It is the inspiration and dedication of Mr. Carl E. Stotz that so many young people have experienced the thrill of baseball. The efforts of this fine man have put Williamsport, PA, on the map as the "Home of the Little League World Series."

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DANTE B. FASCELL ON THE 65TH BIRTHDAY OF DR. ANDREI SAKHAROV

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Foreign Affairs, under the leadership of its outstanding chairman, Congressman DANTE FASCELL, held a special reception to pay tribute to Soviet human rights leader Dr. Andrei Sakharov on his 65th birthday.

On this festive occasion, Chairman FASCELL made thoughtful and sobering comments:

We honor a man most of us have never met, a man who cannot even know that we are remembering his birthday, nevertheless, this man holds a permanent place in our thoughts and our memory.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read and consider the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The statement follows:

OPENING REMARKS OF HON. DANTE B. FASCELL ON ANDREI SAKHAROV 65TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

Mrs. Bonner, Members of the Sakharov Family, Members of Congress, Distinguished Guests:

Thank you all for coming here today to honor a man most of us have never met. That is our loss, and I look forward to the day when Andrei Sakharov can be with us in person for such an occasion as this.

Last week Anatoly Shcharansky was in this room, speaking eloquently for Sakharov and for the campaign for human rights to which both men have contributed so much. Shcharansky's freedom seems like a miracle, but those who worked nine long years for his release know that it was a miracle of his endurance—and of yours.

The Soviet Union freed him because his friends in the West never forgot him, because he and every prisoner of conscience Moscow holds remain alive and important to us. We will go on demanding their freedom, their fundamental human rights, until the Soviets understand that respect for those rights is a basic premise of normal, productive East-West relations.

Andrei Sakharov, whose 65th birthday we celebrate today, has always understood that political truth about our shrunken world.

As a physicist he stands in the great, humane tradition of Einstein and Nils Bohr, men who saw that the power of the atom made peace a necessity for humanity's survival.

As a political philosopher, Sakharov stands in the tradition of Gandhi and Martin Luther King, men who made the power of conscience a force for freedom.

And as a Russian thinker, he stands in the tradition of Herzen and Tolstoy, men who

thought for themselves and whose thinking defined the moral debate of their times.

We honor him—in his absence—for the greatness of his spirit, for being, as Nikita Khrushchev said, "a crystal of morality among our scientists." But we can honor Andrei Sakharov best by continuing, in his name, the campaign for peace, progress and human rights for which he has given his own freedom.

What this ceremony today says to Andrei Sakharov, who cannot even know that we are remembering his birthday, and to the leaders of the Soviet Union, who force him to celebrate the day in lonely exile, is that Americans have not forgotten him and will not forget him.

Our memory is the only birthday gift we can give. It can't be held up by the postal censors or blocked by the border guards or stopped by the KGB agents who surround his apartment in Gorky and close him off from normal, human contact.

Andrei Sakharov holds a permanent place in our thoughts and our memory. He matters to us, not just on his birthday today, but every day. We care for his well-being now and for the future. We think of him in captivity, and we wish for his freedom.

And we do more than wish for it. We demand it. We will continue to demand it until the Soviet leaders grant it.

Like Andrei Sakharov, Americans want stable, constructive and peaceful relations between the superpowers. We know that many obstacles stand between us and that goal.

Few of them are easy to overcome, but one is simplicity itself: freedom for Andrei Sakharov. He could be free now. He should have been free long ago.

And until his voice is part of the world's discourse again, those who share his hopes and values, as we do, must speak out for him.

Thirteen years ago a Western reporter asked Andrei Sakharov why, when his efforts to defend others seemed so futile, he continued his public protests.

"A man may hope for nothing," Sakharov answered, "yet speak nonetheless—because he cannot remain silent." We speak out for Sakharov today because he has been forced into silence, because we hope to hear his voice again, and because, as long as he cannot speak, we must.

We cannot remain silent. And we will not. Thank you.

ROMULUS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL BAND PROGRAM RECEIVES HIGH HONORS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the recent accomplishments of the Romulus Junior High School Concert and Symphonic Bands. Romulus Junior High School is located in the 15th Congressional District of Michigan, which I represent.

Both the Romulus Concert and Symphonic Bands performed at the State Band Festival on May 3 and received first division superior ratings. The concert band was in class C junior high school category and the symphonic band was in the class A junior high school classification.

Earlier, on March 15, the Romulus groups received first division ratings at the district band festival held at the Romulus Senior High School. This qualified the young musicians for the State festival.

The bands were graded by three judges in the prepared music section, which includes a required composition, a march and a selected number, and then by another judge in the sight reading section, where two numbers are performed without practice. The State band festival is administered by the Michigan State School Band and Orchestra Association.

The Romulus Junior High School Band Program, under the leadership of the Band Director, Richard Kruse, was 1 of 3 out of 624 junior high schools in the State of Michigan to have two groups earn the coveted first division rating at the State festival. Romulus Junior High School was the only school out of the 114 junior high schools in Wayne County to have a band earn a first rating as well as the only school out of the 264 junior high schools from the greater Detroit metropolitan area with two groups earning the first ratings. For Director Richard Kruse, the first ratings were his 13th and 14th consecutive first ratings at the State festival.

The Romulus Junior High School bands have achieved these high performance goals because of the concern, understanding and support of the members of the Romulus Board of Education. The Romulus Board of Education and Central Administrators Dr. William Bedell, superintendent, Dr. Terrel Le-Cesne, assistant superintendent for administrative services and Joel Carr, business manager have been able to add many new and innovative programs in the Romulus schools so that the performing musical groups continue to achieve superior results. Romulus school system bands earned four first ratings at the district festivals this year with the jazz band at the senior high also receiving a No. 1 rating. Romulus was the only school system in Michigan to accomplish this feat this year.

Members of the Romulus Board of Educators who have demonstrated this educational leadership are: Kenneth Berlinn, president; Jo Ann Marvicsin, vice president; Sandra Langley, secretary; Mary King, treasurer; Daniel Bales, trustee; Pat Patterson, trustee; and Edward Wilkerson, trustee.

The bands have also received the help and special support provided by the principal, Tom Dolan, and the assistant principal, Dan Hurst. These gentlemen also initiated many new programs at Romulus Junior High School which aided the overall educational environment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my congratulations to the Romulus community and to these fine bands. The members of these bands who performed at the State festival and who have made us so proud are:

CONCERT BAND

Flute: Jennifer Moore, Shelly Kopchia,

Brooke Hammers, Teri Rea, Terri Smith, Trisha Vargo, Robert Long, Amy Sherman, Belinda Rose, Mary King, Julie Keating, Natalie Dane, Trina Venturini and Carrie Whiles.

Clarinet: Laura Crieth, Stacie Brown, Jason Roy, Leslie Vance, Mary McEwen, Jennifer Sherbrook, Veronica Marusak, Dorinda Davis, Michelle Kelly, Tawana Spease, Kerri Crutchfield, Sylvia Harris, Cindy Jones, Marcy Ur-siney, Joan Dubanik.

Alto clarinet: Rachel Scott and Nancy Moomaw.

Bass clarinet: Leshon Holmes and Angela Hopewell.

Alto sax: Michelle Haines and Sandy Jones.

Tenor sax: Amy Phillips.

Baritone sax: Garth Hixon.

Cornet: Kelly Miller, David Dork, Roman Stanowski, Mike Tackett and Shannon Shar-row.

French horn: Molina Tolbert.

Trombone: Jeff Martinez, Mark Pyenta, Jeff VanAmejde, Todd Hauter, Jennifer Woodall, Brea Hance and David Lumpkin.

Baritone: Mike Cantrell, Scott Boger and Jennifer McGraw.

Tuba: James Thomas, Keith VanAmejde, Guam Lee and Patrick McDaniel.

Percussion: Lanise Parker, Pam O'Connor, Brian Winborn and Kim Hopewell.

SYMPHONIC BAND

Flute: Juan Rivera, Christine Fortune, Cina Jackson, Susan Hamel, Dawn Clark, Laura Wasvary, Leslie Drozd, Venise Smith, Jennifer Stump, Lynette Cain, Andrew French, Jennifer Sample and Angela Beckett.

Oboe: Becky Bales.

Bassoon: Anita Wood.

Clarinet: Elizabeth Jones, Krystal Brown, Heather Baron, Nicky Stoyhoff, Amran Mukaran, Charlene Clelland, Denice Miller, Melissa Anderson, Patti Imielowski, Heaven Jackson, Carissa Steele, Nicole Thomas, Eben Smith and Carrie Christopher.

Alto Clarinet: Yvonne Kenner and Tracy Haylor.

Bass clarinet: Tonya Thompkins and Melissa Avery.

Alto sax: Sherri Coffy, Michelle Haines, Christine Martell, Beth Bergman, Becky Szente and Stephanie Kennedy.

Baritone sax: Tony Colackio

Cornet: Jennifer Tabbs, Tina Kvicala, Mark Hoinka, Jennifer Daniel, Shelly Krauth, Kim Lewis, Dominic Parise, Erin Newland, Harold Gregory, Renee Roehrich, Mike Jones, Tom Patterson.

French horn: Rochelle Brooks, Amy Ur-siney, Renee Bitner, Crystal Thompson, Tracy Lawyer.

Trombone: Jackie Shay, Nathan Henning, Ricky Rogala, Doug Stewart, Debbie Svacha, Eugena Halimon.

Baritone: Joel McClure and Rodney Halimon.

Tuba: Matthew McIntosh, Jon Sharp and Edward Miller.

Percussion: Doug Allen, Lamont Kennedy, Ginger Miles, Martina Rock, Gary Hardt and Chris Jones.

1986 CONGRESSIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN INTERNS: HELEN S. BROWN AND PHILLIP CHELNICK

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the 1986 Congressional Senior Citizen Intern Program is taking place this week on Capitol Hill. This program provides active, involved and concerned senior citizens with the opportunity to come to Washington to observe the work of their representatives in Congress, attend seminars on the legislative process and attend briefings on legislative initiatives affecting America's seniors.

In this, my fifth consecutive year of participation in the Senior Citizen Intern Program, I am very pleased to sponsor two outstanding seniors from the 21st District of Ohio. Mrs. Helen S. Brown of Cleveland and Mr. Phillip Chelnick of Cleveland Heights are two individuals from my district who have made numerous contributions to the community.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Brown is well-known throughout the Cleveland metropolitan area for her work with and for the benefit of the elderly. She is the former director of the east Cleveland Office on Aging and the Helen S. Brown Senior Citizen Center. The center was named in her honor at the request of the seniors she served. Although she retired from the director position in February 1986, she has continued her active involvement in working to increase services for east Cleveland seniors. Mrs. Brown has received numerous awards as a result of her work with the elderly and in 1981, served as a representative from Cuyahoga County to the White House Conference on the Aging.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chelnick has made similarly illustrious contributions to the community. He was the founder and motivating force behind the Adult Social Action Committee of the Jewish Community Center in Cleveland Heights and served as its chairman for 14 years. He is currently chairman emeritus of that committee. The Adult Social Action Committee was established to create a vehicle at the Jewish Community Center for senior adult advocacy and involvement in issues of concern, and has worked in such areas as housing for the elderly and reduction in Social Security payments to retirees on fixed incomes. Mr. Chelnick is the recipient of many awards and citations including the JCC's Kronenborg Award for Outstanding Service both to agency and community and the Senior Adult Leadership and Community service award of the JCC. He was named as one of six outstanding senior adults in Ohio in 1973 and like Mrs. Brown, has been a delegate to the White House Conference on Aging.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have had the opportunity to sponsor such fine citizens as Helen Brown and Phil Chelnick for participation in the 1986 Congressional Senior Citizen Intern Program. I am confident that they

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 22, 1986

will return to the 21st District eager to share what they have learned and experienced with their fellow seniors.

THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, MA

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as Springfield, MA, the place of my birth, continues the year-long celebration of its 350th anniversary, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the May 21, 1986, Boston Globe, which offers a brief, yet interesting and informative, portrait of Springfield. It summarizes the history and spirit of the city in as fine a manner as I have read, and at this point I would like to submit it to the RECORD.

A SPRINGFIELD TRIBUTE

The virtues of Springfield and its environs have long been lost on the chauvinistic denizens of Boston. In 1974, a Boston politician seeking statewide office spoke to Springfield Mayor Richard Neal about campaigning in Springfield. The politician asked, "Can you get there in one day?"

Ninety miles from Boston, Springfield, the birthplace of the postcard, basketball and Dr. Seuss, is celebrating its creative spirit and rich heritage in a year-long 350th-anniversary party.

Yankee ingenuity and immigrant labor built Springfield into the financial and cultural capital of western Massachusetts. Charles and Frank Duryea invented the gasoline-powered automobile in a machine shop on Tyler Street; Alonzo D. Phillips invented the friction match; Amos Call invented the monkey wrench, and Charley Martin the parking meter. Horace Smith and Daniel B. Wesson invented the Smith & Wesson revolver, and Dr. James Naismith the sport of basketball. The Hende Manufacturing Co. built the first motorcycle with a gasoline engine on State Street.

Today, Springfield has a symphony orchestra, live theater, 15 colleges within a 20-minute drive, a low unemployment rate, a diverse economy and a booming downtown that is as clean as any suburb.

The anniversary of fur trader William Pynchon's decision to leave Roxbury in 1636 and cut a deal with the Wampanoag Indians for the Connecticut River site includes public concerts, picnics, parades, sporting events, lectures, fireworks and exhibits. Last Sunday, a pancake breakfast for 25,000 stretched down Main Street.

Schoolchildren are reenacting historical vignettes. Outdoor fitness centers are being built at public parks, and corporations and individuals are planning to underwrite a city agency "wish list" of items, like park benches, that the city budget cannot afford. The celebration is an appropriate tribute to 350 years of history and progress.

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE HAROLD M. NITTO, AND TO THE HONORABLE HERBERT SUSSER, JUDGES OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, we commenced this month proclaiming by Presidential decree that May 1, 1986, be declared Law Day, U.S.A., with the theme designated by the American Bar Association as "Foundations of Freedom," and throughout our land we traditionally focused our attention on the importance of the rule of law in our free society.

Our Nation's history has been replete with great men of law who have played major roles in the fight to preserve freedom and the rule of law. Today, I call your attention to two outstanding lawyers in my congressional district and State of New Jersey who have given long and distinguished service to the legal profession—in the courts—in their daily lives—ever seeking individual freedom and equal justice for all: The Honorable Harold M. Nitto and the Honorable Herbert Susser who have formally retired from their high offices of public trust as judges of the Superior Court of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, in tribute to these learned judges and their many meritorious achievements on the bench in exemplary service to our people, with your permission I would like to insert at this point in our historic journal of Congress excerpts of a recent published article reporting on the testimonial retirement dinner held in their honor. This report appeared in a highly respected publication among lawyers in our State and Nation—The Reporter: "An Antidote to Law Reviews"—which is published by our Passaic County Bar Association and reads, as follows:

NITTO-SUSSER RETIREMENT DINNER DRAWS FULL HOUSE (By Daniel Crystal)

A massive turnout of friends and admirers jammed the banquet room of the Robin Hood Inn in Clifton at the retirement dinner given by the Passaic County Bar Association for popular Judges Harold M. Nitto and Herbert Susser on Tuesday evening, January 7th.

In each case though, actual retirement is something of a myth. Both guests of honor intend to continue to be active in the law.

The mandatory retirement at 70 requirement of the state constitution has forced Judge Harold M. Nitto of the Family Part of the Superior Court, Chancery Division, and Judge Herbert Susser of the Civil Division of Superior Court, to retire. Nevertheless, Judge Nitto plans to continue to serve part time as a judge, while Judge Susser will be "of counsel" to the firm of Fischer, Kagan, Ascione & Zaretsky in Clifton in which his son, Allen, is an associate.

Approximately 260 people, including many judges and leaders of the Bar in Passaic and other counties, attended the retirement dinner and made clear their respect and admiration for the two jurists.

Each was presented with a plaque from the Bar Association thanking him for his

long years of dedicated service as a judge in Passaic County.

Herman Osofsky, president of the Association, presided over an evening which sparkled with camaraderie and affection for Judges Susser and Nitto.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE SUSSER

Retired Superior Court Judge Irving I. Rubin, himself a victim of the same mandatory retirement provision of the constitution, introduced Judge Susser and presented him with his plaque, which states: "To the Honorable Herbert Susser, in grateful recognition of your dedicated services as a Superior Court judge."

Judge Rubin sketched Judge Susser's close ties over his entire lifetime to the Passaic County courthouse.

"If I were presenting the background and qualifications of Judge Susser to a jury", Judge Rubin noted, "I'm sure the jury would decide that Judge Susser was destined for the judiciary from birth. He was born on Market Street in the City of Paterson, not too far from the courthouse. He was raised on Oliver Street which to the uninitiated might be called practically around the corner from the courthouse. He attended Public School 23 which became part of the new courthouse parking lot. When he became associated with Abe Brenman and later Marty Piper in the practice of law, it was on Market Street not far from the courthouse here. He has lived all his life in Paterson and still lives in the city with his wife, Gloria. He attended Central High School in Paterson."

Judge Rubin congratulated Judge Susser for his years of work as a judge which he termed pleasure for the retiring judge.

A GOOD JUDGE'S CREDO

Judge Susser was eloquent in his response. Noting that he had deliberately not prepared a written talk, he told the attentive audience:

"... I decided that I would not write, but that I would speak to all my friends, to all my colleagues, from the heart.

"It has been for me a wonderful experience.

"I've been a pretty lucky guy. I've had a wonderful wife, wonderful children, daughters-in-law, grandchildren. I've had the good luck to have had a career at the bar and then to achieve what so many men would like to achieve—to have served here on the judiciary for thirteen years, and all of it has been a wonderful experience for me. But the greatest pleasure I got was the friendships that I made over these many years.

"And I think, reflective of it, are the numbers that are here tonight. You're not doing me honor, you are merely giving me pleasure and making me feel that in some degree my career has been worthwhile.

"When I knew that I was going to become a judge, I thought of what I would like to do most. I decided then that the thing that I wanted to do most was to be able to treat those men and women who came before me in the manner that I would have like to have been treated when I practiced law.

"And if I have to some small degree lived up to that pledge and that expectation, then my years on the judiciary have been a success and you have helped me make it that success. Thank you very much."

Thunderous applause greeted Judge Susser's unassuming, eloquent response to the Association's tribute to him.

HONORING JUDGE NITTO.

The other honoree of the evening, Family Court Judge Harold M. Nitto, was intro-

duced by Newton M. Roemer, former Bar Association president, former editor-in-chief of *The Reporter*, and retired chair and member of the Board of Bar Examiners. Newt, deftly and affectionately, told the attentive audience of his long-time association with Judge Nitto. He claimed the title of being midwife to the latter's judicial career since he had given a favorable response as to the future judge's judicial potentialities when questioned by the late Pierre Garvin, then Appointments Secretary to Governor Cahill and later Chief Justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court.

On a more sober note, Roemer praised Judge Nitto's outstanding judicial career.

"I must say," he declared, "that there is a very serious side to Harold Nitto that I want to comment on. He has written some rather heavy opinions.

"One had to do with a very erudite article that he submitted to the *New Jersey Law Journal* on the proposed Family Court. Then in 1976 he wrote a very important opinion on the right of institutionalized mental patients to receive effective medical and psychiatric treatment during their confinement. There was also the *Brandenburg* case which involved the important question of determining the proper time to evaluate equitable distribution. In that case, our Supreme Court eventually adopted his trial court findings.

"In addition, in 1983, he wrote a very scholarly opinion which gave a comprehensive analysis of the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act."

Congratulating Judge Nitto on his years as a jurist, the Reporter's former editor-in-chief pointed out that it was significant that he of the Jewish faith was presenting the Bar Association's plaque of thanks and approval to Judge Nitto of Italian origin.

"So, having delivered myself of these choice thoughts and recollections," Newt said in concluding his witty introduction of Judge Nitto, "I guess what it all comes down to is that Nutah Mordecai, the son of Schmuel, is going to introduce Haraldo Mihael, the son of Francesco, and I guess that's what democracy is all about."

Then he presented the Bar Association's plaque to Judge Nitto: "Judge Nitto, it is a great honor, a privilege, to be able to present this plaque to you."

YEARS OF CHANGING LAW

Judge Nitto made clear how much he was moved by the massive outpouring of Bar Association members, judges and friends to do honor to himself and Judge Susser. He thanked the members of the dinner committee who had arranged the dinner, and paid tribute in his turn to the help he had received from his Assignment Judges in Passaic County: Assignment Judges Nicholas Mandak, Peter Ciolino, Charles S. Joelson and John F. Crane. He told the audience about how much the encouragement and help of his family had meant to him. And then he gave a brilliant address, summarizing the changes in law during the 18 years that he had served as a judge as follows:

PROGRESS IN FAMILY LAW

(By Harold M. Nitto, Judge, Superior Court of New Jersey)

Retirement dinners, like testimonial dinners in general, are usually distinguished by rubber chicken and war stories. The chef has spared us from the former and I shall do my best to avoid the latter.

From the time of my appointment to the bench as Judge of the Juvenile and Domes-

tic Relations Court in 1970 my judicial activities have centered around the family and its innumerable problems. During that time we have witnessed a major restructuring in the way these matters are handled. I need mention only the Divorce Reform Act and the reports of the Supreme Court Committee on Matrimonial Litigation. Having been an active participant in this transition you may be assured that there were many times when progress was almost overcome by frustration, born of the limitations implicit in the scope and nature of judicial powers.

It is in this connection that I would like to share some thoughts with you for a moment.

On January 24, 1982 Chief Justice Warren E. Burger of the United States Supreme Court delivered his annual report on the State of the Judiciary. During the course of his remarks he noted that a "host of new kinds of conflicts have flooded the courts . . . there is some form of mass neurosis that leads many people to think that courts were created to solve all the problems of mankind."

Nowhere has this observation been more valid than in our own state. Our courts have not hesitated to address a myriad of complex and technical problems with remarkable results. Let me cite a few examples:

Robinson v. Cahill broke new ground in the field of education; *State v. Leonardis* in pretrial intervention; *State v. Carter* in criminal justice; *Department of Health v. Owen-Corning Fiberglass Corp.* on questions of air pollution; *Newark v. Natural Resource Council* in infra-red aerial tidal mapping; *State v. Hurd* in hypnosis; *Woodsum v. Pemberton Township* in aquifer technology; *Malvasi V. Malvasi* in dealing with human leucocyte antigen typing, *Berman v. Allan* in amniocentesis; *Cepeda v. Cumberland Engineering Co.* in machine design defects; *D'Arc v. D'Arc*, voiceprints; *State v. Chatman*, flameless atomic absorption analysis; *In re Quinlan* and *in re Conroy*, life sustaining mechanism; *State v. Finkle, Vascar, Tenore v. Nu Car Carriers*, economics; *In re Grossman*, sex reassignment surgery; *State v. Johnson*, use of drunkometer; *State v. Walker*, use of polygraph; *State v. Dantonio*, use of radar; *State v. Sinnott*, use of sodium pentothal; *Cortese v. Cortese*, use of blood grouping; in *State v. Cerchiello*, use of fingerprint identification; and *Becton Regional High School*, invasion of privacy, a case which has attracted national attention. The judge who made the *Becton* decision was Assignment Judge Peter Ciolino.

Having mentioned these, can we ignore *Mt. Laurel*, the Pinelands cases, the right to life and the numerous issues evolving from new modalities and dynamics of state of the art? The power of the courts has been clearly and firmly stated, as our Supreme Court in *State v. Abbot* has reminded us, only last June that judicial power imports the power to fashion needed and appropriate remedies.

It can be fairly stated that the courts have been given a major role in the resolution of social and political issues. Litigation has come to be accepted as a part of the natural order. Again, as was stated by Chief Justice Burger "Americans are increasingly turning to the courts for relief from a range of personal distresses and anxieties. Remedies for personal wrongs that were once considered the responsibility of institutions other than the courts are now boldly asserted as legal entitlements. The courts have been expected to fill the void created by the decline of church, family and neighborhood unity."

Nowhere have the courts responded to the new challenge with greater responsibility than in our own state. Rarely has the concept of non-judiciality been invoked because the remedy might be difficult to fashion. Judicial pioneering has become the rule rather than the exception. Problem solving has become the hallmark of the judicial establishment while maintaining a proper respect for separation of powers in our tripartite structure.

In a free and open society as ours, it is only natural that the general society should turn to the courts to fill in the seams which separate our three branches of government.

The complexities of social economic and technical problems which have so far yielded to courtroom solutions are only the harbingers of things to come. Given the continuation of a responsible judiciary and a committed bar, such as is represented here tonight, we cannot fail.

THE DEPRESSION GENERATION RETIRES

The fortuitous fact that both Judge Nitto and Judge Susser have retired at approximately the same time has a deeper significance to students of the law. Each is very much an individual, yet in some ways they are both paradigms of important strands that help make up part of both the Bench and the Bar in our country.

One by one, like the retirement of Justices Morris Pashman and of the late C. Thomas Schettino of our own Supreme Court, we are witnessing the youth of the Great Depression retire from brilliant legal and judicial careers. Many have been Italian; many have been Jewish. They came to maturity in difficult years, and they have honored their respective ethnic backgrounds at the same time as they have enriched both the practice of law and the practice of judgeship. It's eminently worthwhile accordingly to appraise the individual achievements of these two Passaic County jurists against the broader issue that in many ways each is the representative of an outstanding ethnic group that found opportunity for full expression in law and the judiciary.

JUDGE NITTO'S BACKGROUND

When Judge Nitto formally retired on February 27, 1986, it marked the completion of eighteen years of judicial service.

He was first appointed to the bench as Judge of the South Hackensack Municipal Court on January 8, 1948 and was subsequently reappointed through April 9, 1952 when he resigned to attend to the mounting responsibilities of an active private practice.

In June 1970, Nitto was appointed to the Passaic County Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court and was designated Presiding Judge of that Court.

His next step up the judicial ladder came in September 1976 when he was named to the Passaic County Court where he was assigned to hear matrimonial cases. In December 1978, he was appointed to the Superior Court of New Jersey. Since that time he has served in the Chancery Division, Matrimonial (now Family) Part, after having been reappointed in April 1980.

Judge Nitto came somewhat late to the study of law since, as Newt Roemer reminded the audience at the retirement dinner, the future judge had originally taken a pre-medical course in college. He went to law school because it was thousands of dollars cheaper than medical school. From 1934-1938, he pursued a B.A. degree at New York University. In 1942, he received his L.L.B. from Rutgers. In 1953, he formed the firm of Nitto and Nitto with his later brother,

Carl, and pursued an active trial lawyer's career, representing insurance companies among other clients. He served as General Counsel to St. Mary's Hospital in Passaic, and was a member of the hospital's Board of Trustees. He was a charter member of the Society of Hospital Attorneys and also a member of the Advisory Board of the New Jersey Bank & Trust Company, now Midlantic National Bank/North.

Judge Nitto has served on the Board of Paul VI Regional Diocesan High School. He has held membership in the Serra Club, the Institute of Fairleigh Dickinson University, St. Andrew's R.C. Church in Clifton, and numerous civic and service organizations. He is a member of the Passaic County and American Bar Associations and of the American Judicature Society.

Judge Nitto lives at 140 Hepburn Road, Clifton, New Jersey, with his wife, Jeanne. They have a daughter, Lisa, who is a registered nurse, and granddaughter, Marissa.

He hopes for a part-time family court assignment after his formal retirement.

"The following day I hope to be back to work," he told reporters.

APPRAISING JUDGE SUSSER

Judge Susser's legal and judicial career is equally revelatory of how the young men and women of various faiths and ethnic backgrounds who had to cope with the Great Depression of the Thirties and with World War II found niches and legal and judicial honor in the law.

Judge Susser was born in Paterson, as his long-time friend, Judge Rubin, told the audience at the retirement dinner. He attended Paterson School No. 23 (on the site of which the new Court House stands), Central High School, New York University and Rutgers Law School. He was a partner in Brenman & Susser, later Brenman, Susser and Piper, with offices in Paterson.

On a family note, he is married to the former Gloria Mogul, originally resident of New York City. He has two sons, Jack, married to Bonnie, and Allen, married to Andrea, as well as three granddaughters, Alexa, Alicia and Carly.

He was counsel to the Passaic County Planning Board. On December 13, 1972, he was appointed Judge of the Passaic County Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court. On June 18, 1973, he became Presiding Judge, Passaic County District Court. He moved up the judicial ladder on July 2, 1976, to the Passaic County Court. On December 7, 1978, he was appointed to the Superior Court of New Jersey.

As a judge, he sat in the Juvenile and Domestic Relations, Matrimonial, Criminal and Civil Divisions. He has served on the Supreme Court Judicial Education and College Committee, and has been a lecturer both on Landlord-Tenant and on Sentencing under the New Jersey Criminal Code. He is presently a member of the Supreme Court Committee on Pensions and Salaries. He is a member of the Passaic County and New Jersey State Bar Associations, as well as the American Judicature Society.

How active lawyers and judges contribute to civic causes and organizations is well illustrated by Judge Susser's affiliations.

For five years he served as President of the Y.M. & Y.W.H.A. of North Jersey. He also served for two years as President of the New Jersey Federation of Y.M. & Y.W.H.A.'s. He was formerly a member of the National Board of Directors of the Jewish Welfare Board. He has been the recipient of the Harry S. Feller Award for outstanding service to the Jewish Community

Centers and Y.M. & Y.W.H.A.'s on a local, regional and national level. He has been past President of the Paterson B'Nai Brith and a recipient of their Americanism Award. He has been a member of the Board of Directors of the Community Synagogue and of the Hebrew Free School.

In addition, he has been active in the United Fund Campaign and a member of the Veritans Club. He twice served as General Solicitation Chairman of the United Jewish Appeal Campaign.

Nor is that all. He also served on the Board of the Miriam Home for the Aged and was Senior Vice-President of the Miriam apartments and one of the original trustees. Like Judge Nitto, he has never forgotten his roots. Both have used their legal and judicial skills to benefit the civic organizations of their own national groups. Each has been a public spirited citizen throughout his entire career. They have both continued to pay their dues to their own people and the country as a whole.

Future plans?

"I promised my son I would one day join him," Susser said. He will work for the Clifton firm of Fischer, Kagan, Ascione & Zaretsky. "If I don't feel that excited, I can always come back to the bench."

New Jersey law allows part-time assignments for retired judges.

Judge Susser's last days on the bench provided plenty of challenge. On December 19, he approved a \$2.5 million settlement in a suit filed against Six Flags-Great Adventure by the family of one of the eight victims of a 1984 fire at the Jackson amusement park.

It was the first monetary settlement in the case and was subsequent to the acquittal of the company by an Ocean County jury on criminal charges of manslaughter. "I went out with a bang," Judge Susser told reporters at the time.

Of rather diminutive stature, Judge Susser has nothing of the Napoleonic complex of over-reaction. The son of eastern European immigrants grew up in Paterson. His family owned a candy store at Oliver and Marshal Streets. While clerking in a law office he worked nights and weekends to get through New York University and Rutgers Law School, from which he graduated in 1939. His law school years were accordingly those of the depression.

He will take on the big ones when he returns to the practice of law after a three-month vacation in Palm Beach, Fla. His plans are to join in his new firm's legal action against the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and the owners of the Achille Lauto cruise ship in the death of Leon Klinghoffer. The firm had represented Marilyn Klinghoffer, wife of the 69-year-old New York City man who was killed October 10, 1985, by Palestinians who hijacked the cruise ship in the Mediterranean. (As we go to press, we learn that Mrs. Klinghoffer has died of cancer.)

The Reporter extends its own words of praise to Judges Susser and Nitto in the familiar line: "Well done, thou good and valiant public servants."

Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, appropriate that we reflect on the deeds and accomplishments of our people who have contributed to the quality of life here in America and the preeminence of our representative democracy, second to none, among all nations throughout the world. I appreciate the opportunity to seek national recognition of Judges Nitto and Susser for their lifetime of dedication to the

cornerstone of freedom, the rule of law, in their notable judicial careers which have truly enriched our community, State and Nation. We do indeed salute two distinguished citizens, esteemed lawyers, and great Americans—the Honorable Harold M. Nitto and the Honorable Herbert Susser, judges of the Superior Court of New Jersey.

TRIBUTE CEREMONY FOR MR. BRADFORD MORSE

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Bradford Morse, a former Member of Congress from the State of Massachusetts, recently retired as administrator of the United Nations Development Program. I would like to commend to your attention the remarks made by U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar on April 30, 1986, at the tribute ceremony in the honor of Mr. Morse.

The information follows:

REMARKS AT THE TRIBUTE CEREMONY FOR MR. BRADFORD MORSE, APRIL 30, 1986

Mr. Brown, distinguished guests, ladies and gentleman, it gives me great pleasure to join you here this evening in paying tribute to a truly remarkable colleague, Bradford Morse.

His name is a household word. It immediately brings to mind the dynamic, resourceful and humane approach to international problems which he has demonstrated in various fields of endeavour at the United Nations over nearly a decade and a half. Few have worked harder and given more of themselves than he. His departure is a great loss to the United Nations system. The memory and the fruits of his contribution will endure.

Brad Morse has brought to this Organization a pragmatic and imaginative disposition which reflected very well his rich experience in the legislative branch of the United States government.

As the Permanent Representative of my country over a number of years and subsequently as Brad's fellow Under-Secretary-general, I came to know and appreciate his professionalism and his total dedication to the ideals of the Organization. Many times over the years we have seen him cut through red-tape and reconcile conflicting viewpoints. He did so with fairness and skill, in a manner which has won him great respect in widely disparate parts of the world. Of this he—and indeed all of us at the United Nations—can be justly proud.

Brad's contribution has been marked by an extraordinary ability to organize and administer: to energize colleagues and to convert plans, programmes and projections into real action on the ground. Perhaps above all, however, he has approached every task with a level of energy that can be at the same time both inspiring and, to the dormant, quite terrifying. But this energy was always channelled to the most remarkable and constructive effect. His many achievements are testimony to this fact.

It is to the United Nations Development Programme that Brad has given of his great qualities in fullest measure. Within three years of his appointment as Administrator in 1976, he had conducted an overhaul of

the Programme and ensured an unprecedented level of confidence in its work on the part of donors and recipients alike.

Over the past decade, the Programme has increasingly been seen as the world's most comprehensive source of development assistance, with ever more important coordinating and catalytic roles. No longer is it regarded simply as the sum of its project financing.

No one but Brad could possibly have handled both the responsibilities of UNDP with those of the Office for Emergency Operations in Africa which I asked him to set up and direct in December 1984. The situation then was bleak indeed. Famine, caused by a variety of factors, was threatening the lives of 35 million Africans, with ten million uprooted from their homes and lands. A truly herculean effort was undertaken by the Emergency Office in cooperation with other branches of the United Nations system. There is no doubt that it saved millions of those lives and helped bring the crisis in Africa down to manageable proportions.

It has been said that the accomplishments of the United Nations are taken for granted as soon as they are registered. I am certain that the millions of people who are now alive as a result of this extraordinary endeavour will never take the United Nations for granted. They will be the witnesses to one of the finest ever undertakings of the international community. For this, Brad, you have our profound gratitude.

Of course, none of these accomplishments could have been possible without the extraordinary loyalty and affection that Brad always inspired in those around him. His generosity of spirit and his rich capacity for friendship nurtured a genuine and extremely valuable team spirit among his colleagues and opened governmental and other doors which to many would have remained locked.

Ladies and gentlemen, how should I conclude a tribute to our good friend? The United Nations career of Brad Morse illustrates how this institution—dedicated to a better world—is a truly effective force for good. It channels the capacities of many remarkable individuals in the interest of the human family as a whole and not just certain parts of it.

The cause of development, which Brad served with such distinction, derives from the Charter aim, quote, to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, unquote. We have come to learn that the global peace which we all seek will remain elusive so long as cruel and grotesque disparities in living standards endure. Peace cannot be guaranteed before all members of the human family can live in dignity. For this to happen their hopes and their horizons cannot be circumscribed by endemic poverty and deprivation. Peace and development are therefore inextricable. Brad Morse worked tirelessly for both.

To his fellow citizens I say. Look at the record of this Great-hearted son of the United States of America in the service of the United Nations, for there is important meaning to be found therein.

To all those who have worked with him. Let us take up his example and act on it, as the best tribute we could possibly pay.

My dear Brad, I have little doubt that in the future we will stand to benefit from your wise counsel. For the moment, however, we reluctantly yield you to a well-earned reduction in your workload and of course to your family.

We thank you from our hearts and wish you every good fortune.

AVOID OVERREACTION TO TERRORISM

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, last week the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights held 2 days of hearings on the antiterrorism capabilities of State and local police. We heard testimony from the FBI, representatives of the New York City and Chicago police departments, and the heads of two leading police organizations.

Our witnesses agreed that more needs to be done, particularly in the area of training. But after months of terrorism hysteria from the media and from some of our Federal officials, it was refreshing to hear law enforcement professionals warn against the dangers of overreaction to a problem that, domestically, has been on the decline. The testimony of one of our witnesses, Jerald R. Vaughn, executive director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, was reprinted this morning on the op-ed page of the Washington Post. I commend Mr. Vaughn's balanced and realistic comments to my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, May 21, 1986]

TERRORISM: WHAT POLICE CAN DO

(By Jerald R. Vaughn)

Terrorism is highly publicized on a regular basis by the news media and consequently generates significant fear in our citizens. Therein lies the dilemma for the police executive in the United States; developing a reasonable response capability without overreacting in the face of declining incidents of terrorism.

Unfortunately, since terrorism is such a highly publicized activity, a whole cadre of "entrepreneurial experts" on the subject has appeared and has exploited that fear in order to provide training, equipment and publications—much of which is of dubious quality.

Perpetuating a fear that is unwarranted on the basis of fact only assists the terrorists in achieving their purposes, however repugnant they may be to our traditional values. Similarly, equipping local police at airports and other risk locations in the United States with heavy armament and other equipment of warfare would only serve to alarm citizens about the threat of terrorism. When we alter our basic way of life, we have in fact been defeated by the terrorist.

To address this issue appropriately, the fundamental differences between our country and other nations must be recognized. The majority of foreign nations utilize a national police force, which in many cases is either directly associated with the military or operates very much as a military unit. Those countries have but one police authority to rely on for a response to terrorism.

Unlike a national police system, the United States was founded on the principle of local control. Consequently, more than 17,000 independent law enforcement agencies serve our cities, countries, states and federal government. It is almost always the local police who are the first responders to any criminal event. This situation holds true for acts of terrorism.

In many departments, specialized tactical response teams are in place to handle such criminal events as hostage taking and barricaded gunmen. Many other jurisdictions, however, do little to prepare for such occurrences, and many police officials honestly believe that such things cannot happen in their jurisdictions. As they analyze their communities, they simply do not see any likely target for such an activity. What they often overlook is that a potential target—a dignitary or other person who may serve the purpose of a terrorist—could visit their community.

Cities such as Chicago, Los Angeles and New York are well prepared for terroristic events. Cooperation between local and federal authorities is on a very high level, and joint response teams have been developed. On balance, however, the level of preparedness for terrorism in most state and local law enforcement agencies is probably less than desirable.

In my opinion, the most important thing that can be done to increase that level of preparedness is to provide accurate, timely and realistic training to key decision makers—mayors, city managers, top police executives—so that as they look objectively at the problem of terrorism in the context of their communities, they can make logical and reasonable choices based upon the resources available. They can also pursue mutual aid compacts and increase communication with other law enforcement entities if information suggests that as an appropriate course of action.

I do not believe that it would be a wise expenditure of funds or in the best interest of the public to have the federal government finance such things as heavy armament for local police, except in those cases in which there is a clearly identified risk in that community and it is beyond the capability of the community to equip its officers accordingly. The most appropriate role for the federal government would be to assist state and local governments in training the key decision makers. This can be done by agencies such as the FBI, which has lead-agency responsibility for response to such occurrences.

It must be kept in mind, however, that it is the local police who most often will respond first to such incidents. To rely on state or federal terrorist response teams is often very ineffective because of the lapse between the occurrence and the arrival of those teams.

Perhaps the most important consideration is to achieve a reasonable balance between the safety and security of our innocent citizens and realistic assessment of the actual level of the threat to ensure that serious overreaction does not occur.

REASSESSMENT OF NATO—POSSIBLE REDEPLOYMENT OF U.S. ARMED FORCES

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, last week the Washington Post carried a column by Henry Kissinger on the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces in Europe. Dr. Kissinger has long been a strong supporter and protector of the Atlantic Alliance, and his column deserves careful attention. He concludes that, in Europe's inter-

est as well as our own, it is time for a major reassessment of the alliance, a greater role for Europe in its own conventional defense, and a redeployment to the United States of some of our forces currently based in Europe.

I agree with these conclusions, and I have introduced today a resolution embodying them and including the major supporting arguments. Although the major reasons for realigning roles of the alliance partners and redeploying some United States forces are strategic and political, not economic, we would also realize significant U.S. defense budget savings, which we need badly. Dr. Kissinger's column follows:

ALLIANCE CURE: REDEPLOYMENT

(By Henry Kissinger)

The American retaliation against Libya and its aftermath have brought home dramatically the extent of discord in the Atlantic Alliance over issues outside of Europe.

In the United States there was widespread support for President Reagan. In Europe there was near-unanimous disapproval, except in French public opinion. Even in Britain the remarkable Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, was nearly alone in maintaining, against the press, most of the Cabinet and the opposition, the special relationship with the United States.

The governments that dissociated themselves from American policy were in most cases the friendliest conceivable. Had the opposition in most nations been in office, the reaction would have been far more overtly hostile.

All this has produced a new source of tension in the Alliance. Few Europeans have grasped the bitterness their attitude has caused among much of the American public. On the other hand Americans have not understood that these disputes go back at least a generation and have become critical largely because of the success of the Alliance.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was a response to the fear of Soviet aggression against Europe. At that time, 40 years ago, the United States had a huge nuclear superiority and was dominant economically, while Europe was only beginning its recovery from the war. Conflicts outside Europe were produced by the process of decolonization; the Soviet role in them was relatively minor. The United States, reluctant to be involved in colonial wars, insisted that the obligations of the Atlantic Treaty did not extend outside of Europe. Indeed, it reserved the right to oppose its allies in the Third World, and during the Suez Crisis of 1956, when it went so far as to threaten Britain and France with economic sanctions.

Since then, conditions have changed dramatically. Europe has recovered its economic dynamism and is moving, although fitfully, toward political unity. The fear of Soviet invasion has diminished. American nuclear superiority has been replaced by rough parity with the Soviet Union, and European Allies increasingly question the credibility of the nuclear deterrent.

But one early problem remains almost unchanged, although the two sides of the Atlantic have exchanged their roles. Now it is Europe that insists that the treaty's obligations do not extend to the developing world. And it is Europe that feels free to dissociate itself from U.S. actions where indigenous upheavals and Soviet efforts to outflank the Alliance produce contemporary crises.

That process of dissociation has been accelerating for at least a decade and a half.

During the 1973 Middle East war, Britain and West Germany refused to grant the

United States permission to use American bases for reconnaissance or blocked American arms shipments to the Middle East from their territories. Allied governments almost unanimously have opposed American policy on Afghanistan sanctions, toward Iran during the hostage crisis and in Central America and Grenada.

But there is one fundamental difference. When the United States thwarted Europe a generation ago, it was accelerating an inevitable process of decolonization. When Europe dissociates itself from the United States today, it challenges a concept of global defense and therefore, indirectly, the psychological basis of America's commitments even to the defense of Europe. The practical consequence is that a major portion of America's armed forces is tied up where governments will permit its use only against the least likely threat, an all-out Soviet attack on the Central Front. With respect to the most probable challenges—where crises have in fact arisen—the Allies not only veto the use of the forces based in Europe but involve the Alliance to seek to block U.S. action even by American forces based outside the treaty area. Gradually the concept of reciprocal obligation is being drained from the Alliance.

This produces the following problems, which must be solved if long-term paralysis is to be avoided: the United States cannot grant Europe a veto over its actions outside the NATO area unless it is ready to abdicate its responsibilities for the global equilibrium, but neither can it be in Europe's interest to undermine America's willingness to defend its vital interests, for the defense of Europe is part of these vital interests.

Hence the political and military arrangements within the Alliance will have to be adjusted.

Improved consultation, the traditional patent medicine for Alliance ills, will not suffice by itself. Secretary of State George P. Shultz had delivered several thoughtful and eloquent speeches on the basic theme that governments that nurture terrorist groups would be held accountable. The president had made the same point frequently since his first days in office.

All these efforts were rebuffed. The Allies insisted that terrorism was a police problem, not a military problem. They rejected economic sanctions as unworkable. They blamed the spread of terrorism on the alleged American failure to make progress on "solving" the Israeli-Arab confrontation, ignoring the fact the terrorist groups attacking America used terror in part to destroy moderate Arab governments and the peace process.

All this time Americans were seeing defenseless fellow countrymen being murdered and terrorized on foreign soil. In such circumstances no American president could fail to act, especially as economic sanctions were being rejected.

In due course some common Allied program against terrorism may well emerge if only to forestall further American unilateral action.

But this will no longer go to the heart of the problem. The United States as well as its allies would make a mistake to paper over the cracks in the Alliance that recent events have made explicit.

European governments might begin the process of re-examination by asking themselves whether they have not permitted the cracks to become unnecessarily wide by taking so passive an attitude toward the radical peace organization and militant church

groups that are so ready to mount anti-American demonstrations. Too many European governments have sought to purchase domestic tranquility by catering to the myth that they are restraining the immature, bellicose Americans. As a result, in cries European public opinion often takes on the qualities of a Frankenstein monster driving governments to ever greater dissociation from the United States. In its appeal for restraint the European Community seemed to put the United States and Libya on the same level.

Sources of the problem can be seen in two facts: First, it is unnatural for a continent with a population larger than that of the Soviet Union and a gross national product one and a half times greater than it to rely for so much of its defense on a distant ally. Second, the prevalent strategic doctrine of nuclear retaliation is inconsistent with the realities of nuclear parity.

All this breeds an attitude of helplessness in Europe with regard to defense, and it is coupled with the conviction that opposition to America is free. It turns European foreign policy increasingly into an issue in European domestic politics.

A larger European role in the defense of Europe is long overdue. This will require not only a more substantial material effort—where in fact progress is being made—but also an explicit European identity within NATO. If the Atlantic relationship can encourage a European Economic Community where competition with the United States is inevitable, it should welcome a European Defense Community, in which all incentives—in case of a Soviet attack or pressure on Europe—would be for cooperation rather than dissociation.

If Europe were to assume more responsibility for its defense, the two sides of the Atlantic could then deal more realistically with the declining credibility of the nuclear deterrent and the increasingly evident need to rely more heavily on traditional ground and air forces.

As the defense of Europe is being redefined, the disagreements outside the NATO area should be faced explicitly.

The Allied countries that are members of the annual Economic Summit—the United States, France, West Germany, Britain and Italy—should immediately set up a high-level group under the chairmanship of the distinguished Secretary General of NATO, Lord Peter Carrington. The assignment should be to define frankly what differences are foreseeable and how to manage them. Of course, unilateral action by any NATO country should be a last resort, but realistically there will be times when it is necessary. In that event, the allies owe it to each other to remember that undermining an Ally's self-confidence inevitably erodes the ability to act in concert where they do agree.

Whatever the group concludes in this essentially political study, a careful strategic study should be made of whether current NATO deployments still fit strategic and political realities.

The conclusion, I believe, is unavoidable: Some of the American forces now in Europe would contribute more effectively to global defense if they were redeployed as strategic reserves based in the United States and able to be moved to world trouble spots.

The F-111s in Britain are a case in point. The outcry in all circles of British opinion against Mrs. Thatcher's granting of permission for the F-111s bombers to fly from Britain to attack Libya raises for Americans

inevitable questions: In the future, is it safe for America to count on a similar decision in comparable circumstances? Two former British prime ministers from each of the major parties, Edward Heath and James Callaghan, have stated publicly that they would have refused permission, and so did the leaders of all opposition parties. Should therefore America expose another prime minister to such grave domestic risks? And can the United States take the strategic risks of such precarious deployments?

The case for moving these planes to the United States is powerful. The air base for them could be kept in Britain with all required maintenance and support facilities, and the planes could periodically visit there to make the point that they were available to NATO if needed. But fundamentally they would be available for action outside the NATO area directly from the United States. Similar principles could be applied to other forces suitable for a strategic reserve, forces such as certain long-range fighter planes and air-transportable ground forces. The objective should be to distinguish clearly between those American forces earmarked exclusively for the defense of Europe and those available for other areas.

Such a major reassessment of the Atlantic Alliance should not be undertaken as a reaction to a transitory mutual recrimination. It should be done carefully and constructively with the goal of increasing the overall effectiveness of the defense of free peoples and of bringing the demands on political leaders into line with that which a democratic framework will sustain.

H. CON. RES. 341

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization should reassess armed forces deployments in Europe with a view toward withdrawing some units of the United States Armed Forces as a strategic reserve available to respond worldwide to threats against the security of the United States

Whereas the United States has responded, where it could do so effectively, to threats to its security arising anywhere in the world, including threats from terrorism, indigenous upheavals in the third world, and Soviet attempts to outflank the Atlantic Alliance;

Whereas a major portion of the United States Armed Forces is positioned in the countries of Western Europe where the governments of those countries will permit the use of United States Armed Forces only against the least likely threat, an all-out Soviet attack on Western Europe;

Whereas the countries of Western Europe challenge the defense concept of the United States which is based on a global strategy directed against threats to the United States arising anywhere in the world;

Whereas this global defense strategy is indirectly the psychological basis for the commitment of the United States to the defense of Western Europe;

Whereas the United States cannot grant Western Europe a veto over United States actions outside the member nation area of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization unless the United States is ready to abdicate its responsibilities for the global equilibrium;

Whereas it cannot be in the interest of Western Europe to undermine the willingness of the United States to defend its vital interests, of which the defense of Western Europe is a part;

Whereas a large European role in the defense of Western Europe is both long overdue and feasible since Western Europe has a population larger than that of the Soviet Union and a total gross national product one and a half times that of the Soviet Union;

Whereas there is a particular need to focus greater European attention on the conventional defense requirements of Western Europe in an era of approximate superpower parity in strategic nuclear forces; and

Whereas some units of the United States Armed Forces now in Western Europe would contribute more effectively to the global defense of the United States if those units were redeployed in the United States as strategic reserves available to respond worldwide to threats against the security of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (hereinafter referred to as "NATO") should make a major reassessment of the Atlantic Alliance, including a careful strategic study of whether current armed forces deployments by NATO still fit NATO's strategic and political realities;

(2) the nations of Western Europe should take greater responsibility for their own conventional defense; and

(3) those units of the United States Armed Forces currently based in Western Europe which are not earmarked exclusively for the defense of Western Europe should be withdrawn to the United States for use as a strategic reserve available to respond worldwide to threats against the security of the United States.

EAST FALMOUTH MAN PULLS STRUGGLING YOUTH FROM COLD WATERS OF LITTLE BAY IN BOURNE

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 6, Julio Barrows was participating in an ecumenical youth program retreat in Monument Beach, MA. Mr. Barrows was suddenly alerted to a young man who was struggling in the frigid water of Little Bay after having fallen from a canoe. Without hesitation, Mr. Barrows courageously rescued the boy.

Following is a detailed account of Mr. Barrows' heroic act from the Falmouth Enterprise of April 11, 1986:

EAST FALMOUTH MAN PULLS STRUGGLING YOUTH FROM COLD WATERS OF LITTLE BAY IN BOURNE

(By David D. Theall)

Late Sunday afternoon, Julio Barrows Jr., Sandwich Road, swam into the frigid water of Little Bay, Monument Beach, and rescued a Lynn youth who had fallen out of his canoe.

Mr. Barrows was serving as an adult leader with Echo of Cape Cod, an ecumenical youth program sponsored by the Catholic Church of the diocese of Fall River, at a retreat at Briarwood Conference Center on Shore Road, Monument Beach. During a

talk by the Right Rev. Bruce Nealon of Fall River, one of the high school boys in the program glanced out the window and saw Andre Comeau Jr. floundering in the water after having fallen out of his canoe.

"I charged waist-high into water, which was frigid, and yelled out to the boy if he could hang on for a few minutes until I could find a rope or something. He was about a hundred yards off shore and in well over his head. His canoe had gotten away from him, and he was struggling in the water. . . ."

Standing on shore was Mr. Comeau, who kept yelling at his son. He was pale, said Mr. Barrows.

Noticing an upturned rowboat on shore, Mr. Barrows flipped it over and attempted to release the oars, which were tied securely to the boat. Not wanting to waste precious time on the oars, he pushed the boat into the water and started swimming the boat in choppy water to the struggling boy. Off in the distance, he could see the boy bobbing up and down.

"A CALMING EFFECT"

"Seeing the boat coming toward him seemed to have a calming effect," said the modest rescuer. "I told him to grab hold of it at first and just rest; then I climbed in and pulled him in too."

Mr. Comeau took his son away soon after the rescue. Mr. Barrows described Andre as a young teen-ager, possibly 11 or 12. He was visiting family friends in the neighborhood of the conference center and was not involved in the youth program that was meeting there.

"He had layers of clothes on," recalled Mr. Barrows, "and hip-high boots. It's not surprising he had difficulty swimming . . . although the water was freezing also."

Asked whether the boy was wearing a life preserver, Mr. Barrows said, "No, but there were two in the canoe." How he learned this resulted from a strange request from the boy's father, who yelled at them, when they were halfway back to shore, both wet and shivering, to go back and retrieve the wayward canoe. Reluctantly, Mr. Barrows rowed out and fetched it. It was full of water, but floating, and the boy held its rope while Mr. Barrows resumed the rescue operation.

Upon reaching shore, Mr. Comeau shook Mr. Barrows' hand and then turned his attention to his shaken son. Mr. Barrows left quietly, neither expecting nor receiving any recognition.

The Bourne rescue squad arrived on the scene quickly, but probably not in time to have kept the boy from drowning. When asked about the near-fatal accident, a spokesman for the rescue squad said that by the time they got there Sunday afternoon, "the police had already saved the kid." The police did arrive, but after the rescue was completed by Mr. Barrows.

Mr. Barrows, a 48-year-old native of Harwich, married a Falmouth woman, Mary Rezendes, in 1962 when he was in the Air Force. They have four children, two girls and two boys. While in the service, he was trained in water safety. In 1976 he retired from the Air Force with the rank of technical sergeant and opened an upholstery business, which he operates from his spacious Sandwich Road home.

Mr. Barrows is a eucharistic minister of St. Anthony's Church in East Falmouth, a member of the Falmouth Knights of Columbus and a serious racquetball player at Falmouth Sports Center.

"I'm in excellent physical shape," was Mr. Barrows' self-evaluation with regard to his

ability to stand up to the physical demands of the situation, without mentioning the instinctive courage he demonstrated on the occasion.

Asked what he thought about as he went to bed Sunday night, Mr. Barrows recalled vividly, "The look in his eyes. I don't even remember what he looks like, but the look in his eyes told a story."

What was that story?

"Gratitude . . . thank God."

THE MEDICAID COMMUNITY SPOUSE PROTECTION ACT OF 1986

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a legislative package which addresses the problem of spousal impoverishment as a result of Medicaid spend down.

Each year, thousands of elderly citizens face a very traumatic situation: the need to institutionalize a sick spouse. This situation often occurs at a time of mental and physical exhaustion for the community spouse and is coupled with a sense of anguish. This anguish stems from the realization by the community spouse that he or she can no longer care for their sick spouse in their home.

Adding to the emotional strain of the institutionalization process, is the discovery by most elderly that Medicare does not pay for long-term care and that the cost of long-term care far exceeds the couple's available resources or income.

The next step in this scenario usually leads to the local public assistance office. There they may learn that their income and resources exceed the State Medicaid eligibility requirements. They must, therefore, spend down to the State determined Medicaid eligibility level in order to qualify for Medicaid assistance.

Through this process of spend down, honest middle-income elderly citizens are forced into bankruptcy in order to meet the costs of their spouse's institutionalized care. In most cases, the community spouse's living expenses are not reduced with the institutionalization of their spouse. Yet, through the spend down process, the spouse remaining in the community is often left without sufficient income to meet even the most basic needs for subsistence. This places many essential items in the senior market basket out of reach for the community spouse. These items include special diets, medications, life line utilities, and medigap health insurance.

This problem is particularly acute among older women. After a lifetime of playing by the rules and saving for their retirement years, the community spouse is forced into destitution in order to meet the long-term care needs of her institutionalized spouse.

To address this problem, I am introducing the "Medicaid Community Spouse Protection Amendments of 1986." Under this legislative

package the community spouse will be entitled to retain a modest, but adequate standard of living. A couple will be able to cut back and scale down so as to meet the family's responsibilities for the costs of institutionalization, but it will not be forced to spend down into poverty.

More specifically, this legislative package will:

1. Allow the community spouse to keep up to \$25,000 of the couple's liquid assets so that their life savings are not devastated as a result of the institutionalization of one spouse. This provision recognizes the communal nature of a couple's savings and other resources. It's not his money or her money, but their money.

In addition, there would be a minimum Federal standard for the living allowance for the community spouse of \$750.

2. Require State Medicaid agencies to recognize court ordered support plans as exemptions in determining Medicaid eligibility. Individuals now can have their unique financial circumstances reviewed on a case by case basis in State court to determine the institutionalized spouse's financial responsibility to the community spouse. In this way, special circumstances can be accounted for that might otherwise not be foreseen by Federal regulations. Under my legislation, State Medicaid agencies would be required to recognize such support orders.

3. Establish a system of nursing home pre-screening. Through this process, potential Medicaid beneficiaries will be advised of requirements for eligibility, and their options for payment. In addition, this system could be used to determine the appropriateness of institutionalization and serve as a referral mechanism for those in need.

4. Establish an individual Long-Term care account to encourage individuals to save for health related expenses so that they can avoid financial ruin.

Through the introduction of this legislative package, I hope to initiate debate on how we, as a Nation, meet our social responsibilities to the institutionalized elderly and their families. We are witnessing a trend where it is not the hospital stay that pauperizes our elderly. Rather, it is the length of stay in a long-term care facility that consumes a couple's life savings leaving them no financial security after a lifetime of hard work and saving. This is truly an American tragedy.

Many times we feel helpless in the wake of catastrophes that befall our fellow citizens. Prior to the introduction of these bills, the case of community spousal impoverishment was such an instance. The enormity of a problem, however, should never prevent us from developing a solution. The Medicaid Community Spouse Protection Amendments of 1986 is a bold, yet simple solution to the problem of spousal impoverishment as a result of Medicaid spend down.

STATEMENT OF YELENA
BONNER ON THE 65TH BIRTH-
DAY OF HER HUSBAND, DR.
ANDREI SAKHAROV

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in honor of the 65th birthday of Soviet scientist and human rights leader Andrei Sakharov, the Committee on Foreign Affairs held a special reception to honor him and his outstanding wife Yelena Bonner.

As one of the founding members of the Moscow Helsinki Monitoring Group, Mrs. Bonner herself is a leading international advocate for human rights. But yesterday, Mrs. Bonner spoke eloquently of her double role—both as a devoted wife and as a dedicated coworker with her husband and fellow human rights advocate, Andrei Sakharov.

It was a very moving statement. She expressed concern for his health and his fate, living in forced internal exile in Gorki. She has shared that fate with him and will soon leave the United States, where she has been receiving medical treatment, to rejoin Andrei Sakharov in Gorki to resume their shared lives there.

Yelena Bonner expressed faith in Dr. Sakharov as the "spiritual leader of our time," who has spoken so profoundly about his view that the "defense of human rights is the defense of life on Earth."

Mr. Speaker, I commend Yelena Bonner's thoughtful remarks to my colleagues.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY ELENA BONNER AT THE
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, MAY 21,
1986

Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of my husband I thank everyone present in this hall as well as all those who are celebrating his 65th birthday, wherever they may be.

I thank President Reagan for his warm letter which I received yesterday. I take it as an expression of concern for my husband, and I hope his concern will not be in vain.

In celebrating Andrei Sakharov's birthday, we honor him, and our thoughts turn to the country where he was born, lives and works. It is a signal honor for any country to number among its citizens such a man as Andrei Sakharov.

I find myself today in a difficult situation. I am speaking both as a wife and as a contemporary of Andrei Sakharov.

As a wife, I fear for his life and fate. In Gorky, anything can happen, and the world will never learn the truth about us. You all know that during the last years our letters and telegrams have been altered, and misleading films about our life have been sent to the West. After my return to Gorky, we are likely to be cut off from any communication with the outside world. The West will receive nothing but disinformation.

Andrei Sakharov is confined in Gorky in violation of Soviet laws. As long as he does not enjoy the same rights as other Soviet citizens, his life is in danger.

As his wife, I could speak of his state of health, of his isolation, and of the deprivation of normal scientific and personal contacts. I could tell you that for six years he has not been allowed to spend a single

minute outside the limits of Gorky. I could tell you that living under the lens of a concealed camera is oppressive and psychologically dangerous. I could tell you how desperately afraid I am of returning, of living again in that atmosphere of falsehood where everyone lies—the press, officials, and scientists. If it were not for Andrei Dmitrievich, I would not return there, I would not even give it a second thought. But I do not want to speak of all that. There are enough people who can understand my feelings.

Today I would like to speak simply as a contemporary of Andrei Sakharov.

Every age has its heroes. In fairy tales, people are simply born to be heroes, but in real life, it requires many qualities and the right circumstances for a person to live his destiny. To begin with, it depends on the social system in which he lives and the people who surround him.

Andrei Dmitrievich Sakharov has become the spiritual leader of our time as a consequence of the interaction of external events and his individual qualities, together with the nature of his upbringing and the environment which shaped him.

We live in the aftermath of World War II. We must not underestimate the importance of that fact. We live after the Holocaust, the Gulag, Katyn, Auschwitz and Hiroshima.

Since World War II, people have been trying to create social institutions capable of preventing a repetition of those tragedies. These have included the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants on Human Rights, and the Helsinki Final Act. Sakharov stands for these institutions and his philosophy is closely linked to them.

The times called for someone like Sakharov to appear. We are all witnesses of an astounding spurt of progress for our civilization. Science determines the quality of our life in the second half of the twentieth century. Sakharov's scientific brilliance, his profound understanding of the benefits and hazards of progress, place him on the cutting edge. His personal qualities include absolute honesty, courage so natural that it tends to be overlooked, and a morality founded on his innate knowledge of good and evil. All these together have made him Andrei Sakharov, the Andrei Sakharov who is known and respected throughout the world.

His basic premise is the indivisibility of Peace, Progress and Human Rights; his basic ideology is the defense of human rights as the defense of life on Earth. Such an ideology can unite people of East and West, of different creeds, of different races. But it requires us to recognize our responsibility before history, to apply equal standards in judging the events and people of different social systems, and to refrain from bending the truth for personal advantage. We must be serious in our approach.

Let me give you a few examples.

It is great that the International Committee of the Red Cross has succeeded in gaining access for its delegates to prisons in Chile, but they must be admitted to the prisons of the Soviet Union, Cuba and China as well. Western journalists, aided by world public opinion, are able to visit Nelson Mandela, but why are they not allowed to visit prisoners of conscience in the Soviet Union?

The catastrophe in Chernobyl must not become a pretext to halt the development of nuclear power in the West. The proper guarantees for safeguarding the environ-

ment are an open society and the right of citizens to control their government's actions, not efforts to hinder progress. Chernobyl showed that the Earth is a small planet, that our successes and failures are shared by all of us, and that we have a common stake in the future. That is the cornerstone of Andrei Sakharov's philosophy.

And finally, let me mention a subject close to the theme of today's celebration. Is it responsible for scientists from East and West to conduct nongovernmental talks on disarmament and on nuclear testing while ignoring the only voice on the Eastern side that is both competent and independent, the voice of Andrei Sakharov?

I thank the Congress of the United States and the American people for the opportunity to speak here and to say that by honoring Andrei Sakharov on his 65th birthday, we affirm once again our determination to defend life on Earth and our freedom.

"STAGING AREAS" VITAL TO
SHOREBIRDS MIGRATIONS:
LOSS OF KEY AREAS COULD
THREATEN MILLIONS OF
SHOREBIRDS

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, It has been known for some time that shorebirds of the Americas, including sandpipers, plovers, turnstones, and sanderlings, commonly fly thousands of miles every year. The marathon migration typically begins in the Arctic, where most shorebirds breed and hatch their young, down to the warmth of Central or South America for the winter and back to the north in the spring. The roundtrip for many will be more than 15,000 miles.

Recent research, however, shows that shorebirds are highly dependent on a few key staging areas where they concentrate in enormous numbers to consume plentiful food supplies that allow them to quickly refuel and continue their endurance flights. Four such staging areas have been identified in North America that support more than a million shorebirds every year: the Cooper River delta in Alaska; Gray's Harbor, WA; the Bay of Fundy in eastern Canada; and the Delaware Bay. Almost all of the breeding population of some species feed in one of these areas at a time. Numerous sites in North, Central, and South America are also vital as stopover or wintering areas.

Congressman AL SWIFT and I represent the Gray's Harbor, WA staging area, which is the last major estuary many shorebirds will use before embarking on the final 1,500-mile leg of their migration to Arctic and sub-Arctic breeding grounds. Contributing the importance of the 94-square mile Gray's Harbor estuary is Bowerman Basin, a remarkably productive 500-acre mudflat that is host to nearly half of the spring migrants. Although Bowerman Basin has been threatened by development for years, there appears to be a growing appreciation in the area for the vital role it plays in shorebird migrations. Permanent protection for Bowerman is a must.

The dependence of shorebirds on these vital staging areas makes them more vulnerable than their great numbers might suggest. The loss of one of these areas to pollution, overfishing, or development could threaten the existence of entire species. As research more clearly identifies those sites that are essential to shorebird migrations, the Government and private organizations must take steps to protect these areas from conflicting uses.

I would commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article from the New York Times by Mr. Erik Eckholm which details the spring migration of shorebirds and their dependence on the key staging areas in North America.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1986]

SPRING RITE OF GLUTTONY FATTENS BIRDS
FOR JOURNEY
(By Erik Eckholm)

REEDS BEACH, N.J.—Every May the normally tranquil shores of the Delaware Bay are transformed into a frenzy of life as a million migrating shorebirds stop by to partake of the nearest thing to a free lunch that nature has to offer.

The scene at Reeds Beach this week is primeval. A narrow, otherwise unremarkable beach seethes with an undulating carpet of sandpipers, thousands crowded wing to wing amid clusters of horseshoe crabs that inch up from the sea like invading army helmets.

The birds pick earnestly at the sand, gorging in the crabs' freshly laid eggs. Strewed about are helpless crabs that were flipped over by the waves, their legs waving frantically as they shrivel in the sun.

After two weeks of gluttony, as fat as they can be and still fly, the little birds will take off for nesting grounds in the Arctic.

Much to their astonishment, ecologists did not learn about this avian melee, the largest spring gathering of shorebirds in North America, until the late 1970's. Their subsequent research has established how important this area is for the birds, and on Wednesday the Governors of New Jersey and Delaware will dedicate large parts of the bay's shoreline as a protected area.

Shorebird scientists hope this will be the first in an extensive network of reserves throughout the Americas to safeguard vital feeding grounds, many only recently identified, of the intercontinental migrants.

Because of their fantastic yearly journeys, the 20 million or more shorebirds that pass through the United States, representing an assortment of species from the sandpiper, plover and phalarope families, cannot be protected in any one place.

Underpinning the Delaware Bay's spring pandemonium are the horseshoe crabs, an endless stream of which crawl onto the beach to deposit billions of pale green eggs the size of pearls of tapioca.

In an ancient mating ritual, male crabs station themselves along the water's edge as high tide recedes. When a female creeps out of the surf, males race for the chance to grab her carapace with their pedipalps, special grippers the males have behind the mouth.

Once a male has successfully attached himself to the much larger female, she burrows into the sand to lay tens of thousands of eggs, which the male fertilizes. By mid-May, the sands are saturated with crab eggs.

In May, too, the shorebirds begin arriving from South America, first a few at a time

and then in hordes. Species mainly from the sandpiper family, including sanderlings, red knots, ruddy turnstones, semipalmated sandpipers and dunlins, are joined in the feast by laughing gulls, which bully aside the smaller birds.

By early June, the crabs will have disappeared back into the sea and the overstuffed shorebirds will have flown on to their northern breeding grounds.

While shorebirds have long been respected for their feats of flight, only recently have studies begun to reveal just how awesome their achievements really are. But the new findings also suggest that many shorebird species may be far more vulnerable than their observed multitudes would imply.

About 40 of North America's 49 shorebird species make the round trip every year from the Arctic, where most breed, down to the warmth of Central or South America for the winter and then back north in the spring. Strangely, the birds that nest the farthest north tend to be the ones that winter the farthest south, in Argentina, southern Brazil and Tierra del Fuego. The annual circuit for many exceeds 15,000 miles.

The travel schedules of individual species are being traced through the banding and survey efforts of hundreds of volunteers and scientists throughout the hemisphere, an effort begun in 1974 by the Manomet Bird Observatory near Plymouth, Mass. Birds are banded with multiple colors that allow their later identification with binoculars.

The studies show that several species—especially red knots, sanderlings, ruddy turnstones, whiterumped sandpipers, Baird's sandpipers, still sandpipers and semipalmated sandpipers—concentrate in enormous numbers during their migrations at a few key "staging areas," where plentiful food allows them to replenish their energy quickly and move on.

KEY STAGING AREAS

At least four sites in North America each support more than a million shorebirds every year: the Copper River delta in Alaska, Gray's Harbor, Wash., and the Bay of Fundy in eastern Canada as well as the Delaware Bay. Four-fifths or more of the entire breeding populations of some species feed in one of these sites at a time. Numerous other sites in North, Central and South America are also vital as stopover or wintering areas.

These unusual concentrations "break the usual link between a species' abundance and its immunity to extinction," warned J.P. Myers, an ornithologist with the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia. Shorebirds have low rates of reproduction, so major incursions into the adult population, as would occur if a crucial stopover area were damaged, could jeopardize an entire species.

That abundant shorebirds can indeed be threatened became clear at the turn of the century, when intensive hunting for sport and food drastically depleted many species. With the banning of hunting early this century, most species have recovered. But the once-plentiful Eskimo curlew remains on the verge of extinction and some plovers, too, are still scarce.

Now shorebird scientists, with the backing of the World Wildlife Fund and other groups, are trying to gain protection of the hemisphere's major shorebird staging and wintering areas as a network of "sister reserves." The cause has also been endorsed by the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, which joins wildlife officials from individual states and from Mexico

and Canada. Conservation groups are pushing the concept in Central and South America as well.

The idea of sister reserves is gaining attention, Dr. Myers said, but many key sites remain without formal protection and some face immediate threats. The Cheyenne Bottoms of Kansas, for example, a critical staging area for shorebirds flying east of the Rockies, are losing their waters to agriculture. Conflicting water demands also imperil the role of Mono Lake, Calif., as a stopover site. Almost everywhere, in South America as well as the United States, remaining wetlands visited by migrating birds are candidates for commercial or agricultural development.

AVIAN EXCESS IS NOT UNKNOWN

The spring feeding frenzy at the Delaware Bay shows just how vital a staging site can be for its visitors.

Red knots, for example, winter in southern Brazil, where they feast on small snails. When they head north, often in early May, they are "extraordinarily fat," said Brian A. Harrington, a biologist with the Manomet Observatory. But when the robin-size birds arrive later in the month in the Delaware Bay, they are thin and exhausted after a flight of 5,500 miles with little or no rest.

Then, in just two weeks of feasting on crab eggs, they double their weight, building up energy reserves for their flight to the Arctic.

"There are few places where the birds can lay on fat so fast," Dr. Harrington said. "The food has to be rich and abundant."

Avian excess is not unknown. Some of the birds, said Paul D. McLain of the New Jersey Division of Fish, Game and Wildlife, "get so fat they can hardly even fly," and bounce along like an overloaded airplane when trying to take off.

For birds flying along the East Coast in the spring, the horseshoe crabs of the Delaware Bay provide what is probably an irreplaceable resource, which is why scientists are so anxious to see the bay protected. In the fall, when the birds move south food is plentiful in marine areas such as the Bay of Fundy, Cape Cod Bay and eastern Maine, and the shorebirds refuel in these areas instead.

With their accumulating survey results, biologists are learning for the first time how far and long different shorebirds species fly.

Some species migrate in a singleminded manner, taking a few weeks to reach their destinations with lengthy flights and few rest stops. Others mosey along for months, and some are in almost perpetual migration, following a moveable feast up and down the Americas.

The birds usually fly high, at around 15,000 feet and at speeds approaching 50 miles an hour, scientists believe. Many fly as much as 2,000 miles at a time in 35 to 50 hours without stopping, according to Dr. Myers. And recent evidence gathered by Dr. Harrington suggests that Hudsonian godwits may fly as much as 8,000 miles at a time, although they might be taking brief rests at undiscovered stopovers in South America.

Only three years ago Dr. Myers discovered that many sanderlings circumnavigate the Americas each year, traveling from Chile and Peru up the Western United States in the spring and then flying home through Cape Cod. This "staggering extension of their migration distance," Dr. Myers said, "was not even suspected" before recent field studies revealed it.

Research on migrating songbirds indicates that they orient themselves with a combination of visual, magnetic and astronomic cues. No one knows if the same holds for shorebirds. A particular mystery, Dr. Myers said, is how the juveniles find their way south: the adults tend to leave the Arctic as soon as they can after breeding, often before their new progeny can fly, and the juveniles fly south on their own. Yet somehow they find the right rest stops and arrive at the right winter home.

For the professional and voluntary bird-banders who are making the new discoveries, tracing the journeys of shorebirds brings more than scientific satisfaction.

"It's a euphoric experience to find a bird that you had banded thousands of miles away," Dr. Myers said. "it makes migration tangible."

Sometimes the scientists get carried away. Dr. Meyer's colleagues do not let him forget the time along the Louisiana shore that he spotted a bird he had banded in Chile. He jumped into a truck and chased the bird onto a mud flat. The truck, as well as the bird, was lost for good.

Dr. Harrington recalls one red knot he first caught in Massachusetts in July 1980, captured again in April 1981 in southern Argentina, then again in Massachusetts in July 1981, the bird having flown nearly 20,000 miles in the interim.

"It made me think about how much difficulty we humans, with our luggage, visas and airplane tickets, have getting from one part of the world to another" Dr. Harrington said.

"The birds just pick up and fly," he said wistfully.

"JUST SAY NO" WEEK

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this past week, all across our Nation, children and adults alike have been celebrating their commitment to remain drug-free. The scourge of drug abuse takes its toll many times over, in lost lives, pained families, crime and corruption.

Earlier this week President Reagan proclaimed May 18-24, 1986, as "Just Say No" Week, an extension of the First Lady's outstanding drug abuse prevention work. Mrs. Reagan's commitment and leadership in this area has been the impetus for renewed dedication on the part of parents, teachers, public officials and so many of our schoolchildren that the way through life must be drug free. It is crucial, however, that we reach the millions of other children and teenagers who may fall prey to this deadly menace. Accordingly, the activities and celebrations being planned this week will hopefully reach all of our country's youth.

The Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, of which I am ranking minority member, has held substantial hearings on the need for additional drug abuse education activities. Though our law enforcement community is doing everything in its power to interdict the illicit substances that enter our borders, they stress that the fight will only be won if we aggressively address the demand side of this massive problem and educate our population

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

until there is no longer demand for these illegal and devastating substances.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the President's and first lady's remarks upon the commemoration of "Just Say No" Week. I encourage my colleagues to participate in appropriate activities in their districts, and accordingly, feel that the annexed President's proclamation succinctly sums up all of our attitudes on this important issue.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AND THE FIRST LADY, MAY 20, 1986

The President: I appreciate all of you joining us here today to kick off "Just Say No" Week. And before I begin, I want to give a long-distance hello to Senator Paula Hawkins. Senator Hawkins has been a loyal warrior in the battle against drug abuse. So, long-distance, Senator, thank you for all you've done, and best wishes for a speedy recovery.

When our team got to Washington nearly 5½ years ago we pledged to put America's house in order. Well, that required more than economic reform and bolstering our national defense. Our country was threatened by an epidemic of drug abuse that's been growing in intensity since the 1960's. By 1980, illegal drugs were every bit as much a threat to the United States as enemy planes and missiles. The plague was fueled by an attitude of permissiveness, both public and private. America was losing its future by default.

Early in our administration, I issued a challenge. Americans in and out of government, I said, should do all we can to defeat the drug menace threatening our country. And I'm pleased that many of you who were in there when I issued that challenge are with us today. I'm also grateful for all the hard work and long hours that you've committed to this truly noble endeavor.

The first thing we did was take down the surrender flag and raise the battle flag. Together we beefed up our enforcement arm, and today more arrests are being made and more narcotics are being seized than ever before. Today there's also more communication and effective coordination between the levels of government and department and agencies than many believed was possible. We are, indeed, trying to do everything government can do to combat drug traffickers.

But just as important, I happen to think more important, we've enlisted the American people in this battle. Parents, service clubs, youth organizations responded to our call. We found prominent citizens, captains of industry, singers, actors and athletes—individuals who young people look up to—were more than willing to do their part. Why? Well, because they love people and they love this country.

What we've got to do now is make certain that we continue to give our young people—like the ones with us here today—the support and backing they need to "Just Say No" to drugs.

[A Proclamation by the President of the United States of America, May 20, 1986]

JUST SAY NO TO DRUGS WEEK, 1986

People all across America are becoming increasingly aware of the terrible dangers of drug abuse. Permissive attitudes about drug use have been replaced by deepening concern and—what is more important—action. People of all ages and from all walks of life are rallying against this terrible scourge. Many young people are taking a leading role

in the effort to help other young people from "getting hooked," and in assisting addicts to break the chains of their addiction.

Although young people are exposed to far too many opportunities to experiment with drugs, an ever-increasing number are saying no to drugs and to alcohol. They are joining together to learn how, and to make it stick. They are forming "JUST SAY NO" clubs to help them resist temptation and to encourage their peers to stay drug-free. On May 22, many thousands of children and teenagers will Walk Against Drugs to encourage others to join them in saying "No" to drugs.

These young people of America are demonstrating that healthy and productive lives are possible when you "Just Say No." Many other children of the world share this commitment to put a stop to drug abuse; in Great Britain, Canada, Ireland, Costa Rica, and Sweden, children are actively pursuing this same idea—JUST SAY NO!

We, as adults, owe a debt of gratitude to our children for setting such a fine example; for leading the way to a better future for generations. I congratulate our young people for their courage and zeal in this crusade. I challenge the adults of the world to encourage and support them, and to follow their lead in saying "No" to drugs. I am confident that, working together, we will conquer drug abuse.

To recognize those American young people who are publicly fighting drug abuse by saying "No" to drugs and thereby contributing to the end of this plague in America, the Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 337, has designated the week beginning May 18, 1986, as "Just Say No To Drugs Week" and authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this event.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, RONALD REAGAN, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week of May 18 through May 24, 1986, as Just Say No To Drugs Week. I ask each person to make a personal commitment to saying "No" to drug and alcohol abuse; and I call on all Americans to join me in observing this week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this twentieth day of May, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and eighty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and tenth.

RONALD REAGAN.

PUBLIC NEEDS FULL FACTS ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, recently the administration's bilingual education proposal was introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives as S. 2256 and H.R. 4538. Education Secretary Bennett asserts that this legislation is necessary because current law prohibits "flexibility" in local schools and that the Federal Government mandates a particular method of instruction called transitional bilingual education [TBE] in this law renewed several times by the Congress and even signed by this President.

Under the General Education Provisions Act, as amended through December 31, 1984, section 432 reads:

Prohibition Against Federal Control of Education—No provision of any applicable program shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration or personnel of any educational institution, school or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by an educational institution or school system, or to require the assignment or transportation of students or teachers in order to overcome racial imbalance.

The current Bilingual Education Act (reauthorized in 1984) is in compliance with the letter and the spirit of that law.

The following are methods of instruction well known in the teaching profession: Audio-lingual method; total physical response method; grammar-translation method; concurrent approach; and, more recently, the natural language approach.

Transitional bilingual education is not a method, but rather a legislative label which describes a program which uses a non-English language initially while at the same time introducing individuals to a well-structured program of English.

Just as the words "humanities," "business" or "vocational education" do not imply a method, neither does "transitional bilingual education."

Since 1968 when the Bilingual Education Act was introduced, local schools have always had the flexibility to choose and propose whichever method they want to use for bilingual education programs of instruction.

Secretary Bennett's use of the "flexibility" is a euphemism for eliminating all native language instruction from these programs. Similarly, his use of the word "choice" is a euphemism for eliminating chapter 1 from local schools so that parents can "privatize" Federal support for local schools.

Secretary Bennett continues to ignore the flexibility provided in the current Bilingual Education Act. He also has ignored evidence of research and evaluation reports funded by his own Department which support bilingual education.

The American public deserves an honest debate on this issue. I am confident that such a debate will help us to focus on the needs of the ever-growing number of children needing bilingual courses in school in order to learn English and to become productive citizens.

HANFORD SHOULD COMPLY WITH ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I introduced a bill (H.R. 4848) to require the Department of Energy (DOE) to begin complying with Federal and State environmental laws at its Hanford Nuclear Reservation in the State of Washington. The bill also would require,

with 3 years, the termination at all DOE sites of the dumping of liquid radioactive and hazardous wastes directly into the soil.

I introduce this bill, along with my distinguished colleague JOHN MILLER of Washington, because strong environmental safeguards at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in southeast Washington are critical to the future of the Pacific Northwest. The Hanford reservation is located on the Columbia River, which divides Washington and Oregon, and which serves as a source of food, irrigation and transportation for both States.

Nevertheless, State and Federal officials have repeatedly testified that Hanford currently violates a variety of environmental laws and standards, including the Solid Waste Disposal Act and State hazardous waste laws. My bill would force Hanford's present operations to comply, within 2 years, with these and other State and Federal environmental laws, including the Clean Air Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

H.R. 4848 also would require DOE, within 3 years, to identify and characterize wastes previously dumped at Hanford, and to remove or otherwise safely dispose of all such wastes which are an environmental hazard.

Under the bill, within 180 days of enactment, DOE will submit a schedule of the steps it will take to comply with the Act, along with an estimate of the costs of carrying out those steps. The compliance schedules and activities would be adopted in consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Governors of the States of Washington and Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, if a commercial nuclear facility did business the way Hanford does, the Government would shut it down tomorrow. A commercial facility would not be allowed to dump radioactive and hazardous liquid wastes right into the ground. And yet that's exactly what Hanford is doing at its "Plutonium and Uranium Recovery through Extraction" (PUREX) facility. A commercial facility also would not be allowed to pollute springs so that they exceed the Federal drinking water standards for nitrates. And yet, according to Washington State officials, that's just what the PUREX dumping has done.

DOE officials have indicated in the past that they intend to begin complying with environmental laws at some point in the future. However, I am concerned that left to their own devices, the compliance may be "too little, too late." For example, when the EPA and the State of Washington cited Hanford last February for violations of hazardous waste laws at two dumping sites, they stopped dumping there, but continued to argue that those sites should be granted a waiver from the environmental laws. I believe this reflects DOE's general attitude that it is a special case; that it cannot allow environmental laws—at the State or Federal level—to "get in the way" of its work.

DOE officials, and others, have at times argued that its lack of compliance is due to lack of necessary appropriations from the Congress. H.R. 4848 will allow DOE to show this, if indeed it is the case, through the compliance schedule and cost estimate provisions.

This bill would complement the bill I introduced on May 23, 1985, H.R. 2593, which gives EPA the responsibility for monitoring DOE's compliance with environmental laws. This new compliance and clean-up bill will tell us what needs to be done and requires DOE to do it. The monitoring bill will ensure we have an accurate picture of DOE's progress toward meeting these goals.

Mr. Speaker, too many times we wait for a crisis before taking action to protect our citizens from radioactive and other hazardous wastes. The terrible legacies of Love Canal and other superfund sites stand as symbols of such misplaced complacency. H.R. 4848 would end DOE's failure to comply with minimal environmental standards, which everyone else must obey, before Hanford becomes the Love Canal of the West. We cannot wait for the hazardous wastes at Hanford to lead to tragic consequences. It is morally right and cost effective to take preventive action now, before it is too late for us and for our children and succeeding generations.

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA NATURAL RESOURCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT TRAINING AND EDUCATION ACT

HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will contribute substantially to the long-term economic development of sub-Saharan African countries and take a giant step forward in protecting the critical natural resource base of these countries. Importantly, it will help to ensure that famine-stricken African countries have the necessary skills and expertise to achieve economic growth without damaging the natural resource systems on which growth depends.

This bill, the Sub-Saharan Africa Natural Resource and Environmental Management Training and Education Act, is the result of 5 days of hearings held last fall on the African famine crisis by the Subcommittee on Natural Resources, Agricultural Research and Environment of the Science and Technology Committee. Testimony at the hearings made clear that the fragile natural resource base of the sub-Sahara requires particularly wise management. Evidence also clearly demonstrated that there is a lack of skilled personnel in the sub-Sahara who are able to provide the prudent natural resource management which is necessary. The lack of trained personnel is a major factor in the current agricultural crisis. A recent U.S. Department of Agriculture study concluded that most African countries do not have trained people to administer government programs or to improve food productivity using environmentally sound methods.

The famine that has wracked large parts of Africa in the last few years has brought about an outpouring of American generosity. I am proud of my fellow citizens for this incredible concern for the needs of people halfway around the world. We in the Congress, however, would be shortsighted if we did not see

that mere famine assistance is only a Band-Aid. A stable and economically viable Africa is vital to the United States interest in global stability. We must look to the longer term, more difficult task of creating new partnerships with these countries which will help them to become self-sustaining. This can only happen if the economic development that takes place does not further erode the fragile and already damaged natural resource base on which economic growth depends.

The African training bill is one step in addressing the long-term problems in the sub-Saharan. The bill requires the United States to establish a training and education program designed to encourage the development and utilization of appropriate natural resources and environmental management techniques in the sub-Saharan. This program will provide support for, first, appropriate regional training and educational institutions engaged in natural resource and environmental activities in this area; second, national and local training and education program through Government extension services, non-governmental organizations and other program institutions that demonstrate potential for effective community based educational capacity; third, U.S. research and development programs designed to incorporate the training and educational personnel in natural resource and environmental activities that are relevant to the sub-Saharan region, and fourth, other development training programs, educational efforts and related activities carried out by international, regional, bilateral, and nongovernmental organizations aimed at establishing or strengthening institutions to increase the capacity of sub-Saharan nations to effectively manage their natural resources on a sound environmental basis.

While flexible in approach, this legislation emphasizes two important target groups for training assistance:

WOMEN

Women carry out as much as 80 percent of farm activities and provide up to 90 percent of the rural food supply. Yet these same women rarely receive any of the agricultural training, extension service, research or technology innovations provided by foreign assistance. In many countries, laws and customs deprive women of access to these tools. This bill would specifically require that women receive training in proportion to their participation in the funded activities such as forestry, agronomy, water management and herding.

NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Nongovernmental organizations can provide training to local community people who otherwise might not be reached by government programs but who are the backbone of the local economies. The bill requires that its objectives should be met wherever practical through nongovernmental organizations which are active in the region where the training or education activity is to be undertaken.

To implement the program, the bill requires the Agency for International Development to include in each sub-Saharan nation's development strategy statement a plan to assist the nation in developing an effective training and education program. The bill requires no additional Federal spending. AID would be required to spend at least 1 percent of funds

made available to each sub-Saharan nation under sections 103, 106, and 121 of the Foreign Assistance Act to carry out the act. AID also would be required to prepare a report to Congress on additional steps which can be taken by Federal agencies to meet the goals of the bill.

The bill is consistent with recommendations made by various organizations which have studied the situation in the sub-Saharan. For example, the Office of Technology Assessment concluded in a 1984 report that agricultural extension systems in Africa generally are ineffective, that women contribute significantly to the production of food crops but have limited access to training and that private and voluntary organizations can play a significant role in assisting the people of the region in meeting their essential needs. The bill is also consistent with the Environment and Energy Study Institute's 1985 recommended congressional agenda for improving management of natural resources in less developed countries. This report recommends that the United States enhance environmental and related development training in less developed countries.

It is particularly fitting at this time to concern ourselves with this issue. The U.N. General Assembly special session on the critical economic situation in Africa will begin May 27. The session is intended to establish a frame of reference for the future actions of the international community and of its members in assisting Africans toward sustainable economic development. Essential in this process is the training of local citizens in environmental management practices.

Mr. Speaker, few events have galvanized the attention of the world as has the recent famine in Africa. The dimensions of this problem are staggering. There is no question that the sub-Saharan region will face serious food production problems for some time to come. Despite the end of the drought in many regions, the destruction of the soils and forests in recent years has been so severe that a major international effort must be made to help restore these damaged lands. This effort must result in the people of these countries managing their development with the best information available for sound decisionmaking. This legislation will ensure that U.S. foreign aid to sub-Saharan nations will help the people of Africa to become self-sufficient and the economies of the countries to become self-sufficient.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE WITH RESPECT TO THE TREATMENT OF CERTAIN AIR TRANSPORTATION

HON. DOUG BARNARD, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, together with 24 of my colleagues, I am today introducing legislation to correct a serious inequity in the fringe benefit provisions of the Tax Reform Act of 1984. While that act established a tax

on certain fringe benefits provided by employers to employees, it exempted from taxation specified categories of fringe benefits including "no-additional-cost services"—that is, benefits provided to employees and their families when the benefits do not impose "substantial additional costs" on the employers. Congress created this "no-additional-cost services" exception so that the Tax Code would not discourage the consumption of goods and services that would otherwise be wasted. The report accompanying the Tax Reform Act of 1984, defined the exemption in the following way:

"Generally, situations in which employers incur no additional cost in providing services to employees are those in which the employees receive, at no substantial additional cost to the employer, the benefit of excess capacity which otherwise would have remained unused. * * *

In other words, if the employee's fringe benefit doesn't impose any additional cost on the employer and would otherwise go to waste, it should not be considered taxable income.

Unfortunately, and I believe inadvertently, Congress limited the "no-additional-cost services" exemption to those services which are also sold to the public in the ordinary course of the employer's business. The result is that while commercial airlines and railroads, for example, can offer employees and their families tax-free empty seats, firms not in the transportation business but owning or leasing aircraft or railroad cars, cannot—even though the employer does not incur any additional expense and even though the seat occupied would otherwise have remained empty.

Mr. Speaker, this "line of business" limitation, which creates an artificial distinction between unused capacity on a commercial airliner versus unused capacity on an employer-provided aircraft, is illogical and unfair. All of the public policy reasons that justify a tax exemption for the value of an empty seat on a commercial airliner or commercial train, apply equally to an employer-provided aircraft or railroad car.

In both cases, the trip would have taken place with or without the "hitchhiking" employee;

In both cases the business owning or leasing the aircraft incurs no substantial additional costs by permitting the empty seat to be occupied;

In both cases excess capacity would have remained unused except for the employee occupying the seat; and,

In both cases the imposition of a tax on the "hitchhiking" employee discourages the consumption of goods and services that would otherwise be wasted.

In point of fact, Mr. Speaker, it would have made far greater public policy sense, in the case of empty aircraft seats, to offer the "no-additional-cost services" exemption only to employees of firms not in the commercial airline business. This is because employees of commercial airlines view free seats as an inducement to accept and continue in their jobs; whereas employees of firms not in the transportation business, do not anticipate the benefit. In other words, if a fringe benefit is regarded as something that an employee counts on

as a part of his compensation, then it makes greater public policy sense to tax the value of free flights by commercial airline employees than by employees of firms not in the air-carrier business.

I am in no way suggesting that commercial airline employees be taxed on the value of empty seats they occupy. What I am suggesting and what my legislation would accomplish, is that all employees be treated equally in the face of unused, cost-free capacity, whether or not their employer happens to be in the commercial transportation business.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing today is straightforward and fair: It amends the Internal Revenue Code by including in the definition of "no-additional-cost services" the value to an employee or other occupant of an empty seat on any employer-provided aircraft but only if the following three conditions are met:

First, the aircraft flight must be for a legitimate business purpose;

Second, the employer must not incur any substantial additional cost in providing such transportation; and,

Third, the seat occupied by the "hitchhiking" person would otherwise be empty.

All three tests would have to be met in order for the value of the flight to be excluded from taxation. If the aircraft was flying for a nonbusiness purpose, my amendment would not make the value of the flight tax exempt. If the employer incurred substantial additional cost in providing such transportation—if, for example, the aircraft flew out of the path of its scheduled flight plan—the value of the flight would similarly not be tax exempt. If an employee, scheduled to fly for business reasons, was "bumped" by a person not traveling for business, the value of the flight would not be tax exempt.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the basic unfairness of the current distinction between services offered "in the line of business" versus other services, there is another powerful argument for amending the Tax Code. That argument has to do with the cost to the IRS of enforcing this fringe benefit provision; and the expense to business firms of complying with the complex set of implementing regulations proposed by IRS. As chairman of a House IRS oversight subcommittee which has faithfully supported vigorous, but efficient and fair, tax administration, it is my view that if the existing law is not amended and if the temporary Treasury/IRS regulation implementing that law becomes final in its present form, it will actually produce "negative revenues." That is, it will cost far more to enforce than it will return in dollars to the U.S. Treasury. Given the constraints of Gramm-Rudman and the necessity for collecting all the tax dollars currently due the Treasury, this must not be allowed to happen.

The Commerce and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, which I chair, has strongly supported IRS' contention that except for compelling reasons directly impacting the integrity of our tax system, use of its resources should be prioritized based on tax revenues produced. Given the shrinking dollars available to IRS and the pressing enforcement problems it faces, I believe it would be a great mistake to force the Service into an expensive compli-

ance effort that would raise almost no revenues and force firms that operate business aircraft to maintain a mountain of required records. IRS presently lacks manpower resources to collect hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes that have been assessed, but not paid. It lacks the resources to pursue proven cases of tax evasion representing the loss of additional hundreds of millions of dollars in revenues. How can we justify imposing this additional burden on the Service when it lacks resources to carry out its main function of assessing and collecting dollars desperately needed to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of this amendment to the Internal Revenue Code. I also hope that its introduction will send a signal to the Treasury Department that it should reexamine its temporary regulation governing the taxability of empty seats on employer-provided aircraft. Once before, in recognition of strong congressional and private sector concern over Treasury's original "empty seat" regulation, the Department modified its proposal by allowing empty seats to be occupied on a tax-free basis, but only if 50 percent of the seats on the aircraft are occupied by business travelers. While Treasury's change slightly improved the original proposal from a public point of view, it complicated the already difficult paperwork and recordkeeping burdens of that proposal. I believe that a strong case has been made in favor of a further modification of the temporary regulation. Pending legislative action on my bill, I call on the Treasury Department to take the initiative and eliminate the discriminatory feature and paperwork burdens presently in its pending temporary regulation.

A copy of the legislation is included below:

H.R. 4884

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of certain air transportation

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (h) of section 132 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to certain fringe benefits) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN NONCOMMERCIAL AIR TRANSPORTATION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'no-additional-cost service' includes the value of transportation provided to any person on a noncommercially operated aircraft if—

"(A) such transportation is provided on a flight made in the ordinary course of the trade or business of the taxpayer owning or leasing such aircraft for use in such trade or business,

"(B) the flight on which the transportation is provided would have been made whether or not such person was transported on the flight, and

"(C) no substantial additional cost is incurred in providing such transportation to such person.

For purposes of this paragraph, an aircraft is noncommercially operated if transportation thereon is not provided or made available to the general public by purchase of a ticket or other fare."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 1985.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM CARNEY

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, today my close friend and colleague from New York, Congressman BILL CARNEY, has announced that he will not seek reelection to this House for a fifth term.

This is a saddening bit of news not only for me and our New York colleagues, but for all Americans whose deeply rooted faith in traditional American values were represented by BILL here in the House over the past 8 years. As the Republican whip for New York, there were no other Members of this body who could be more consistently counted upon to cast votes in strong support not only of the policies of the Republican Party, but also those of our great President, Ronald Reagan. Not only has BILL CARNEY been the tops in New York, but in my book, he has been one of the tops in the entire Nation.

Not only will I miss his friendship and legislative skills, but this Nation will be less well off because of the absence of his voice in the 100th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD the text of BILL CARNEY'S statement announcing his retirement.

STATEMENT BY REP. WILLIAM CARNEY

Thank you all for coming. Today I am announcing that I will not seek reelection to the House of Representatives for a fifth term.

This was a difficult decision to reach, and it goes against my every instinct to leave the office the voters of eastern Long Island entrusted to me for 8 years. I came to Congress in 1979 filled with the desire to do good things—for my constituents—and this nation. And while I will not be a member of the 100th Congress when it meets next year, I know that I have accomplished much of what I set out to do.

The United States is a stronger, more respected—and far more prosperous land than it was when I first took Office. In those dark days, President Carter spoke of a national malaise, the economy was in a shambles and the United States seemed to doubt its ability to serve as the leader of the free world.

But I believed in the inherent strength of this nation, confident that with foresight and leadership greatness would again be ours. I believed that the system would serve us well if channelled in the right direction. I believed, too, that one man could make a difference.

And I was right. The individual men and women who I am privileged to serve with and call my colleagues have made a very great difference.

The malaise is gone. We in Congress courageously supported the policies that brought America back. Our economy is strong and robust, and just as importantly, we have rediscovered our national pride, patriotism and sense of purpose.

From my first day in Washington up to this very minute, the only questions I ever asked before making a decision or casting a vote, first, is it right, and secondly is it to the benefit of the people who put me here.

Those same questions acted as my one and only guide on the issue of Shoreham.

I strongly believe in upholding federal law and protecting an orderly licensing process. A procedure which guarantees opponents and supporters alike their day in court. The law specifically shields an issue as crucial as public safety from political tampering. I could not sanction any attempt to subvert the law or tamper with the process to influence the outcome.

This, then, is my dilemma. Shoreham pitted Bill Carney the public servant against Bill Carney the politician. I'm happy to say that Bill Carney won.

I faced a crisis of conscience which placed my commitment to do what I know in my heart to be right—that is see the system through to its conclusion—up against pursuing the path of least political resistance to do and say the things necessary to save my political career.

I can tell you that political expediency never had a chance, and that is why my name will not be on the ballot in November. I could not sell out my conscience or the trust you placed in me for another two years in Congress.

Now as I prepare to leave this office, I would be saddened and disappointed if all that I have tried to do—to contribute to a restored economy, a renewed respect for America abroad and a revitalized sense of patriotism—was pushed in the background by Shoreham.

I hope that one day these things will carry more weight than my stand on one issue. Today, however, is not that day. I want to assure every resident of the First Congressional District that in the weeks and months ahead I will continue to provide the professional and concerned constituent service you all deserve. In addition, I will work closely with my successor—whoever that may be—to ensure a smooth transition.

I'd like to thank my dedicated staff for all their hard work and patience. I am also deeply indebted to my loyal supporters, close advisors and—most importantly—my family for their guidance and understanding. Without them, I could not have come this far. They were there when both Bill Carneys needed them. I believe we have all won, thank you.

**A TRIBUTE TO SGT. MAJ.
CHARLES FERG**

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, As Memorial Day approaches, I want to call attention to Sgt. Maj. Charles Ferg of the U.S. Marine Corps, who has served our Nation in military service for nearly 30 years.

Sergeant Major Ferg's military record includes tours of duty spanning the globe to such hotspots as Vietnam and Beirut.

Sergeant Major Ferg is a credit to himself, his family, and his Nation.

His personal military decorations include: The Navy Achievement Medal, the Presidential Unit Citation, four awards of the Navy Unit Commendation, the Meritorious Unit Commendation, nine awards of the Good Conduct Medal, the Marine Corps Expeditionary Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the

Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal with Silver Star, the Humanitarian Service Medal, the Sea Service Deployment Ribbon with two stars, the Republic of Vietnam Meritorious Unit Citation, the Gallantry Cross Color, the Republic of Vietnam Meritorious Unit Citation Civil Actions Color, and the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Major Ferg represents the best and the brightest in our military service and he is an example for all of our Nation's youth who look to military service as a career.

Sergeant Major Ferg will be leaving soon from his post at Fort Schuyler in the Bronx to assume duties with the 4th Marine Division in New Orleans.

The transfer of Sergeant Major Ferg, his wife and two children is New York's loss and New Orleans' gain.

I wish him the best in his new post.

**AMERICA'S TRADE CRISIS—A
TIME FOR ACTION**

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is widely recognized that international trade is an essential component of the American economy. A strong and viable international trade sector is critical to the health and vitality of the U.S. economy. But it is also clear that international trade is just as essential to the economic well-being of western Wisconsin. This is no secret to the people of western Wisconsin, who recently responded to a districtwide questionnaire distributed by my congressional office by indicating that they ranked the trade issue above terrorism, arms control, Central America and United States-Soviet relations as a foreign policy priority issue.

The residents of western Wisconsin, joined by the American public, recognize that something must be done about the U.S. trade deficit—a deficit that reached \$148.5 billion in 1985—more than double that of 1983. Today, through its vote on H.R. 4800, the "Trade and International Economic Policy Reform Act of 1986," Congress has the opportunity to show that it will do something about the trade deficit. We have a chance to enact legislation that will help move us beyond a framework governing international trade that was designed in an era when total trade was less than 4 percent of U.S. gross national product and little more than raw materials were imported from developing countries; to a system recognizing that imports of manufactured goods account for more than one-fourth of overall U.S. industrial consumption, and American farmers and manufacturers are competing daily with countless low-wage paying newly industrialized nations.

The bill we are considering today tackles the difficult issue of trade through a variety of strategies and methods. Provisions are included that will help provide the Wisconsin and American agricultural sectors with an opportunity to regain some of the market share that

has been lost over the past few years. Well-focused education and employment training programs are established as an integral part of the U.S. trade effort. The problem of nations aiding their trade posture through the use of unacceptable and substandard foreign labor practices is also addressed. Most importantly, the bill goes beyond empty words to requiring concrete actions to reverse the trade deficit now threatening the American and world economy.

ALL IS NOT GLOOM

There have been some positive signs in recent months. Underlying conditions affecting the trade balance have improved markedly. The dollar has fallen 30 percent against an average of the major currencies since its peak in February. Interest rates have continued to decline more in the United States than in any other countries. And, as U.S. interest rates decline and the dollar decreases, U.S. goods should increase in attractiveness to foreign buyers.

PROBLEMS REMAIN

Since 1960, the U.S. share of world trade has dropped from roughly 18 to 13 percent. In 1970, imports represented only 8 percent of the U.S. market in capital goods. Last year, foreign imports in this area increased to 26 percent.

In 1980, when U.S. exports in manufactured goods were at their peak at \$224.5 billion, over 6 million Americans owed their jobs to exports. Since that time, U.S.-export volume has dropped off by about 14 percent—resulting in the loss of approximately 1.5 million jobs since 1980.

American agriculture has been equally hard hit by declining trade. The value of agricultural exports has fallen from \$39.1 billion in 1982 to \$31.2 billion and is expected to fall even further to \$29 billion this year. In addition, commodities imports are increasing—\$19.8 billion in 1985 and \$20 billion forecasted for 1986.

Despite the fact that the United States had a positive trade balance for agricultural commodities in 1985, there is still much concern over the fact that we have seen a significant decline over recent years. In 1981, the United States enjoyed its largest agricultural trade balance with \$43.8 billion in exports and only \$17.2 billion in imports.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE TRADE DEFICIT

So what exactly do these trade statistics mean for the United States?

One consequence of the U.S.-trade deficit, felt in very real human terms, is the loss of American jobs. Until 1980, the growth of U.S. exports had stimulated employment in the United States. In that year, merchandise exports alone represented \$224.2 billion for the United States—and 6 million jobs. However, between 1980 and 1983, the International Trade Administration estimated that 1.5 million total jobs were lost throughout the economy, largely due to falling export volumes.

In addition to the loss of jobs, the United States is in the process of losing entire industries. Key industries—steel, textile, footwear, machinery—and even those U.S.-dominated industries such as electronics, telecommunications and other "high-technology" fields are threatened by rising foreign competition. It can

be justifiably argued that America's ability to defend itself in a time of war will be seriously jeopardized if we allow basic U.S. industries to vanish from the domestic scene.

CAUSES

It is obvious that we face a trade problem of enormous proportions, but what are the causes?

First, despite recent reductions the overvalued U.S. dollar remains as one of the largest contributing factors to our current trade deficit. As the dollar increased its value by 30 to 50 percent against other currencies in the past few years, U.S. firms competing against foreign competitors have been placed at a severe disadvantage. In effect, the increased dollar served as a tax of between 30 to 50 percent on U.S. exports and as a subsidy of the same amount on U.S. imports.

A rapid expansion of income and demand in the United States compared to diminishing buying power and demand abroad, particularly in Third World and debtor nations; standard labor conditions in competing foreign countries resulting in much lower labor costs as compared to those in the United States; ability of our own industries and U.S. products to compete with those from foreign nations; and unfair trade barriers in other countries, are other contributing factors to the U.S. trade deficit.

ADMINISTRATION RELUCTANCE TO ACT

Another very significant factor has been the administration's reluctance to act in a timely manner on recommendations and findings from the International Trade Commission [ITC] and on provisions in current law.

Since 1948, when the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs [GATT] was implemented, we have maintained reasonable alternatives to protectionist legislation, which, as structured and enforced, provide relief from imports. Sections 201 and 301 of the 1974 Trade Act, for example, are intended to restrict imports, based on an ITC's favorable recommendation. Following are three examples of such alternatives, which unfortunately, have been either ignored or not enforced.

Last year, the ITC ruled unanimously that imports had imposed serious injury to the domestic industry. Consequently, the Commission recommended quotas for 5 years on non-rubber footwear imports valued over \$2.50 per pair. However, President Reagan failed to implement the Commission's recommendation.

TEXTILE

Likewise, the textile industry faced with administration inaction found it necessary to appeal to Congress for relief from unreasonable import levels. The Commerce Department has confirmed that had the multifiber arrangement [MFA] been enforced, the legislation intended to limit textile imports by 30 percent would not be necessary. A Presidential veto has thwarted legislation passed by Congress that would have implemented the ITC recommendations.

THE ITC AND PORK

At times, even the ITC has failed to adequately address the trade issues confronting American industry and producers. The Commission ruled last year that Canadian pork had injured our domestic industry. Accordingly, the

import of live hogs into America was restricted. It was recommended, however, to allow unrestricted quantities of fresh pork products into the United States. Ultimately, this decision merely benefits Canadian pork processors. As a result, American pork producers have found it necessary to appeal this decision in the courts.

TRADE AND AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

I want to thank my colleagues who worked with me in developing a number of initiatives, included in this bill, that are of particular importance to farmers adversely impacted by U.S. trade problems. These new programs, if enacted, will greatly benefit the farming and rural communities in which they reside.

Two provisions in particular will help the dairy farmers of this country. One would provide for the reclassification of casein from an industrial product to a food product. The other would prohibit milk produced by foreign-owned dairies, financed by or with industrial development bonds, from receiving the class I or II price for their milk established under the Federal market order program.

CASEIN

Only 1 percent of all casein imported into this country was used for food and feed purposes back in 1955. In 1985, 90 percent of all casein went toward food and feed uses. It is necessary and proper that casein be reclassified as a food product. In the 6 years I have been in Congress, several attempts were made to reclassify casein, but all proved unsuccessful. This change will not have a direct impact in the short term, but rather gives us the means to address casein imports in the long term.

FOREIGN-OWNED DAIRIES

With an ever increasing surplus of milk, a dairy termination program has been put in place in an effort to help bring about a balance in supply and demand. At a time when American dairy producers are being asked to help pay for a dairy termination program, it is appalling that our Government is permitting foreign investors to use low-interest industrial development bonds to finance large dairies which will help to defeat the purposes of the farm bill.

The legislation today, incorporates a bill I introduced earlier this year that corrects this inequity by prohibiting these large foreign investors from selling their milk at a class I or II price and effectively limiting them to the manufacturing price of \$10.98 per hundredweight. When you consider that the overorder price being paid in the Georgia market order is approximately \$15.35 per hundredweight, this legislation will effectively reduce the incentive foreign-owned dairies might have to add to the American dairy surplus.

ADDITIONAL AGRICULTURE PROVISIONS

In addition to the reclassification of casein and dealing with the foreign investors in the dairy industry, H.R. 4800 has several other provisions that are essential to the agricultural sector.

As mentioned earlier, the ITC's decision on imports of hogs and pork products and their effects on our domestic producers has failed to adequately resolve the issue of importation of raw and processed products. This legisla-

tion would clarify our unfair trade laws with respect to processed products to insure that the ITC examine the possible injury to growers of these products.

H.R. 4800 also makes it a priority that all interested foreign purchasers be allowed to acquire U.S. commodities through our Export Enhancement Program. This will allow us to move more of our commodities and at the same time develop new markets for our products.

Other provisions will give more authority to USDA in agricultural trade matters, as well as require the President to submit an annual agriculture trade strategy report. The report will have to include recommended policy and spending goals for 1-, 5-, and 10-year periods.

EDUCATION COMPONENT

Title V of H.R. 4800, the Education and Labor component of the bill, establishes well-focused education and employment training programs as a integral part of the U.S. trade effort. In order for American industries to compete internationally, both now and in the future, we need to maintain a well-trained work force.

FUNDING FOR STATE PROGRAMS

In the education and training component of the bill we address several areas of concern, both for workers and for potential employers. First, this section provides funding to States for supplemental programs in vocational education and training to displace workers; literacy education to adults and to out-of-school youth; and provides assistance to improve math, science, and foreign language instruction for elementary and secondary students in order to better prepare our current and future work force for the employment needs of the future.

TRAINING AND ASSISTANCE FOR DISPLACED FARMERS

Second, during committee consideration of the trade issue, I worked with my colleagues to ensure that displaced farmers, were eligible for employment training and transitional assistance to individuals displaced due at least in some part to competition from imports and exports. This bill requires the Department of Labor to identify not only those industrial workers displaced due to import and export competition, but it directs the Department to identify farmers being dislocated from their farms due in part to international competition or to financial hardship. Through this provision which I authored, the Federal Government will make its first formal effort to identify and locate these farmers in need of transitional and retraining assistance.

Another important program established by this measure is a joint labor-management training program, encouraging the development of labor-management committees to provide retraining and education assistance to existing workers in threat of displacement.

TIME FOR ACTIONS

Again, H.R. 4800, the "Trade and International Economic Policy Reform Act of 1986" is not perfect. There are a number of problems in this bill which I hope can be resolved during its consideration. But, the time for talk has passed. If we do not act soon, we will not

need to worry that our actions will result in foreign retaliation—there will be no U.S. firms against which to retaliate. This legislation is a starting point from which we can build a bipartisan consensus on trade. It is critical that we to act now with substantive measures in order to adequately address the Nation's problems in international trade.

**KIM DAE JUNG, DEMOCRACY
AND FREEDOM IN SOUTH
KOREA**

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Shultz' praise of Korean President Chun Doo Hwan while visiting Seoul last week was overstated and unjustified. His words demonstrated the Reagan administration's misunderstanding of the real South Korea—a nation full of tension, repression, and violence.

In recent months violent student protests pervaded with anti-Americanism have become a regular occurrence throughout South Korea. Two weeks ago over 4,000 protesters marched in Inchon carrying placards defaming the Chun government and the United States. And just after Mr. Shultz' visit, over 100 police and students were hurt after a peaceful demonstration turned into a fire and rock throwing riot.

Kim Dae Jung, cochairman of the Council for the Promotion of Democracy in Korea, denounces this violence. But he knows that in part it stems from the perception that the United States tacitly supports the authoritarian Chun government. Secretary Shultz' blatant support of Chun last week merely adds fuel to the fire.

I received a letter recently from Mr. Kim. In it he explained the goals that the United States must support, not only to promote democracy, but also to regain the backing of the Korean people: reform of the constitution, direct presidential elections, prompt restoration of democratic institutions, the end of the military dictatorship, and an open and firm U.S. support of democratic and human rights developments.

As Korea hosts the 1988 Summer Olympics, the eyes of the world will be focused on its people, its natural beauty, its rich history, and its current government. Now is the time for the Chun government to make real progress toward democratic reform that will bring an end to the repression, and therefore, the violence. Now is the time for the United States to make clear its record that it stands for democracy and against repression wherever it occurs—be it Korea, Nicaragua, South Africa or the Soviet Union.

I would like to submit for the RECORD a recent statement written by Mr. Kim that appeared in the Washington Post.

KOREA: WHAT WE WANT

(By Kim Dae Jung)

SEOUL.—Secretary of State George Shultz is scheduled to visit Korea this week, just at a time when, I believe, the Korean-American relationship is at a very important stage.

In the military coup led by Gen. Chun Doo Hwan in 1980, I was arrested and imprisoned. After five years in prison in Korea and in exile in America, I returned home in February of last year. The most shocking thing to me was the cooling off I noticed in the Korean public's feelings toward the United States and the pronounced anti-American sentiments of some elements in Korea society. This year, their anti-America slogans are becoming very pronounced and frequent.

It seems that there are three major reasons for such worsening of sentiments toward the United States. First is the perception, unfounded as it is, that at the time of the coup carried out by Chun and the massacre of citizens in Kwang Ju, the United States acted in support of these activities or at least failed to endeavor positively to block them.

Second, in Korea now, all democratic institutions, such as the press, National Assembly and the courts, have turned into mere tools of the despotic Chun regime. Despair prevails. The general public has no place to turn in order to solve these problems by democratic means. There is a widely held perception that the United States tacitly supports this tyranny.

Third, the U.S. government, Congress, news media and citizens have criticized human rights and the lack of progress toward genuine democratization in Korea. The fact is that all these criticisms have been kept from being reported by the Korean media. On the other hand, the remarks made by U.S. government leaders and some pro-Korean personages in support of the Chun regime are played up in the press. A false impression is thus given to the Korean people that the U.S. government and people all support and tolerate the undemocratic Chun regime.

Even more unfortunate is the fact that we in the political opposition, being concerned about this trend and making efforts to correct it, are blocked from working effectively for that purpose. Our publications are censored by the government. I am prohibited from speaking directly to students and industrial workers. I am constantly under surveillance: my phone conversations are tapped and my mail is censored before reaching me. Those who associate with me are themselves subjected to police harassment.

The political reality in Korea today is that if we fail to remedy the situation soon, there is a great possibility that there may be a drastic deterioration in the political situation and in the Korean people's feelings toward America. How can such a negative development be prevented? The only remedy is a prompt restoration of democratic institutions.

When democratic institutions are established, the freedom-loving Korean people will be able to speak out and participate actively without fear of reprisals. Once this occurs, the influence of radical elements within Korean society will be greatly reduced. Once the popular desires for freedom and justice is satisfied the root cause of radicalism will disappear.

If the United States supports such democratic developments, our people's current misconceptions concerning the United States will be corrected. Although the absolute majority of our people may criticize U.S. policy toward Korea, continued oppression by the despotic regime provides the best chance for radicals to expand their influence.

Our people are resolved now to put an end to the military dictatorship in the coming presidential elections. This is an absolute commitment. As long as the military dictatorship continues, there will be neither freedom and justice nor national security and peace. Now will there be the friendly relationship with the United States. If we fail to end the military dictatorship in the presidential elections next year, this nation will be eventually thrown into chaos and toward political polarization. This would clearly present an open invitation for North Korean aggression. Korea could then become another Vietnam.

Democracy is the only path toward stability and security. Democracy is the only way to attain the common interests of Korea and the United States. We are not asking the United States to restore our democracy for us. The restoration of our democracy must be achieved with our own efforts and through our own sacrifices. We have asked the United States for only two things: one is that the United States should unequivocally declare its open and firm support of the great cause of Korean democratization and restoration of human rights. The other is that the commander of the U.S. forces in Korea, who is the commanding general of the Korea-U.S. Combined Forces Command, should endeavor to ensure the political neutrality of the Korean Armed Forces. Then, we will take care of the rest.

Secretary Shultz' visit will provide a very important opportunity for Koreans to judge whether U.S. policy toward Korea has really changed since the Philippine elections and the promulgation of the Reagan Doctrine. While the Korean people have great interest in the Shultz visit, some misgivings still linger.

Under a democratic system, compromise is an essential political function and virtue. However, tyranny and democracy are absolute extremes. There can be no compromises between the two unless Chun's regime completely accepts democratization of our nation. The Korean people earnestly desire an end to the military rule which has persisted over the past 25 years. To this end, they believe that constitutional revision is necessary to enable them to pick their president by direct popular vote. The opposition party in Korea is mounting a major, nationwide campaign to urge constitutional revisions to allow for such direct presidential elections. The voting in the February 1985 general election showed a high degree of support for our party's position on constitutional revision. In rallies that have been held throughout the country this spring, it has become obvious that there is tremendous grass-roots support for such a change.

In a country such as Korea, where there is a total absence of freedom of the press, local autonomy and fair elections, no one can expect a transfer of power with either an indirect presidential election system or the "Cabinet responsibility" system. Our people are confident that only through a direct presidential election system can the nation overcome election frauds and other built-in institutional advantages held by the government party.

Corazon Aquino could never have won if she had to face the same conditions that currently confront the political opposition party in Korea. President Chun has now offered a compromise in which the ruling party agrees to move up constitutional revision to before 1988 in return for opposition party concessions on the direct election system. I believe that this would be a great

setback for the Korean people. There can be no compromise on how the Korean people should be allowed to choose their own president.

The democratic forces in Korea, which genuinely hope to return to the traditional friendly relationship with the United States, now await Secretary Shultz' visit with both high expectations and feelings of uneasiness.

THE MICRO-ENTERPRISE PROMOTION ACT OF 1986

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to encourage micro-enterprises owned by the poor in developing countries. The purpose of this bill is to enable poor people to achieve food security and meet other basic needs by helping them to help themselves.

The micro-enterprise approach to development has been neglected by governments and multilateral banks even though informal sector activities employ from 30 to 70 percent of the labor force in developing countries.

Micro-enterprises typically have four workers or less, usually involve family members, and are located both in urban and rural areas. Their activities include light manufacturing, tailoring, retailing, and very small industries, such as rice husking, basket weaving, shirtmaking, and selling food. One financial intermediary currently making loans to micro-enterprises is loaning less than \$200 at 16-percent interest. It has a 98-percent repayment rate, compared to 50 percent to 90 percent default rates for big industrial loans in Third World countries.

In addition, 65 percent of the loans are to women—the farmers of the Third World.

The smallest loan—\$1 to a beggar woman—enabled her to become a vendor of ribbons, hair clips, and bangles.

Constant indebtedness to traders, informal moneylenders, loansharks, or relatives perpetuates the poverty of poor people in developing countries. Formal financial institutions in developing countries do not recognize the viability of income-generating enterprises owned by the poor. These formal financial institutions prevent the poor from gaining access to legal credit through extensive collateral requirements and difficult repayment schedules.

Documented increases in incomes of micro-enterprise borrowers and successful repayment rates among poor borrowers have begun the process of penetrating the barriers of formal financial institutions which have previously excluded the poor. Emphasis must now be placed on making funds available so we can better target assistance to entry-level micro-enterprises owned by the very poor.

Accordingly, I am inserting a full copy of the full text of this measure and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor and support the legislation.

H.R. 4894

A bill to amend section 108 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to encourage loans for micro-enterprises owned by the poor in developing countries

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Micro-Enterprise Promotion Act of 1986".

SEC. 2. MICRO-ENTERPRISE CREDIT PROGRAM.

Section 108 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1708) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j)(1) The Congress finds that—

"(A) numerous micro-enterprises owned by the poor comprise the informal sector economy in developing countries;

"(B) micro-enterprises are small-scale operations, typically having less than 4 workers;

"(C) micro-enterprises, which are located in both urban and rural areas, engage in activities such as light manufacturing, tailoring, retailing, processing and transporting food, and servicing farm machinery;

"(D) micro-entrepreneurs who have been able to obtain small loans have demonstrated their ability to repay those loans and have achieved significant improvements in their living standards and made significant contributions to the local economy;

"(E) formal financial institutions in developing countries, however, have not recognized that, although micro-enterprises owned by the poor may lack collateral for loans, they can nevertheless be financially viable;

"(F) as a result, micro-enterprises owned by the poor have had little access to formal sources of credit; and

"(G) in order to address this problem, a high priority in carrying out this section should be to provide financial assistance to these micro-entrepreneurs.

"(2) Accordingly, the President shall establish a program under this section, administered by the Agency for International Development, pursuant to which foreign currencies generated from the sale of United States agricultural commodities under this section are used by financial intermediaries in developing countries to provide loans to micro-enterprises owned by the poor.

"(3) The financial intermediaries selected to participate in this program shall include (but not be limited to) cooperatives and other indigenous organizations that are privately owned and controlled.

"(4) For each of the fiscal years 1986 through 1990, foreign currencies shall be made available under this subsection for loans to micro-enterprises owned by the poor in an aggregate amount equivalent to not less than 20 percent and not more than 30 percent of the value of all sales of agricultural commodities for foreign currency for use under this section.

"(5) For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'micro-enterprise' means a small-scale enterprise (either a single proprietorship, a small-group enterprise, or a cooperative) which operates within the informal sector economy of a developing country, in either an urban or a rural area, and which lacks access to formal credit sources."

ENTRANCE INTO A NEW ERA:
CLEVELAND HEIGHTS DEDICATES A NEW CITY HALL

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the city of Cleveland Heights, located in the 21st District of Ohio, completed a major step this year toward its goal of creating a town center for the community.

On Sunday, June 1, 1986, city officials will dedicate its new city hall, approximately 1 year and 7 months after the groundbreaking for the structure. Designed by Cleveland Heights architects Dickson & Dickson, the new facility provides not only a symbolic core, but also a real center for all city services: Administrative, judicial, and safety.

Mr. Speaker, the new Cleveland Heights City Hall provides the citizens of that community with a convenient facility in which all city services are housed under one roof. A resident will be able to come to city hall, find parking with little problem, and conduct routine business quickly and easily. The city hall will also accommodate visitors in wheelchairs; something that was impossible in the old structure.

The new structure is a marked departure from the old cramped quarters at the former city hall. The exterior design of the new building leaves a stately, yet contemporary impression. Inside, a 50-square-foot atrium, topped with a pyramid-shaped skylight, gives the building a spacious, brilliant quality. The atrium provides a forum for ceremonial functions, as well as a focal point in design, by having municipal offices surround it.

However, Mr. Speaker, the hall's site also has a historical significance. It is located on land adjacent to Severance Center. The entire area was the setting for Severance family's estate, Longwood. The Severance family is noted for its contributions to Greater Cleveland, including the world-renowned Cleveland Orchestra. At the present time, there are plans to develop the surrounding area into a town center that would serve a multitude of needs in the Cleveland Heights community.

I should also note that in the cornerstone ceremony for the building in November 1985, city officials buried a time capsule scheduled to be opened in the year 2036.

This is important, Mr. Speaker, because Cleveland Heights is perhaps the most culturally diverse community in the Greater Cleveland area and the town prides itself on its commitment to fostering an environment where people of many cultures, races, and religions can peacefully live, work, and raise families. Cleveland Heights has major programs in place to maintain its integrated nature.

This commitment to maintaining this kind of community is symbolized in the time capsule's contents. Clearly a concerted community effort, the time capsule contains essays, poetry, and artwork from area school children, menus from local restaurants, worship service programs from Heights' churches, and various

artifacts from city hall, all reflective of life in 1986 in Cleveland Heights, OH.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the new Cleveland Heights City Hall serves its residents well, and would like to offer my congratulations to Mayor Alan J. Rapoport, Vice Mayor Carol Edwards, and council members Robert H. Arnold, Barbara Boyd, Philmore J. Hart, Leonard Horowitz, Joanne E. O'Brien, and Richard Weigand; former City Manager Richard V. Robinson; current Manager Robert C. Downey and the city hall staff for their contributions in making this structure a reality.

IN HONOR OF CLAIRE L.
ROTHMAN

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Claire L. Rothman, who, on May 29, 1986, will be honored by the City of Hope, Medical Center Aides.

Whether dealing with temperamental rock stars, high-strung athletes, burly boxing promoters, or obstinate labor union officials, Claire Rothman displays a combination of charm and tenacity which makes her unique. As vice president and general manager of the Forum in Los Angeles, Ms. Rothman is the only female general manager of a major entertainment facility in the United States. Jerry Buss, the Forum's owner, calls her "talented and creative, and she goes about our business with a dedication that makes her one of our most valuable people."

The scope of her responsibilities makes possible the smooth operation of the Forum. In a typical week, Ms. Rothman can be seen supervising a ticket sale for the latest rock group, negotiating with a local union, and running the show for a sold-out Lakers basketball game. It is a job that can go from 9 a.m. until midnight, requiring spontaneous and creative solutions to a myriad of problems.

In her years at the Forum, Ms. Rothman has received numerous awards, both for herself and the arena. These honors include: Billboard's "Facility Manager of the Year"; Harper's Bazaar "Diamond Superwoman Award"; Women in Business' "Ten Women of the Decade," and Bullock's "Portfolio Award," honoring women who have excelled in their careers.

Ms. Rothman is also very active in the community, sharing her time and expertise with many worthwhile organizations. She is on the board of directors of the International Association of Auditorium Managers. She also serves as a board member of the American Collegiate Talent Showcase (ACTS) which seeks new talent at the college level. In addition, Ms. Rothman also is a member of the Centinela Hospital Advisory Board and the City of Hope Resources Board. In 1983, she was elected to the City of Hope Board of Directors. She is also currently a member of Convention Cabinet of the Executive Council of the City of Hope for their national convention in 1985. Ms. Rothman is active in women's groups, such as Women In Business and The Trusteeship for the Betterment of Women.

"Entertainment and sports are no different than any other field that women can bring something unique to," says Ms. Rothman. "This is a business where women's creativity and the ability to deal with people and bring out that team spirit are evident."

It is a pleasure to share Claire Rothman's accomplishments with my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives. I ask that they join me in wishing Claire all the best in her future endeavors.

ADDRESS OF SECOND LIEUTENANT
MICHAEL K. LENNON

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of attending Bravo Company's Mess Night at Quantico, VA. During the course of that evening, Marine 2nd Lt. Michael K. Lennon—who was serving as master of ceremonies—gave a stirring address on the qualities and characteristics of leadership. Lieutenant Lennon's remarks exemplify the caliber of the young men and women serving in our Armed Forces today, and I am pleased to share his thoughts with my colleagues in the Congress.

Good evening General Wendt, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. As President of the Mess, I welcome you to Bravo Company's Mess Night.

We gather this evening as members of an elite corps of officers to celebrate that which we share in common.

Certainly we share many things—our uniform, our training, our camaraderie and love for corps and country.

But what deeper bond do we share?

What we share is that fundamental desire to lead Marines.

We have been taught a great deal about leadership in the past 17 weeks. We have been taught in the classroom and in the field, and through our discussion groups. We practice our techniques on a day-to-day basis as billet holders.

In retrospect recall what our first few weeks were like here, as "lieutenantdates" if you will—formations at the drop of a hat, unsure of each other, and unsure of ourselves—only beginning the metamorphosis from college students to Marine Officer.

We as Marines, as officers, and as a Company have grown.

General John A. Lejeune, defined leadership as the sum of those qualities of intellect, human understanding, and moral character that enable a person to inspire and to control a group of people successfully.

I memorized that definition as a Marine recruit in 1978 just as I memorized many things—and from time to time I thought about what this definition meant to me and how I could apply it to the daily challenges that faced me as an NCO and Staff NCO.

I noted that, although leadership is defined as a sum, the sum itself is not limited or restricted. General Lejeune obviously intended that leadership be an ongoing and ever-growing aspect of our obligation.

We as leaders must acknowledge these aspects and strive to improve ourselves as professionals just as we seek to improve those in our charge.

To those in our charge we must be firm and fair, yet just and compassionate. General Lejeune noted that the relationship between officer and enlisted should be in no sense be that of superior to inferior nor that of master to servant, but rather that of teacher to scholar.

So where does TBS fit in and exactly what do we learn here?

Well, we become physically and mentally tough while gaining the technical and tactical proficiency that will enable us to fill the role of the teacher in General Lejeune's model.

As teachers we must not forget that at one time, we too were just learning. We must recall the questions that we asked about material not covered in the Enabling Learning Objectives. For example: What is the Effective Casualty Radius of a Nuclear Hand-grenade? Why can't I hitchhike from box to box? Should I throw the grenade now, Sir?

We also improve the intellect that General Lejeune found so necessary in leadership. We must note, however, that the knowledge gained at TBS is not gained for selfish reasons. Our purpose is to utilize the knowledge we gain to increase the abilities of those we lead.

Next, we gain insight into the nature of human understanding. We discover our own strengths and weaknesses as well as those of our peers and of our leaders.

We gain this knowledge with the realization that the enlisted Marines in our command will have a different perspective on our Corps based upon the individual reasons for service, and their widely varying educational and cultural backgrounds.

We have memorized the principals and traits of good leadership. We have practiced on each other.

Now we must choose to attack the leadership challenges which will face us with the flexible determination of an understanding, moral and educated representative of our society knowing that TBS is not an end unto itself, but merely a means to a larger end. For it is here that we have truly learned The Basics.

We gather this evening at Quantico, the crossroads of our beloved Corps.

For some of us, this crossroads marks the beginning of a challenging and honorable path in life.

But regardless of our pasts, or commissioning sources, or our prior experiences, we must now stand together as one Corps of officers, just as those before us have stood—uncompromising and unwavering. Facing the present and the future with more pride in what we are now and in what we shall be than in what we have been or where we are from.

For in our hands lies the future of our Corps and our Country. Thank you.

COLOMBIA TO HOLD PRESIDENTIAL
ELECTION MAY 25

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 25, Colombia will hold its presidential elections. As the following report from the Council on Hemispheric Affairs (COHA) explains, the balloting represents a crossroads for the

nation. Among the issues at stake are whether Bogotá will continue to play a leading role in the Contadora process, and if the effort to promote internal reconciliation that the retiring President, Belisario Betancur, pioneered will be abandoned. The report was written by COHA Research Associate Lawrence Boudon. I commend his findings to the attention of my colleagues.

COLOMBIA AT CROSSROADS AS COUNTRY POISED TO ELECT NEW PRESIDENT

(By Lawrence Boudon, Research Associate,
Council on Hemispheric Affairs)

Colombians go to the polls May 25 to elect a new president and the result may determine Colombian politics at home and abroad for years to come. Colombia's constitution is 100 years old this year and the country finds itself at a critical crossroad, both in terms of its continued commitment to democracy, and the maintenance of an active Central American policy.

COMPROMISE OR CONFRONTATION?

At stake is the future of the internal peace process, begun by President Belisario Betancur in 1984, which, although marred with failures, has had some success integrating guerrilla forces into mainstream political life. The military, against the process since its inception, may either be given freer reign in suppressing the insurgency, or invite demands that it further yield some of its almost plenary authority to civilian rule. Colombia's leading role in the Contadora group may also be compromised by the outcome of the voting. Finally, with an improving economic scenario, the elections may decide whether the country will follow in the footsteps of neighboring Ecuador with efforts aimed at export-oriented growth, or, rather, use its added revenues for vitally-needed domestic socio-economic reforms.

A TOUGH ACT TO FOLLOW

Under the Colombian electoral laws, a president may not seek a consecutive term of office, thus the country must bid farewell, for now, to a man who stood apart from the autocratic, frequently corrupt, traditional politicians who went before him. His immediate predecessor, liberal Julio Cesar Turbay Ayala, was implicated in a major financial scandal and was a known heavy drinker.

Belisario Betancur, a college professor from a very humble background, initiated dozens of public programs—such as a 20,000 unit housing project in South Bogota, and an electrification program to extend electric power throughout the country. He put Colombia on the road to domestic tranquility by offering the guerrillas an opportunity to re-enter legal life, supported the development of oil and coal exports, and brought Colombia into world politics with an active policy in Central America.

Barely after his inauguration in August 1982, Betancur made the controversial but popular decision to reject a Colombian bid to hold the World Cup soccer tournament in 1986, in favor of devoting its limited resources for badly needed social programs. Although his popularity shrunk towards the end of his term, due to continued guerrilla and military violence and the mishandling of the Palace of Justice takeover, experts doubt that either of the contenders for this year's elections are likely to be as bold as was Betancur in breaking new political ground. All in all, Betancur was one of Latin America's most extraordinarily contemporary leaders.

THE CANDIDATES

The Liberal candidate, Dr. Virgilio Barco, who is considered the frontrunner due to his party's victory in the March congressional elections, favors industrial growth, rural development, internal peace and social justice, and a dynamic role for Colombia in hemispheric affairs. He is likely to continue many of the policies begun by Betancur including the pacification and integration process. The ruling Conservative Party candidate, Alvaro Gomez Hurtado, on the other hand, is for export-led growth, fiscal conservatism including a smaller role for the state in development, and internal peace through law and order. Although his party suffered reverses in the March poll, his hardline against the guerrillas has gained him growing popularity among those Colombians who feel the peace process has been an unqualified failure.

TWO-PARTY HEGEMONY

The other candidates—Colombia has traditionally been a restrictive two-party system—have either dropped out of the race, as did New Liberal Luis Carlos Galan and Patriotic Union candidate Jacobo Arenas, or are not considered to be factors in the election. In the Liberal Party platform, Barco is committed to "the broadening of political, economic and social participation," while Gomez promises "National Participation" which is "placing the people within our democracy." But the realities are that besides the two main parties, political groups in Colombia have never been able to mount any real electoral challenge. This fact has been one reason why many alienated Colombians have chosen the path of armed struggle and, should the system remain relatively closed, may force groups as the Colombian Revolutionary Armed Forces (FARC)—who ran in the March elections as the Patriotic Union (UP), but who received only 1 percent of the vote—back into clandestinity.

INTERNAL PEACE PROCESS IN TROUBLE

The future of the peace process, which in recent months has seen the signing of truce agreements with several National Liberation Army (ELN) fronts, depends upon the outcome of the election. Barco favors the process, but wants to go beyond simple cease-fires to an actual integration of the guerrillas into Colombian political life. The Liberal Party "supports providing guarantees so that the groups or parties which disagree with the system can publicize their programs, engage in political action and join in civilian life, abandoning armed action as a strategy for seeking power." But Barco has also emphasized that Colombia "cannot continue to live in a state of war." He may in the end, display less patience in dealing with the guerrillas than did Betancur.

Alvaro Gomez has continually criticized Betancur's peace initiative, saying that "enough time has passed and the results are unsatisfactory," although he claims that "we are not going to rashly declare an experiment over when there are still possibilities of victory." Gomez's father was ex-president Laureano Gomez, under whose rule from 1950-53 was unleashed the bloody "Violencia" which claimed the lives of over 100,000 Colombians in a brutal partisan civil war. Colombian specialists consulted by COHA generally believe that Gomez intends to terminate the peace process and give the armed forces the green light to combat the guerrillas in the manner they see fit. The Colombian military has never accepted the prospect of peace and has continually vio-

lated the truce with the FARC, the ELN, and the M-19 guerrilla groups. When the latter occupied the Palace of Justice last November, one of their demands was to publicize the records of the government's peace commission to demonstrate the military's guilt.

The guerrillas have never been satisfied with the truce, either, and, despite the extension signed by the FARC in March, a government announcement April 30 that the military's budget would be increased by some \$12 million, prompted the group's leadership to warn that "if the government doesn't put the enemies of peace on a leash," they would be forced to submit the country to a civil war. This announcement came despite the fact that the FARC has already demobilized 2,500 guerrillas out of an estimated 6,000.

The Colombian military has been increasingly active against the insurgents, especially since the Palace of Justice siege. At Christmas time, the Armed Forces carried out a dragnet campaign in the Cali region in which 25 people were killed, 70 wounded and over 100 arrested. Various parts of the country remain under a state of siege, which Defense Minister Miguel Vega Uribe has stressed will run through the elections, citing continued guerrilla activity. The almost unqualified autonomy displayed by the military is an issue with which the new civilian president will have to grapple.

IMPROVING ECONOMIC PICTURE

Colombia, like most of Latin America, has suffered a long recession dating back to 1981. Although inflation has not been excessive, unemployment has risen to 14 percent. Colombia is blessed with having one of Latin America's smallest relative foreign debts at around \$11 billion, and is also the beneficiary of rising coffee prices—which accounts for 50 percent of the country's export earnings and is expected to bring in \$2.7 billion in additional revenues in 1986. The country has also become a net exporter of oil and the Cerrejon coal project is scheduled to add another \$16 billion in income by the year 2002.

Barco has declared that "the main objective of my government will be the creation of jobs, which is the most heartfelt need of the country." His program includes industrial growth, an accelerated agrarian reform and state intervention. His platform claims that "the economic and social policies of the state should be oriented toward making the sustained growth in production and equitable distribution of assets and income compatible." Barco will also push ahead with the development of oil and coal exports.

Gomez, as a final conservative, leans towards the private sector and foreign investment. His platform promises to reduce the size and involvement of the state in the economy in order to "create employment in the private sector with better efficiency and higher salaries." Gomez will cut taxes and reduce government spending in favor of private initiative. His program is not unlike that of President Leon Febres Cordero in neighboring Ecuador, who has been touted as the "Latin American Reagan," whose economic policies have received blessings from the International Monetary Fund and the White House.

INVOLVEMENT IN CONTADORA

The remaining question to be resolved May 25 is whether Colombia will cease to be a leader of the Contadora Peace Process in Central America, a high priority for Betancur, but one over which he has been criti-

cised internally for letting it take precedence over pressing domestic problems. Indeed, Betancur has been very active internationally over his four-year tenure and it remains to be seen how much attention the victorious candidate will devote to this arena.

Barco is likely, as is Gomez, to pay more attention to internal matters than did Betancur. However, Barco remains committed to the idea of inter-American cooperation and Latin American solidarity. His platform stresses "committing the United States to a policy of peace and economic equity for the continent." Gomez, on the other hand, is more nebulous on this issue and is expected to warm up relations with Washington.

On the issue of Contadora and Central America, Barco promises to "support the right of the Central American peoples to pursue their policies of economic, social and political transformation without any type of foreign intervention, particularly that of a military sort, and assistance in conflict in this region, with a view to finding political solutions to the serious situation of conflict faced by the Central American region." He will undoubtedly, though, devote less time to the process than did Betancur. Gomez may abandon the group altogether or, at least, convert Colombia into a passive non-contributor.

IN AGREEMENT ON DRUGS

At least the two major candidates are in basic agreement on the need to combat drug production and trafficking in Colombia. The country has received millions in U.S. aid towards this end and both have expressed a strong commitment to cooperation, including a continuation of the extradition treaty. The country was able to eradicate 2,000 hectares of coca in 1985 and expects to accomplish more this year.

PRO BONO REPRESENTATION BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, current law (18 U.S.C. 205) makes it a crime for an officer or employee of the United States in any of the three branches or any U.S. agency—including the District of Columbia—to represent anyone in any proceeding or matter in which the United States or the District of Columbia is the opposing party or has a direct and substantial interest. During the 98th Congress I introduced H.R. 6267 which would have removed several limitations in 18 U.S.C. 205. H.R. 6267 had the support of the Federal Bar Association, the American Bar Association, and the Judicial Conference for the D.C. Circuit. The main impetus of the bill was to increase pro bono opportunities for federally employed and D.C. Government attorneys. The broad impact of H.R. 6267 was that it would have allowed representation by a federally employed attorney or other employee when a different agency of the Federal Government was on the opposing side, "if not inconsistent with the faithful performance of his duties." The administration through the Federal Legal Council and the Office of Government Ethics [OPM] indicated its opposition to the broad bill—H.R. 6267—but its potential

support for a narrower bill. In response to their concerns a narrower bill was drafted, and is being introduced by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Judiciary and Education of the Committee on the District of Columbia, Mr. DYMALLY, and me.

This bill merely removes the barriers preventing Federal employees from doing pro bono work in which the District of Columbia is the opposing party and preventing D.C. employees from doing pro bono work in which the Federal Government is the opposing party. The bill removes this barrier which is inconsistent with home rule, and puts the District of Columbia in the same position as States. In no case could an employee perform pro bono work if it was inconsistent with the faithful performance of his or her government duties. Government agencies generally develop internal guidelines for employees relating to possible pro bono activities by attorneys and others.

It is expected that the bill will primarily affect attorneys and broaden their ability to perform pro bono work. There are more than 20,000 federally employed lawyers in the country and the majority live and work in the D.C. metropolitan area. This legislation will assist the client community, many of whom cannot receive legal services due to Federal funding cuts. I plan to conduct a hearing on the subject on June 12, 1986.

OUR CANADIAN TRADE PROBLEM

HON. BILL SCHUETTE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, Canadian softwood lumber consumption in the United States has increased from less than 20 percent of the United States softwood lumber market in 1975 to more than 31 percent in 1984. Between 50 and 60 percent of Canadian lumber production has been exported to the United States over the past decade. Imports of Canadian lumber are a concern for United States producers because productive capacity in the United States and Canada currently exceeds what the North American lumber market can absorb. This leads to heightened competition, depressed lumber prices and employee layoffs.

The United States concern over Canadian lumber imports is primarily a result of the continued low price for lumber. Estimates from Data Resources, Inc., indicate that capacity utilization in the United States is just 80 percent while in Canada it is 90 percent. Other studies report a less dramatic, but nonetheless important utilization rate.

U.S. producers have estimated that more than 250 sawmills have been closed since 1978, causing the loss of 38,000 jobs. During this same time, 85 mills were opened in Canada. In Michigan, Canadian softwood occupied 53.2 percent of the market share in 1983.

Clearly, we must address this serious problem.

In addition, United States imports of both live swine for slaughter and fresh, frozen, and

chilled pork meat from Canada have increased substantially over the past few years. This increase is the result of several factors, including the strength of the dollar and Canadian Government support policies which constitute an unfair subsidy on Canadian pork exports.

Agricultural products must be treated or processed before being sold to end users or manufacturers. Producers and initial processors, therefore, are part of the same industry. A high tariff exists on live hogs from Canada which are subsidized. To escape this tariff, processed pork is sent from Canada to the United States. When United States pork producers brought a trade remedies case citing injury to our pork industry due to the influx of subsidized fresh, chilled, and frozen pork from Canada, however, the International Trade Commission ruled that processed pork products were not part of the same industry as live hogs, and therefore countervailing duties should not be imposed on the pork, which they determined was not directly subsidized.

In light of the intent of Congress, this was a very questionable decision, underlining the importance of clarifying Congress' original legislative intent. This is even clearer when we realize that the result of this unfortunate decision has been that while the import number of live hogs from Canada was reduced by 7 percent last year, fresh and chilled imported pork from Canada has increased 22 percent, thereby overwhelming all benefits of the countervailing duty placed on live hogs. Michigan, just across the border, has taken in more than its share of Canadian pork.

This ITC determination conflicts not only with the intent of Congress, it conflicts with findings made by the Commerce Department. As a result of the ITC, Canadian producers are escaping punitive duties on their hogs simply by slaughtering them in Canada and exporting pork, which remained exempt from the extra duties.

In the past 3 years, the U.S. trade deficit has tripled and the instances I have cited involving hogs, pork, and softwoods are a part of the reason.

This unprecedented trade deficit is partially the result of the strong dollar, which in turn is partially a result of the huge Federal deficit. It is therefore necessary that we reduce and eliminate the deficit if we are to restore the balance to our balance of payments.

Canada is our largest trading partner, and a healthy and competitive trade relationship between our two countries is in the best interest of us all. But our merchandise trade deficit with Canada more than tripled between 1980 and 1984. Widespread Canadian Federal and Provincial subsidies on products exported to the United States have placed our domestic industries in an unfair competitive disadvantage. The result is lost jobs, diminished production and production capacity, and a threat to the future of our farm families, small and large business, and entire industries.

American producers are good enough to compete anywhere in the world. It is not through any lack of will or capacity that they often fall behind on world markets. Rather, we often see foreign governments offering subsidies for their industries that compete against

our domestic industries. Decisions such as the one reached by the ITC regarding Canadian pork imports do not help to alleviate this situation. Our trade laws must be geared toward securing a fair and open world market for the American farmer and manufacturer. Their products can stand up to any in the world.

MRS. SHIRLEY PHELPS
HONORED

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 28, 1986, at 7 p.m., Mrs. Shirley Phelps will be honored at the National Democratic Club by her many friends and admirers for her 25 years of dedicated and personable service to the National Democratic Club and its members.

At this event, many Members of Congress, family, and friends will gather to honor this very personable person who has faithfully carried out her duties at the club.

Shirley is perhaps one of the most recognized persons in the Democratic Club to both members and guests. Her ready smile and witty conversation was always present and available.

Her ability to recognize and greet members and guests is legendary. This ability has helped to make many neophytes in the club feel welcome and comfortable.

I am delighted that many of my colleagues and friends of Shirley have decided to honor her. I am pleased to thank and congratulate her on her many years of service and commitment to duty. She is truly an example to all of us.

DARING TO SPEAK OUT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, at a recent dinner honoring Paul Findley, our former colleague and author of the recently published "They Dare to Speak Out," a distinguished American Rabbi, Dr. Elmer Berger, introduced the featured guest with a speech on American politics and the Mideast, the value of which merits reprinting in the RECORD.

Dr. Berger was ordained after graduating from Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati and the University of Cincinnati where he was elected Phi Beta Kappa. He served congregations in Pontiac and Flint, MI, before helping to found the American Council for Judaism in 1943, which he became executive director in 1955 and later executive vice president. Since then, Dr. Berger has specialized in issues related to the preservation of Judaism as a religion of universal values in the United States and in advancement of the Mideast peace process.

Rabbi Berger's observations and insights are as provocative as they are useful. In the spirit of the Argentinian editor Jacobo Timmer-

man, he concerns himself with the themes of world silence, democracy, and its susceptibility to subversion and the ever-recurring phenomena of political persecution.

REMARKS BY ELMER BERGER

It would be possible to begin these remarks by saying to the spirit of Diogenes, "Throw away your lantern." But although this is a happy occasion, it is also too suffused with serious matters to be so flip. For we are here to honor a man who really believes literally in the old maxim, "Politics is the art of the possible". And we are here to acknowledge the import of a book this man has written which, if the grammarian purists will forgive me, translates the word "possible" in that maxim as an activist verb rather than a static noun or adjective. For Paul Findley's "They Dare to Speak Out" is testament to the truth of another injunction of democracy that works: "Let the people know". For Findley obviously believes that in knowing, the "possible" of politics is stretchable, expandable, extendable to horizons to be better than we are. So, honoring this man and acknowledging the merit of his book we reaffirm our faith in the inherent superiority of freedom over regimes which operate on the premise that what is politically possible is limited to what a few know, or think they know, who confuse power with omniscience and are tempted to claim near-infallibility by virtue of their accessibility to memoranda stamped "top secret".

But the title of Paul Findley's book contains an implicit caveat. With deliberation, I am sure, he chose the word "dare" to characterize the action of those he selected for speaking out on one of the most politically hazardous public issues of recent American history. That the former journalist and congressman chose this particular word suggests two, following ideas. First, that in the problems of Zionism and American relations with the State of Israel, a kind of mind-fix has set in among the American people. The two phenomena have been cultivated as subjects above and apart from the usual, hurly-burly of popular, political debate. They have been invested with a kind of sanctity and the holy of holies is perceived as a place not to be invaded politically without hazard. And secondly, in commending those who have taken the "dare", Findley implies that they have performed a service to our * * * induced by methods of intimidation which, if not all illegal flirt with the barest minimum of a free society's values.

The book is about much more than the unquestioned efficiency—if not the ruthlessness of the American-Israel Political Action committee, the official Israeli lobby, too often called "the Jewish lobby", in Washington. Findley documents meticulously the pervasive influence of AIPAC reaching to schoolboards to affect decisions about what text books may be used in local school systems, as for example in Tucson, Arizona. He lists universities throughout the country where Zionist influence, operating on academic authorities or boards or regents nominate or veto who may or may not be invited as visiting lecturers, or who may, or may not be, approved for tenure. It penetrates church councils and pulpits where inter-faith dialogues are being held to persuade the participants, with not-so-subtle threats amounting to defamation, that pro-Israeli political positions have a proper place in theological discourse involving Judaism and often Islam. And AIPAC influence on the managers of mass media of information

often exceed conventional methods of competition for column inches or air time. I can testify personally to the truth of the examples Findley recounts in all these vital areas of American public opinion makers. All of these activities are in addition to, as well as in support of, the more or less jungle rules followed by most of the more obvious lobbying efforts among the nation's political leaders. AIPAC, directly, or through surrogates, reaches across legally established election districts, taking advantage of the obscene costs of modern political campaigns, making financial contributions supporting candidates voicing the most extravagant commitment to Israel and discouraging support for more responsible opinions expressing some objectively demonstrable concerns for wider American interests. In short, there is virtually no working part of the American public opinion machinery in which the Zionist/Israel lobby does not supply ample lubrication.

There is very little real secrecy about these activities and, in a strict sense, certainly no deep, dark conspiracies. In fact, the AIPAC managers boast of their achievements, no doubt believing that nothing succeeds like success and to underline, perhaps even to exaggerate public perception of their power increases the efficacy of their intimidation potential. So, after the 1984 election, Thomas Dine, according to The Wall Street Journal, boasted that what he called "Jewish money" defeated Senator Charles Percy who had been Chairman of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee and had expressed serious reservations about the Israeli claim to have annexed Jerusalem. I suggest to you that such a boast from another's mouth would be labeled an anti-semitic canard. And Dine, the Director of AIPAC, in the same report described the present Congress as the "most pro-Israel" in history, as if its members should be awarded at least Boy Scout merit badges for such zealous minding of the business of the American people.

What is so worrisome and frustrating in all of this is not really the reach of the Zionist lobby into every hamlet of our nation's life. It is rather the apathy, the acquiescence of the American people, beginning with our political, academic, journalistic and clerical leadership. And the worry and frustration are intensified by the fact that many of these same leaders consistently remind the nation of the vital interests of America and the free world in the Middle East.

The great service of Paul Findley's book is that it is a collection of documented case-histories which, at least partially, explains the contradiction of a free people losing by default to a special pleading apparatus in an area of public issues involving vital, national interests. And the wide variety of the cases Findley examines cautions all Americans the distortion of the democratic processes begins in the fabric of our own lives and is not limited to a mishapen policy toward Israel and the broader, more important and assets of the rest of the Middle East.

It would be inappropriate for me to pre-empt much more of this evening which belongs to Paul Findley. But I would speak less than my conscience and, I think, knowledge, if I failed to mention here a nuance of a difference of opinion with a few lines in the concluding pages of his revealing book. He says, "The Jewish community, acting alone, could retrieve free speech from the casualty list" of victims of this peculiar reticence in our political dialogue about issues

associated with this Zionist/Israel phenomenon. He does add that Jews are "some of the most thoughtful and outspoken critics of Israel. But they speak out as individuals. They are not seen as Jewish leaders".

I am pleased to have been included in his list as I am always pleased to be on the hit list of the Anti-Defamation League which, in its perceived passion for civil and human rights, exercises its right to vilify any who find the Zionist state less than saintly or who criticize the minions it directs through the organized Zionist movement in the United States. It is patently not true that those of us who will not be told what to think by the Zionist/Israel apparatus all act or speak as only individuals. For more than forty years I have had the devoted and generous support of an organized following who have made it possible for me to keep alive and, I think to enrich, the tradition of anti-Zionism which is older in American life by many decades than perceived, present, uncounted support of Zionism. And there are other organizations and numerous individuals who stand on a platform essentially the same as ours. We reject the anti-semitic conception of Jews as a separate national entity. Judaism, or free identity as Jews, we all insist has nothing at all to do with the gratuitous extension of Israel's extraterritorial nationality claims automatically to include all Jews. We recognize the national character of the Palestinians, displaced originally by the discriminatory character of Israel's illegitimate "Jewish people" nationality claims, Palestinians still condemned to exile by the Zionist state's exclusivist citizenship laws and the institutionalized exclusivism of its social, political and economic structures.

The failure is not an absence of protest against the Zionist practice of repression and intimidation Findley inventories. The failure lies with the operators of the political power-structure of American life. The tin horn, self-appointed spokesmen for a non-existent entity called "an American Jewish community" are welcomed at the White House and their advice is sought before the men elected to represent the interests of all the American people make a move involving Israel. But when one of us numbered among those who "dare to speak out" writes a letter to the Secretary of State, or asks for an appointment we are met with stone-walling or a computerized reply. It is not that the policy-makers do not know we exist. It is that they want to hang on to the claim of deniability. They do not want to know what we have to say. For to hear us and comprehend what we have to say would start a process of self-indictment for many of the power-brokers on counts of dereliction, of failure to enforce even existing legislation designed to maintain the integrity of the nationality status of individual American citizens and of any voluntary organizations they may design to sustain their legitimate heritage. Those are harsh words. But the accusations can be substantiated. As my dear friend and frequent mentor, Dr. W.T. Mallison has made clear more than once and about more than one aspect of this problem, one constructive action the United States Government could perform would be to enforce relevant legislation, without fear or favor.

Without presuming to the multiple roles of prosecutor, judge and jury, I believe, on the basis of my own years of research and that of more specialized authorities, there is sufficient credible evidence to warrant the suspicion that the tax laws, the Foreign

Agents Registration Act, the laws limiting the use to which grants in military are put, the espionage acts, the legislation requiring the licensing of certain sophisticated components of weaponry are all enforced, with something less than the constitutionally-sworn application of the laws of the land without regard to race, religious faith or ethnic derivation. We have had deals already made on the Pollard case. We have silence on the Kryton trigger case. We know United Jewish Appeal funds finance settlements in the occupied territories in violation of both domestic and international law. When I review this dismal record of the elected guardians of our national integrity I am often reminded of Britain's World War I statesman, David Lloyd George who is reported once to have said, "I am a man of principle; and one of my principles is expediency".

The second reservation I have about Paul Findley's well-intentioned exhortation to American Jews is that, innocently, he employs Zionist jargon when he speaks of "the American Jewish community". While it is a convenient expression, it is dangerously misleading when employed in any political context. For in the political sense not only is there no such entity as a community of Jews. It is a concept easily determined to be fictitious by any investigation of the genuine conceptions American Jews are proud to hold of their own identity. Ask the garden variety American Jew, walking the street or managing his shop, or practicing his profession how he thinks of his place in the political spectrum of this democracy and by far the majority will insist upon his status as an individual, American citizen. Ask him if the American Jewish Committee, or the collective called Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, the so-called Presidents Club, or the Anti-Defamation League speaks for him on general American political issues or can deliver his or her vote and he or she is likely to be insulated. The chances are more than 100 to 1 he will not know the president of any of these organizations, even if he should happen to belong and he will not know, let alone knowing anything about a litter of them all together. Not more than half of all American Jews belong to the ever-breeding number of listed, so-called "Jewish" organizations. Something like 4% of American Jews contribute to the United Jewish Appeal and some of those do so under duress which threatens jobs or social ostracism. None of this is esoteric knowledge. It would be easily available to even amateur researchers on the staffs of our legislators and in the White House. But it would be inconvenient for the incumbents to know these things for it might greatly alter a cliché in the usual, dull campaigning and it would shift responsibility for a seriously flawed foreign policy to those who are responsible for declaring or financing it, instead of their posing as pragmatic politicians democratically responding to perceived attitudes of a small segment of American voters.

I say to you with full confidence that there is no one, and no organization and no conglomerate of organizations possessing legitimate mandates to speak for American Jews. If general characterizations are to be used, the old maxim that where there are two Jews there are always three opinions is much more accurate. There are no ballot boxes to be stuffed for the election of those with vested interests who claim to speak for this country's six million Jews; and if history tells us anything it says, "woe to anyone

who ever tries to erect an electoral structure for a separate constituency of this country's citizens who are Jews." "The corruption of language", said some anonymous sage of another era, "is the beginning of the corruption of civilization". I have devoted this must time to some examination of the vocabulary often used to characterize Jews in American life because Paul Findley makes a point in his book. And I suggest to this audience that the imprecise use of language which often says "Jews" when it should say "Zionist" and which says "Judaism" when "Zionism" is the accurate term, only serves Zionist ends. The confusion is deliberately cultivated by the Zionist apparatus. Where it is successfully employed it magnifies Zionist strength many fold. We who oppose excessive Zionist influence in American policy-making and who oppose Zionism's discriminatory society in Israel as the root cause of the Palestine conflict should do everything possible to isolate the phenomenon, shrinking its perceived political clout in the public image by respecting the crucial, character difference between this movement of a foreign, theocratic/racist nationalism and the universally acknowledged moral and ethical values of Judaism which are shared by the sister religious faiths of Islam and Christianity.

With apologies for taking so much of your time, I close paraphrasing the last few thoughts eloquently expressed by Paul Findley in the concluding paragraphs of his book. Not without justifiable apprehension he suggests that if we Americans fall in our responsibilities for a peace in the Middle East built upon justice we may invite the apocryphal catastrophe of modern war. A prelude to that unspeakable horror could well be that we Americans would have lost the delicate, sensitive skills to maintain the precarious balances of freedom which are the soul of our democracy. In the last, eloquent sentence of his book Findley puts it this way:

"In short, when a lobby stifles free speech nationally on one controversial topic—the Middle East—all free speech is threatened."

He might have put it somewhat differently. He might have said if we Americans allow this to happen we will by default have surrendered one of our most precious birthrights. But however it is said, this veteran on the hustings says to Paul Findley, a solemn "Amen!" and offers a rousing "Salute!" for his book and a prayer which says, "More power to your good right arm."

JOSH HASSOL REPORTS ON OZONE POLLUTION

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, this past semester, my staff and I had the privilege of having Joshua Hassol, of Norton, MA, serve as an intern in my office. Josh, who will be a junior at Wesleyan University in Connecticut, spent a semester in Washington working in my office and pursuing his interest in learning how the legislative process operates. I was impressed by Josh's diligence and perseverance as well as his deep interest in not only our Government's workings, but also in current domestic and foreign policy issues.

In particular, during his tenure, Josh discussed a firm interest in the environment and in legislative proposals that would address the problems toxic waste and emissions are causing. An area that Josh explored related to ozone pollution and the policy that the Environmental Protection Agency is considering. This is a very timely issue, considering the fact that the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health and Environment, on which I serve, is currently addressing the problem of acid rain and ozone pollution through a comprehensive acid deposition control act.

I was so pleased with the clear and concise analysis in a culminating report Josh Hassol wrote for me that I wanted to share this report with my colleagues. I wanted to extend to Josh my appreciation and the appreciation of my staff for his hard work this past semester and with him success in his future efforts. The report follows:

INTRODUCTION

Details of EPA ozone policy are briefly discussed in this memo, along with the process by which ozone is formed in the atmosphere, the health and economic threats it poses, and the growing issue of non-attainment.

TWO ROLES OF OZONE

Ozone plays two distinct and contrary roles in the atmosphere. In the upper atmosphere it is the source of the much-discussed ozone layer, which shields the earth from harmful ultraviolet rays. Because of this, ozone is absolutely necessary in the upper atmosphere, and there is concern that the ozone layer may be being depleted. In the lower atmosphere, however, ozone presents a serious threat to the environment and the public health. Because of the chemistry and dynamics of the atmosphere, ozone can not be exchanged between layers, and therefore the issues of the ozone layer and ozone air pollution remain separate. This memo focusses on ozone as an air pollutant.

OZONE FORMATION

The problem of ozone air pollution is a particularly vexing one. Central to the complication is the fact that ozone, as a pollutant, is not released directly into the atmosphere, but is instead the product of a complex chain of atmospheric reactions involving various emissions. This makes ozone an evasive pollutant to regulate, as its sources are diverse and not easily targeted.

The production of ozone in the atmosphere begins with the emissions of precursor gasses, specifically hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides. The precursors have many sources, among them fossil fuel burning power plants, motor vehicles, petroleum refineries, petroleum storage tanks, and many less obvious sources and activities, such as painting, using household cleansers, and filling our cars with gasoline. In the atmosphere nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) is broken down, releasing an oxygen atom (O). The oxygen then reacts with molecular oxygen in the atmosphere (O_2), to form an O_3 molecule, or ozone. Of great importance is the fact that the original breakdown of NO_2 is powered by sunlight, and therefore ozone is only produced during daylight hours. Nitrous oxide (NO), produced during the breakdown of NO_2 , can rapidly react with O_3 (ozone) to produce NO_2 and O_2 , thereby destroying the ozone and bringing the cycle back to where it began. The reaction system

can thus establish an equilibrium, wherein ozone is produced and destroyed, and its concentration regulated. The situation is complicated, however, by simultaneous emissions of hydrocarbons, which interfere with the cycle and allow ozone to accumulate at higher than equilibrium levels.

HEALTH EFFECTS

Data gathered from both animal experiments and controlled studies of humans indicate that even short term exposure to ozone can be detrimental to health. Minor complications include eye and throat irritation and chest pain. Major problems can also occur, such as reduced lung function, respiratory track damage, decreased blood-flow to the heart due to thickening of arterial walls, and lung fibrosis. Individuals with respiratory problems (such as asthmatics) have a greater susceptibility to the health effects of ozone, but large numbers of healthy people can also suffer.

ECONOMIC EFFECTS

Several national studies have been conducted to determine the economic consequences of ozone pollution. The studies examined virtually every cash agricultural crop in the nation and show a clear, if not absolute, link between ozone and crop losses. It is believed that 90% of the crop losses due to pollution are caused by ozone, and economic losses of several billion dollars annually have been estimated. The studies are supported by biochemical experiments that have conclusively shown ozone to damage plant foliage, root structure, and to inhibit growth and yield.

Ozone is also believed by many scientists to be causing severe damage to many ecosystems, including forests. This additional economic and environmental concerns of considerable magnitude. For example, some estimates of economic losses from forest damage exceed \$10 billion annually.

NONATTAINMENT

In 1971 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for all photochemical oxidants (of which ozone is one) were set at .08 ppm, and an attainment date of 1982 was mandated. When the Clean Air Act was amended in 1977, the attainment dates for some severely polluted areas were extended to 1987. In 1979 the NAAQS were changed to ozone standards specifically, and the levels were relaxed to .12 ppm. Even with these extensions and relaxations, however, it appears certain that many of our major cities are not even going to come close to meeting the NAAQS.

Every major metropolitan area in the United States has ozone levels above the NAAQS. Predictably, Los Angeles has the highest amount. Perhaps of more concern than overall levels is the fact that since 1981, 17 cities have shown increases in ozone levels, while only twelve cities have shown decreases, and 7 have shown no change. The Philadelphia region is one of the areas in which ozone levels have risen since 1981; from .153 ppm to .2 ppm or above (.2 ppm in 1983). It is virtually certain that the New Jersey-Philadelphia area will be non-attainment in 1987.

EPA POLICY

The EPA seems reluctant to make any definite statements with regard to ozone policy. From my conversations, I gathered that the Agency is committed to stringent regulation and enforcement and is considering regional programs to help problem areas develop strategies for meeting the NAAQS. Beyond that, the individuals I spoke with provided no details.

The EPA formulated a two stage approach for dealing with ozone. Stage one is essentially a strengthening of existing programs for monitoring, regulation and compliance, and would also include a "tracking program, to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the components of stage one Stage two, sometimes referred to as Gasoline Marketing, is concerned with controlling the release of vapors when gasoline is being pumped into automobiles. (During the filling of underground storage tanks, gasoline vapor emissions are under the jurisdiction of stage one.) As mentioned earlier, gasoline vapors are one of the precursor emissions that can form ozone in the atmosphere. Specifically, they are a major source of hydrocarbons. With stage two technologies, refueling vapors are collected at the pump and returned to the underground tank via a specialized nozzle and hose system. Of importance to New Jersey is that since much of its ozone problem originates in the Philadelphia and New York areas, it is doubtful that implementing stage two technologies would be effective in lowering its ozone levels to the mandated NAAQS.

Another alternative is onboard technologies, wherein each automobile would be equipped with a system for containing vapors from its gas tank and burning them in the engine, rather than simply releasing them as in present automobiles. Onboard systems would appear to necessitate federal policy in much the same way as catalytic converters on automobiles do.

The need for government action is addressed in H.R. 4567, the Acid Deposition Control Act of 1986, which would amend section 202(a)(6) of the Clean Air Act. H.R. 4567, mandates that within six months of enactment, the EPA institute nationwide regulations requiring either stage two technologies, onboard systems, or both.

Still another option is to chemically lower the volatility of gasoline. Volatility is a measure of how readily a substance vaporizes or evaporates, so that by lowering the volatility of gasoline, the emission of vapors can be reduced. Furthermore, volatility lowering would affect all automobiles, regardless of what onboard technologies they may or may not have.

A related issue is the fact that before onboard systems can be instituted, specific national volatility levels must be established, as the specifications of onboard systems (i.e. the size of containment vessels, filters, etc.) are contingent on volatility.

FRANCIS X. BELLOTTI

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the end of his current term, the able attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Honorable Francis X. Bellotti, will retire from public office.

During his 12 years as our State's chief legal officer, Attorney General Bellotti has made the office a vital force in benefit of our citizens. The political vision that has shaped the philosophy of his office is eloquently stated in Mr. Bellotti's recent address to the State Democratic Convention, and I would like to share his remarks with my colleagues:

REMARKS OF ATTORNEY GENERAL FRANCIS X. BELLOTTI AT THE MASSACHUSETTS DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION, SPRINGFIELD CIVIC CENTER, FRIDAY, MAY 16, 1986

It has been a long, hard road, with many turns, that has brought me to this time and place—to stand before you tonight with the singular honor of representing the Democratic Party.

I speak to you as someone who has truly grown up with the Democratic Party—not just because I have been in Democratic politics for three decades, but much more important, because growing up poor, it was my support, my source of opportunity, my inspiration.

And as we begin this convention, I can feel the same strength and vitality that made the Democratic Party the powerful force for social change that it was in those early, difficult years.

In the 20's and 30's, there were no pensions, no medical benefits, no job benefits, no child care, no elderly programs. We were a generation that grew up in a depression, trying to survive in a world where we always seemed to be on the outside.

We did not turn on the radio at night and hear editorials about the "quality of life". We did not open newspapers in the morning and read feature stories about "lifestyles". In those "good old days", we talked about, thought about and planned for—survival.

My father was gassed in the first world war and stayed in a veteran's hospital until I was 16, when he died. My mother supported our family on the unequal pay that women earned—so I know what discrimination is and I know that the E.R.A. is not a feminist issue—it is a survival issue—I also know that I could not have lived—or ever have become educated without what we call social or democratic legislation.

The values we learned then were the values of human dignity and personal sacrifice. We learned that government had to protect the worker, the young, the elderly—the people.

It was during this time that both institutions and individuals had a natural alliance with a strong central government, a government that was perceived as necessary to coordinate the economic and social programs that could put our world back together again.

It was a time when liberal values and liberal assumptions went virtually unchallenged.

And then it all changed. Our parity and our programs were so successful, our precepts so unassailable, that we did not see the urgency of new problems on the horizon. We had remembered all of the answers, but we had forgotten the questions.

For a while, we stopped talking to all of the people. We talked to narrow constituencies and we addressed narrow problems. We still cared, but it didn't show.

The warmth and humanity of personal leadership, with all of its frailties, was submerged. We developed a whole class of technocrats, managers and statisticians to give us supporting data for our assumptions, to help us fine tune our solutions. We formed committees and blue ribbon commissions to make our decisions.

And something very important was lost along the way. Many of our political leaders gave away their power to make the decisions and lost their will to fight for the individual.

When political leaders stopped asking the important questions and began hiring managers to give them the right answers, they

became farther and farther removed from the human aspects of decision making. Managers are not chosen for their strength of character or the integrity of their personal opinions. They are asked to put aside such human elements and to rely upon "professionalism" and "expertise".

When the manager tells the politician that schools must be closed or factories shut down, the human aspect of those decisions—the price that must be paid by the children, the workers and the families—is just another variable in the equation—another intellectual problem that must be addressed in the managerial scheme and not the overriding consideration. And there is lost the fundamental purpose of all government—to take care of its people.

We, as Democratic leaders, have always seen things differently. To us, government is not a business with a profit and loss bottom line. To us, fiscal responsibility means doing as economically as possible the things that people need to have done but cannot do themselves.

As far back as 1764, James Otis said: "The end of government being the good of mankind points out its great duties: It is above all things, to provide for the security, the quiet, the happy enjoyment of life, liberty and prosperity. * * *"

That hasn't changed and never will.

Yes, we need technical experts in a complex technological world—they play an important role. But clearly, the most important force for change must come—has to come—from the will, the drive, the spirit of our great political leaders.

And that brings us to this precise moment in time. Maybe, without even becoming aware of it, we have begun to understand this, we have begun to awaken.

In our State, particularly, we are in the midst of a renaissance. These have become good times—they will remain good times if we only know what to do with them.

So I am especially proud and honored to be able to address this convention—my birthplace—and my party—at a time when our Commonwealth is stronger economically and in almost every other way than any State in the Nation. When, by virtue of the quality of its Democratic leaders, it has an unparalleled opportunity to be a driving force as the national Democratic Party boldly challenges the future.

Our State and our party can be justifiably proud of their ability to produce leaders of national stature—throughout history and to this very moment.

And as we go forward from here, it is not individual issues that should consume our thoughts—they must be addressed—but they pass and new issues constantly appear. What endures is the general commitment to all of our people, to their happiness and to their dignity. The purity of this commitment is the very heart of the Democratic Party.

It is here and in strong political leadership that our hope for the future lies.

For only in a leadership vacuum would we be seeing judges and courts asked to make moral and political decisions—decisions they are not equipped to make. A process that makes people lose faith in their government. Because any social change that does not involve the people themselves in the political process is, at best, illusory and at worst, unjust.

Today, for the first time in many years, we in the Democratic Party are asking questions instead of just proposing answers. We are asking where we have been, where we are and where we want to go.

I hope we have learned that political leadership does not derive from a negotiated agenda, nor from impersonal managerial strategies, nor from articulating the perceived public will.

The political leaders we seek to carry on the tradition of the Democratic Party will not be just managers, they will not be just idealogues, they will not be just consensus takers, they will not be just power brokers.

They will be the men and women who will refuse to routinely sacrifice their judgment to public opinion, who will not be afraid to take political risks—including the risk of losing political power. Because it is not power that corrupts, it is the fear of losing power.

Above all, our political leaders of the future must be men and women who care about people, who believe that they each have a special kind of dignity. They must believe in the enduring values of the Democratic Party, values that will outlast time and temporal troubles, the values that have made it the magnificent instrument of social change that it is, the party of my childhood—and of my future.

Leaders who will understand and accept that ours is a party of turbulence and dissent—of excitement and passion—the powerful and driving force that has brought us here tonight, that is our life—and our future—that has given us the opportunity to be anything in the world that we want to be.

As you have taken me from defeat after defeat and given me the opportunity for 12 wonderful years to do what I most wanted in all this world.

In a short while, I will be leaving office—but tonight I want you to know how grateful I am to you and to the people of my State. With all of the hard times, I would not have missed it—or you, for the world.

There will, I am sure, be better attorneys General than I, but there will never be one who cares more about you than I do.

Thank you—for everything.

REFLECTIONS ON MEMORIAL DAY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate another Memorial Day, all Americans should remember the supreme sacrifice made by the more than 1 million Americans who have died in the service of their country. By remembering them, we honor their example.

In 1868, Gen. John Logan, the commander-in-chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, stated:

Let no ravages of time testify to coming generations that we have forgotten as people the cost of a free and independent nation.

While the observance of Memorial Day evolved out of tributes to the dead—both Union and Confederate—from the Civil War, this day has become an opportunity to honor all of our country's courageous soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen. Throughout our country's history, they have shed their blood in defense of our country, our values, and our freedoms.

During the American Civil War, the bloodiest conflict in our country's history, thousands of men—from the North and the South—died during the goriest single day of that war. It has been almost 124 years since the noise of thousands of Union and Confederate rifles and cannons filled the air near Sharpsburg, MD, in the Battle of Antietam. Today, our country is not at war. But, neither are we at peace. In recent weeks, an American soldier has been killed during a terrorist bombing of a nightclub in West Berlin. Two other Americans, the Air Force crew of an F-111, died in carrying out a retaliatory air strike against Libya, a country whose Government has aided and abetted international terrorism.

Our country's history is replete with hundreds of military battles and skirmishes—both minor footnotes and major historical events. Recently, American military personnel have become the targets of terrorists. The death of brave American military personnel, at the hands of cowardly assassins, is no different than death on the battlefield.

On Monday, May 26, 1986, let us all remember the young men and women who have died in defense of the United States and freedom. Further, let us pray for a peaceful and just world in which young Americans will no longer face death at the hands of anonymous terrorists or hostile forces.

en. James A. Garfield, a future President of the United States, served as the main speaker at the observance of the first national Memorial Day. On May 30, 1868, speaking at the National Cemetery at Arlington, VA, General Garfield remarked:

I am oppressed with a sense of the impropriety of uttering words on this occasion. If silence is ever golden, it must be here beside the graves of 15,000 men whose lives were more significant than speech and whose death was a poem the music of which can never be sung. With words we make promises, plight faith, praise virtue. Promises may not be kept; plighted faith may be broken; and vaunted virtue may be only the cunning mask of vice. We do not know one promise these men made, one pledge they gave, one word they spoke, but we do know they summed up and perfected, by one supreme act, the highest virtues of men and citizens. For love of country they accepted death, and thus resolved all doubts, and made immortal their patriotism and virtue.

THE AFL-CIO AND SOUTH AFRICA

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a number of Members of Congress introduced a new sanctions bill against the Government of South Africa. While most media attention has been paid to congressional pressure on the Government of South Africa, as well as pressure on United States companies and institutions of higher learning to divest themselves of South African holdings, the labor movement in this country has been also actively involved in the fight to eliminate apartheid.

I am including an article from the April 21 edition of Africa News on the work being done in this country by labor in conjunction with the Free South Africa Movement. It is only after all Americans work together can we really begin to have an effect on the Government of South Africa. The struggle to abolish apartheid will not come easily, and I'm certain labor will play an important role in this struggle.

U.S./SOUTH AFRICA—ANTIAPARTHEID ACTIONS SPREAD

NEW YORK.—Shanties built to dramatize the living conditions of South African's blacks have sprung up on campuses across the country as part of a new wave of anti-apartheid protests that have included actions on more than 100 campuses and labor-sponsored rallies in seven major cities.

Most of the campus protests have focused on forcing university trustees to sell investments in companies doing business in South Africa. Students in 35 states took part, according to the American Committee on Africa in New York, which for the fifth year acted as coordinator for two "National Weeks of Anti-Apartheid Action" between March 21 and April 6.

On March 22 the American labor federation, the AFL-CIO, sponsored the rallies to protest corporate involvement in South Africa. A key focus of these events was the Shell Oil boycott launched in January as a joint effort of the United Mine Workers (UMW) and the Free South Africa Movement (FSAM).

According to the organizers, local boycott committees have been set up in ten cities, with active campaigns already under way in Miami, Houston, Birmingham, Detroit and Cleveland. The UMW has devoted seven full-time organizers to the boycott and UMW President Richard Trumka has vowed to wage a "million dollar" campaign against Shell.

One of the largest, sustained college protests has been taking place in Berkeley, where students calling for divestment and "an end to institutionalized racism" at the University of California have clashed repeatedly with police and campus security officials.

The Berkeley demonstrations began in late March when students erected twelve shanties, which were quickly torn down by city police who cited them as a "fire hazard." When demonstrators erected eighteen new shanties two days later—apparently with the approval of the local fire marshal—a major confrontation developed.

Seven squads with over 200 police in full riot gear moved in early on the morning of April 3, surrounded the shanties and began assaulting students in what one observer called "a full scale police riot." By most accounts, demonstrators then responded by throwing rocks, bottles and eggs at the police and pushing garbage dumpsters, bins and other obstacles in the way of paddy wagons being used to remove arrested protesters. As a result, it took police more than four hours to dismantle the shanties and arrest 89 protesters.

Administration and police officials blame the protesters for the violent confrontation, but the coalition of groups that organized the shanties disagree. Coalition members claim that police had prepared for a violent confrontation, saying that the policemen who staged the attack were not wearing badges by which they could be identified, that they arrested coalition's legal observers first and that they attempted to keep the media away from the area of the protest.

In the week following the shanty actions, students held two major rallies on campus and blockaded the doors of one main administration building in an effort to press their case.

"We've had dialogue after dialogue after dialogue with them [the administration], and they've refused to allow us even to sit on the committees that are considering these issues," said one participant in the protest, 22-year-old English major Mia Laurence. Berkeley students "will do whatever it takes" to achieve their goals, she said in a telephone interview.

Continuing frustration over the reluctance of university administrations to divest has been behind many of the other campus confrontations this spring. At the University of Utah, where students built three shanties to press their demands that the school divest \$1.7 million in South Africa-related stocks, Alan Chandler, a spokesman for the protesters declared: "Frankly, we're convinced the university will not consider the issue of divestment seriously until they find the student body restive. We're hoping these shanties will force them to reconsider the issue."

Portland, Oregon students staged a sit-in at the offices of IBM, where twelve persons were arrested. At Boston and Brown Universities and Smith College, divestment protesters have staged hunger strikes. And at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., a reverse apartheid simulation day—in which white students were the object of discrimination—was followed by a sit-in at the entrance to the administration building by some 50 students demanding divestiture.

Shanties of various types have been built at the universities of Texas, Wisconsin, Michigan, New Hampshire, Maryland and North Carolina, as well as at Duke, Yale, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Dartmouth College, among others. But the mock townships have not been universally welcomed.

Many school administrations ordered dismantlement of the improvised structures. Two of the Utah shanties were fire bombed the first week after they were erected, as was one of the University of Michigan's Ann Arbor campus. At Dartmouth, one of the first campuses to erect shanties, conservative students armed with sledgehammers and crowbars tore down two structures last February before campus police intervened. The subsequent legal battle on the New Hampshire campus has drawn national attention.

Nonetheless, anti-apartheid students at Dartmouth persevered, turning one shanty into a "mobile home" that was trucked first to a protest at Phelps Dodge's New York headquarters and later used in a demonstration at Columbia University.

The two-week protest climaxed on April 4, the 18th anniversary of the assassination of Martin Luther King, which organizers dubbed National Divestment Protest Day. A major rally in New York City that day included stops at Citibank, Shell Oil Company and Mobil as organizers sought to highlight those companies' involvement in South Africa.

In Atlanta, a coalition of student and community groups laid a wreath at the grave of Martin Luther King Jr., and then organized a picket out-side Coca-Cola's downtown headquarters to highlight a boycott of Coke products because of that company's investments in South Africa. At central park in downtown Houston, more than 200 student

May 22, 1986

protesters rallied to demand that the University of Houston divest.

But many of this year's protests have had a broader focus than earlier anti-apartheid actions. "Intensified student pressure for divestment during the Weeks of Action has also been the occasion for the linking of anti-apartheid work to struggles against domestic racism and U.S. intervention in Central America," says Josh Nessen, national student coordinator for the American Committee on Africa (ACOA).

A National Divestment Day rally at the University of Chicago, for example, was addressed by South African exile Don Ngubeni and Julio Dimas Sosas, a student from El Salvador, in support of both divestment and an end to U.S. support for the Duarte government. A joint project of the southern African and Central American solidarity movements, Ngubeni and Sosas toured the United States in March, making stops in Charlottesville, Va., Gainesville, Fla., Montgomery, Ala., and Madison, Wis. A major aim of the tour was the mobilization of opposition to U.S. funding for UNITA in Angola and the Nicaraguan contras.

Nessen believes the resurgence of campus protests during this school year has laid the basis for continuing actions in the months ahead. "The campus and grassroots movement has put South Africa back on center stage," he said.

The locus of action may now shift to the labor-led Shell boycott campaign, which though still in its formative stages, has already had a major impact on anti-apartheid organizing in the United States. It is the first national, labor-initiated anti-apartheid campaign and the first recent effort to mount a nationwide consumer boycott of a company because of its links to South Africa.

In Houston, local groups stage demonstrations each Wednesday at Shell's offices there. Ada Edwards, the head of the local Free South Africa Movement chapter, reports that they are planning daily protests. Among the campaign's backers is the local chapter of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union, which represents Shell employees in Houston.

In Birmingham, Ala., Sidney Hill, a black electrician and UMW member who works underground at a local mine, has taken a leave of absence to work full time on the boycott. A local coalition of labor, community and civil rights activists launched the boycott March 6 at a press conference in downtown Birmingham, and Hill reports that since then there have been pickets "two or three days a week" at Shell gas stations in the area.

"Unless the dollars stop flowing into Shell gas stations, they will not deem it necessary to stop supporting apartheid," says Hill. "That's the key—to move out of rhetoric and into action."

The Shell campaign seems certain to bolster efforts by activists to bar companies operating in South Africa from doing business with state, local and municipal governments, many of which have already passed divestment legislation. Selective purchase measures restricting a company's ability to do business with state and local government are beginning to raise alarms in corporate boardrooms across the country.

Bell & Howell, for example, cited a "real fear" of boycotts by state and local governments in announcing its decision to withdraw from South Africa in February.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A CONGRESSIONAL TRIBUTE TO DENNIS MCCARBERRY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dennis McCarbery, a leader in my district, who will be honored June 6 for the completion of his outstanding tenure as president of the California State University, Dominguez Hills Alumni Association.

Mr. McCarbery's accomplishments in his capacity of association president are almost too numerous to list. Not only did he launch a successful annual fund drive, conduct a new homecoming program, initiate a past presidents recognition program, and conduct new membership activities such as Alumni-Night at Lakers and Clippers games, but, under his leadership, the alumni association implemented new methods of membership retention and recruitment with the result of increasing membership to over 500.

Before embarking on his long and fruitful career which spans journalism and public relations, Mr. McCarbery gained a B.A. in journalism from California State University at Los Angeles, and a master's degree from California State University, Dominguez Hills. He began what would prove to be a notable career in journalism as sports editor of the Palos Verdes Peninsula News (1965), moved on to a position as managing editor of the Lomita News (1966), and from there, progressed to assistant city editor of the South Bay Daily Breeze (1966-70).

Following his fine work as a journalist, Mr. McCarbery embarked on a new career in public relations, beginning as public information officer for the Los Angeles County Department of Beaches (1970-78). He then served as special events director for the American-Pacific Group (1981-83). Mr. McCarbery is currently serving as public affairs media director for Los Angeles 15th District Councilwoman Joan Milke Flores. As media chief, he directs all media relations and publicity, and produces the councilwoman's "Inside Community Issue" cable television program.

Mr. McCarbery has served as executive director of the Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce, and as president of the South Bay Athletic Club. Additionally, he is a life member of the Palos Verdes Peninsula Jaycees and the California Junior Chamber International Senators.

It is with great pride that my wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Dennis McCarbery for his many civic contributions. He is truly deserving of this recognition by the California State University, Dominguez Hills Alumni Association. We wish Dennis, his wife Lena, their children, Cindy, Tammy, and Michael, and their grandchildren, all the best in the years to come.

MARGERY TYRE—CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, Margery Tyre has been selected by the Beverly Hills YMXA as the 1986 Citizen of the Year.

No one could better deserve this honor and I wanted to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

Marge is a remarkable woman. She has not only served her community in too many capacities to mention in a short statement, but her warmth and wit have been an important part of the lives of all of those people fortunate enough to call her their friend, including myself.

I have known Marge and her husband Norman most of my life. Her daughters Patti Tanenbaum and Joy Coburn are lifelong friends of mine and their charm and warmth reflect the legacy of their mother.

As a member of the board of the National Council of Christians and Jews, Cedars Sinai, the American Red Cross and the Assistance League of Southern California, Marge has contributed substantially to her community.

I am pleased to report Marge's honor to my colleagues and to ask them to join me in saluting her on this accomplishment. It is important to recognize here for this honor at this time as well, so Patti's husband, Bob, will remember that he is not the only celebrity in the Tyre family.

CLEVELAND HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL HALL OF FAME

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues that 10 celebrated Cleveland Heights High School alumni have recently been inducted into the school's "Distinguished Alumni Hall of Fame."

Mr. Speaker, it was in 1981, that Cleveland Heights High School first established the "Distinguished Alumni Hall of Fame." The hall of fame project was begun to graphically show current students what an extraordinary adult population the school has produced over the years and to inspire the students to strive for the same level of accomplishment. Distinguished graduates of this fine institution are selected by current students for induction into the hall of fame. This unique involvement of the students in choosing the inductees further serves to strengthen the student role model relationship.

On April 17, 1986, Cleveland Heights High School held its sixth annual hall of fame ceremony. On this occasion, nine alumni returned to the school and participated in an entire day of activities and celebrations held in their honor. This included speaking to selected

classes and a dinner which was held at the school.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to present to my colleagues, this year's inductees into the Cleveland Heights High School, "Distinguished Alumni Hall of Fame." They are:

Martin Alpert, a doctor who gave up medicine to become founder and president of Tecmar, Inc., a company that designs, develops and manufactures computer products.

Nelson Blachman, senior scientist, office of the engineer, GTE, Sylvania Systems Corp.

Gary Ellis, science policy analyst, project director, biological applications program, Office of Technology, U.S. Congress.

Muriel Ente, principal of Coventry School, Cleveland Heights, OH.

Thomas Herbell, senior research scientist, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Lynda Hirsch, soap opera expert.

Joel Hyatt, founder of Hyatt Legal Services.

Rosabeth Moss Kanter, professor of sociology and organization management, Yale University and chair of the board of trustees of Goodmeasure, Inc.

Muriel Siebert, the first woman to hold a seat on the New York Stock Exchange and the former superintendent of banks for the State of New York.

Jerry Sloan, vice president, public relations, American Motors.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my heartiest congratulations to the honorees for their peerless service to the public good and wish them continued success and happiness in the years ahead. The students of Cleveland Heights High School are to be commended for their selection of such a notable and worthy group of individuals.

ADULT ILLITERACY AWARENESS MONTH

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans are unable to read a newspaper or write a simple sentence. Even by the most conservative estimates, a staggering 23 million adults lack the basic communication skills to handle the day's minimum demands, such as balancing a checkbook, looking up names in a telephone directory, or following traffic regulations.

Illiteracy is unquestionably a national shame. The United States controls more than one-third of the world's economic power, but ranks only 49th in literacy levels. The problem is likely to get worse instead of better with society's increasing emphasis on high technology.

A nonreader is a family tragedy and a failure to learn to read, either by children or adults, is the educational equivalent of cancer.

The total costs of the haunting specter of illiteracy vary, but estimates run into the billions of dollars annually. Employers must train workers for the jobs they hold and often provide remedial and basic literacy courses for employees.

More than one-third of the people who receive Government assistance are illiterate; almost 75 percent of the unemployed lack the basic skills to get a job and the Nation's prisons are filled with inmates unable to read.

Moreover, illiteracy is often passed down through families. Children of high school dropouts and illiterates often become dropouts themselves and are a cog in the vicious cycle of poverty and unemployment.

I believe that this serious problem must be brought to the attention of the American people, therefore, I am introducing a joint resolution designating the month of September 1986 as Adult Literacy Awareness Month.

During September, 1,400 newspapers, public broadcasting and a major network will participate in a literacy awareness and information campaign called Project Literacy US [PLUS]. The campaign will include public service announcements, news articles, and prime-time television programming on the problem of illiteracy.

In addition, the President has been requested to issue a proclamation urging the American people to observe the month with activities to increase awareness of the problem of adult illiteracy.

AFRICA FAMINE RECOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT FUND ACT OF 1986

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from Florida, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs, Mr. FASCELL, in introducing the Africa Famine Recovery and Development Fund Act of 1986. A similar measure, S. 2208, has been introduced in the other body by Senators KASTEN and KENNEDY.

The United States can be proud of the significant role that we played in combatting the Africa famine, but now is not the time to let up, when the recovery is just beginning. A U.S.-led global initiative, undertaken with the same sense of urgency as the emergency response but with a commitment to a much longer time period and directed toward the root causes of Africa's development problems, is needed if future famine is to be prevented.

There is a growing consensus among Africans and donors alike on the major constraints to African economic development which have been outlined in recent reports such as the Compact for African Development sponsored by the Overseas Development Council, the InterAction-proposed African Recovery and Development Act, and Africa Tomorrow by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment. These include the need for overall macroeconomic policy reform and sectoral reforms which emphasize agriculture, policy reform and sectoral reforms which emphasize agriculture, especially food production, the importance of environmental protection and rehabilitation to increasing agricultural production, slowing population growth, the relationship of health and nutrition to agricultural production, the importance of nonfarm edu-

cation, and the need for small-enterprise development to complement agriculture. The proposed legislation does the following:

Establishes a permanent fund within AID to which future appropriations can be made for long-term assistance in Africa, and requires all existing AID programs in Africa be administered through the new authorities of the Fund;

Strengthens and expands the current authorization language, making its implementation more flexible than AID programs elsewhere;

Emphasizes the role of private voluntary agencies and international organizations, giving authority for them to use the Fund;

Provides short-term assistance to form a bridge between famine relief and the long-term development effort;

Mandates long-term assistance be used to achieve policy and agricultural reforms, and to assist small farmers, especially women, for environmental rehabilitation, primary health care/family planning, human resource development, and income generating projects;

Requires steps to achieve better international cooperation and coordination of African aid programs;

Calls for a special effort to reduce trade barriers and encourage United States-Africa trade; and

Recognizes the important role of the African Development Bank and Fund and the World Bank's special facility for Africa.

The Fund would be financed from the normal appropriation for Africa and in addition "such amounts as may be necessary" to carry out the program.

This legislative proposal does not contemplate shifting large amounts of resources from other regions to Africa, but it does seek to increase the flow of United States development assistance to Africa to a level more commensurate with need; 20 of the 34 poorest countries in the world are in Africa. In Asia and Latin America per capita food production is increasing and population growth rates are decreasing, while in Africa the opposite is true. Africa has experienced a 20-percent decline in per capita food production over the past two decades. According to the 1985 U.N. report on the World Social Situation, acute malnutrition affects 35 percent of preschool children in Africa, 16 percent in Asia, and 4 percent in Latin America.

The initiative represents an important opportunity for the United States to make a long-term commitment to self-sufficiency and development in Africa.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support and cosponsor this legislation.

SMALL BUSINESS AND NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, tourism is big business in America. So big, that it is our Nation's second largest employer. In 1984, Americans spent \$218 billion on travel in this country. And that same year, foreign travelers

brought an additional \$11 billion into our Nation. Together that represents 6 percent of the U.S. gross national product. Yet while the tourism industry is big business it is overwhelmingly made up of small businesses. In fact, 98 percent of the businesses in the travel and tourism industry are small businesses. So it is befitting that for the week of May 18 to 25, 1986, we are recognizing the numerous contributions made by our small businesses across the country and highlighting the tourism industry's economic impact.

We should also remember the enormous contributions small businesses make. For instance, 98 percent of the 14 million nonfarm businesses in the United States are small businesses. And, the small business sector creates far more jobs than bigger businesses. They employ 48 percent of the private work force and account for 38 percent of our gross national product.

I believe these facts and figures illustrate the significant contributions of our Nation's entrepreneurs. I would also point out that we are a nation of opportunity, unlike any other nation. Our countries' small business owners' have demonstrated perseverance and overcome countless difficulties. So it is, indeed, important that we designate this week to recognize their achievements and contributions.

We, in Congress, recognize that the strength of our Nation's economy is rooted in the ability of our business owners to tend to their business efficiently and effectively and not spend their limited time on needless Government paperwork and other administrative burdens. Therefore, we should take this opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to assist small businessowners.

This week is set-aside for small businesses. I am hopeful that a message of encouragement reaches all the small businessowners of our Nation and that the tourism industry's economic contributions are emphasized. I take this means to offer my congratulations to our Nation's small business men and women.

THE KICCI NOKA PEACE CHAIN

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues once more a visit to Washington, DC, by seven industrious young ladies of the Kicci Noka Camp Fire Club of Eau Claire, WI. These special young ladies travelled over 1,000 miles this week to present an 18-mile-long "Chain of Peace" to the President.

The National Camp Fire theme for 1986 is world peace. And, as their first project, the Kicci Nokas of Eau Claire and other national camp fire clubs circulated petitions which read: "As a legacy and gift to the children who will be born and live on this planet Earth, I hereby commit myself to fostering peace. I promise to do everything I can to help create a common future of peace for all human beings." Those signatures were included on a laser disc with thousands of others, from over

100 countries, that was aboard the space shuttle *Challenger* when disaster struck last January 28.

Wanting to further their efforts to promote peace, the seven members of the Kicci Noka Camp Fire Club chose to undertake a unique project to demonstrate their commitment to peace. They solicited assistance from 18 other States, 5,000 schoolchildren and senior citizens throughout the Eau Claire area in constructing a 1 million link, 18-mile-long "Chain of Peace."

On Monday, May 19, the Kicci Noka Camp Fire Club and their advisers presented one-fifth of that chain to me and a special assistant to the President on the steps of the U.S. Capitol. As you know, the chain was also on display on the Capitol's west front terrace.

At a time when there is so much strife and tension in our world, it is refreshing to witness the untiring commitment and accomplishments of seven energetic, special ladies toward furthering the message of peace. They, their advisers, and the supportive community of Eau Claire, WI, should be commended and proud of this project which stands as a monument of hope and peace for all generations, for today and tomorrow.

OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend this country's older citizens and all the organizations that participated in this year's Older Americans Month activities. It is fitting that we acknowledge the great contributions that older Americans have made and continue to make to our society. We have benefited from their many achievements and the wisdom they provide us. Their efforts deserve this special recognition.

The designation of May as Older Americans Month is important because it helps to focus national attention on our older citizens, who represent the fastest growing segment of the population. This year's theme, "Plan on Living the Rest of Your Life: Have Your Health and Have Everything," is especially timely. The theme was chosen to highlight the holistic approach necessary to maintaining an enhancing health and fitness for older adults and their families. Preventive health care is important at every age, and particularly as we grow older. Increasingly, we have recognized that health promotion and disease prevention can help people of all ages live healthier, longer lives.

On May 1, 1986, the Administration on Aging appropriately kicked off Older Americans Month by honoring 52 exemplary community projects that help older people improve their health and fitness, and thus improve their quality of life. In my home State of Washington, a project called Elderscreen of Snohomish County was honored for developing an innovative health screening program. I want to publicly applaud their efforts and this much deserved recognition. Certainly thousands of

health service providers throughout the country are to be commended for their work and dedication in serving the needs of older Americans.

Mr. Speaker, today I join with many of my colleagues in the Congress in paying tribute to all older Americans and the organizations that serve them. Our Nation's older Americans enrich our lives and our society, and I salute their many contributions and accomplishments.

THE FARM INCOME SECURITY ACT

HON. BILL SCHUETTE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone would support the imposition of a 1-year holding period on all paychecks for every working person in the country.

But there is one group of workers that are suffering under that restriction—and of all people, it's America's farmers.

Under the law, farmers must wait 12 full months to receive part of their Government crop—deficiency—payments. Although many will harvest their crops in the fall of 1986, they won't be paid in full until late 1986.

We all know the hardships and great stress farmers and their families are struggling with today. To deny them the help we have promised until a year has passed is Government at its most heartless, and for some—too little, too late.

Today, I am joined by Representatives MARLENEE, TAUKE, CRAIG, BEREUTER, WEBER, MCEWEN, BOULTER, MADIGAN, COLEMAN of Missouri, ROBERTS, FRANKLIN, SUNDQUIST, COMBEST, EVANS of Iowa, GUNDERSON, and LIGHTFOOT in introducing the Farm Income Security Act of 1986. This bill makes all deficiency payments payable at the same time, approximately 5 months after harvest. It is simple justice for those who work in America's largest industry.

TRIBUTE TO DR. CAROL B. CHOYE

HON. SALA BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell my colleagues, especially my friend from Princeton, NJ, Representative COURTER, that Dr. Carol B. Choye, a native San Franciscan, was appointed superintendent of Princeton Regional Schools on April 14, 1986.

Dr. Choye is one of only five Asian-American women superintendents in the country. Mrs. Choye attended the public schools in San Francisco and received baccalaureate and master's degrees with honors from the

University of California at Berkeley and a doctor of education degree from the University of San Francisco.

She accepts the post at Princeton after having distinguished herself as an outstanding public educator in the State of California. During her 26 years of service to the San Francisco Unified School District, Dr. Choye served as a teacher, a vice principal, a principal, an area superintendent, a curriculum coordinator, and an associate superintendent.

Some of Dr. Choye's other related professional accomplishments and activities include:

Member, California State Superintendent Bill Honig's Transition Team;

Vice president, Executive Board of California Task Force for Integrated Education; and

Assistant professor, San Francisco State University.

Dr. Choye was also responsible for developing San Francisco's model curriculum standards; the selection of district textbook and instructional materials.

Her new appointment is effective July 1, 1986.

A TRIBUTE TO JEAN G. ISAACS

HON. DAN DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, before we return to this Chamber in early June, one of the most dedicated individuals it has ever been my privilege to know will have left us.

Jean G. Isaacs, Congressional Liaison Specialist, Air Force Legislative Liaison, is retiring after 34 years in Federal service, 32 years here in our midst.

It understates the case to refer to Jean as merely competent. She is the memory for the liaison office. She has served under countless directors and Air Force secretaries, and can recall at a moment's notice what has transpired under any given set of circumstances. Jean knows what can be done—and what cannot—and can be a world class diplomat in steering you toward the former and away from the latter.

Members of Congress, their personal staffs, committee personnel all rely on Jean Isaacs, and they know that their reliance is well-placed. When the subject is the Air Force, Jean is the one to whom many turn.

Jean is known by her associates as a team player, but she is a star player in any league.

To say that Jean will be missed does not say nearly enough. She has become a part of our working lives in such a way that we will all feel a little loss—a little lonesome—when she has gone.

I do not know what Jean Isaac's plans are for the future, but I am firmly convinced that whatever course she follows there will be others who share our own high esteem for this lady.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO DR. GENERO B. "HANK" GARCIA

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Genero B. "Hank" Garcia, a leader in the academic community in my district, who will be honored at a retirement dinner on June 19, 1986. Dr. Garcia is retiring from his position as the assistant superintendent of the secondary division of the Long Beach Unified School District.

A native of Arizona, Dr. Garcia moved to southern California. He served in the Navy during World War II and returned to California to complete his education. Over the years, Dr. Garcia received a B.A. from Santa Barbara State College, an M.A. from Los Angeles State College, a Ph.D. from the University of Southern California, and has done additional graduate work at Long Beach State College.

In 1952, Dr. Garcia joined the staff of the Long Beach Unified School District as a teacher of English and history. He was then promoted to a vice principal's position and later to a position as assistant director of personnel. He has also held the principal's position at four schools, respectively, Stephens Junior High School, Hill Junior High School, Polytechnic High School, and Wilson High School. In 1974, he was appointed to his present position as assistant superintendent of the secondary division of the Long Beach Unified School District. For the last 12 years, Dr. Garcia has been responsible for the education of thousands of students who have attended Long Beach's junior and senior high schools, and adult schools.

In addition to his fine work in managing the secondary division, Dr. Garcia has been responsible for many innovations in secondary school programs. Dr. Garcia was instrumental in the planning of many model projects that serve as national examples for other school districts. These programs include, the Adopt-a-School Partnerships; School Site Budgeting; the Learning Assessment Program; the Center for International Commerce (CIC); the Program of Additional Curricular Experiences (PACE); off-campus guidance classes; Saturday SAT test preparation; the Better Teenager Association; intensive English for limited English proficient students, and a dropout prevention and reduction program that has contributed to the record \$10 million in academic scholarships won by the class of 1985. These and other major accomplishments are a testament to Dr. Garcia's tireless dedication to providing the best quality of education for the students in my district.

Our local high schools are nationally known and respected for their academic and athletic excellence, largely because of the quality of leadership that has been provided by Dr. Garcia. I am sure that he will be sorely missed by his colleagues and by students; however, the positive influence that he has had on secondary education will be felt both in the schools and in the communities in Long Beach, and throughout southern California, for many years to come.

May 22, 1986

It is with great pride that my wife, Lee, joins me in wishing Dr. Genero B. "Hank" Garcia, his wife Carlyn, and their children, Linda and Rick, all the best in the years ahead.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY AT HARRISBURG CELEBRATES 20TH BIRTHDAY

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1986, I had the pleasure of attending a Founder's Day Dinner to celebrate Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg's 20th birthday. Many institutions would consider 20 years of existence only a stage of infancy, and for many that might be the case. But that is not the case for the Capitol Campus of PSU, as it called.

This birthday officially marked the transfer of 177 acres of land from the Federal Government to the college. The land was formally known as the Olmstead Air Force Base. Returning to participate in the birthday celebration was the man who helped create Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg 20 years ago, Eric A. Walker, then president PSU.

The campus has changed since its birth 20 years ago. In 1966, the first graduating class included 17 students. The college employed eight instructors to teach the students. One hundred and five students enrolled part time for night graduate courses.

Today, the college has 2,500 full-time students and 137 full-time instructors. It offers 18 undergraduate degree programs, 11 master's degree programs, and two doctoral programs.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues in the U.S. Congress to join me in recognizing the Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg on its 20th birthday and everyone who worked to make the dream become a reality.

TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM T. CARTY

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to pay tribute today to a distinguished citizen from my district, Dr. William T. Carty. As a scholar, educator, and administrator, Dr. Carty has dedicated his entire adult life to ensuring that thousands of students received quality educations to equip them with the skills necessary to lead successful lives.

Thirty-six years ago Dr. Carty received his doctor of education degree and began working as a teacher. Since then he has served the education field as an instructor, a principal, and he will retire this year from 25 years as the superintendent of the Carpinteria Unified School District.

Throughout his career he has set an example as an educational leader by vigorously

continuing his own education. After receiving his doctorate he returned to the university 6 years later to do post graduate work in the field of psychology and pupil personnel services. In 1981 he returned to take computer literacy courses.

As a young man Dr. Carty was a volunteer in the U.S. Navy and fought in the Pacific Theater. He was awarded a One Battle Star and a commendation for bravery. Within the educational field he has received awards for administrative and academic excellence and is a member of various academic boards.

Dr. Carty has been a leading member in the Carpinteria community. He has worked with the Red Cross, United Way, Crippled Children's Fund. He has also been in the local Chamber of Commerce and a church member. His outstanding participation in the community illustrates his sincere concern for its growth and prosperity.

The retirement of this distinguished citizen, dedicated family man, and educational role model is a loss to Carpinteria. He will be missed by all who have been touched by his professionalism, leadership and personal involvement. He leaves behind a legacy of excellence that will provide a challenge and an example to his successor.

ON NEED TO END NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, in 1965, Tom Lehrer put out a record album entitled, "That Was the Year That Was." One rather humorous song asked "Who's Next?" It referred to the spread of nuclear weapons and the fact that many regimes, believed to be unstable or otherwise dangerous, could soon have the bomb, as it was referred to in that slightly simpler era. Listening to that song today, our list of potential forces for nuclear proliferation has increased. Today, small scale nuclear weapons could clearly fall into the hands of the various forces fighting governments as well as unstable governments themselves.

Accepting the very real possibility of nuclear weapons as well as other sophisticated weapons falling into the wrong hands, the question remains just what can we do? Assuming that all reasonable people agree that it would be dangerous if sophisticated weapons, and the technology which makes them possible, fell into the hands of those who would cause untold harm with them, it becomes our responsibility to control the flow of those weapons which originate in our own country. It is also reasonable for us to urge our allies to take the same position.

Over the last 5½ years, the amount of foreign aid which is for military purposes as opposed to civilian use has increased. This increase is not because we are selling or giving away six-shooters or Remington rifles. This increase represents the transfer of high-technology weapons which, once out of our hands, we have precious little control over. Although one can sympathize with the desire to keep

American military personnel out of other countries, the exchange of sending weapons without American military control is very frightening indeed. We send forth weapons of destruction, which can be aimed at us and our allies, with virtually no control over what is done with these weapons by the recipient Government. Furthermore, and perhaps even more dangerously, we do not have any way of securing these weapons and keeping them out of the hands which are seen as a threat to American citizens or America itself.

For example, it should give one pause to know that surface-to-air missiles can now be hand held and launched. The advances in miniaturizing instruments of destruction may make them easier to handle in the field, but it also makes it easier to obtain them through thefts or capture from the intended recipient. Surface-to-air missiles can take down a military or civilian plane with one shot. Sophisticated sensing devices which are built into the missiles make it possible for even a bad shot to hit its target. That target may well be an American plane.

Even simple weapons pose a threat. While we may perceive ourselves as arming one side of a conflict, we should not rest easy that the weapons will remain with the side that we support. One of the first lessons of guerrilla warfare is to inflict damage and seize the enemy's weapons for future use. In many situations, the weapons of one side are captured and turned against the original owners.

Sophisticated technology supplied for peaceful civilian use also has its own dangers. Nuclear powerplants may well be established to supply energy, but material from those plants can be utilized to create weapons. The technology needed for this transformation is relatively simple. It can be carried out by technical personnel with minimal knowledge.

Given the fact that technology given to one side or for one purpose can be turned on us and our allies, it is time that we looked at the dangers realistically and tailored our foreign policy in recognition of these dangers. A policy which allows weapons to leave this country without ensuring the control of those weapons is foolhardy. A policy which sees only economic advantage in selling nuclear energy facilities, but ignores the danger of misuse of nuclear materials, is both shortsighted and foolish. It is high time to stop the export of weapons and technology which can so readily be misused.

BEULAH SMITH RETIRES

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Beulah Jefferson Smith, a special education teacher at Buder School in St. Louis, MO, will retire on June 13, 1986, after 30 years of continuous service.

Mrs. Smith was born in St. Louis and is a product of the St. Louis public schools herself, having attended Cole Elementary, Sumner High school, and Stowe Teachers' College.

Mrs. Smith's career began at L'Ouverture School. After 18 years at Franklin, she was

appointed to Banneker Reading Clinic to help those children with the greatest need. She received further training in special education at St. Louis University. Mrs. Smith taught reading in the Catholic schools, on loan from the St. Louis public schools. From there she was assigned to Adams School and then to Buder School as a resource special education teacher.

Mrs. Smith has been important in uplifting the morale of both staff and students through her influence. At Buder she sponsored the student council. Her artistic abilities have been displayed throughout the halls of Buder School.

The St. Louis public school children have greatly benefited by Mrs. Smith's service as a teacher whose philosophy is: "If teachers put forth their best, students will try to put forth their best."

Special education teachers play a crucial role in giving all our children the opportunity to fulfill their potential. I commend you, Mrs. Smith, and join with the Buder School family and the St. Louis public schools in wishing you the best in your retirement.

EQUAL ACCESS TO TECHNOLOGY AND THE TRADE BILL

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a moment to express my sincere appreciation to my distinguished colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. FRENZEL, and to the leadership of the House for including in the omnibus trade bill legislation I introduced earlier this year to make reciprocal access to technology a formal, priority negotiating objective in all upcoming multilateral and bilateral trade talks.

All our past efforts in this critical area have been thwarted. Most foreign technology is off limits to Americans. In Japan we are prohibited from licensing Government-held patents. We are denied participation in joint research and development ventures. We are refused access to Government funded laboratories. In a nutshell, the reciprocal flow of technology between the United States and other industrial countries is seriously out of whack.

What we need and ought to receive is fair and reciprocal access to foreign government-owned or government-supported technology. Our trade negotiators must give top priority to ensuring that U.S. firms are given an opportunity to participate in foreign government-supported research programs and laboratories.

Reciprocal access to technology should be a particularly high priority in any future trade negotiations with Japan. We've had informal talks with the Japanese on technology exchange in the past—the 1983 United States-Japan High Technology Group, for example—but nothing has come of them. That's why a more formal and a more direct process needs to be put in place. Designating access to technology as a formal United States negotiating objective is a responsible and constructive approach that will allow negotiators on both

sides to determine the most effective and flexible means to achieve this goal in good faith.

The alternative to a fair sharing of new knowledge could be a hard-line approach that would cut off foreign access to our technology. Some have suggested exactly that. Reluctance to provide equitable access to technology would be considered an unfair trade practice—and we would retaliate by cutting off foreign researchers who seek to acquire U.S. know-how.

Congress should take a more positive approach. Since technology ultimately knows no national boundaries, we should negotiate for the removal of government-imposed restrictions—wherever they exist. Rather than slamming the door to our own research labs, we should strive to increase the world's storehouse of knowledge by working cooperatively to develop and share new, cutting edge technologies—those that will determine the kind of world our children and grandchildren will inherit. If we proceed with wisdom in this area, we can go a long ways toward ensuring a healthy international marketplace in which all nations can prosper.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted that the omnibus trade bill includes reciprocal access to technology as a formal negotiating objective—and I'm very grateful for the cooperation and support of the chairman and ranking minority member of the House Trade Subcommittee.

**CANTERBURY ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL WINS NATIONAL
AWARD**

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it was a smashing success. Working under the theme "Communicating With the Young at Heart," the Canterbury family honored senior citizens during the entire month of November 1985. Some of the activities included:

A senior adult who was a former television show host gave a television production workshop with fifth grade students using the school's video equipment.

Several senior adults were invited to share the art of storytelling with many classes.

A grandfather showed fourth grade students the art of glass designs.

A senior adult who is a world traveler and museum docent shared pictures and adventures from his recent trip to Europe and Asia.

"Kids on the Block," a touring puppet show, presented a show on aging which heightened student awareness of the capabilities and desires of some senior adults.

Senior adults were invited to join students and the Canterbury art teacher to work together on projects.

Municipal Judge Murrill Capers spoke to an assembly of senior adults, students and parents.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of Senior Citizens Month, many senior adults have stayed on at

Canterbury School as permanent volunteers, others have come in to conduct special projects and still others have donated books to the school library. The students have benefited also, by gaining a better understanding of the aging process, increasing their respect for senior adults, and increasing sensitivity toward our senior adult population.

On behalf of the residents of the 21st District of Ohio, I wish to congratulate Principal Katie Shorter, students, teachers, staff and parents of Canterbury Elementary School on receipt of the National School Public Relations Association 1986 Golden Achievement Award and on its successful efforts to communicate and interact with one of our community's most valuable resources—our senior adults.

ROCHESTER, MA: 300 YEARS

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, the town of Rochester, MA, will celebrate its 300th anniversary. To describe Rochester's earliest history is, in many important ways, to recount the birth of this Nation. The economic, cultural, and social forces that helped a handful of colonies evolve into the United States are mirrored in Rochester's past.

The story begins in 1680 when a few Englishmen of the Plymouth colony made a plantation near Sippican harbor on the upper shore of Buzzard's Bay. These planters belonged to the class which Governor Bradford described as "used to a plaine cuntry life and ye innocent trade of husbandrie." In pursuit of this trade, they came to seek richer pastures than were to be found on the Plymouth shore. When they laid out their new homesteads, allotting to each associate sections of woodland, salt meadow, cedar swamp, and sea beach, they provided for certain future for a grist-mill, a saw mill, fishing station and one lonesome acre for a burying place.

The remoteness from other English settlements forced the settlers to rely upon their own resources. They wove flax and sheep's wool into materials for clothing; they made and shared in the use of the plows and tools needed in their methods of agriculture; they cut firewood in a common forest and grazed cattle in common pastures; they built sloops for freighting and fishing, and traded with each other by "truck and dicker."

In time, families expanded around the homesteads and formed small isolated villages. On June 4, 1686, the town of Rochester, Plymouth County, was established from this common land called Sippican. It took its name from the ancient city of Rochester, in Kent, England, the ancestral home of many of the first settlers. Oysters found on the shores of Rochester, England, were celebrated for their excellence and the earliest American settlers, finding an abundance of shellfish here, named this tract "Rochester Towne in New England." The original "Proprietors" included

names that are still present today in Rochester: Winslow, Clark, Briggs, Burgess, Dexter, White, Barlow, Hammond, Davis, Foster, Ellis, Dunham, and Bradford.

Before them was the open bay; behind them was a primeval forest stretching away for miles and miles, offering no lines of travel except the meandering paths trodden by Indians on their journeys to the shore for shellfish, or by herds of deer. This forest was a valuable inheritance. From its pine knots, tar was made in restricted quantities and sent to the West Indies, to be bartered for such tropical products as were needed at home. Lest a time might come when the forests of pine, oak, and spruce trees might suffer, the people of Rochester decreed that no timber of any sort could be carried away; that no man could cut posts, rails, or house-frames except for his own use; and every boat's load of white cedar brought to the landing for shipment abroad would pay an export tax in money. The basis of their political economy was the "protection" of future values. To this action, the upper shore of Buzzard's Bay today owes its picturesque woodlands; while nearby highlands are barren of trees.

The larger settlement of Rochester soon spawned other towns and, as a result, lost the shoreline which inspired its name. What Rochester never lost, nor ever will, is its proud history, as one of this great Nation's earliest settlements.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate the citizens of Rochester and I urge my colleagues to join with me as we celebrate the occasion of the Town of Rochester's Tricentennial.

**PROTECTING RELIGIOUS
FREEDOM IN THE MILITARY**

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this minute to speak out for religious freedom and religious choice for those who are serving in our country's military. Mr. Speaker, I think that the men and women who protect our country are great. They have made a big commitment. They are protecting our way of life. And one of the pillars of our way of life is the freedom to worship, religious freedom. The least we can do for these men and women is to make sure that they also can worship with a military chaplain of their own faith.

That is why I support the Military Chaplains Faith Balance Act, H.R. 1875. This bill would make sure that all religious faiths, Catholic and Jewish and Protestant, are fairly represented among military chaplains. And we need to give every man and woman in the military who wants to worship, the chance to do so. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1875.

THE MEDICAL DEVICE AMENDMENTS OF 1976—10 YEARS LATER

HON. HENRY A WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks a very important milestone for the oldest of our Government's consumer protection agencies, the Food and Drug Administration. On this date 10 years ago, a new era of consumer protection was begun with the enactment of the Medical Device Amendments of 1976. This historic legislation substantially broadened the FDA's regulatory jurisdiction over medical equipment used by health professionals in diagnosing and treating injury and illness, as well as home health care products used by consumers.

This relatively new role for FDA is appropriate in view of the explosion in the development of new medical technologies, such as artificial hearts, implantable drug pumps and defibrillators, prosthetic limbs, and a variety of home test kits to detect conditions such as pregnancy and cancer. These developments can relieve pain and suffering and extend life, but they also raise new and very difficult questions about safety and effectiveness, and therein lies the main value of the 1976 Device Amendments. With their passage, the American people were afforded a greater degree of health protection by having new products subjected to rigorous scientific scrutiny by FDA before being made available for clinical use.

As with any complex new law, the Medical Device Amendments has presented a difficult challenge for the agency to implement and for Congress to oversee. In looking back on FDA's performance over the first decade in implementing this law, I believe the agency has done a very creditable job overall. Congress, through its oversight, has identified certain areas for improvement, and we hope to work with FDA and all interested parties in making those improvements.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend the FDA and its Center for Devices and Radiological Health, and to recognize the skills and professionalism of the scientists, engineers, and health professionals who make up the Center. They have given the Nation 10 years of dedicated public service in the field of medical devices.

UPDATE ON THE RAILROAD ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES BOARD

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most crucial elements in establishing reasonable railroad rates is the determination of railroad costs. It was due to the Interstate Commerce Commission's rather inept attempts to develop sound and reasonable railroad accounting principles necessary to determine the accuracy of railroad costs that the Congress, in the

Staggers Rail Act of 1980, transferred this responsibility to a Railroad Accounting Principles Board.

The Board would be independent of the ICC, established under the auspices of the Comptroller General, and composed of experts in the field of rate regulation, accounting, economics, rail transportation, and shipping. However, appropriations were never provided for the Board and its 3-year authorization expired at the end of fiscal year 1983.

As abuse of the Staggers Rail Act increased due to the manipulation of its provisions by the ICC through the rules and regulations it promulgated, the Congress recognized that the Railroad Accounting Principles Board [RAPB] was badly needed and with the enactment of the legislative appropriation for fiscal year 1985, the Board was reauthorized and funded. Additional funding was provided in fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987 will be the finish up year for the RAPB.

At this time, the Board is in the process of developing a body of cost accounting principles applicable to railroad regulatory proceedings and is to submit a report with recommendations for appropriate legislative or administrative actions to the Congress in 1987.

In this process the Board has issued for public comment a discussion memorandum on January 31, 1986, covering issues on which the RAPB is seeking input from interested parties. The regulatory measurement and costing principles and other issues identified in the Board's January memo are fully within, and responsive to, the mandate given the RAPB by the Congress and represent desirable and appropriate coverage of matters that are to be addressed within the scope of the Board and its finding, conclusions and recommendations to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as one who worked hard for the enactment of the reauthorization of the RAPB, I would again offer my deep appreciation to the chairman of the legislative subcommittee, VIC FAZIO, as well as to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Transportation and Tourism, JIM FLORIO, for their support and continued effort to insure that railroad rates are maintained at reasonable levels.

PEACE—A PRODUCT OF MUTUAL COOPERATION—A MESSAGE TO THE SOVIET UNION FROM TEENAGERS OF NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the theme of the American Legion's 26th Annual Project Democracy Essay Program and Speech Contest focused on how to achieve peace between the United States and the Soviet Union. The contest winners expressed their thoughts in the form of a letter to General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev of the Soviet Union. The common message of the winning presentations was that peace can be achieved through mutual cooperation, better communication, es-

tablishment of trust between the two superpowers, and that the consequence of failure to achieve peace would be the unleashing of the most brutal, destructive force known to the history of our planet: nuclear war.

The winners in the Essay Contest were Dan Weaver of Virginia, first place; Jennifer Giroux of Mountain Iron-Buhl, second place; Julie Matonich of Hibbing, third place; and Becky Maki of Chisholm, fourth place. Honorable mention winners were Amy Maly of Toivola-Meadowlands, Patrick LaLonde of Aurora-Hoyt Lakes, and Becky Jordan of Cook. Winners in the Speech Contest were Jodi K. Ellwood of Gilbert, first place; and Janet Clement of Cherry, second place. Honorable mention winners were Katherine Lean of Mountain Iron-Buhl and Julie Strukel of Chisholm.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the winning presentations for the consideration of my colleagues because these essays represent the very thoughtful, sensitively expressed and deeply felt views of today's teenagers on the most fundamental question facing the United States and the Soviet Union, President Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev, and all of us in the Congress: the issue of peace that will last not just for our time, but for all time and the thoughts of these young people on how to achieve that goal.

(By Dan Weaver, Virginia)

DEAR MR. GORBACHEV: I have a question that is very perplexing to me. Why is it that our two countries can't live in harmony. It doesn't seem right that two countries such as our own have so many disagreements just because of the different ideologies and forms of government. I would think that different governments would back each other no matter what kind of government they are as long they are the better for the people.

The United States and the Soviet Union have had many differences over the years, but that doesn't give either country the right to destroy the world. There is no reason for such a tremendous build-up in nuclear arms. Both our countries talk about the need for defense. Why is there a need for such overpowering defense if neither country is on the offense. If the two countries could swallow their pride and stop building bombs that could destroy the world many times over, maybe other countries would follow the example.

The United States and the Soviet Union would both benefit from mutual cooperation. Just think of the money each country would save if they didn't have to spend it on weapons. That money could help living conditions of the people of both countries. New technical advances would be unbelievable. With more cooperation things such as trade might increase. This would bring even greater profit to both countries. The people of the United States and the Soviet Union would profit greatly from this mutual cooperation.

Collaboration between our countries could be a great help to the world. Terrorism, world hunger and many other things could be halted or at least slowed down with the cooperation of our two countries. Living standards of many countries could rise with backing of our two countries.

Not only would the United States and the Soviet Union but also the whole world would benefit if we'd drop our differences and work on our things in common. I hope we realize that we can live in harmony

before it's too late. Dropping differences would not only help us (us meaning the United States and the Soviet Union), but it would also help the whole world.

(By Jennifer Giroux, Mt. Iron-Buhl)

DEAR MR. GORBACHEV: "Into the depth of the earth. . . we cast all weapons of war. We bury them from sight forever and plant again the Tree of the Great Peace." Dekanawidah, a native American Indian who devised the idea for the League of the Iroquois, spoke these words in his speech for the opening of the Iroquois Council.

Several hundred years ago, before Europeans and others came to North America, five Iroquois Indian tribes living apart as separate nations formed the League of the Iroquois in pursuit of peace. They had engaged in battles with each other for many years and had little in common but a desire for peace and harmony.

The purpose of the confederation was to live in peace, to protect against invasion of their domain by other nations, and to form a government among themselves. The acceptance of the Iroquois Constitution led to the end of bloodshed among the nations for over three hundred years, and they unified against outside enemies.

Through their wisdom, these Indians looked past their pride as separate nations and united for the good of all. If it was possible for so-called "ignorant savages" to lay down their weapons in return for peace and friendship, why is it not conceivable that your nation and mine, both comprised of civilized people, can throw away mutual distrust and animosity in exchange for the guarantee of a peaceful future?

An American forefather and great leader, Thomas Jefferson, is said to have studied the Constitution of the Iroquois at the time that the United States Constitution was being formed. Today it is my desire that the world community also follow the Iroquois' example by disarming their weapons, embracing each other, and working for the good of all.

The United States and the Soviet Union are the two most powerful countries in the world. If our two nations together follow the example of the Iroquois and lay down our arms, we will serve as an example to the rest of the world and perhaps make it possible to achieve global peace.

From our noble past comes these words of Longfellow's poem "Hiawatha":

"Buried was the bloody hatchet;
Buried was the dreadful war club;
Buried were all warlike weapons;
and the war-cry was forgotten.
Then was peace among the nations."

I challenge you, Mr. Gorbachev, to hold counsel with the leaders of my country in an effort to effect a just and lasting peace.

1. "I Have Spoken," Virginia Armstrong, Swallow Press Inc., 1971.

2. "Hoyt's New Encyclopedia of Practical Quotations," Funk and Wagnalls Company, copyright 1940.

(By Julie Matonich, Hibbing)

DEAR MR. GORBACHEV: I would like to discuss with you our two countries, their similarities, differences, and problems. I would especially like to compare our people, but unfortunately, I don't know very much about the Russian people. Your country, it seems to me, has not opened its doors to us or our press as much as I would like; consequently, we have to guess at what goes on in Russia and what its people are really like.

I have been led to believe that your people are generally poor and unhappy. The few with money and power are generally shown as being greedy and wanting to control the world. I have been informed by newspapers and magazines that your people, in their turn, have negative opinions about us. They think that we do not care for our poor, and that we are a careless society where crime is very high. We also believe the worst of each other as far as dangerous escalation of nuclear arms is concerned.

Some of the above conceptions on both sides may be true to a greater or lesser extent, but it would be healthier to focus on more positive points. If we are to live in peace, we must learn to communicate with and understand each other. The secrecy between our countries can only cause more fear and mistrust—we have to open our doors. It is imperative that we see each other as real people, people with hopes, fears, dreams, aspirations, and concerns for others and for the world. Our ideals may differ, but we are all human.

It is not enough, Mr. Gorbachev, that our leaders meet only every so often. There should and must be constant communication. Our scientists and economists should share their ideas and work together. Our athletes should compete much more frequently, in totally nonpolitical ambience. People should be able to travel more freely between our countries; indeed, they should be encouraged and aided to do so. Delegations of teachers and students should visit each other's countries to learn as much as they can, and then they should share that knowledge with their countrymen. Our cultures should be interchanged; books, music, magazines, fine arts—all should be shared for understanding.

These, Mr. Gorbachev, are just a few of my thoughts on steps that should be taken to help our countries achieve mutual trust and understanding. I firmly believe that trust and understanding are the necessary first, vital steps that will bring Russia and the United States to a more secure and lasting relationship.

(By Dekki Maki, Chisholm)

DEAR MR. GORBACHEV: One of the greatest fears of people today is that of nuclear war. Teen-agers are not immune to this fear. We are just now approaching the time when we are becoming aware of world relationships. In a few years, we will be able to express our views and to act on them.

It is important that everyone is aware of the competition between the United States and the Soviet Union in the nuclear arms race. Although this race is a means of preventing either country from becoming too powerful, a limit should be set on nuclear arms production.

As a teen-ager, I wonder if I am going to live past the age of thirty, because the threat of a nuclear holocaust grows greater every day. The through of waking up one morning the finding the United States and the Soviet Union at war frightens me.

Even though we must be realistic and accept the fact that world peace is not in the near future, it is possible for the United States and the Soviet Union to become allies.

As the two strongest nations, ours should set an example. We can prove to other, smaller countries that it is not necessary to be opponents in the game of nuclear war. Nuclear war is not like a mere chess game. Checkmate is total destruction.

An alliance between our two countries should be advantageous to all sides. We could pool our resources to achieve higher goals. Scientists and chemists would share knowledge and work together to uncover new cures for deadly diseases. Biologists could work together and discover new resources to improve our economies. Perhaps most important of all, education could be combined and furthered to better instruct the up-and-coming generations who shall one day be our leaders.

It would be well worth the while if peace could be obtained between our two beautiful nations.

(By Jodi K. Ellwood, Gilbert)

DEAR MR. GORBACHEV: In Europe and America there is a growing feeling of fear over the destruction of world peace. The citizens of the Soviet Union and the United States are asking themselves: Can world peace finally occur?

Communism is a word that puts fear and anger into the minds of the citizens of the United States. Do the citizens of the Soviet Union get this same feeling when the words Capitalism and Democracy are mentioned?

Why are our two countries always made the villains in some wicked novel by each other? Aren't we just trying to deal with our own problems such as the economy?

A few months ago, the superpower leaders met in Geneva. You and Mr. Reagan met and discussed many items such as security issues, regional conflict, bilateral issues, and human rights. Only one area of arms control was agreed on. The area was nuclear nonproliferation or an agreement to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. But while improvements were being made, a lot of criticism was going on. You criticized the United States for abusing American Indians, blacks, and other minorities while President Reagan criticized you for your government's treatment of Jews, Andrei Sakharov, and the failure to comply with the Helsinki accords. The time spent criticizing could have been used more wisely. Why can't we be positive rather than negative?

In January, 1986, the citizens of the United States saw and heard you present a speech and the Soviet Union citizens heard Mr. Reagan. It seemed then as if we were finally advancing. But now the headlines once again read, "U.S. vs. Soviet Union," or "Nuclear Arms may cause third World War." A third World War is something that nobody wants. The war would not only ruin everything that we have strived for but it would also destroy the world.

Mr. Gorbachev, I am worried about the future of both of our countries. Will this feeling of fear or threat of war always be with the people? Will they ever be able to live freely? As a high school senior, I often wonder what my future will be like. I do not want it to be clouded with this fear.

People are the best natural resource of any country. Letting the people know the truth about each other may lead to a feeling of security and peace. The people of the Soviet Union and the United States are similar in so many ways. We are both loving and caring people trying to survive. Our children are the future doctors, lawyers, and leaders. They should be able to meet their goals without the threat of nuclear war over their heads.

Having trust in another person gives a sense of security. Could having trust in another nation also lead to world security and peace?

The time has come for our two countries to work together. We need to have more meetings to work out a plan for the future. Not to criticize each other for what has already been done, but to strive for the future by starting over.

Let's advance to better relations by trusting one another and working together for a successful future. Let's put our differences aside and work to solve our problems . . . To be successful countries, understanding countries, and most important of all, the Peaceful countries.

(By Janet Clement, Cherry)

DEAR MR. GORBACHEV: You don't know me and I know very little about you. I only know that at any time you could destroy most or all of my country and I am afraid. I also know your people think we are monsters, they, too, are afraid. Why is there all this fear?

At one point we were allied; our great powers united. We are still great powers but now they are directed against each other and the whole world sits on edge as we wait for the day when our powers will clash and life as we know it will cease to be.

I would like to think this clash will never happen; not in my lifetime, my children's lifetime, or any of my descendants' lifetimes. But if you will look back in history any two cultures with such conflicting points-of-view have settled it one way—war. One side forces the other to adopt their way of life. I feel, though, in a war today there wouldn't be any winner. We must learn from our past mistakes and overcome our differences.

This doesn't mean you have to become the perfect democratic nation or that we would have to turn communist. This means we must solve the mystery and settle the mistrust between our countries. Behind your secretive curtain I can see nothing. I can't see your people's joy or pain because I can't even see your people. I don't know if every Russian person truly hates me in their heart just for being American. I don't know if Russian children know the joys and freedoms I know. I do know that I have no great desire to see the Soviet Union disappear and could learn to live in harmony beside them if you would only let me try.

So, Mr. Gorbachev, I ask you, would you let me try? Would you let me see a little part of your country, of your people, of your way of life? Maybe we would discover we are not so far apart. The worst that could happen is we could discover we really don't want to murder each other.

FATHER WALTER E. SCHMIDT

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you and my distinguished colleagues to join me in saluting Father Walter E. Schmidt. Father Schmidt will be honored at a testimonial banquet on Tuesday evening, June 17, 1986, for his 43 years of service to Santa Clara University and the community at large.

When the newly ordained Jesuit arrived at Santa Clara in 1943, he expected to begin a career as a college theology professor. But no sooner had he begun to teach theology, he was asked to assume additional responsibilities as dean of men. It was an appointment

that launched an administrative career that would span more than four decades of sustained growth at the university.

In 1944, Father Schmidt discovered he had extra time at his disposal due to conscription for the war which reduced Santa Clara's all-male student body to only 60 students. With juvenile delinquency sharply on the rise among Santa Clara Valley youngsters, the Santa Clara City Council permitted a small group of teenagers to open a youth club in a vacant grocery store. Dubbing themselves the Wutzit Club, the teens went looking for adult supervision. The teenagers found the young dean of men agreeable to helping them as best he could. Under Father Schmidt's leadership, the Wutzit Club grew to 1,000 members within 3 years.

In 1947, to assist the Wutzit Club finance its many activities, Father Schmidt flew to Hollywood and garnered support from studio executives for the production of a benefit of a performance of "Hollywood Star Time." The show was headlined by Frank Sinatra and included Jack Carson, Robert Alda, and Rhonda Fleming.

Two additional benefits secured Father Schmidt's reputation as a master fundraiser, and with money from these and other promotional activities, he purchased a 5-acre site to build a modern facility for "his kids." In 1956, the Santa Clara Valley Youth Village opened at 2147 Newhall Street. For the next 30 years, it would serve as an important center for both the young and the elderly in the valley.

Father Schmidt's accomplishments did not go unnoticed. He was asked by President Eisenhower to serve on the Council of Youth Fitness, and later he was appointed a special advisor to President Kennedy's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. He received many community awards, including the First Annual Community Service Award for the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

During these years, Father Schmidt was also working diligently on his administrative duties at the university. Appointed vice president for university relations in 1960, he assumed responsibility for the growing public relations, development, and fundraising programs at Santa Clara.

In 1965, Father Schmidt founded the Board of Fellows, and for the next 20 years coordinated the activities and meetings of the organization. One of his responsibilities with the Fellows was coordinating the arrangements for their annual black-tie benefit, the Golden Circle Theatre Party.

In 1971, after serving as special assistant to the university president, Father Schmidt was named senior vice president of the university. He served in that capacity until his retirement in October 1985. Father Schmidt continues his lifelong interest in helping young people as president of the Father Schmidt Foundation for Youth. It is fitting that the foundation has become a major source of financial assistance to outstanding students at Santa Clara University.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his retirement from Santa Clara University, Father Schmidt can be confident that our country is most grateful for his contributions and accomplishments, and I, consequently, ask my colleagues to join with me in expressing our

thanks and congratulations to Father Walter E. Schmidt.

EB AWARENESS: A MOST WORTHY CAUSE

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, for the majority of Americans, every morning involves a series of routine tasks in preparation for a new day. Each morning we think nothing of eating breakfast and going to the office. For most of us these tasks are effortless. But for a victim of epidermolysis bullosa [EB], accomplishing these tasks is a result of extreme effort which generally requires assistance. Those who suffer from EB experience pain from just a touch or an accidental nudge. This pain prevents them from carrying out many of the ordinary tasks which most of us take for granted.

EB is an as-yet-incurable skin disorder that causes open bleeding sores to form more or less all over the body. It is created by a genetic defect that makes the skin's connective tissue extremely fragile. Though in no way contagious, the disease may often cause its victim to be socially ostracized.

In the most severe form of epidermolysis bullosa, the entire skin surface can erupt in blisters from even a slight trauma, producing unsightly scars that never disappear. The disease also affects the extremities, creating web-like scars that cause fingers and toes to actually fuse.

This baffling disorder is often disastrous to children born with it, and to their families. Because the afflicted person's life is so constricted, the future so discouraging, and the demands on the family so great, many parents are simply unable to cope and have to institutionalize their EB children.

This week I introduced House Joint Resolution 639, a bill that would make the week of December 1, 1986, Epidermolysis Bullosa Awareness Week. It is my hope that, as more people are made aware of the terrible effects of EB, new funds essential to the researching of this disease will be made available. There are few programs which pay greater dividends, which provide so much hope, and which make such a material difference in the lives of our constituents than the research into this tragic disease. Over 40,000 people in the United States are presently affected with EB, and researchers have shown that approximately 1 out of every 50,000 children is born with it.

I am also proud that DEBRA, one of the Nation's most active public health organizations, is headquartered in my Brooklyn district. Their selfless work on behalf of EB should serve as an example to all those in the health care field.

According to Dr. Lawrence E. Shulman, a director at the National Institutes of Health, "Research and advancement in treating and identifying the causes of EB are expected to benefit all those suffering from this grave skin disorder." At this moment, researchers at the University of California at Torrance, Harvard

Medical School, and the Shriners Hospital for Crippled Children in Portland are studying the basic science of the skin basement membrane zone, the region between the epidermal and dermal layers. Scientists at the Rockefeller University, New York City, and the University of Alabama are using highly specific monoclonal antibodies as research tools to identify components of the skin. Studies at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill are focused on characterization and isolation of a basement membrane zone molecule involved in acquired EB and of its possible significance in inherited forms of EB.

Yet without further congressional support, many of these programs will not be able to continue their groundbreaking work. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation and assist the Dystrophic Epidermolysis Bullosa Research Association of America [DEBRA] in its valiant struggle to increase the public's awareness of this debilitating disease.

LITTLE IMPROVEMENT NOTICED IN SOVIET EMIGRATION POLICY

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years, I have participated in the Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil in an attempt to draw attention to the plight of Soviet Jews and other prisoners of conscience who are seeking freedom and emigration from the Soviet Union. This is a specially worthy effort and a timely moment for the call in view of Anatoly (Natan) Shcharansky's visit to the Capitol last week and his heroic efforts to call the country's and the world's attention to the plight of those, not so fortunate as he, who are still in the Gulags and behind the Iron Curtain yearning to be free.

Despite the best efforts of Members of Congress and concerned American citizens in recent years, there has been little noticeable improvement in Soviet emigration policy toward its Jewish citizens.

In fact, sadly to note, Soviet Jewish emigration has been in decline since 1979—when Soviet officials placed more stringent restrictions on emigration. Emigration reached its highest level in nearly 2 years in April 1985, when 166 Jewish citizens were permitted to leave. And that number is appallingly low.

In particular, I am concerned about the plight of the Yakov Beilin family. Yakov Beilin is a forestry technician who lives in a small Jewish community in Tula. Most of his family, eight aunts and uncles who previously lived in Vilna, were exterminated with their young children during World War II.

In 1973, Beilin's father died after a long illness. Before he died, his last stated wish was that his family move to Israel where his only sister resided. This request the widow Beilin decided to fulfill.

Yakov Beilin's mother was granted permission to emigrate to Israel, but Yakov Beilin, his wife, and two children were refused. Despite her age and frailty, Yakov Beilin's mother decided to make the move.

His mother remains most distressed by being separated from her family. She writes:

"I have but one desire. I beg you to help me bring my son and his family to Israel. The few years that I have left to live, I would like to spend together with him."

Mr. Speaker, as one of many concerned Members participating in this year's vigil, I hope the Soviet Union will exhibit respect for basic human rights and privileges, as guaranteed under the Soviet Constitution and the Helsinki Accords, and reunite the Beilin family and other Soviet families in similar circumstances.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL FOR THE SALT RIVER PIMA-MARICOPA INDIAN COMMUNITY

HON. JOHN McCAIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would return a measure of local control to the local government of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. Prior to the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Oliphant v. Suquamish Indian Tribe*, 435 U.S. 191 (1978), Indian Tribal governments exercised limited criminal jurisdiction over Indians and non-Indians passing through or located on lands within the boundaries of their communities; much like our other local systems of government such as counties and municipalities.

Oliphant defined both the limits on a State with regard to jurisdiction within Indian lands, and the limits of tribal governments over non-Indians. Specifically, the Court stated that under the plenary powers of the Congress it could, but it had not, grant Indian tribes jurisdiction—over non-Indians—for criminal offenses. This reversed a large body of case law that had developed, particularly in relation to the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968, Public Law 90-284, title II, section 202. The Indian Civil Rights Act guaranteed to the Indian people the general constitutional rights outlined in the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights, except that it differed in regard to the separation of church and state, and it did not require public provision of counsel to indigents.

As an unforeseen consequence of this decision, a gap now exists in some areas of the country concerning misdemeanor criminal jurisdiction over non-Indians passing through Indian lands. Prior to Oliphant, many of the criminal codes of Indian tribes provided the misdemeanor provisions that are not included in the Federal Major Crimes Act, nor would be considered by State criminal codes which are enforced by Federal officials pursuant to the Assimilated Crimes Act. Since Oliphant it has been unclear what misdemeanor law applies to non-Indians within Indian boundaries.

In the case of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Community in Arizona certain actions which are violations of misdemeanor criminal codes for community residents are not applicable to non-Indians, and are not violations of any applicable State, county, or municipal codes; re-

sulting in a situation in which two classes of people exist side-by-side and law enforcement officials can only prosecute the Indian class.

For example, it is a violation of the Community criminal code to publicly consume alcoholic beverages. However, non-Indians regularly disregard this law because tribal police cannot enforce the law against them. This has caused disputes over the use of public areas within the community's borders and hard feelings between Indians and non-Indians.

The legislation that I am introducing, along with my colleagues, Congressmen JIM KOLBE and MORRIS UDALL, would grant the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community misdemeanor or criminal jurisdiction over non-Indians passing through the reservation. We do this, not only to bring equity back to this particular area of government in Arizona, but as a recognition of the efforts of the Salt River community to act as a responsible citizen and good neighbor in Arizona.

The mayors of all the surrounding non-Indian communities and the Governor of the State of Arizona have endorsed this legislation. These local and State officials recognize that Indian communities should be treated like other communities in the State and be accorded the same respect and responsibilities.

I am hopeful that the legislation will move quickly through the Congress. However, I also recognize the need to make a complete record on this issue as it is the first congressional exercise of its authority to grant such jurisdiction, as laid out by the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Oliphant*. I believe this legislation is necessary and appropriate, and I urge my colleagues to support this effort.

GEORGE PALMER, SCHOOL OFFICIAL, RETIRES

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, my fellow Representatives, I ask you to join me in paying tribute today to a veteran of the Bakersfield City School District.

Associate superintendent, Mr. George Palmer, is retiring after running the business side of the municipal school district for 23 years. The district includes 32 schools with students from kindergarten through junior high school.

George Palmer started his career in education as an elementary school teacher in 1952. He became a school counselor and then in 1958 a principal at Hort and then Noble Elementary School in Bakersfield. In 1963 George took on the role of associate superintendent of the Bakersfield City School District and served as acting superintendent three times. Being in this position since the 1960's has not always been smooth sailing. But throughout the tough times George Palmer has acted as a calming influence. His wit and professional conduct were an inspiration to all during some of the most turbulent years in public education.

Throughout his administrative career George has kept a real understanding and

caring of the needs of teachers and students. He exemplifies the real benefits of administrators who come from the ranks of teachers.

George is an active member of the Bakersfield community. He has served as chairman of the Kern County United Way campaign, as well as the president of the California Association of School Business Officials, and chapter president of the educational fraternity Phi Delta Kappa.

The Bakersfield City School District will surely miss George Palmer but the residents of Bakersfield are lucky because he is remaining in the area and his contributions to the community will continue long after his retirement.

PROFESSIONALS' LIABILITY INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 1986

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in an effort to address the current crisis due to the unavailability and unaffordability of liability insurance, I introduced the Professionals' Liability Insurance Reform Act of 1986. You may have heard from professionals in your district asking for help in this area. Officers or employees of State or local governments, members of boards or commissions of colleges or universities, social service organizations, and nonprofit organizations have all suffered lawsuits while trying to serve their communities. Professionals such as physicians, dentists, attorneys, engineers, public accountants, and architects, individuals who provide the intellectual base for so much productive employment in our society, are also in jeopardy. When these professional workers' efforts are curtailed, there is a domino effect bringing down related jobs as well. If engineers, and architects don't work because they cannot get liability insurance, construction workers are also idle, steel and cement for the projects aren't made, furnishings aren't sold, and so it goes across the economy.

The Professional's Liability Insurance Reform Act of 1986 will go a long way toward eliminating current problems in the tort liability system at the State level. What this bill does is give the State legislatures strong incentive to move rapidly toward reform of their State tort liability systems. It gives each State 4 years to substantially comply with a set of minimum standards set out in the bill. These minimum standards are generally agreed as necessary to address the unavailability and uninsurability problem. In general the bill asks for States to set up:

- Pretrial screening of cases as an inexpensive means of excluding spurious claims;
- Limits on non-economic damages pain and suffering, mental anguish, et-cetera;
- Restrictions on attorneys' contingency fees;
- Limits on joint and several liability attribution of fault;
- Punitive damage awards that go to courts rather to plaintiff;
- Counsel's liability for excessive costs;

Structured settlements using a system of periodic payments; and

Judgment awards to be reduced by collateral compensation.

If, and only if, the States do not change their tort liability system to substantially comply with these proposed changes, these changes would supersede State law. It is my hope that this will not have to happen.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation and similar legislation addressing the tort liability crisis. Until this problem is addressed, our productivity as a nation will suffer. American businesses and American workers need relief from this crisis and legislation such as the Professional Tort Liability Relief Act will go a long way to provide that relief.

HOMELESSNESS AWARENESS WEEK

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I strongly endorse House Joint Resolution 347 proclaiming this Homelessness Awareness Week. This resolution is a painful reminder of the continuing crisis of homelessness in America. The millions of Americans who experienced homelessness this year demand more than our awareness. There must be a commitment of public and private resources sufficient to assure that every American has a place to call his or her own "home."

Homelessness has been growing significantly since 1982 in both major metropolitan and rural areas of our Nation. During 1985 alone, the U.S. Conference of Mayors reports homelessness increased by 25 percent in 22 major cities surveyed.

The forces responsible for this human crisis are rooted in recent social and economic factors. First, the rise in unemployment in the early 1980's displaced hundreds of thousands of potentially self-sufficient wage earners. Today, nearly two of every three jobless workers are without benefits, not including the "discouraged workers" who have given up looking for employment because their job skills do not match the jobs available.

Second, a growing number of poor Americans cannot afford the housing that is available. This is a result of increasing poverty, urban renewal efforts, reductions in the real value of welfare benefits, reductions in disability benefits, reductions in Federal funds for housing and community development, rising utility costs, and severe cuts in section 8 Federal housing assistance for low-income Americans.

Third, a revolution in mental health care during the 1970's has displaced thousands of mentally disabled Americans out of institutions and onto the streets. This "deinstitutionalization" was intended to protect the health and welfare of those who would otherwise have been locked up for life. Unfortunately, sufficient community mental health resources have not been provided to assist these individuals to reenter mainstream America.

I feel strongly the problem of homelessness must be addressed with the combined will of Federal, State, and local governments as well as the charity of the private voluntary community. In the coming weeks, I will be introducing comprehensive legislation which improves services to fight homelessness and its underlying causes. Specifically, the bill would improve assistance under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children and Supplemental Security Income programs, prevent unnecessary evictions from private rental housing, provide increased health, education and job training services for the homeless, and improve the accessibility of Federal assistance programs to eligible homeless persons. Additionally, it would establish a national right to shelter for the homeless.

According to a January 1986 New York Times/CBS news poll, the majority of Americans think Government is not demonstrating enough concern for the homeless. I urge my colleagues to join with me in making a commitment to invest today in preventive and remedial services for the homeless. This is both a moral and budgetary imperative.

IRRIGATED AGRICULTURE THREATENED IN CALIFORNIA

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, two great issues have paralyzed water policy and agriculture in the Central Valley of California far too long.

The continuing selenium contamination crisis at Kesterson Reservoir and the valleywide drainage problem threaten the future of irrigated agriculture in California.

The proposed settlement of a longstanding lawsuit between the Westlands Water District and the Department of the Interior jeopardizes the repayment of the entire Central Valley project and the integrity of Federal reclamation law.

Both these crises—Kesterson and Westlands—have been grossly mismanaged by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior. Footdragging, secrecy, evasion, and ignorance have become the hallmarks of the administration's policy.

The cost of their failures—degradation of water quality, increased repayment costs and utility rates, contamination of farmland and wildlife, and endless, multibillion-dollar subsidies for agribusinesses—those costs will be borne not by bureaucrats in the Bureau, but by the taxpayers of America.

The fact is that the administration has failed—failed to solve problems, failed to win the confidence of the public or the Congress, and failed to abide by the mandates of reclamation law. We are witnessing a repetition of the bureaucratic bungling which created these problems in the first place.

No longer can we entrust the Keystone Kops of Kesterson to solve these problems.

My Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources has conducted a thorough review of the documents produced for the Westlands

lawsuit negotiations. That review has led me to the inescapable conclusion that there are numerous issues being considered by the litigants which should be decided in the open by elected representatives, not in closed rooms by regional solicitors.

That is why I am today introducing a comprehensive bill to resolve in a fair, economically sound and environmentally safe manner, the drainage problems and the reauthorization of Westlands. I intend to hold hearings on this legislation immediately after the Memorial Day recess.

The bill would require the Secretary to establish guidelines to insure that any agricultural drainage from California irrigation districts does not pose a threat to public health, safety, or the environment. Irrigation districts would be encouraged—through Federal assistance—to develop plans to meet these guidelines. The Secretary would be prohibited from signing any contract with a district that fails to develop a drainage plan by 1992.

A California Water Exchange would be established to market surplus agricultural water under contract to Central Valley Project [CVP] customers. Any irrigation district could make water available to the exchange and the Secretary would be required to market the water to the highest bidder.

Districts must use the proceeds from the sale to pay their appropriate share of operation, maintenance, and capital costs. Districts could retain 75 percent of the remaining funds to finance solutions to their drainage problems. Otherwise, the district would only keep 25 percent of the profits.

Any funds received by the Federal Government would be equally divided for three purposes: One, repaying the costs of the San Luis Drain, a land retirement program and establishing a ground water management research area; two, restoring California wetlands and sport fish; and, three, repaying the capital costs of the CVP. By expediting repayment of project costs, this bill will reduce long-term subsidies and save taxpayers millions of dollars.

The bill would authorize a \$30 million research program to examine the drainage problems of the Central Valley, and also would establish the research objectives for this program. However, the program would proceed only after the State of California had agreed to pay 35 percent of the costs.

The bill would direct the Secretary to comply with the State Water Resources Control Board order to close Kesterson Reservoir. It would authorize the Secretary to spend up to \$30 million to clean up the contamination at the reservoir.

To assist farmers affected by drainage problems, the bill permits the Secretary to purchase two types of farmland from willing sellers at fair market value. First, lands which if permanently retired would improve the quality of a district's agricultural wastewater. Second, lands no longer suitable for sustained production because of contamination.

The bill would authorize the Secretary to purchase up to 4,000 acres immediately adjacent to Kesterson Reservoir for a groundwater water research area.

The bill would finally resolve the complex problems surrounding the legal battles be-

tween Westlands and the Federal Government. The bill would expand the service area of the District from 500,000 acres to 650,000 acres. It would replace an outdated surplus crops provision with one recently approved by the Congress in the Garrison Diversion Unit Reformulation Act (P.L. 99-294).

The bill would prohibit any further construction of the San Luis Drain beyond its present terminus at Kesterson Reservoir. However, the bill would relieve the district from repayment of the \$42 million spent on the drain to date.

Finally, the bill would authorize an additional \$100 million for distribution systems and drains in Westlands. However, in order for these funds to be spent, Westlands would have to come into compliance with the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 [RRA]. In addition, the legislation clarifies that any additional long-term water service to any portion of the San Luis unit would trigger full compliance with the RRA for the district which enters into the contract.

This legislation establishes the framework we need to resolve the drainage problems which threaten the future of irrigated agriculture in California. It is a comprehensive and innovative solution to these problems and I intend to work diligently to seek enactment at the earliest possible date.

A TRIBUTE TO CAPT. JAMES SMITH

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, a veteran of the Vietnam war once said, "Poor is a Nation that has no heroes; beggard is that Nation that has, and forgets". Truer words were never spoken. Here is the story of one man, Capt. James Smith, whose bravery during the battle of Mobile Bay in the Civil War earned him the Congressional Medal of Honor. The published account of Captain Smith's valor during this battle reads as follows:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as Captain of a gun on board the U.S.S. *Richmond* and against the ram "Tennessee" in Mobile Bay, on August 5, 1864. Despite the damage to his ship and the loss of several men on board as enemy fire raked her decks, Smith fought his gun with skill and courage throughout the prolonged battle which resulted in the surrender of the Rebel Ram "Tennessee" and in the successful attacks carried out on Fort Morgan.

But, tragically, the Nation that had so commemorated Captain Smith's courage soon forgot his exceptional spirit of loyalty. Upon his death in 1881, there were no military honor guards to mourn his passing, no one present to tell of his heroic valor, and no military awards or honors. In fact, there was no recognition of any kind, not even a simple headstone to dignify his grave. Captain Smith's outstanding achievement and contribution to the success of the Civil War was buried along with his casket in a New City

cemetery until his story was unearthed almost 100 years later.

Through the efforts of Mr. Thomas Brenker this injustice has been rectified and Captain Smith will have the ceremonial burial befitting his heroism. My office has worked closely with Mr. Brenker in bringing Captain Smith's remains to their rightful resting place in Arlington Cemetery. However, Captain Smith's selfless loyalty to this country and his courageous deed should never have been forgotten. I commend Mr. Brenker for bringing this gross negligence to our attention and I am pleased to have been a part of his effort to pay tribute to this American hero.

Although this story has a happy ending—that is, our recognition of Captain Smith's courage and self-sacrifice—there are many others who have not been so appropriately honored. Indeed, there are over 200 deceased recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor who have been buried, without notice, in unmarked graves around the country. I have introduced legislation, House Joint Resolution 501, which addresses this grave injustice. This bill, instigated by my work on behalf of Capt. James Smith, makes clear the resolve of Congress to acknowledge and honor these near-forgotten heroes by examining the need for a central clearinghouse for information on recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

On this Memorial Day we take time to remember our war dead. I can think of no more fitting tribute to these fallen soldiers than this ceremony honoring Capt. James Smith. On Memorial Day we make clear that we have not forgotten, nor will we ever forget, the heroism of all our veterans who so fiercely protected "liberty and justice for all".

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK—FOCUSING ON SMALL HIGH TECHNOLOGY FIRMS AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, almost 4 years ago President Reagan signed the Small Business Innovation Development Act into law. In his Rose Garden speech, he noted that:

The Small Business Innovation Development Act recognizes that we in Government must work in partnership with small business to ensure that technologies and processes are readily transferred to commercial applications.

With those words, the President pledged his total commitment to the new SBIR Program.

Today, my subcommittee took a small step toward ensuring the continuation of this landmark measure by repealing its sunset provision. This action is particularly timely coming as it does during Small Business Week, 1986.

I would like to point out that when announcing this year's Small Business Week, President Reagan stated that:

Business of America begins with small business * * * Their innovative entrepre-

neurial spirit has brought a new excitement to the marketplace.

It is this most innovative sector, working together with the participating agencies, that has made the SBIR Program a success. The testimony of these agencies attest to the high quality of the SBIR proposals; and the agencies' SBIR Program managers are very enthusiastic about the program. It has increased small business participation in the R&D process, while allowing these agencies to explore new and risky ideas that would never have been considered before.

In reviewing the testimony my subcommittee received during recent hearings which looked at the achievements of the SBIR Program, I personally believe that SBIR is a particularly appropriate use of Federal funds.

It is true that we must have patience regarding the future marketing of the innovative ideas being developed under SBIR. The agencies, however, have stated that the potential for commercialization of the SBIR projects they have funded is very promising.

Unfortunately, despite these favorable reviews, many agencies have indicated that it may be impossible, without this statute, to continue an SBIR-like program on their own.

Therefore, it remains up to the Congress to ensure that our Federal agencies continue this cooperative arrangement with small high technology firms. By considering reauthorization now, we would be ensuring that there is no gap in its implementation as well as sending a message to the participating agencies and interested small businesses that we want this important program to continue.

I recently received a letter from the National Federation of Independent Businesses, which has long been among the most vocal supporters of the SBIR Program. Their letter pointed out that:

The successes of this program are many, and the biggest winner has proved to be the Federal Government.

NFIB also states that:

The excellent job being done by the Small Business Administration in managing the SBIR is the primary reason the program can boast so many successes.

Furthermore, the NFIB letter expresses support for the timely reauthorization of the Small Business Innovation Development Act, pointing out that:

While the act does not expire until 1988, Government agencies must begin their budgeting efforts now for the upcoming years. It is appropriate that you begin the process of permanently reauthorizing the SBIR.

I think we will all agree that the SBIR is no longer an experiment. There is no better time than Small Business Week to take the first steps toward reauthorization.

THERESA EBERENZ RETIRES

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 1986, Miss Theresa Eberenz will retire from

the St. Louis Public Schools after more than 40 years of loyal service as a teacher.

Miss Eberenz was born in St. Louis, educated in Normandy, MO, and received her teacher training at Harris Teachers' College, earning a bachelor of education degree. Her master of science degree was earned at St. Louis University.

Miss Eberenz' career as a teacher had its beginning at Field School. She has also taught at Clark, Lindenwood, and Buder Schools. Miss Eberenz has kept a close association with her colleagues from Field School. She is active on the board of the Lindenwood Community School.

She has always had a keen interest in science and has involved her fifth grade students in the St. Louis Science Fair. Some have received awards.

Miss Eberenz has been an asset to St. Louis children throughout her teaching career, working actively with students, parents, and fellow teachers. Her philosophy is: "There is good in every child, and with enough patience you will find it."

I know that the whole community at Buder School will miss Theresa Eberenz. There is no more important service to our country than teaching our children. With the students and staff of the St. Louis Public Schools, I salute you, Miss Eberenz, and wish you the best in your retirement.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. ROBERT W. SENNEWALD

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce to my colleagues the retirement and pay tribute to an outstanding military officer, Gen. Robert W. Sennewald, who is stepping down as the commanding general, U.S. Army Forces Command.

Throughout his career, General Sennewald has held a wide variety of important command and staff positions, including the commander in chief of the Republic of Korea [ROK]/United States Forces, deputy commander in chief of all U.S. forces in the Pacific Theater, and commanding general of the U.S. Army Training Center and Fort Dix in New Jersey.

General Sennewald is a 1951 distinguished military graduate from Iowa State University. His military education includes completion of the basic and advanced officer courses at the artillery and missile school, the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, and the National War College.

Awards and decorations received by General Sennewald include the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, Distinguished Service Medal, Defense Superior Service Medal, Legion of Merit with two Oak Leaf Clusters, Bronze Star Medal with Valor Device with one Oak Leaf Cluster, Air Medals, Army Commendation Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster, the Vietnamese Service Medal, the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal, and the Purple Heart.

Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that the Members join me in praising this distinguished American

soldier for his many years of dedicated service to his country, and in wishing General Sennewald and his wife, the former Nancy Jane Vance, and their three children, Steven, Ann, and Julie all the best in the many years to come.

GIRL SCOUT SILVER AWARD TO MICHELLE MOYER

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 1986, Michelle Moyer of Beavertown, PA, will receive the Girl Scout Silver Award, Girl Scouting's highest honor. This award has special significance because Michelle is the first Girl Scout from Beavertown to receive it.

Michelle has put forth a great deal of effort in pursuit of the Silver Award, including earning the Challenge of Being a Girl Scout by helping set up a children's fingerprinting program for her community and helping with Girl Scout day camp. She also worked on the emergency preparedness, global understanding, music skills for living, leadership, career exploration, and photography projects.

I would like to congratulate Michelle on her achievements in Girl Scouts and wish her similar successes in her future endeavors.

STAR WARS BOYCOTT

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a report on the progress of the strategic defense initiative (star wars) boycott by researchers in science and engineering. These researchers have pledged to not seek any star wars funding and not to accept any funding for star wars research if it is offered to them. This is quite an incredible effort! It is almost beyond belief that researchers in the academic community are willing to forego available research funds in an era when the research dollar is pursued with greater devotion than the knights pursued the Holy Grail.

The star wars boycott was begun by concerned scientists for a number of reasons. One can be sure that those reasons did not include an excess of research moneys. However they did include concern that star wars was not technically feasible, that a limited capacity system—which might be feasible—would simply serve to escalate the arms race, that star wars research would violate existing arms control agreements and that the development of a system would be a step toward a strategy which could trigger a nuclear war. The strength of these concerns motivated the scientists to take a step which is virtually unprecedented in this country—the refusal of research scientists to develop arms which would ultimately prove destructive to all people.

The Manhattan project of World War II to develop the atomic bomb had some interest-

ing fallout. Scientists involved with the project were confronted with the destructive capacity that they had generated. The two bombs dropped on Japan were real weapons which landed on real people and caused real destruction. This was no longer an exercise in theory which was motivated by a desire to end the war and the sheer intellectual curiosity which made finding out if the bomb was a possible challenge. Once the bombs had been dropped, the consequences had to be dealt with. The scientists involved divided into two camps. There were those who stood in awe of what they had created and decided that it was not good. There were those who were equally awed by the ability that they had created to use for defense or offense. Those pressed on to develop bigger, and to them, better bombs. Of course, our adversaries were busy doing the same thing and soon "they" too had the bomb and we entered the era where it was possible to destroy the world as we know it.

Each leap in the technology of destruction has been applauded by those who somehow feel protected by this. However, there are others who have wondered why we continue to squander our resources so that we may increase the magnitude of destruction possible.

Young people have come to my office to question why they are having a hard time getting the resources to go to college while we continue to spend billions of dollars to increase our destructive capacity. With their rather direct perspective on survival, they ask why it is necessary to destroy the world so many times over. I have no answer for them. I find no reason to classify devices as weapons of defense or offense, when the consequences of their use is destruction of the user as well as the target. In order to be useful, a weapon is supposed to have the capacity to be aimed at an enemy without having it backfire on the user with equally devastating consequences. The scientists and engineers who have signed the pledge recognize the fact that star wars is dangerous. So far, 3,700 professors and senior researchers as well as 2,800 graduate students have signed the pledge. They have done so knowing that they will not have access to one of the greatest boondoggles around. Their concern for their fellow beings has outweighed their concern for their own careers. This was no small act for each and every person who signed the pledge. Both their courage and concern are to be commended.

UNFAIR FOOTWEAR COMPETITION FROM BRAZIL

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion lately about United States' export problems with our trading partner, Brazil. Just last week, a Cabinet-level committee ordered the preparation of retaliatory trade actions directed at Brazil in response to its refusal to ease restrictions on the import of computers and related technology.

Clearly, American companies are experiencing problems as they attempt to do business in Brazil and we are aware of many Government actions in that nation which have been designed to protect Brazilian domestic industries.

Today, however, I would like to center my remarks on a problem involving the rubber footwear industry.

For some time, a firm located within my congressional district, Joneric Products, has maintained a manufacturing facility for the production of safety shoes. These safety shoes are used by countless of workers in their daily work to protect themselves from injury. The growing need for these safety shoes is demonstrated by the recent expansion and modernization of Joneric Products' operations. The company has purchased new machinery and equipment and created new manufacturing jobs within Montgomery County to continue to expand its operations.

Unfortunately, their new enterprise and private investments in our Nation's manufacturing base are threatened by a Brazilian company which has begun exporting a similar product at unreasonably lower prices.

Jonerich's safety shoes are priced in the \$20 range which is a reasonable price to guarantee worker protection. The similar shoes currently being exported by Brazil cost approximately \$8 a pair. This \$8 figure, I should point out, includes a 37-percent import duty. While I recognize that Brazil has a lower wage rate for its production workers, I nevertheless believe that the Brazilian shoes must be coming into our Nation at a price below its production costs. If this allegation is proven, a clear case of import subsidies by the Brazilian Government would appear.

These subsidies pose a serious threat to the economic viability of Joneric Products and its workers. If Joneric is forced to cut back its operations due to this unfair foreign competition, it will result in the loss of jobs and increased hardship for the families of its workers.

The pricing mechanism of the Brazilian imports must be comprehensively examined. In light of the United States Trade Representative's efforts to negotiate with the Brazilian Government on trade issues, I think the situation of Joneric Products should be investigated.

I hope that the USTR investigates whether the Brazilian Government is unfairly subsidizing its safety shoe exports and if subsidies are found, that appropriate actions be taken. Quite simply, our Nation cannot afford to lose any more of its vital manufacturing base.

TRIBUTE TO FRITZ HUNTSINGER

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this moment to bring to the attention of my colleagues the death of one of my most honored constituents.

Fritz Huntsinger, founder of VETCO Offshore, Inc., was born in Eimeldingens, Germa-

ny, on June 8, 1899, and attended schools in Switzerland. He served in the German Army during World War I, in Russia on the Western front. He was a prisoner of war in England until 1920. He returned to Germany and earned a diesel engineering degree from Nurnberg University in 1923. That same year he immigrated to the United States and became a floor sweeper for Schwab Tool Co., in Ventura, CA. This company served the emerging oil industry in Southern California. In 1928 Fritz rose to general foreman. At the height of the depression, the Schwab-Lane Tool Co. went bankrupt and Fritz bought the company in 1930 at a sheriff's sale, using his life's savings. This was the birth of Ventura Tool Co. and parent of VETCO Offshore which now employs over 3,000 people worldwide. In 1977 VETCO became a subsidiary of Combustion Engineering headquartered in Stamford, CT.

Ventura Tool Co. started out as a job shop operation earning the confidence of the oil patch by providing innovative services and craftsman machining work to solve the industry's problems on an urgent basis. Fritz became much in demand, because he didn't know the things that couldn't be done so he did them. He developed innovative tools and services over the years, many of which later developed many into sizable industries in themselves.

Fritz, early in his career, began sharing his good fortune in his newly adopted country with the less fortunate. He was a prime contributor to the establishment of the new Community Memorial Hospital in Ventura, donating to them one of the first brain and body scan diagnostic machines west of Chicago. He contributed to the City of Hope and other medical research. In the field of education, he donated the Huntsinger Academic Center to Pepperdine University, an aquatic center to Hood College in Maryland for use by handicapped children in the three neighboring States. He contributed to a youth center in Celle, West Germany for orphaned children from the Eastern Zone. He has contributed to the California Institute of Technology since 1952 and was a member of the advisory council. He has always been a contributor to organizations fostering a strong American youth such as the Pyle's Boys Camp, the Boy Scouts of America, Y.M.C.A., Salvation Army, various Little League teams and the Ventura Girls' Softball Team, which became the National Champions 2 years in a row. In December 1977, the Ventura County Boy Scouts awarded him with their highest award—the Gold Condor Award.

He was an active participant in civic affairs, having served three sessions on the Ventura County Grand Jury, twice as foreman, and was chairman of the Ventura County Flood Control Committee. He was very active in trade associations which foster the preservation of the private enterprise system. He was a frequent speaker before various government bodies, providing expert testimony.

Fritz earned many awards for his achievements and contributions to society. In 1972 he received the Ventura Jaycees award as Outstanding Citizen of the Year. In 1977 he was elected to the 33d Degree Mason and was appointed the Grand Supreme Commander as the First Vernable Master of the County Scot-

tish Rite Bodies. Also in 1977 he was named Industrialist of the Year by the California Museum of Science and Industry. In 1979 he was named Man of the Ages by the American Petroleum Industry. In 1982 he received the highest honor awarded by the American Offshore Industry for his achievements in supplying equipment to the offshore industry and for his humanitarian and philanthropic accomplishments.

Early in World War II, Fritz, remembering his own loneliness during World War I, formed the Tuesday Afternoon Rest and Aspiration Society to provide a place for servicemen to meet and mingle with the businessmen of Ventura. He remained Chief of the R&A until his death and enjoyed weekly respite from responsibility reveling in the fellowship of men from all walks of life.

Fritz was a member of the board of directors of Community Memorial Hospital in Ventura from 1951, serving as its president from 1960-65. He served as a member of the board of trustees of Pepperdine University, helped organize the Ventura County Taxpayers Association and served as its first president, was a member of the executive board of the National Ocean Industries and served as its national finance chairman. He was a member of the Poinsettia Lodge of Masons, member and president of the Ventura Shrine Club, member of the Legion of Honor of the Demolay and Knight Commander of the Court of Honor. He served as Guardian Member of the Boy Scouts of America and was a member of the Ventura Chamber of Commerce and served as its president in 1938 and 1946.

Fritz is survived by his wife, Marianne, sons Carl and Fritz R, six grandchildren and three great grandchildren. I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing sympathy to the Huntsinger family and in celebrating the life of such a great man.

rooms and 10,000 campsites. Also in this area we have the Intracoastal Waterway and the Waccamaw River providing water sports, fishing, and hunting.

Brookgreen Gardens, the world's largest outdoor collection of American sculpture, is housed in a garden setting along the southern Grand Strand. It contains more than 400 pieces of sculpture, amidst nearly 500 species of native trees, flowers, shrubs, and a wildlife park featuring birds and animals native to South Carolina in a natural setting.

I am also proud to have in my congressional district a wide array of local festivals celebrating the heritages, specialties, and cultures of these areas. Included are tobacco, cotton, sweet potato, chicken bog festivals, arts and crafts shows, horse shows, and old fashioned days.

My district is home for the largest 1-day tourism event in the State, the Darlington 500 NASCAR race. Other races including the TranSouth 500 are held throughout the year, and the Joe Weatherby Museum houses the world's largest collection of stock racing cars.

A touch of France can be found at the family-owned Truluck Vineyards in Lake City which offers tours of its vineyards and bottling facilities, along with a sampling of its premium wines.

There are abundant hunting and fishing areas throughout the district including the Georgetown low country and the Santee lakes area.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the resolution proclaiming National Tourism Week for 1987. I also welcome those who may choose the variety, the beauty, and the excitement of a South Carolina vacation.

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK 1986

HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, as vice chairman of the Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus. I have long been aware of the outstanding partnership that exists between the travel industry and the Federal and State governments in the promotion of tourism to our country. This spirit of cooperation is best symbolized in the annual observance of National Tourism Week which is being celebrated this week all over America.

Tourism is gaining wider recognition every year as one of our Nation's leading employers and revenue generators. Tourism is a wide variety of enterprises such as restaurants, hotels and motels, amusement parks, buses, travel agencies, car rentals, and souvenir shops. It is fitting that we honor them during National Tourism Week as important businesses that attract domestic and international travelers to our areas and provide services to those travelers during their stay.

California is the No. 1 travel destination in the Nation and receives more foreign visitors than any other State. Tourism is the third largest employer in our State. California had more people employed in tourism industry jobs than any other State in 1983 and ranked second in

jobs generated by foreign visitor spending. In 1983, travelers to California spent nearly \$28.5 billion and our tourism businesses paid more than \$3,366 million in tax revenues.

Tourism works for California and for the rest of America. This week we salute the travel and tourism industry as a major and growing force in our national and State economy. I am also pleased to join my Tourism Caucus colleagues as we introduce legislation today to designate the week of May 17, 1987, as next year's National Tourism Week.

GOODBYE TO THE FIRST WOMAN FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER AT U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my sorrow at the death of Lucile Atcherson on May 9, 1986, and to bring to the attention of my colleagues the achievements of Ms. Atcherson, the first woman in the U.S. diplomatic corps.

Lucile Atcherson received her A.B. degree from Smith College at age 18. She did volunteer work for the Franklin County (Ohio) Suffrage Association, then worked as a paid organizer for woman suffrage at the local, State, and Federal levels. She was secretary to Anne Morgan, president of the American Committee for Devastated France; and directed the general headquarters of that committee in Paris from 1919 to 1921.

After being in France for over 4 years, she recognized that the job of aiding the French would end soon. She had met some of the men in the American Embassy, even helping to type some of their papers. Work in the Foreign Service interested her, so she decided to apply to take the entrance examination.

She returned to the United States in 1921 and set about teaching herself what she thought she should know for work in the Foreign Service. She took the Diplomatic Service examination in July 1922 and ranked third with a combined written and oral score only a fraction of a percentage point behind the highest scoring candidate.

She was notified on December 5, 1922, that she had been appointed to the Diplomatic Service and would be assigned to Washington. On December 18, she reported to the Department of State and became the first woman Foreign Service officer in the United States.

The efforts of Ms. Atcherson and other women to enter the Foreign Service set off quite a debate among Government officials as to whether women should be allowed to serve. Some felt that an Executive order should be issued excluding not only women, but blacks and naturalized citizens as well from eligibility for employment. Some argued that there were ways for rating applicants from these groups so low on the examinations that they would not get a passing grade. Still others felt that applications must be judged on an equal basis and with equal treatment.

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with Congressman BILL BONER in introducing a resolution designating the week of May 17, 1987, as National Tourism Week.

The purpose of this resolution is to bring to the public's attention the opportunities and adventures provided by tourism in the United States. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this resolution.

As we celebrate National Tourism Week for 1986, I would like to highlight some of the events, festivals, and scenic attractions that not only bring thousands of tourists to my district, but also provide interesting and exciting opportunities for our residents.

Probably best known is the Grand Strand—a 60-mile stretch of clean, wide, safe, public beach. There's plenty for young and old, from miniature golf to three dozen golf courses. We enjoy abundant surf, pier and offshore fishing, and host to the popular Arthur Smith Fishing Tournament. Accommodations include 45,000

Fortunately, one of these last was Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes, who refused to even suggest to the President that he issue such an Executive order. Hughes also told the Board of Examiners that he thought

It would only be a question of time before women would take their place in diplomacy and consular work just as in other professions.

He added that there was no reason for creating friction by attempting to stem the inevitable tide temporarily.

The next question to be dealt with was the issue of Ms. Atcherson's assignment. She was initially assigned to the Division of Latin American Affairs in Washington. Although most officers received training in political affairs for a month or two and then were sent overseas, Ms. Atcherson was not assigned until she had served for 2 years and 4 months. In April 1925, she was assigned to the Legation at Berne, Switzerland.

In spite of the objections raised by the head of the Legation, Hugh Gibson, Ms. Atcherson was assigned anyway and sent across the Atlantic. She even managed to deal with such concerns Gibson worried about as what she should wear on official occasions and where she should sit at official dinners.

Ms. Atcherson continued in Berne for 2 years, then was transferred as Third Secretary of the Legation in Panama in February 1927. She resigned from the Foreign Service in September 1927. Her resignation was accepted with regret.

In 1978, the Department of State honored Lucile Atcherson on Foreign Service Day for her pioneering efforts.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES FREDRICK CASH

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the late Charles Fredrick Cash.

A large entourage of State and local corrections officials and employees attended the funeral of Charles Fredrick Cash Monday morning, May 12, at St. Paul's Catholic Church in Princeton, KY.

Cash, age 35, died at approximately 4:45 a.m. Friday, May 9, at the West Kentucky Farm Center from injuries caused by a blow to the head with a blunt instrument, according to Kentucky State Police. Cash held the position of corrections farm program supervisor in charge of the dairy, gardens, orchards, and food processing plant at the farm center. He and his family lived on the farm.

The accused criminal in the incident is in custody at Kentucky State Penitentiary and is expected to be indicted by the June Lyon County Grand Jury, according to Commonwealth Attorney Bill Cunningham. He was serving a life sentence for a 1974 willful murder conviction.

Farm center Warden John Duncan said the incident has been turned over to the State police and Cunningham for investigation.

Cunningham has said he feels the Kentucky Department of Corrections and Classifications will take a look at the inmates who are placed at the farm center and Duncan said he too is sure there will be a re-evaluation of who is sent there.

There was a more than capacity crowd at both the funeral and at the rosary service that was conducted at 7 p.m. May 11 at Dunn's Mortuary in Eddyville.

Approximately 150 to 200 attended a memorial service for Cash at 3 p.m. Sunday at the farm center and a separate memorial service was held by farm center inmates.

The murder of Fred Cash, a well liked, hard-working young man, was tragic, front page news across Kentucky May 9-12.

When I called the young widow of Fred Cash to express my sympathy and offer my assistance to her and her family, Marilyn Cash did ask that Fred Cash's untimely and unfortunate death not be in vain. Marilyn Cash urges through her Congressman that correctional institutions' officials be given more security as they guard our correctional institutions. Marilyn Cash's hope at this point is that additional funding from the Federal and State governments will give those who guard and work at our correctional institutions more protection in the future.

This Congressman would add that our Nation's correctional institutions' officials are generally underpaid. Kentucky is a good example.

In Kentucky, law enforcement officers are entitled to hazardous duty pay. Correctional institutions' officers and workers are not entitled to hazardous duty pay in Kentucky, which is very unfair.

Bill Cunningham, the western Kentucky Commonwealth attorney whose jurisdiction includes Kentucky State Penitentiary at Eddyville and the KSP farm center near Fredonia recently said: "No one deserves hazardous duty pay as much as corrections officers. Unfortunately, it takes tragedies like this one to call attention to it." I agree with those views.

Charles Fredrick Cash was a member of St. Paul's Catholic Church, the St. Vincent DePaul Society, and the Cursillo Movement. He was a 1973 graduate of Murray State University with a bachelor's degree in agriculture.

Surviving are his wife, Marilyn Cash of Lyon County; one son, Christopher Cash; two daughters, Karen Cash and Kathy Cash; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Cash of Graves County; four brothers, Don Cash of Corpus Christi, TX, John Cash of Anaheim, CA, David Cash of Memphis and Terry Cash of Bethany, OK; three sisters, Carole Embry of Missis-sauga, ON, Canada, Janet Jones of Mayfield and Annette Cash of Louisville.

MICHAEL DEAVER'S GUATEMALAN CONNECTION

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by Colin Danby and John Burstein re-

garding former White House Deputy Chief of Staff Michael Deaver's lobbying activities on behalf of Guatemala.

The article, prepared on behalf of the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, provides details about Mr. Deaver's efforts to enlist support for the military Government of Guatemala during the 1980 Presidential campaign in the United States. In light of the allegations concerning Mr. Deaver's current activities on behalf of other foreign governments, I believe this matter deserves attention.

MICHAEL DEAVER'S GUATEMALAN CONNECTION
(By Colin Danby and John Burstein, Research Associates, Council on Hemispheric Affairs)

Reagan confidant and former White House staffer Michael Deaver's possible violations of conflict of interest laws in his lobbying for Canada and other nations are now well-known, but Deaver has other skeletons in his closet as well, including ties to the Guatemalan military government of Gen. Lucas Garcia, a regime that compiled one of the world's most abominable human rights records.

Michael Deaver, said to be among President Ronald Reagan's closest friends, worked for two extreme right-wing Guatemalan organizations in 1980, as part of an effort by the military government of that country to gain influence with the Reagan camp. At the time, the Lucas Garcia regime was among the hemisphere's worst human rights violator, accounting for over 5,000 victims in 1980 alone. The regime had become such a pariah that the Carter administration decided to recall its ambassador to Guatemala, Frank Ortiz, that year for being overly friendly with the dictator.

Guatemalan rightists ardently wooed the Reagan campaign in 1980, hoping for a reversal of the Carter administration's human rights policy if the Republicans won. In June 1980, Deaver's then-existing firm of Deaver & Hannaford arranged for two trips to Guatemala by California journalists and politicians at the expense of the Guatemalan Freedom Foundation. The head of this organization was sugar baron Roberto Alejos, one of whose plantations was used to train Bay of Pigs invasion participants. Another leading figure was the notorious John Trotter from Texas, who has been accused of being involved in the death-squad murders of at least five union organizers at his Guatemala City Coca-Cola bottling plant. After an international boycott of Coke over the incident, the Coca-Cola company bought the franchise back from him.

In August 1980, Deaver & Hannaford was also retained by Amigos del Pais, several of whose members were also implicated in financing death squads. (At the time, Deaver briefly got into trouble with the U.S. Justice Department for not registering promptly as a foreign agent.) The firm received \$130,200 a year, plus expenses, for an "information program to journalists, businesses, elected officials and other persons interested in U.S.-Guatemala trade and relations." Deaver set up meetings between leading Guatemalan rightists and U.S. businessmen and politicians, particularly Reagan campaign figures, several of whom promised a resumption of U.S. military aid. Deaver left the firm, which became Hannaford Co., in early 1981 when he joined the new Reagan administration.

Deaver later insisted that he had been hired to improve the human rights reputa-

tion of the Guatemalan government, but most of the contacts that he made with government officials and members of Congress were aimed at lifting the arms embargo. Deaver continued to champion Guatemala's interests after he joined the White House staff, and is credited with setting up a last-minute meeting between Reagan and then-dictator Gen. Efraim Rios Montt, after Reagan had already left on a trip to Latin America. Deaver, the President's advance man for the trip is said to have hastily worked the Guatemalan ruler into Reagan's itinerary after the President was in the air, and long after the itinerary had been released to the press—with no mention of a meeting with Rios Montt. After the encounter, Reagan said that Guatemala had gotten a "bum rap" on human rights.

An inquiry in May 1981 by then-COHA Board of trustees Chairman Chauncey Alexander, who at the time served as director of the 90,000-member National Association of Social Workers, into the propriety, of Deaver's engaging in discussions of Guatemala policy while his firm held the Amigos contract, elicited a reply from White House counsel Fred Fielding that "if Mr. Deaver were to participate in such discussions, no conflict-of-interest would result."

Deaver & Hannaford also worked closely with Richard Allen, who himself met with a number of prominent Guatemalans and who later sold his consulting firm to Hannaford when he became White House national Security Adviser. Allen had been forced to "withdraw" from the Reagan campaign in October 1980 after revelations that he had used his position as an aide to president Nixon to land lucrative consulting contracts when he left that administration. A later scandal forced Allen to leave the Reagan administration in 1982.

Deaver & Hannaford's role in influencing Guatemala policy was not unprecedented. In mid-1980, it was disclosed that the firm was receiving \$60,000 a year from the government of Taiwan at the same time that candidate Reagan called for restoring full U.S. diplomatic relations with that country.

Dr. John Foster, head of the Division of Mission of Canada's United Church of Christ and Robin Sears, principle secretary of the leader of the Ontario New Democratic party, both COHA Trustees issued the following statement: "It is sad indeed that Canada has entrusted its interests in such important issues as acid rain and bilateral trade to a man who, without compunction, served the interests of the most blood-thirsty dictatorship in this hemisphere, the military government of Guatemala, by working to ply weapons to Latin America's worst human rights violator. Michael Deaver is a man of questionable public morals who has vended his access to Ronald Reagan to the highest bidder. We urge Prime Minister Mulroney and External Affairs Minister Clark to immediately consider cancelling Mr. Deaver's contract."

Deaver's firm currently holds a one-year contract with the Canadian government, worth \$106,000, which is due to expire June 30, 1986.

INTERPRETATION OF LEGISLATION IMPLEMENTING COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, last year when the Congress considered the legislation implementing the Compact of Free Association between the United States and the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands, one of the key issues in the debate was the question of post-compact management. Specifically, the issue was which agencies of the U.S. Government would play the lead roles in implementing the compact.

As chairman of the Subcommittee of Asian and Pacific Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I played a key role in the negotiations with my colleagues on the Interior Committee concerning the resolution of this issue. The outcome of these negotiations was that the Department of State was made responsible for government-to-government relations with the Freely Associated States.

It was my understanding of the phrase "government-to-government relations" that the Department of State would be responsible not merely for consular duties in the Freely Associated States, but for all dealings with the governments of the Freely Associated States, other than on questions concerning the administration of various Federal programs specified in the compact legislation, for which the Department of the Interior would be responsible.

It was my clear understanding at the time, and it remains my understanding now, that government-to-government relations was meant to be interpreted broadly, and not limited to the narrow interpretation of consular affairs. For example, the compact requires consultations by the Freely Associated States on foreign affairs issues. It would make no sense for any agency of the U.S. Government but the Department of State to conduct such consultations.

When the executive branch drafts an Executive order to implement the compact legislation, including the provisions on post-compact management, I expect that the Executive order will reflect the same understanding of the role of the State Department that I have just expressed.

TRADE NEGOTIATIONS WITH BRAZIL

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House, negotiations which are currently between the U.S. Trade Representative and the Government of Brazil regarding certain trade problems.

I am particularly concerned about a small firm located in my congressional district in Warrington, PA. This firm, Joneric Products Inc., manufactures safety shoes used by workers for railroads, public utilities, and the Postal Service. It employs about 100 people and has been in operation for 12 years.

It has come to my attention that Brazil may be exporting to the United States subsidized shoes that unfairly compete with domestically manufactured shoes. Brazil already has lower wage rates for its production employees as well as reported Government subsidization in this and in other areas as well. This pricing greatly damages the competitive abilities of Joneric Products and other footwear manufacturers. In fact, the Brazilian companies are able to price their footwear below the actual cost of production in the United States.

Last year, Joneric expanded and modernized its plant with new equipment and additional employees in an attempt to expand production of its safety shoes. Despite this investment, the foreign competition could very well result in the layoff of many Joneric employees. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this action could also result in increased costs to the Federal Government in the form of support programs and lost taxes. Once again, unfair foreign competition is damaging the manufacturing base of our country and it is my opinion that this problem deserves a closer look.

I urge the U.S. Trade Representative to include the domestic rubber footwear industry in his attempts to deal with these Brazilian trade practices affecting the working people of southeastern Pennsylvania. I have written to Mr. Clayton Yeutter making that request and am attaching a copy of my letter.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 22, 1986.

Mr. CLAYTON YEUTTER,
U.S. Trade Representative,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. YEUTTER: I am writing in reference to the trade negotiations which are currently underway with the government of Brazil. Basically, I would like to request that the domestic rubber footwear industry be included in these negotiations.

This issue is of particular importance to me as it affects a firm located in my Congressional district in Warrington, Pennsylvania. This firm, Joneric Products, Inc., manufactures safety shoes used by workers for railroads, public utilities, and the Postal Service.

Unfortunately, however, Joneric is being undercut by unfair competition from Brazil. Brazil not only has lower wage rates for its production employees but also has reported government subsidization in this and other areas as well. As a result, the Brazilian companies are able to price their footwear below the actual cost of production in the United States. Needless to say, this pricing greatly damages the competitive abilities of Joneric Products and other footwear manufacturers.

Although Joneric recently made a substantial capital investment to modernize its facilities, the Brazilian imports could very well result in the layoff of many Joneric employees. In addition, this action could result in increased costs to the federal government in the form of support programs and lost taxes.

Unfair foreign competition continues to damage the manufacturing base of the United States and it is my opinion that this problem deserves a closer look.

I urge you to include the domestic rubber footwear industry in your discussions with the Brazilian government in an attempt to protect the interests of the people of southeastern Pennsylvania and the nation as a whole.

Sincerely,

PETER H. KOSTMAYER.

RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline the reasoning behind my votes on the budget resolution options put before us today. I will focus primarily on the Republican budget substitute offered by the Mr. Latta and the House Budget Committee bill.

Let me first offer my congratulations to the members of the 92 Group that have put many long hours of thought and calculation into the budget process. The 92 Group Budget Task Force produced a very well thought-out document that clearly explains the various impacts of its spending decisions and carefully evaluates the economic climate and funding needs of the coming year. This budget also meets the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction target for fiscal year 1987. The 92 Group can take pride in having produced the most responsible budget to come before us this year.

Because the 92 Group budget formed the basis for the Republican budget alternative, I supported Mr. Latta's substitute. I am especially pleased that this alternative meets the deficit reduction target without resorting to increases in taxes beyond those revenues identified in the President's budget request. While I can understand the reluctance of both the House and Senate Budget Committees to make the cuts necessary to meet the Gramm-Rudman targets without increasing revenues, we must make that additional effort to curb spending. The House Republicans have shown this is possible without making unacceptable cuts in domestic programs.

I am uncomfortable, however, with the amount of funding provided for the Department of Defense. The guideline of a discretionary spending freeze should apply to defense spending as well. Because funding for the Department of Defense has nearly doubled since 1980, the constraint of level funding should not have an adverse impact upon our national security or readiness. Therefore, I have endorsed the House Budget Committee's philosophy of disallowing any increases for the Pentagon. When the Republican alternative failed to receive majority support, I voted for the committee's bill, partly because of its posture on defense spending.

I would like to briefly outline the components of my own budget proposal that strikes a reasonable compromise between the priorities of Democrats and Republicans and of the House and the Senate. My budget, I believe, again illustrates how a reasonable spending

blueprint can be formulated without resorting to new taxes.

Function 050: Defense spending should be held constant at 1986 levels, providing \$285 billion in budget authority and 276.2 in outlays.

Function 150: In addition to the Republican international affairs proposals, I include the 92 Group provision of an additional \$295 million cut in the MAP authorization. We should be concentrating more upon domestic needs or international development programs than on military equipment grants to other nations.

Function 250: I support the Republican general science budget levels, but with the incorporation of the Budget Committee chairman's recommendation of a \$400 million reduction in NASA funding.

Function 270: I endorse the Republican energy funding level, but would not cut the conservation/weatherization program.

Function 300: On natural resources, my budget includes the Budget Committee proposals.

Function 350: The 92 Group level of \$23.5 billion in budget authority is most appropriate for agriculture.

Function 370: On commerce and housing, I have adopted the Budget Committee proposals.

Function 400: For transportation, I recommend the Budget Committee level, without the additional \$200 million for the Federal Aviation Administration.

Functions 450 and 500: The Budget Committee proposals come closest to my own recommendations in the areas of community and regional development, and education and training. I am particularly pleased that the Budget Committee followed the Senate's lead in providing strong support for education.

Functions 550 and 570: Here, I believe that the Republican evaluation best meets the Nation's health needs. These levels will provide adequate health coverage without further aggravating the increases in hospital costs.

Function 600: Income security is a crucial category. My budget provides for full COLA's for all civilian and military retirees at the CBO estimated level for fiscal year 1987. I am distressed that the Budget Committee assumes 4.1 percent inflation, yet budgets for only 2 percent COLA's. In addition, my budget provides full funding for child nutrition and the AFDC program.

Function 650: Social Security recipients must also receive a full COLA consistent with the CBO projections, not a 2 percent COLA as advocated by the alternatives before us.

Function 700: Veterans benefits are funded at the Budget Committee level, with the exception of some reduction in construction funds.

Function 750: I follow the Republican levels for the administration of justice function, except that my budget does not reduce funding for Legal Services.

Function 800: Here again, the Republican level is most appropriate, although my budget does not include an 8-percent cut for the legislative branch.

Function 850: Under the general purpose fiscal assistance category, my budget provides for a \$4 billion reauthorization for the general revenue-sharing program for fiscal year 1987.

Functions 900 and 920: I follow the lead of the Budget Committee in the net interest and allowances categories.

Function 950: My budget incorporates the Republican proposals for offsetting receipts.

A NICARAGUAN DEMOCRAT SPEAKS OUT

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, in our seemingly eternal debate over the Reagan administration's misguided policy of aid to the Contras, we too often lose sight of the real issues. In the May 12 Washington Post, Cardinal Miguel Obando y Bravo, archbishop of Managua, brings us back to the real issue, which is the necessity for national reconciliation in his country.

The cardinal rightly refuses to be drawn into a debate over U.S. policy. He resents the cynical efforts of both sides to use him for their own purposes: the Sandinistas by trying to make his right to freedom of speech conditional on his denunciation of U.S. policy; the Reagan administration and its allies by suggesting that he, in fact, favors that policy.

I make no pretense that the cardinal is on my side; he is on the Nicaraguan peoples' side. But I quote the words of the Nicaraguan bishop, which he cites in his article:

"We feel that any form of assistance, regardless of the source, which causes the destruction, suffering, and death of our families, or which sows hatred and discord among the Nicaraguan people, is reprehensible."

The cardinal says that reconciliation is the only real solution, and he is right. In my view—and that of most Latin Americans—reconciliation in Nicaragua cannot begin until United States policy changes. I believe the Hamilton alternative would give reconciliation a chance. When the House again takes up this issue, I urge my colleagues to vote for reconciliation.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 1986]
NICARAGUA: THE SANDINISTAS HAVE "GAGGED AND BOUND" US

(By Cardinal Miguel Obando y Bravo)

Your message asking me for an article arrived on Sunday, April 13, just as I finished celebrating Mass, and my first decision was not to grant your request. I must not confuse my pastoral mission with others, however worthy, such as politics or journalism, which are different from the mission that our Lord has entrusted to me. But, I am not obligated to keep silent either. As a man, as a citizen, as a Christian and even as a bishop, I have certain duties that I must fulfill, and these duties compel me to grant your request.

In the Mass I just celebrated, I had to announce, with great sorrow, that some of the offices of the Curia, occupied by the State Security Police since October 1985, had been confiscated by government order, despite the fact that they were built on land occupied by the Apostolic Nunciature.

In these offices there was a small printing press donated by the German Bishops' Con-

ference, which was used to print our bulletin "Iglesia," a strictly intra-ecclesiastical publication. Both the press and the bulletin were seized by the State Security Police, along with all the files, including baptismal records and my own personal seal.

During the Mass, I read the pastoral letter which we, the bishops of Nicaragua, had written for Holy Week. The pulpit was now our only means of disseminating information, because the letter was totally censored and pulled from the pages of the newspaper *La Prensa*, the only private newspaper in the country, which attempted to publish it, but in vain. We believe that the reason for the censorship was that for the second time we called all Nicaraguans to reconciliation and dialogue as the only way to peace.

It was also announced that the Sunday bulletin with the prayers and texts for the day would not be available because it was confiscated and that my Sunday address would not appear in *La Prensa*, which, under the heading "The Voice of Our Pastor," had been published for many years in that newspaper, because it too had been censored, despite the special care taken to exclude from it anything that could serve as the remotest excuse for censorship.

"Radio Catolico," the only Catholic radio station, had been closed by the State several months earlier. It was at this point, when the Church was gagged and bound, that your request arrived.

The reading for the day, taken from the Acts of the Apostles, was about an incident that pricked my conscience. The Sanhedrin sent for Peter and John, intending to force them into silence. "But Peter and John said to them in reply: 'Is it right in God's eyes for us to obey you rather than God? Judge for yourselves. We cannot possibly give up speaking of things we have seen and heard'" (Acts 4:18:20).

I felt then that I ought to tell the truth and speak as a prophet speaks, even at the risk of being a "voice that crieth in the wilderness." I would explain to those that have ears to hear the sensitive situation of our church and the serious danger we place ourselves in simply by speaking out.

I am reminded of the incident related in the 22nd chapter of Matthew: "Then the Pharisees went away and agreed on a plan to trap him in his own words." The method they chose was to appeal hypocritically to His spiritual authority, saying: "Master, you are an honest man, we know; you teach in all honesty the way of life God requires. . . . Give us your ruling on this: are we or are we not permitted to pay taxes to the Roman emperor?" Jesus was aware of their malicious intention and said to them: "You hypocrites! Why are you trying to catch me out?"

History repeats itself, and this is the situation of the Nicaraguan Bishops, a situation that we denounced in our recent pastoral letter. An appeal is made to our moral authority and to our position as spiritual leaders of the people. We are asked to make a statement on an extremely sensitive political matter, but the real objective is not to seek moral guidance, but rather to use our statement to manipulate opinion.

If Jesus had answered that taxes should be paid to Caesar, He would have become a collaborator of the occupying Roman imperialists. If He had answered no, he would have become a criminal and an agitator who violated the laws of the land. If He had not answered at all, He would have lost His authority in the eyes of the people.

We are asked to issue a statement against U.S. aid to the insurgents. The state-con-

trolled communications media, the organizations of the masses in the service of the system and their allies is the so-called People's Church and the minister of Foreign Affairs, Father Miguel d'Escoto, are all clamoring for our statement. But, as I mentioned, it is not moral guidance that is sought, since on several occasions our Conference of Bishops has already stated that it was against any outside interference, whether by the United States or the Soviet Union. (Pastoral letter of April 12, 1984). The intention is to use the statement to manipulate.

While no effort was spared in suppressing our earlier statements, this statement would be given international publicity. Not for the faithful—but for the U.S. Congress. But we are not pastors to the Congress of the United States.

If we were to support military aid to the insurgents, we would be persecuted as traitors. If we opposed aid, we would be accused of taking sides, which would automatically disqualify us as pastors to all of the people. If we remain silent, our silence would be considered guilty, the silence of complicity.

It can be argued that the U.S. Conference of Bishops has more than once issued statements on political matters. But there is one big difference the U.S. bishops' statements are made freely, they are addressed to their own people and their purpose is to provide moral guidance. They can make such statements in complete freedom, and they can give their reasons, with full access to the communications media. Their words are not censored, twisted or distorted. But above all, their statements do not make them criminals and traitors to their country.

In Nicaragua any dissident from the Sandinista cause can be placed outside the law through an ingenious distortion of the truth:

The government, with all the media under its control, has taken great pains to convince the outside world that what is happening is essentially a direct attack by the United States on our country. That there is a war, open or covert, between the two countries, and, consequently, any form of assistance to the enemy, whether material or moral, is punishable by law.

Along the same lines, and with equal insistence, it rejects both the idea that an East-West conflict has made of our country a disposable card, a pawn in the game between the superpowers, and the reality of a civil war: an enormous number of Nicaraguans oppose with all their might the turn taken by a revolution that has betrayed the hopes of the Nicaraguan people and even its own promises.

To accept the reality of an East-West conflict would be to admit that the Sandinistas are just as much the tools of Soviet interests as the insurgent forces are of the United States. If this is accepted, aid from the one is equally as deplorable as aid from the other. It would necessitate the withdrawal of the Soviet and Cuban advisors, as well as the withdrawal of all U.S. military aid.

If the reality of an internal conflict between Nicaraguans is admitted, the conclusion could not be avoided that the insurgent dissidents are now in the same position that the Sandinistas themselves once occupied, and, consequently, that they have the same right that the Sandinistas had to seek aid from other nations, which they in fact did request and obtain in order to fight a terrible dictatorship.

To accept this would mean giving the insurgents the title of "rebels," a title that

the Sandinistas proudly gave to themselves in former days.

The only possible argument against this is that unlike the Somoza dictatorship, which the Nicaraguan people fought almost unanimously, this is a democratic government, legitimately constituted, which places the interests of the Nicaraguan people above any ideological struggle or international cause, seeks the welfare and peace of the people and enjoys the support of an overwhelming majority.

Unfortunately, this is not true either. To accept this as the indisputable truth is to ignore the mass exodus of the Miskito Indians, who, on numerous occasions, fled in the thousands, accompanied by their bishop, Salvador Schaeffer. It is also to ignore the departure of tens of thousands of Nicaraguan men and women of every age, profession, economic status and political persuasion. It is to ignore that many of those who are leaders or participants in the counter-revolution were once leaders or members of the Sandinista front or were ministers in the Sandinista government. It is to ignore the lack of any justification for the most terrible violation of freedom of the press and of speech in the history of our country. It is to ignore the progressive and suffocating restriction of public liberties, under the cover of an interminable national emergency law and the continual violation of human rights. It is to ignore the expulsion of priests and the mass exodus of young people eligible for military service. . . . None of this is true of a government that has the sympathy and general support of the people.

And this is what the Nicaraguan bishops wish to state:

"It is urgent and essential that the Nicaraguan people, free of foreign interference or ideologies, find a way out of the situation of conflict that our country is experiencing.

"We reaffirm today, with renewed emphasis, what we said in our pastoral letter on Easter Sunday, April 22, 1984:

"Foreign powers are taking advantage of our situation to promote economic and ideological exploitation. They view us as adjuncts to their own power, without respect for our persons, our history, our culture and our right to determine our own destiny.

"Consequently, most of the Nicaraguan people live in fear and are uncertain about the future. They feel deeply frustrated. They cry out for peace and freedom, but their voices go unheard, drowned out by militaristic propaganda on every side.

"We feel that any form of assistance, regardless of the source, which causes the destruction, suffering and death of our families, or which sows hatred and discord among the Nicaraguan people is reprehensible. To choose annihilation of the enemy as the only possible way to peace is inevitably to choose war."

The Church proposes reconciliation through dialogue as the only real solution, the only way to peace, and maintains, in the words of His Holiness John Paul II, in his visit to El Salvador in March 1983, that this dialogue ". . . is not a delaying tactic to strengthen positions prior to continuing a fight, but rather a sincere effort to respond, by seeking appropriate solutions to the anxiety, the pain, the weariness and the fatigue of the many who yearn for peace. The many who wish to live, to rise again from the ashes, to seek warmth in the smiles of children, free from terror and in a climate of democratic cooperation."

This is the text that was censored by the Sandinista government.

We are asked to issue a statement against aid, the Church and the position of our Conference of Bishops, which is trying to guide the Church through turbulent waters, more by the spirit than by the natural sciences and politics of man, which do not seem to hold any solution for such difficult problems. We are in a difficult situation, but we place our faith and trust in the Lord Jesus, the Prince of Peace and the Lord of History.

TAX RELIEF FOR MORTGAGE REFINANCING

HON. RICHARD STALLINGS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to reverse the Internal Revenue Service decision denying a tax deduction for points paid to refinance home mortgages.

Since the early eighties, homeowners in America have paid exorbitantly high rates of interest on loans of all kinds, including mortgage loans. Fortunately, over the last 6 months, we have seen a drop in interest rates and a concomitant rush by homeowners to lower their monthly housing costs by refinancing their mortgages. It is not unusual for homeowners to save hundreds of dollars each month simply by refinancing.

Under current tax law, homeowners may deduct in the year paid the prepaid interest on loans used to purchase or improve their homes. But the IRS has said points to refinance are different and not covered by section 461(g) of the Internal Revenue Code. Thus, the cost of refinancing must be amortized over the life of the loan.

In contrast, my legislation would impose consistency in the law by allowing homeowners to deduct in the year paid the points on refinancing, just as they deduct immediately the points paid to purchase or improve their homes. In addition, it will help alleviate the extraordinary costs borne by homeowners as a result of Federal economic policy that have held interest rates at such high levels. It would be unfair to have forced homeowners to pay such high interest costs over the last 5 years and not allow them to fully benefit from the lower rates of the last 6 months.

A TRIBUTE TO ROBERT E. McCANN

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the career of a gentleman from my district who has been a faithful servant and now is retiring.

Mr. Speaker, Robert E. McCann, a native of Michigan, was born on October 30, 1927. He received his undergraduate degree—and later, a specialist degree—from Wayne State University. His graduate degree came from the University of Michigan.

Prior to starting his education career, he served in both the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Army and now is a member of the Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. McCann began his professional career as a teacher at the Gompers School in Detroit, later moving to Monroe School in Livonia. Within a short time, he became involved in Livonia's principal training program, becoming principal of Hull Elementary School of Livonia in 1961.

He remained in that position until becoming principal of Cass Elementary School in 1979, a position he still holds.

Robert McCann's leadership as a building principal is characterized by his willingness to listen rather than prejudice the members of his staff. As an administrator, Bob respects, trusts, and treats his staff as highly trained professionals, allowing each to develop and display their own teaching style.

He allows and encourages innovation and staff development. He fosters an independently functioning staff, partly through his skillfully conducted "3-minute staff meetings."

Mr. McCann takes an active role in his community, yet keeps his educational, professional, and civic lives separate. He was first elected to the Livonia City Council in 1968 and has served continuously since then. He held the office of council president from 1975 to 1980 and again from 1982 to 1984. He held the office of vice president from 1968 to 1970.

Mr. Speaker, Robert McCann is a quiet, reserved, approachable, warm, serious man with a sense of humor that is sophisticated, and full of unending Irish blarney. He skillfully uses this humor as a tool to get to the heart of matters, and to inject this quality into situations when really needed. An honest, unpretentious man, he demonstrates a quiet, consistent love for children.

These qualities have made a lasting impression on all those who have known and worked with him. I congratulate him on his retirement and ask the other Members of this body to join with me in wishing him all the best.

TRIBUTE TO TONY CIOFALO— YONKERS THANKS YOU!

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and pleasure to have this opportunity to ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in extending our heartiest appreciation and gratitude for the many years Tony Ciofalo devoted in dedicated service to the Yonkers community through his work in the economic, social, and political life of the community. I was honored to be invited to the Yonkers Italian City Club for their "Toast and Roast of Tony Ciofalo" tonight. I would like to take a minute to share with my colleagues some of Tony's accomplishments and attributes. Tony has truly helped make Westchester County what it is today.

One of Tony's most substantial contributions to the Westchester County community is his business, Ciofalo Tile & Contractors. He

has demonstrated, by his example, the attitude, pride, and service necessary to a successful business. The young entrepreneurs of today have in Tony a shining example of service with a smile, of commitment to his word, of pride in his name and business. If today's businesses look to him as their model for their projects, the Yonkers business community will grow and prosper.

The Westchester community can also use the Ciofalo family as a role model. Tony's lovely wife Grace, his impressive children, John and Carol, and his numerous and delightful grandchildren brighten the Yonkers community.

Tony, an excellent example of Tony's generosity with his time and talent is his involvement in Westchester County baseball. He has been instrumental in the growth and maturing of the thousands of teens who called him "coach," during his work as general manager of the championship baseball teams including the Ninth Ward Dems, the Yonkers Athletics, and the Hillviews. His work with these semipro and amateur teams enabled many young men to grow in confidence and skill while enjoying the marvelous game of baseball. However, his expertise was not restricted to the minor leagues. As a scout for the Mets he helped introduce seasoned minor leaguers to the world of major league baseball. Although baseball is his favorite, his dedication to the youth in the Yonkers community led to his involvement in many other athletic programs including fundraising for the Cardinal Hayes High School Hockey Program. By his example and encouragement, many young men in Westchester County and Bronx have gained experience and expertise in areas they could not have participated in otherwise.

Given Tony's community involvements I already mentioned, I scarcely know where he found the time to be so active in the Westchester County political life. His leadership in the Italian City Club, the Kimbal Crest Taxpayers Association, and the East Yonkers Taxpayers Association demonstrate his dedication to the improvement of Yonkers. If that was not enough, he also founded and served as president of the Hillview Social Club, while serving as a member of the Ninth Ward Republican Club and the Republican County Committee. However, Tony's participation was not restricted to political associations; the Heart Fund, the CIAO, and many other charitable and philanthropic organizations owe him heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for his many hours of devoted service.

"No" is a simple word, but Tony Ciofalo has never been able to say it. Wherever there was a good cause, a needy organization, a worthwhile activity, there Tony Ciofalo could be found. As his Representative in Congress, I must say, if the Yonkers and Bronx community would look to him as their example, the 19th Congressional District would shine as a model to the rest of the country, because Tony Ciofalo shines as an inspiration for all of us.

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK
TRADITION

HON. WILLIAM HILL BONER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, National Tourism Week is being celebrated this week all across America for the third year in a row. State and local proclamations are being issued, tourism conferences are being held, and exciting events are planned to highlight the economic importance of tourism for our people and our Nation. Earlier this year, eight major travel industry organizations formed a National Tourism Week Coalition. This coalition is coordinating the planning and observance of National Tourism Week and developing a year-round promotion of the event. The distinguished honorary co-chairs of the National Tourism Week Coalition are Donna Tuttle, Under Secretary of Commerce for Travel and Tourism, representing the public sector, and William H. Edwards, vice chairman of the Hilton Hotels Corp., representing the private sector.

In my home State of Tennessee, a special tourism promotion is underway involving the Tennessee welcome centers. Hundreds of hotels, motels, and campgrounds are providing lucky travelers with complimentary rooms, meals, flowers, and campground space during National Tourism Week. Tourism is the second largest employer in Tennessee and we recognize just how important it is for our State.

Mr. Speaker, today I am proud as chairman of the Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus to introduce legislation to designate the week of May 17, 1987, as National Tourism Week for next year. Joining me as original cosponsors of this legislation is the entire bipartisan tourism caucus steering committee. One out of every 15 working Americans has a job relating to the travel industry.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the National Tourism Week resolution. Let us keep up the National Tourism Week tradition. It is important that we officially recognize tourism's importance to the economic, social, and cultural welfare of the United States.

CHINESE ENVOY CALLS U.S.
BOMBING STATE TERRORISM

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. RALPH M. HALL. Mr. Speaker, with the impending sale of some \$500 million in advanced electronic and radar equipment to the People's Republic of China, I want to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Houston Chronicle which relates that nation's reaction to the recent American aerial reprisals against terrorist Libya. The remarks are those of the People's Republic of China's Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Han Xu. While a guest of the State of Texas, at sesquicentennial festivities in Houston, Mr. Xu stated

that "the U.S. bombings of Libya was state terrorism which should have been avoided through fair and reasonable discussions." He went on to state that his nation had always been in favor of seeking a fair and reasonable settlement of differences among states through peaceful dialog. This brings to my mind the assault against U.N. forces across the Yalu in the Korean war, and I do not remember any dialog toward peaceful resolutions between the People's Republic of China and other nations in that instance.

I am concerned that this nation, which now is to receive massive technological information and supplies to upgrade its fighter aircraft, was so adamantly against our actions against terrorism in the world, while at the same time our long-time friends, the Republic of China on Taiwan, stood by us. I long have been against the sale of arms and technology to the People's Republic of China and only regret that it was not possible to bring the President's proposal to the floor of the House where objections could have been raised over the threat of these capabilities to our friends on Taiwan. We should remember our friends in Taiwan, and remember that they were our allies in World War II, and they had to leave Red China to seek the freedoms they had fought for and remember that they, too, seek to buy aircraft from us. We should sell the free Chinese on Taiwan the fighter planes they seek because they are a great check and balance against the Communist of Red China.

CHINESE ENVOY CALLS U.S. BOMBING STATE
TERRORISM

(By Nicholas C. Chriss)

The People's Republic of China ambassador to the United States says the U.S. bombing of Libya was "state terrorism" that should have been avoided through fair and reasonable discussions.

"The Chinese government has always condemned all forms of terrorism, but at the same time we are against the encroachment upon the territory of a sovereign state under the pretext of striking against terrorism," Han Xu said in Houston Sunday.

"We have always been in favor of seeking a fair and reasonable settlement of differences among states through peaceful dialogue."

Han, 62, is a veteran diplomat, having served in the Soviet Union, in China's Liaison Office in Washington, D.C., from 1973 to 1979 during the Cultural Revolution and in the Foreign Ministry at home.

Texas officials invited him to take part in the Sesquicentennial and San Jacinto Day celebration in Houston.

In 1971, when Secretary of State Henry Kissinger made a secret visit to China to prepare for an unprecedented visit by a U.S. president—Richard M. Nixon—he was met at the airport in Peking by Han, then a Foreign Ministry official.

"The use or threat of force can only further complicate an issue rather than facilitate a settlement," Han said, regarding the Libyan bombing.

"We ask the U.S. government to stop forthwith its encroachment upon the territory and sovereignty of Libya and call on the parties concerned to exercise restraint, cease hostilities and avoid the further deterioration of the situation in the interests of peace and the stability in this region."

Asked what the United States should do to combat Libyan-inspired and financed terrorism, Han replied:

"I don't want to get involved in the conflict. I haven't heard what the Libya side of the argument is. We have to listen to both sides."

Han said terrorism had its roots in the displacement of the Palestinian people from their homeland by Israel, a position China has maintained for years.

During the last several years, some members of Yasser Arafat's Palestine Liberation Organization had reportedly received training in China.

Han, who has been in this country one year, said the displaced Palestinians could not return home. "So they did something, and so it goes back and forth and there is no end.

"We also oppose state-run terrorism, a kind of terrorism also exists in the world, and it kills a lot of people."

Han cited the bombing of Tunisia by Israeli planes and the South African attack on Namibia.

"The United States' bombing in Libya is also a kind of state terrorism to a certain extent," he said.

The question of the United States air strike on Libya was being taken up by the United Nations, Han said, and "I think the majority of the members condemn this kind of attack."

Asked what China would do if faced with continual attacks of terrorists on its citizens, Han replied, "We believe all this kind of terrorism should be punished." He referred to an attempted airline hijacking several years ago by a co-pilot and his subsequent sentencing to prison.

"We will condemn them (the terrorists)," Han said. "We will try to find out why it happened. We would try to seek a settlement with a fair and reasonable dialogue. But up to now we haven't met such a situation."

Whether a fair and reasonable dialogue works depends on "whether you have tried enough or not," Han said.

"The only countries that support the United States (for its Libyan bombing strike) are Britain and Israel.

"I hope the United States will make a very easy calculation," he said, referring to its support of Israel, with 3 million people, in the Middle East, instead of 20 million Arabs.

"It's a simple matter of mathematics: You are supporting the minority instead of the majority.

"You have supported Taiwan and opposed the People's Republic of China in the past, and you support South Africa instead of the majority of African people, and you supported (President Anastasio) Somoza (of Nicaragua) and opposed the people in Central America.

"We hope the United States will get along with the other countries in the world, on good terms. If you adopt the correct posture, you can do a lot of things that are good for the people in the world.

"You send your fleet so far away to other countries (in the Mediterranean Sea), and you bomb other countries. For instance, if Libya sends its fleet to the Gulf of Mexico, what would be the United States' reaction? Sometimes you have to think what the people in the world feel.

"But we are friends, and I also hope we can learn from you."

In other matters, Han said:

China's oil and gas potential is large, that the price-per-barrel decline will probably have some impact on offshore drilling, but that none of the foreign energy companies

have ceased their exploration efforts in the South China Sea.

China's new economic reforms should not be mistaken for a transition to capitalism but rather as the building of a socialist system with "Chinese characteristics."

Its once-inadequate agricultural system can now export cotton and grain.

The economic reforms and the consequent new wealth have led to some problems with crime, pornography and corruption but "when you open the door, you cannot prevent some flies from coming in or you must keep it closed."

China's policy now is to maintain an open door policy, and that it hopes one day to establish a relationship with Taiwan as it intends to do with Hong Kong when that British crown colony island is returned to the Chinese in 1997, "one country with two systems"—communist and capitalist.

PRODUCT LIABILITY BILL

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a product liability bill which addresses the major concerns of both manufacturers and consumers by providing reasonable redress to injured product users while addressing the problem of skyrocketing damage awards. Under the provisions of this measure, a consumer injured in any one of the 50 States would be entitled to receive actual economic damages plus up to \$250,000 for pain and suffering and \$250,000 in punitive damages. The bill assures reasonable compensation for injured consumers, while enabling manufacturers to anticipate product liability suit limits.

In an effort to ensure fairness in the field of product liability, the bill would incorporate the comparative fault standard under which the manufacturer and the product user are each held accountable for their respective negligence in either the production or the use of the product.

I strongly urge my colleagues to sponsor this needed legislation.

IN HONOR OF DR. ANDREI SAKHAROV'S 65TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker—

Peace, progress, human rights—these three goals are indissolubly linked: it is impossible to achieve one if the others are ignored.

These are the ideas expressed by Dr. Andrei Sakharov in his acceptance speech for the Nobel Peace Prize over 10 years ago. This address was delivered by his wife, Dr. Yelena Bonner, since Dr. Sakharov was not permitted to leave the Soviet Union to accept the award. It is again Dr. Bonner who submitted part of the text of the address for publication in today's New York Times, in honor of

Dr. Sakharov's 65th birthday. It is interesting to note that, even in 1975, Dr. Sakharov recognized the importance of linkage, a policy which only recently has been a cornerstone of our foreign policy deliberations.

In observance of Dr. Sakharov's birthday, and in recognition of the great personal sacrifice both Dr. Bonner and Dr. Sakharov have made to further our mutual beliefs in human dignity and world peace, I have introduced House Resolution 4867 to award these two great humanitarians the Congressional Gold Medal. I have been joined in this legislative recognition by my colleagues, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and Mr. HYDE.

We celebrate in this country with "National Andrei Sakharov Day," and on Capitol Hill with a birthday party in his honor. Once again, Dr. Sakharov must be represented by his wife, Dr. Bonner, as he has not been permitted to leave the closed city of Gorky, where he has been banished to internal exile for the past 6 years.

It is sad to note that we are no nearer now to achieving the goals and ideals Dr. Sakharov expressed than we were when his words rang out in Oslo in Dr. Bonner's voice a decade ago. The intransigence of the Soviets remains tragically the same.

What has also not changed is the free world's commitment to achieving the mutual goals of Dr. Sakharov and freedom-loving people everywhere. While Natan Shcharansky has been allowed to join his wife, Avital, in Israel and Dr. Bonner has been permitted to come to the United States temporarily to obtain the medical treatment she so desperately needed, the number of Jews permitted to leave the Soviet Union has plummeted drastically. Although we are all delighted that Natan has been freed, he himself has been an ardent advocate of our continuing efforts to free those he left behind in the moral prison that is the Soviet Union. Natan reminds us that it was news of the West's efforts on his behalf, on behalf of Dr. Sakharov, and of all other refuseniks, dissidents and prisoners of conscience, that kept the flame of hope alive for them. So let us continue to keep that flame alight, and try to realize the goals Dr. Sakharov stated in his 1975 address, of peace, progress and human rights. And let us hope to hear it from him in person, next year on his 66th birthday.

A RETURN TO GORKY, AND A NOBEL SPEECH

(By Andrei D. Sakharov)

Today is Andrei D. Sakharov's 65th birthday. My husband is celebrating it alone in Gorky. In two weeks, I will return to him and again share the ordeal of exile. The six months I have spent in America since I arrived for medical treatment have convinced me that my husband and his fate will be remembered here. I hope that some of the ideals that he expressed in his 1975 Nobel Peace Prize address will be remembered as well.—YELENA G. BONNER.

Peace, progress, human rights—these three goals are indissolubly linked: it is impossible to achieve one if the others are ignored.

International trust, mutual understanding, disarmament and international security are inconceivable without an open society, freedom of information, freedom of conscience and the right to travel and choose

the country in which one wishes to live. Freedom of conscience, together with other civil rights, provides a basis for scientific progress and a guarantee that it will not be misused, a basis for economic and social progress and a guarantee that social rights can be defended effectively.

Détente can be assured only if it is accompanied by consistent attention to the availability and free exchange of information in all countries and absolute respect in all countries for civil and political rights. In short, in addition to détente in the fields of disarmament and trade, détente is needed in the field of ideas.

The Final Act signed at Helsinki is noteworthy because it extends official recognition to the complex approach which seems to be required for the solution of international security problems. The Act contains far-reaching provisions on the connections between international security and the defense of human rights, the free flow of information and freedom of movement. These rights are secured by solemn undertaking of the participating states. Obviously, we cannot speak of guaranteed results, but we can speak of new opportunities that can be realized only by long-term, systematic work, in which the participating states, and especially the democracies, maintain a united and consistent attitude.

We must fight for every individual and against every act of injustice and against every violation of human rights. So much in our future depends on this.

In struggling to defend human rights, we ought first and foremost to protect the innocent victims without demanding the destruction or total condemnation of the regimes we hold responsible. We need reform, not revolution. We need a flexible, pluralist, tolerant society, which will foster a climate of free inquiry and debate and the open-minded use of the successes of all social systems. What is détente? What is rapprochement? We are concerned not with words but with a willingness to create a better and more decent society, a better world order.

Thousands of years ago, tribes were engaged in a fierce struggle for survival. It was important not only to know how to handle a club but also to be capable of intelligent thought, preservation of common knowledge and experience, and altruistic assistance to other members of the tribe.

Today, the whole human race faces a similar test. In endless space, many civilizations are bound to exist, among them societies wiser and more "successful" than ours.

An infinite number of other civilizations may exist on the preceding and following pages of the Book of the Universe. Yet we should not minimize our sacred endeavors in this world, where, like faint glimmers in the dark, we have emerged for a moment from the dark chaos of unconscious matter in order to fulfill the demands of reason and to create a life worthy of ourselves and of the goals we only dimly perceive.

BONNER'S HABIT OF FREE SPEECH

(By Mary McGrory)

Yelena Bonner, who is a forthright and demanding woman, wanted a birthday party for her husband, and she got one.

It wouldn't be everyone's idea of a gala, although there was a cake and champagne of sorts. The speeches were long, and of course, the newly 65-year-old guest of honor, Andrei Sakharov, was absent. Bonner, nonetheless, seemed elated.

Decked out in white silk and garnets, she was with her 85-year-old mother, a fragile figure with tightly drawn skin who looks like a character from a 19th-century Russian novel. Her daughter and son—children of a previous marriage—spelled each other as her interpreters, and she greeted warmly the score or more of politicians who joined the turnout in the House Foreign Affairs Committee hearing room.

Bonner was a nurse in World War II and is obviously accustomed to emergencies. She has been in one since 1973, when the Soviets cracked down on her and her husband for declaring openly that Russians have a right to human rights, as guaranteed in the Helsinki Accords.

For a while, Sakharov's frame saved him from the worst consequences of his heresy. He is a Nobel laureate, father of the Soviet H-bomb and demonstrably one of the world's preeminent scientists. When the authorities were about to strike, Bonner was on the telephone, at all hours, to Western correspondents, advising them of new torments in store, often averting them.

But in 1980, when the Soviets invaded Afghanistan and Sakharov denounced the action, their chancy, although exhilarating, existence was ended. The Sakharovs were exiled to the wretched hamlet of Gorki. They were cut off from friends, family and fellow scientists.

After Sakharov staged a hunger strike, the Soviets reluctantly let Bonner come to this country for heart surgery. She was supposed to lower her voice while here. She did not. Once a chain smoker, she gave up cigarettes. But she hasn't given up free speech.

Obviously, it costs the Soviets to treat so shamefully a man designated three times a "hero of the Soviet Republic" and a person of qualities that make him nothing less than noble. But they bear the universal disgust that greets each attempt to rationalize the prosecution rather than risk the informed jeremiads of a freed Sakharov.

Sakharov is no Solzhenitsyn, who turned out to be a Slavic Born-again with ideas fresh from the Middle Ages. After the initial furor of his release, Solzhenitsyn disappeared from public consciousness. Sakharov is a modern man, questing, progressive, focused on the imperatives of the nuclear age.

His wife, after six months, must go back to join him in exile. At the birthday party, this intertidal soul said that she is "dreadfully afraid" of what awaits her.

She wants protection, which to her is public tributes and expressions of concern of her husband. Protection means Western scrutiny as unrelenting as KGB surveillance. Congress wants to oblige. Rep. Jack Kemp (R-N.Y.) gave her a bill that would award both Sakharovs the Congressional Gold Medal.

In her presence, the term "quiet diplomacy" slinks away. Clamor, to her, is the only way. Anatoly Shcharansky, another recent Soviet visitor, got out after nine years because his wife, Avital, never stopped reminding the world of his unjust imprisonment.

Shcharansky said last week that "... no quiet diplomacy without strong public pressure can help."

Bonner, expected, as did everyone else, that President Reagan, who has never practiced quiet diplomacy with the Soviets, would receive her with open arms. Bafflingly, his door is closed to her. Our vehemently anticommunist president has been strangely hooded in his treatment of these two fabled Soviet dissenters. He vetoed press cameras at his meeting with Shcharansky and a

White House press briefing with the ebullient little survivor.

Bonner is not welcome at all.

Richard Pipes, a birthday party speaker and former Reagan National Security Council aide, blames Richard Nixon. "He tells Reagan that quiet diplomacy worked for 300,000 Soviet Jews, but it was the Jackson-Vanik amendment. The president looks both aggressive and indecisive this way, gets the worst of both worlds."

Reagan couldn't stay completely out of it, and on Monday sent Bonner what she called a "warm letter" and to the birthday party an Andrei Sakharov Day proclamation.

Bonner was asked if a meeting with Reagan would help. "Of course," she said. "You can't be for human rights and be secretive. We are not thieves in the night. We do not come with bombs and guns."

NEIGHBORLY SENIOR SERVICES—20 YEARS OF CARING FOR OLDER AMERICANS

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, May is Older Americans Month—a time when we give thanks to the valuable contributions older Americans have made throughout their lives and many continue to make to help improve the way of life in our communities. Older Americans Month is also a time when we call attention to the special needs and concerns of our aging population.

It is most fitting that in conjunction with Older Americans Month, the people of Pinellas County, FL, I represent are celebrating the 20th anniversary of Neighborly Senior Services, a predominantly volunteer organization that cares for the special and diverse needs of older Americans. Founded in 1966 as the Neighborly Center, the program provided services at one adult day care center and meals on wheels to 150 people. Since then, the program has grown dramatically to meet the needs of Pinellas County's large elderly population. Today Neighborly Senior Services and its more than 6,000 volunteers provide assistance each year to 10,000 people, serve 1.2 million meals, and provide 400,000 rides to senior citizens.

Neighborly Senior Services offers support to older Americans in four important areas: nutrition, transportation, day care, and community care.

Through the nutrition programs, volunteers provide 4,600 meals per day to senior citizens in the Meals on Wheels Program and at 32 congregate dining centers.

The coordinated transportation program arranges 2,000 trips per day for senior citizens throughout the county. The program is staffed by volunteer drivers whose minibuses are widely recognized around our area.

Six adult day care centers provide for the special needs of 350 senior citizens. The Lealman Day Care Center is specifically dedicated to treating patients suffering from Alzheimer's disease.

The community care program provides critical services to 800 homebound elderly patients to help them live independently outside

a nursing home. In addition to nutritional services, nurses and volunteers help these people with homemaking services, therapy, medical care, and the monitoring for emergency situations.

Other specialized programs offered by Neighborly Senior Services include telephone reassurance and companionship, escort services for those who are unable to travel alone, and a support network of counselors to help families and friends with the special problems of dealing with the elderly.

The programs of Neighborly Senior Services should be a model for organizations serving older Americans in other parts of our Nation. It should be noted, however, that without the dedicated work of the staff and volunteers, these programs would not be available to the senior citizens of Pinellas County, who account for almost one-third of our population.

In addition to the time and energy of these workers, Neighborly Senior Services is only able to offer a wide array of programs because of the financial support of community organizations, clubs, and churches, the contributions of municipal, county, and State governments, and Federal assistance under the Older Americans Act.

Unfortunately though, Neighborly Senior Services has had to curtail some of its most important services in the past year for financial reasons. Fewer meals will be served this year, the number of rides provided to senior citizens will be reduced, and community care services will be strained. Most recently, I learned that the South Adult Day Care Center in St. Petersburg—our Nation's first center of its kind for senior citizens—may have to close.

A variety of financial pressures such as dramatically rising liability insurance costs have contributed to the need to reduce services. Local governments and organizations have indicated their willingness to commit additional resources to these programs and in the coming weeks I will be the chairman of a countrywide fund raising drive to raise the necessary resources so that services will not be curtailed and day care centers will not be closed.

We are making a concerted effort in Florida to provide for our State's growing population of senior citizens. The Federal Government, however, also has a responsibility to assist us in these efforts. Senior citizens are the fastest growing component of our Nation's population. The number of Americans over the age of 65 is projected to increase almost 25 percent by the year 2000, twice the rate of growth for the general population. A large portion of these older Americans will leave the districts of my colleagues in the northeast and midwest and will move to Florida. Florida's population of senior citizens will nearly double by the year 2000.

While we welcome all those Americans who enjoy Florida's warm, sunny weather and natural beauty, we must provide adequate resources to meet their special needs. The freedom to move and live anywhere in the United States is one of our Nation's basic rights, but these migratory trends require Federal support.

We must not retreat from meeting our Federal commitment to provide the appropriate

resources and services to older Americans as they move about our country in their retirement years. Through organizations such as Neighborly Senior Services we can provide for their needs. We have demonstrated that for the past 20 years. The people of Pinellas County are willing to donate their time and money for this cause, but we still need the help of the Federal Government.

As we continue to make the difficult budgetary choices in the coming months and years to ensure our Nation's sound financial future, let's not forget the needs of older Americans who represent a rapidly growing share of our population. And let's not forget the programs and services groups like Neighborly Senior Services have set in place over the past 20 years to provide for these needs.

LET'S PROTECT AMERICAN OBSERVERS ON FOREIGN FISHING VESSELS

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which will require that foreign vessels fishing in the U.S. Fishery Conservation Zone meet minimum health and safety standards for the quartering of U.S. observers and the carrying out of observer functions.

The Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 [FCMA] requires all foreign vessels fishing in our Fishery Conservation Zone [FCZ] to carry U.S. observers. U.S. observers carry out two important functions: First, they monitor compliance with U.S. fishery laws and regulations, and, second, they collect valuable data necessary for fishery management. Unfortunately, the conditions which observers are subjected to aboard foreign vessels are often unsanitary and dangerous. If the observer believes that conditions are too dangerous, he or she may request to disembark at the nearest port or be removed by the U.S. Coast Guard. Under current law, the observer requirement may be waived if the Secretary of Commerce determines that conditions aboard a foreign vessel are so unsafe that an observer's safety is jeopardized. Clearly, a situation has developed that in essence provides no incentive for foreign fishing vessels to provide a clean and safe workplace for our observers. On the contrary, it provides a disincentive.

In 1985, the National Marine Fisheries Service distributed a questionnaire among observers to determine if conditions aboard foreign fishing vessels posed a serious threat to the health and safety of U.S. observers. The results of the survey indicated that 22 percent of the foreign vessels fishing in our FCZ contained obvious health and safety hazards. Vessels from Taiwan, Spain, and Italy were especially unsafe or unhealthy, failing to meet the most basic safety standards in at least 50 percent of the Italian, 58 percent of the Spanish, and 100 percent of the Taiwanese vessels surveyed. The most common inadequacies reported were: inoperable or inadequate number of lifeboats or liferafts; rat infestation;

insufficient number of lifejackets; and no emergency position indicating radio beacons.

The problem of observer safety has been of interest to both Congress and the administration for several years. A recent General Accounting Office [GAO] investigation and audit on several aspects of the observer program, including safety, recommended that Congress amend the FCMA to authorize sanctions against unsafe foreign fishing vessels. The administration, in 1985, submitted draft legislation to Congress which authorized the Secretary of Commerce to revoke a foreign fishing vessel's permit if its observer requirement was waived because of unsafe conditions.

The bill that I am introducing today represents not only the incorporation of the GAO recommendation and a portion of the administration's draft legislation, but also the development of a set of safety guidelines. The first section of the bill requires the Secretary of Commerce to develop health and safety standards for observers and it eliminates the current observer exemption if a vessel is found to be unsafe. The second section of the bill requires that foreign nations certify that their vessels meet the health and safety standards for that country when they apply for permits to operate in our waters. Finally, this section directs the Secretary of Commerce to rescind a foreign fishing vessel's permit if the vessel is not in compliance with the promulgated regulations concerning observer safety.

I believe, as does this administration and the GAO, that we have a moral and legal obligation to prevent U.S. observers from being subject to unsafe conditions. As yet, no U.S. observer has been lost at sea, although there have been several near-accidents. I intend to ensure that our observers have a safe working environment. The bill that I have introduced would do just that and I encourage Members to support this measure when it comes before the House of Representatives.

NERVE GAS AND NATO

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues, Representative DANTE B. FASCELL and JOHN PORTER, have written a highly perceptive and timely article on a forthcoming NATO decision on the production of new nerve gas weapons.

In giving its tentative approval to the production of binary chemical munitions last year, Congress required that the North Atlantic Council, NATO's highest governing body, approve the decision. NATO's Defense Planning Commission has already given its tentative approval, but a number of NATO members have strong objections to the plan.

As our colleagues make clear, it is vital that any decision by NATO to approve the production of new chemical weapons be fully accepted by the NATO countries themselves. It would be folly to base and store these new binary chemical weapons in the United States. Logic requires that they be based in Europe; that is why Congress insisted on approval by the North Atlantic Council.

Over the years, there has been strong congressional opposition to the production of new chemical weapons. Prior to last year's vote, Congress rejected their unconditional production on seven occasions. As our colleagues point out, the multi-billion-dollar binary production plan has not been proven to be satisfactory from a technical performance standpoint, necessary from a defense standpoint, desirable from a foreign policy standpoint, or productive from an arms control standpoint.

At this point, I submit into the RECORD their article, which appeared in yesterday's Christian Science Monitor.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 21, 1986]

STRINGS ON U.S. NERVE GAS

(By Dante B. Fascell and John E. Porter)

Tomorrow, NATO will make a crucial decision regarding the future of new lethal binary chemical weapons in Europe.

NATO's Defense Planning Committee meets in Brussels to consider whether to make chemical weapons part of the arsenal of the alliance.

After four years of rejecting Pentagon requests the United States Congress last year finally approved—conditionally—a plan to produce binary nerve gases.

As they weigh their options in Brussels tomorrow, NATO officials must know that Congress take these conditions seriously.

Congress mandated, for example, that U.S. binary production could begin after next Oct. 1 only if environmental, safety, and testing requirements were satisfied. Congress has also required that the United States hold off producing these weapons until "a force goal of binary munitions has been formally adopted by the North Atlantic Council."

The Defense Planning Committee will make only a preliminary decision tomorrow. Some Europeans may have been misled to think that binary approval by subgroups like this committee would satisfy Congress.

But as House members who were intimately involved in the negotiations that produced these conditions, we state without equivocation that this would not even come close to compliance with the law.

Congressional opposition to the Pentagon's binary nerve gas program has been based on these facts:

The General Accounting Office has found that the binary Bigeye bomb fails to meet even the Pentagon's own operational and safety standards.

Congress has substantially increased funding for improved chemical defense rather than spending billions on new offensive chemical weapons.

A ban on the production and use of chemical weapons is preferable to a costly and dangerous chemical weapons arms race.

The military logic of producing new chemical weapons dictates their forward deployment in Europe. As Gen. Bernard Rogers, supreme allied commander of NATO, put it: "They [binaries] are not going to do any good stored back in the warehouses in the United States, if the times comes when we feel we must have them in the [European] theatre."

However, our European allies have consistently said that such necessary deployment on their soil is inadvisable and unacceptable.

We invite our European allies to decide themselves whether they want to support a chemical deterrent policy based on an im-

proved chemical defensive posture and meaningful arms control efforts.

To do otherwise would engage the alliance in a controversial and costly chemical offensive program that would add to the U.S. deficit at home, split the NATO alliance abroad, and benefit only the Soviets.

U.S. AUTO PARTS—MADE IN JAPAN?

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to applaud the efforts of two of my colleagues, MARCY KAPTUR and SANDER LEVIN, for their significant work in putting the issue of auto parts on the agenda for the formal trade talks with Prime Minister Nakasone of Japan.

Recently, the Toledo Blade printed an article describing the importance of this issue and the fine work of my two distinguished colleagues and friends. I urge you to read this piece.

KAPTUR, LEVIN KEY TO SUMMIT TRADE GAIN
(By Mike McManus)

Reagan was a Clear Winner At Summit," said a typical headline last week, referring to his persuasive skills on terrorism and trade issues.

But to the 200,000 workers in auto-parts firms who have lost jobs to foreign competition since 1979 Mr. Reagan's more important victory was that he persuaded Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone to open formal talks on allowing U.S. auto-parts companies to sell to Japanese car producers.

Two members of Congress deserve special credit for raising the issue and fighting tenaciously: Democrats Marcy Kaptur of Toledo and Sander Levin (D., Mich.).

"The overwhelming majority of the cars Japan exported went to the U.S.—at a value of \$15 billion. But they purchased less than \$200 million of American-produced automobile parts and equipment," says Representative Levin, who represents part of the Detroit area.

"The U.S. auto industry, made up of 40,000 small and medium-sized firms employing 1.6 million workers, has been shut out of one of the most lucrative markets in the world," he said in a May 1 press conference where he added that "the Tokyo summit provides a golden opportunity for concrete bilateral action to reduce the \$50 billion U.S.-Japan trade deficit."

A few days later Mr. Reagan got a letter in Japan from House Speaker Tip O'Neill and the House minority and majority leaders which said "American parts companies have put their house in order: They have set up permanent offices in Japan, they have increased product quality, lowered reject output, and become price competitive.

"However, when adjusted for inflation, their sales to the Japanese have actually declined since five years ago."

One result: Unemployment is still 9.2 per cent in Michigan, and it is 8 per cent or more in Illinois and Ohio—states with auto concentrations.

Why? Haven't auto sales been good?

Yes, but look at how many smaller cars with American names like Ford, Plymouth, or Dodge are made in Japan. Lift up the hood of a Chevy Cavalier, a Buick Skyhawk,

or any GM "J" car—to see an engine made in Brazil.

This "outsourcing" is not only shrinking the work force of Chrysler GM and Ford, but it is wiping a huge swath through auto-parts firms.

What about those new Japanese assembly plants in America?

"The cars being made in the U.S. are no more than kits, like a model-airplane kit that you buy and assemble," says Pat Choate of TRW, a big maker of parts ranging from seat belts to valves and steering gear. "The Nissan plant, Toyota and Mazda plants are only warehouses with an assembly line. All the value added is in the parts that come from Japan," he said.

"Now they are bringing their own parts manufacturers with them. The American firms will be wiped out. The Japanese are intent on coming to the U.S. and capturing the autoparts industry and dominating it."

To get a firsthand feel for the difficulty of selling American parts to Japanese firms, Representatives Levin and Kaptur of Toledo went with a delegation of members of Congress to Japan over the Fourth of July recess. They delivered their request for reciprocity not only to the companies but also to Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone and to Diet (parliament) members.

In December the United States and Japan concluded the first round of yearlong market-oriented, sector-specific (MOSS) talks in the fields of telecommunications, wood products, electronics, and pharmaceuticals. Both sides agreed to discuss two new MOSS sectors in 1986. Congressmen Levin and Kaptur began lobbying the Administration, asking for auto parts.

Meanwhile they hosted a "Trading With Japan" conference for 150 auto-parts suppliers and high-ranking representatives from six Japanese firms. "The suppliers had unsatisfying contacts with the Japanese in the past, or none at all," says Lee Kadrich of the Auto Parts and Accessories Association.

Diplomats would have described the dialogue as "frank." It was clear that Japanese firms preferred buying from sister companies in Japan. Political muscle was needed to get the attention of Tokyo's leaders.

With the help of the Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition (which had arranged their trip to Japan and provided logistics for "Trading With Japan") Representatives Levin and Kaptur secured top bipartisan support in the House and met with the secretary of commerce and the U.S. trade representative.

In April the U.S. Government officially asked for auto parts as the next MOSS sector. But when Prime Minister Nakasone came to town, he told Mr. Levin the issue was at a "delicate stage."

Mr. Levin and Miss Kaptur escalated again, taking the chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and House Foreign Affairs Committee with them to see Secretary of State Shultz, asking that the barriers to U.S. auto parts be discussed at the "highest government-to-government level."

Not only did Mr. Shultz talk to the foreign minister but President Reagan also brought it up with Prime Minister Nakasone, getting an OK.

What can it mean economically? "We are finally at the bargaining table where breathtaking opportunities can arise," said Miss Kaptur.

She's right. As a result of MOSS negotiations U.S. telecommunications business soared from \$200 million a year to \$2 billion.

TERRORIST ATTACKS ON SRI LANKA

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the United States has been the target of international terrorism, and therefore can well understand the predicament of Sri Lanka, a sister-democracy with whom we have close and friendly relations, which is the target of sustained terrorist violence.

Terrorist groups struck twice, in quick succession, recently in that country's capital. On May 3 a bomb placed aboard an Air Lanka jet at Colombo's international airport destroyed the plane and killed 17 passengers. Then, on May 7 a bomb was set off in the capital's central telegraph office killing 12 and injuring nearly 150. These two bombings were reported to be the work of Tamil terrorist groups that are attempting to set up a separate state in Sri Lanka.

The Wall Street Journal of May 15, carried the following editorial, which sets out cogently the situation that country faces, and what needs to be done by the international community:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 15, 1986]

MASSACRE IN COLOMBO

Americans may not consider the friendly, scenic island of Sri Lanka as a hot spot in the East-West conflict, but don't tell that to the Sri Lankans. In recent days, bombs have ripped apart an Air Lanka jetliner, killing 16, and a telegraph office in downtown Colombo, killing 12 and marking a major escalation of violence. One more Western-leaning country looks like falling into the maw of the international terror network.

Like many such troubles, Sri Lanka's have their roots in ethnic squabbles, in this case between minority Tamils and the majority Sinhalese. But as in Lebanon or Ireland, whatever legitimated grievances the Tamils do have long ago ceased to be relevant. Radicals quickly polarized matters, terrorizing both Sinhalese and any Tamils moderate and courageous enough to want to negotiate.

The Colombo government has offered some autonomy for Tamil majority areas, but the radicals by now won't settle for anything less than a separate state.

There may have been a time when these local disputes could be fought without outside influence, but that day is long gone. Nowadays radicals anywhere can avail themselves of sanctuaries, training camps and weapons dealers only too willing to promote trouble in a democratic state. The Tamil groups began tying themselves into this network and bragging about it, telling visiting reporters about their links to the radical offshoot of the PLO led by George Habash and about how their men had trained in Lebanon.

"Our basic alliance is still with the PLO. But we maintain active contact with the other groups like the Zimbabwe African People's Union, the Zimbabwe African National Union and the African National Congress," one of the Tamil leaders told an Indian reporter two years ago.

Sri Lankan officials have also claimed to have evidence of East German aid to the Tamils, and, in any case, East Bloc aid to PLO terrorists is old news. The opportunities for mayhem must seem too good to be true. Sri Lanka remains an underdeveloped place with a weak military. Terrorist sanctuaries are available across the Palk Strait in the Indian state of Tamil Nadu, which is dominated by ethnic Tamils who support the separatists. When Rajiv Gandhi's government tried to deport two Tamil terrorist leaders last year demonstrations broke out in the state, and India backed down. Nor does it hurt that all of the major Tamil groups are avowed Marxists seeking to divide a "capitalist" state. India has done its best to try to mediate this dispute, but its efforts have foundered on the demands of Tamil radicals.

Sri Lankan President Junius Jayawardene said Sunday that his country could be dismembered unless the West comes to his aid with arms and money. "Ours is a democratic country," he said, "and it is being destroyed by these people." It is probably time for the U.S. and other countries to respond to his request. In modern times, terrorism is invasion by other means and the Sri Lankas of the world are the front-line states.

**MONSIGNOR OF THE
SHOESHINE BOYS**

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, Monsignor John Patrick Carroll-Abbing is known the world over as the "Monsignor of the Shoeshine Boys" who took in hundreds of children rendered homeless by the ravages of World War II in a small town outside Rome. That was the beginning of Boys' Towns of Italy, a foundation that would lead to the nine Boys' and one Girls' Town in various parts of Italy that have served over 20,000 children over the last 40 years.

Monsignor Carroll-Abbing's story has been recounted everywhere as a symbol of dedication and understanding for our fellow man. Only last year, he was honored by the Foreign Press Association in New York when they gave him their first World Humanitarian Award. On that occasion, he received tributes from President Reagan, President Sandro Pertini of Italy, and President Patrick Hillary of Ireland. Later that year, he said mass at the Vatican with Pope John Paul II in honor of the 40th anniversary of the Boys' and Girls' Town organization.

While Monsignor Carroll-Abbing's work among children is well known, I want to bring to my colleagues' attention recent remarks he made on the plight of the elderly which deserve special attention.

As one who has worked nearly all his life among children, Monsignor Carroll-Abbing pointed out just last month that the well-publicized attention to youth has in some instances overshadowed the condition of the elderly. Monsignor Carroll-Abbing described the elderly in fact as "the real hidden heroes of the world."

I completely agree with his comments, and I also believe we should take a moment to re-

flect on his recommendation that now is the time to create "self-help programs for aged" along the lines of programs designed for children.

In his own words, Monsignor Carroll-Abbing underscored the heart of the problem:

While the pressing needs of the elderly may not appear to be as obvious or as compelling as those of our children, in reality their needs are quite similar and, sadly, they simply are not being properly addressed at this point in time.

The physical and social needs of the aged are escalating day by day as their number grows, and continuing neglect, public apathy and economic imbalance are now taking their toll.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Monsignor's remarks are especially pertinent as we discuss matters relating to the budget, and I want to commend Monsignor Carroll-Abbing for his leadership not only for youth but for the aged of this world.

His contributions cannot be minimized, and I urge my colleagues to pay heed to his words.

**NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
SOCIAL WORKERS CELEBRATES
30-YEAR ANNIVERSARY**

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to the National Association of Social Workers who celebrate their 30th anniversary this year.

Founded from a merger of several predecessor organizations, NASW smoothed the way for social work's journey toward its present status as a vital and necessary profession. As a social worker and a member of the NASW, I am especially proud of the work that NASW advocates. NASW's members spend their lives caring for others; their work has made a great difference in the lives of many.

The need for social workers in Maryland and in the Nation has never been greater than it is now. In the past 5 years, social programs have been severely cut. In 1981, more than \$1 billion was cut from the \$7 billion budget for aid to families with dependent children. They depended on that money for food, clothing, and basic necessities.

In addition, education funds have been cut, Medicare costs have risen, and pensions have been cut.

The social workers see the direct results of these budget cuts every day. They are the helping hands that reach out to the welfare mother or runaway child. They are the voice of hope to the drug addict.

The NASW has provided the organizational structure social workers needed to consolidate their professional interests with their interest in having a stronger voice in the national political arena. Through NASW, social workers have been able to unite and use their resources effectively to advance sound policies and programs which worked toward human service.

It is an honor to acknowledge the accomplishment of NASW for their commitment to the people of our Nation. It is recognition that is truly deserved.

SUPERFUND REAUTHORIZATION

HON. H. JAMES SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 20, the Environmental Protection Agency announced it was adding 170 new sites to the final National Priority List under Superfund and was proposing an additional 45 more sites. This announcement brings the total number of sites on the NPL to 703 with an additional 185 sites on the proposed list for a grand total of 888 sites in need of Superfund cleanups.

Upon a closer examination of these numbers, we see that New Jersey and in particular, the 13th Congressional District, are disproportionately represented. New Jersey as a whole has 97 sites on the NPL final and proposed list—almost twice as many sites as the second highest State. Furthermore, the 13th District has 18 sites—the highest number of sites of any congressional district in the country.

Mr. Speaker, in light of these additions and the large number of toxic sites requiring hazardous cleanups, it is nothing short of a crime that the Superfund conferees have yet to arrive at a compromise bill. There are 888 toxic sites, endangering our health and environment, waiting to be cleaned up. Both Houses and the administration agree—they must be cleaned up. Both Houses passed legislation, months ago, to reauthorize the program, both Houses and the administration agreed to interim funding pending final reauthorization. With all this support for Superfund, it is inconceivable that a compromise has not been achieved.

With the June 1 deadline on interim funding fast approaching, we once again face a potential EPA shutdown due to a lack of funding. Mr. Speaker, the 13th District, New Jersey and this country with its 888 toxic sites can wait no longer for Superfund reauthorization. On behalf of those who have been and are still waiting, I urge the conferees to achieve a compromise measure as soon as possible. Our constituents deserve no less.

**MARIE DiRESTA OF BAY RIDGE
PRESENTED WITH CIVIC AWARD**

HON. GUY V. MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Marie DiResta, an outstanding and dedicated community leader from my district who has recently been named the recipient of the 1986 Bay Ridge Civic Award by the Bay Ridge Community Council. Mrs. DiResta is currently the outgoing executive secretary of the BRCC. She has been a member of the

council since 1964 serving in many of the elected positions and becoming the first woman president in 1974. Throughout her 28 years of service in the community, she has also served as a member of many community organizations including: the board of directors of the Bay Ridge Nursery; the executive secretary of the Bay Ridge Mental Health Council; Community Board 10—serving on both its health and safety traffic and transportation committees and the board of trustees of the New York League for Early Learning.

As a result of her tireless efforts on behalf of the community, Mrs. DiResta has received many other honors including: The Polaris Award for Community and Civic Activity of the Christopher Columbus Association, awards from the Dyker Heights Civic Association and the 68th Precinct for civic activities, and citations from the New York State Senate and the New York State Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, it is people such as Marie who keep our communities strong. I ask my distinguished colleagues to join with me in extending my proud congratulations to Marie DiResta and in thanking her for her outstanding service.

HONORING WALTER RUFFIN BATTLE

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 29, Walter Ruffin Battle, principal of Suitland High School in Prince Georges County, Maryland will be honored at a retirement dinner marking 30 years of service as an educator.

Walter Battle has positively influenced thousands of children in Prince Georges County as a teacher, junior high school vice principal and principal and, since 1978, as principal of Suitland High School.

A resident of the Washington, DC area since the age of 2, Mr. Battle graduated from Miner Teachers College in Washington, DC in 1952 with a BA degree in social studies. He then served our country in the U.S. Air Force for 4 years. Following his honorable discharge from the Air Force, Walter Battle began his career in education in 1956 as a social studies teacher at Fairmont Heights High School. He also continued to pursue his own education, receiving a masters degree in education in 1960 from George Washington University.

In June 1971, Walter Battle moved from the classroom to become vice principal of Bethune Junior High School. His career as an administrator continued when he became principal of Francis Scott Key Junior High School in 1975. Finally, in 1978, he was appointed to his current position—principal of Suitland High School.

A recitation of Walter Battle's career path does not give you a measure of the man. He has dedicated himself to educating young people in a very chaotic period. He began his career in what was a segregated school system.

Despite low budgets and little support from the country school board, Fairmont Heights

High School was proud to graduate a generation of outstanding young people. These accomplishments are attributable to the ability and commitment of many teachers, including, prominently, Walter Battle. Those professional achievements were recognized as Mr. Battle assumed administrative duties during the 1970s, another turbulent time in our school system's history.

The last few years have brought renewed recognition of the importance of educators to the future of the United States. It seems that our society had, for a time, forgotten that lesson. All that time, among us there were individuals who had not forgotten, educators like Walter Battle who have devoted their lives to preparing young people for productive lives.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you and our colleagues will join me in extending congratulations and best wishes to Mr. Walter Ruffin Battle, and to his wife, Nona Battle, for a happy and healthy retirement.

DON HICKS CALLS FOR COMPLETE EVALUATION OF MIDGETMAN OPTIONS

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, the following essay from the Wall Street Journal, "Go Back to the Scowcroft Blueprints on ICBM Modernization," is a helpful exposition on the current status of the ICBM modernization program. The author, Undersecretary of Defense Don Hicks, makes the case for following the Scowcroft Commission's recommendations for 100 MX missiles, in addition to the development and deployment of a small ICBM. Both programs are integral parts of a reasoned strategy for reducing ICBM vulnerability and strengthening deterrence.

Unfortunately, both the MX missile and the small ICBM programs have been micromanaged and redirected by the Congress, effectively discarding the Scowcroft roadmap. It will be virtually impossible for the President to obtain congressional approval for an additional 50 MX missiles, regardless of basing mode, and, until recently, Congress seemed determined to hold the small ICBM to 30,000 pounds and a single warhead.

If the small ICBM is ever to be survivable and cost-effectively deployed, all reasonable missile configurations and deployment options must be fully explored. Dr. Hicks is doing just that, and he only asks that the Congress bear with him until all the facts are in. I think he makes an eminently sensible case, and I urge my colleagues to pay careful attention to his arguments.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 21, 1986]

GO BACK TO THE SCOWCROFT BLUEPRINTS IN ICBM MODERNIZATION (By Donald A. Hicks)

Some recent comments on the U.S. intercontinental ballistic missile modernization program have suggested that those in the Reagan administration and elsewhere who want to explore the possibility of a multiple-warhead version of the Small ICBM have a

hidden agenda—that far from being supportive of the program, their motive is, in fact, to kill it.

The issue of strategic force modernization is complex, and its understanding is not aided by devil theories. In the case of the Small ICBM, the program must be viewed in light of blueprints the bipartisan Scowcroft Commission drew up in 1983 for the future evolution of our ICBM force on a basis consistent with deterrence, stability, and the goal of mutual force reduction through arms-control negotiations with the Soviets.

The key elements of force structure laid out on the Scowcroft road map, and strongly endorsed by the Reagan administration, were the deployment of 100 MX Peacekeeper missiles coupled with the development of a new missile—the Small ICBM. The combination was designed to provide near-term capability while creating a strong incentive for the Russians to negotiate reduction of heavy ICBMs—represented on the Soviet side by the SS-18 with its 10 (and potentially 14) warheads—while providing a U.S. with a Small ICBM force that would deter the Soviets from a first strike.

There is some concern that the administration may be wavering in its support of the basic Scowcroft proposal. In fact, there has been no change in the administration's position. The attitude of Congress, on the other hand, has changed significantly since the commission's recommendations were published.

At the outset, Congress limited the Small ICBM to 30,000 pounds in weight—with 3,000 pounds of leeway allowed, if needed. Subsequently, Congress reduced the planned MX force by half, capping it at 50 missiles, unless a basing mode other than the silo mode proposed by the Scowcroft Commission was adopted. While this leaves the door open to look at survivable basing modes, some key congressmen have made it clear that no basing mode is likely to receive their approval.

The MX program was also set back by a series of congressional actions that limited annual procurement to rates well below those recommended by the administration. Planners of the original 100-MX program (plus test missiles) envisioned building to an optimum production rate of 48 per year. The administration requested 27 missiles in fiscal 1984, 40 in 1985, and 48 in 1986. The rates approved by Congress were 21, 21 and 12, respectively. The net result of these lower and less efficient production rates was a major (and predictable) escalation of unit cost.

The irony is that at these less-than-optimum rates, projections indicate that we probably wind up paying more for 50 deployed MXs, and associated test missiles, than we would have paid for the full 100-missile program originally contemplated. In short, for the same amount of dollars, we get less deterrence, less arms-control leverage and less efficiency in the use of defense resources than would have been the case had Congress fully supported the Scowcroft Commission's thoughtful and balanced recommendations. Even today, at an efficient production rate, we could procure, and deploy in Minuteman silos (as we are doing with the first 50 Peacekeeper missiles), an additional 50 MXs for a total cost of \$2 billion—a relatively inexpensive complement to the roughly \$50 billion cost projected for an equivalent number of deployed warheads on single-reentry-vehicle Small ICBMs.

It is generally recognized that the 30,000-pound limitation on the Small ICBM that

was imposed by Congress was a mistake and, if literally enforced, would impose its own set of inefficiencies on the further evolution of our ICBM force.

Most of the restriction's earlier proponents now acknowledge that the missile will have to weigh at least 37,000 pounds to allow the addition of penetration aids and other features essential for system effectiveness. One would hope that a collateral lesson learned from this experience would be that the design of complex weapons systems by legislative fiat is fraught with difficulties. To constrain the weapons-development process by arbitrarily limiting the examination of alternatives clearly risks inefficiencies, diseconomies and irrational results.

That is why, in order to prepare for the decision later this year on full-scale development of the Small ICBM, the Defense Department is evaluating a range of options that appear to be technologically achievable, cost-effective, and consistent with national policy. These include the examination of multiple-warhead missiles for the Small ICBM.

The economies of multiple warheads are obvious: By placing two or three reentry vehicles on a single missile, it is possible to achieve the same military capability with a substantially reduced number of missiles. So long as mobility is maintained and the Small ICBM deployment area remains roughly constant in size, survivability is not affected, and the cost to the Soviets of countering the force remains unchanged. This is because the only effective way to attack a mobile Small ICBM force, in which the precise location of each missile is unknown, is to saturate the deployment area with incoming Soviet reentry vehicles. For a fixed deployment area the number of reentry vehicles needed to do this is a constant, regardless of the number of Small ICBMs involved. The key technological issue, therefore, is whether missile mobility can be preserved with a Small ICBM that could accommodate more than a single warhead.

The ultimate decision on configuration will, of course, rest with President Reagan and Congress. However, the Defense Department will provide the technical basis for a fully informed decision, consistent with the national goals of maintaining an adequate defense deterrent, while providing the foundation for effective arms-control negotiations with the Soviets.

SAMUEL A. ROTH HONORED

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen of the 17th Congressional District of Ohio, Mr. Samuel A. Roth.

Mr. Roth has been chosen to receive the Guardian of the Menorah Tribute from B'nai Brith. The award will be presented during a dinner at Sqaw Creek Country Club on Sunday evening, June 1, 1986. This honor is presented each year to a person who, through service and commitment, has demonstrated devotion to the cause of youth and the com-

munity. Chairing this event are Robert A. Lackey, Ronald C. Mostov, and Bruce E. Sherman. Honorary chairpersons are Lawrence J. Heselov, Rabbi Mitchell Kornspan, and James L. Pazol.

A husband and father of two, Mr. Roth has served—and continues to serve—his community in a variety of ways. A professional engineer, he is president of Roth Brothers, Inc. He is a board member of the regional growth division of the Youngstown Area Chamber of Commerce, and is participating in the Leadership Youngstown 1986 Class. Active in national and State engineering organizations, he has served as president of the Mahoning Valley Society of Professional Engineers. He is also a member of Kiwanis and a board member of the Youngstown Symphony Society.

Since 1977, Sam Roth has worked diligently toward the creation of the Commission for Jewish Education, which he currently heads. He has also been active since the early 1970's in the Youngstown Area Jewish Federation, having volunteered in a variety of capacities. He has served his synagogue and the Jewish Community Center as well.

In "Pirkei Avot", it is written: "The world is sustained by three things—by study, by service, and by deeds of kindness." Clearly, Sam Roth is one of those who helps to sustain the world. I am delighted that so many have chosen to honor Samuel Roth on June 1, and am pleased to add my voice to those who thank and congratulate him. His commitment to duty and to others is an example to us all.

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, as we observe National Tourism Week, we learn a number of things about our society and about our national character. As the original author of this legislation in 1983, I'm proud to once again be a strong supporter of this bill in 1986.

National Tourism Week informs us that tourism has become an important part of our lives. Second, it tells us that we place a priority on the acquisition of knowledge: in its highest form, tourism is a quest for knowledge, through tourism, the individual acquires a deeper awareness of his heritage, his environment and the culture to which he belongs. Travel stretches our minds and develops our sense of civilization.

In its highest form, tourism is a quest for knowledge. We want to know about a different place, so we visit it. And there's plenty to learn right in the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania. We have historic Bethlehem, Musikfest, the Sun Inn, the Canal Museum, the Lehigh County Historical Society, the Bach Festival, a variety of ethnic festivals. The list goes on.

Tourism is a freedom—the liberty to explore our State and our Nation, to visit our elected representatives and observe them in action, to engage in outdoor recreation outside our home communities, or to travel abroad.

Not all peoples share that freedom. There are restrictions on travel in some countries. Permission must be obtained from the central government to leave the country, and the citizen's passport is impounded by the national police upon his return. We are fortunate that we may travel freely.

The quest for knowledge and freedom to travel have made tourism important to not only our leisure, but to our work. Roughly 7 percent of the American labor force is employed by the tourism industry, either directly or indirectly. That is more than is employed in mining, construction, agriculture, utilities, finance, insurance or real estate.

Today, tourism, is the second largest private employer in the Nation is one of the top three employers in 39 States; and generates more than \$41 billion a year in wages and salaries.

Tourism also means industrial and manufacturing jobs for those who build roads, bridges, cars, buses, hotels. It means steel, cement, manufactured products. Tourism is important to Lehigh Valley jobs.

This year, two-thirds or more of the American public is expected to travel to a destination 100 miles or more from home. Last year, Americans took 1 billion such trips, more than twice as many as were reported in the 1972 National Travel Survey. Tourism is a feature of American life.

That we have set aside this week to acknowledge the benefits that tourism bestows on this Nation is, therefore, fitting. I hope that every citizen will take this occasion to reflect upon these benefits.

HIGHLAND PARK—AN ALL-AMERICAN CITY

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the city of Highland Park, IL, serves as a model for all other cities which face the flight of retail businesses from their communities. Because of its bold efforts to confront changes accompanying the creation of mammoth suburban shopping malls, the city of Highland Park will be appropriately honored as one of nine All-American Cities for 1986.

In the late 1970's Highland Park's downtown retail area was decaying because residents were attracted to newer, larger retail centers outside the city. The city initiated a controversial redevelopment program which has resulted in a 72.7-percent increase in retail sales in 1985-86 over 1980-81. In addition to the program's success, the redevelopment effort preserved many downtown historical buildings. These achievements show that Highland Park truly deserves this award.

I am proud to represent a city which has shown such tremendous leadership in meeting today's urban challenges.

May 22, 1986

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1986

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues the observance of National Tourism Week. Tourism is vital for all of America, and each of us benefits from its effects. We learn about friends from other

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

12041

parts of the country and develop an appreciation of other geographic regions and for the history of our neighbors' lives. Not only does tourism work for America, but it works for my home State of South Dakota.

In 1983, the most recent year for which figures are available, travel and tourism was the second largest employer in the State. It generated 14,400 jobs for South Dakotans, enhancing payroll potential and bringing in millions of dollars annually from visitors.

And understandably so. South Dakota has so many beautiful attractions and warm,

friendly people, it's no wonder that tourists flock to our State, spending over \$1.3 million every single day on travel-related activities. From Mount Rushmore and the Black Hills to the Badlands, on to Wall Drug and the Corn Palace, and following with the unending glory of golden farmlands, South Dakota is a land of plenty to see and do.

On behalf of my fellow South Dakotans, I celebrate National Tourism Week and invite you all to come visit our land of infinite variety.