

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE CONSTITUTION: OUR
QUEST FOR A MORE PERFECT
UNION

HON. J.J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to offer for inclusion in the RECORD this speech given by you at the Smithsonian's symposium celebrating the bicentennial of our Constitution. I commend this speech to my colleagues, particularly at this time in our history, when as we celebrate the 200th anniversary of the Constitution, there is renewed emphasis upon the indispensable provision in which the Constitution reminds us of the role of our lawmakers.

THE CONSTITUTION: OUR QUEST FOR A MORE
PERFECT UNION[Remarks of Hon. Jim Wright, Speaker,
U.S. House of Representatives]

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union". That's the way they began it. And there is something in those words peculiarly fitting to our experience.

Tonight, as I welcome you here to this historic Statuary Hall, where the only other such ceremony as this occurred when the Queen of England brought the Magna Carta for our keeping during our bicentennial—I invite us to think together upon that unusual phrase: "A more perfect union." The grammarian may ask, "If the word 'perfect' is a superlative, how can a thing be 'more' perfect?"

And therein lies the clue. The society which gave birth to the Constitution was not perfect. It was far from perfect, and the founding fathers knew it. Perhaps they did not dare to dream that we ever would attain the goal of social perfection. But they dared to aim at the goal and to create an instrument which succeeding generations of imperfect creatures might use to work toward that goal of "a more perfect union."

America in 1787 was trouble. Times were hard. The Articles of Confederation were breaking apart. States levied taxes on one another's goods, and nobody paid taxes to the central government. It was deeply in debt and could not maintain an army. The British blockaded our ports, if a merchant seaman were able to run the blockade, he likely would be kidnapped by Barbary pirates who sold Americans into slavery in Algiers. Our national debt was so bad, so nearly insoluble, that there was talk of selling some of the states, Spain owned Florida, and was interested in buying the Carolinas. That was America in the year they wrote the Constitution.

We Americans are prone on such commemorations as this to engage in an orgy of self-congratulation. Perhaps it is well that a Justice of the Supreme Court has interrupted our monody of praise with a discordant criticism. Mr. Justice Marshall suggests that the Constitution was "defective from the start" since it required amendments and upgrading to attain the individual freedoms

and human rights which he says "we hold as fundamental today." Of course the Constitution was imperfect, as were those who wrote it, and the culture it was designed to serve.

It was in fact an implement created expressly for the use of a society of morals, with all our faults and flaws and temptations to selfishness, in our collective efforts at self government.

The political history of the United States can be written in the steady continuous expansion of civil rights, of economic opportunity, and of social equality. None of these is yet perfected, but how very far we've come! And all of it has been done under the Constitution, using its procedures and its protections. It is true enough that its 55 authors compromised and temporized with moral absolutes and that in one such compromise they formally counted each slave as three-fifths of a person. The very fact that we now can be horrified at that is testimony to our growth and a tribute to the vitality of our charter document.

No, the Constitution did not ordain instant utopia. It was a creature of its time. But it was not bound to the mores of its time, and therein is its genius. It set in motion the machinery for achievement in each succeeding age of a continuous social revolution through peaceful means.

It was in the use of the Constitution that we established the Bill of Rights, validated universal manhood suffrage, abolished slavery, adopted the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments, gave the vote to women and extended women's rights, provided direct election of Senators, enacted voting rights laws and opened the public schools to all without discrimination. Some of this was done by Constitutional Amendment, some of it by statute, some by Presidential proclamation, some by court order. But all of it was done under the rubric of the Constitution.

Rather than condemn those 55, therefore, for lacking the vision to foresee for the courage to decree in their own time all the 200 years of hindsight have enshrined in our modern acceptance, we should embrace them for providing internally in this document the mechanisms for lawful change and growth. To condemn the authors for lack of social conscience would be like questioning the geometric credentials of Pythagoras because he did not foresee the relativity of matter, or to disparage Copernicus because he failed to discover that $E=MC^2$.

The Constitution was not a static document. It is not anchored in time. It has tensile strength and contains its own-righting gyroscope. That's why it has endured for these 200 years.

Thomas Jefferson understood this. He said, "We might as well require a man to wear yet the cloak which fitted him when a boy as [to require] civilized society to live forever under the regimen of . . . ancestors."

The Constitution is an organic, living thing which must be fertilized, cultivated, pruned and watered by the nurturing genius and enlightened care of each succeeding generation.

Sometimes a moral absolutist or an ideological purist will be shocked upon learning

that the founding fathers compromised. Indeed they did. Compromise was the soul of their offering. One cannot read Madison's notes on the Constitutional Convention, nor Elliott's debates, which record the trials of its ratification, without being acutely aware of compromise on every page, conciliation in every paragraph.

That they conciliated until they found consensus does not mean that they lacked conviction. To the crucible full of conviction that men should be free, they applied the pestle of their collective experience and the lubricant of mutual tolerance for one another's differences, their fear of too great a central power, their scorn of one too weak. They had lived fretfully through both and they wanted neither.

What they wrought was a legal framework within which succeeding generations have been able to synthesize and compromise our way to successive plateaus of social and economic betterment for plain people.

John Adams wrote: "I must study politics and war that my sons may have the liberty to study mathematics and philosophy . . . in order to give their children the right to study painting, poetry and music."

Those words set a theme for what has come to be called the American Dream. In an important sense, they describe the heart of the American experience. Throughout almost all of our history, each generation has been able to do a little better than its parents. For as long as anyone can remember, the American people have followed a path of upward mobility—not just for the few, but for the average American—for all of us.

The path has not always been smooth, nor the journey comfortable. We've progressed somewhat sporadically, in fits and starts, sometimes lurching, sometimes stopping. We have moved forward in great bursts of creative energy, followed by periods of assimilation and even social and economic retrenchment. Sometimes progressives have been ascendant, followed by conservatives, and then by progressives. Neither has destroyed the other, and we owe that to the Constitution.

During the 1960's, for example, we marched liltily through an era of great social concern and governmental activism—as we had done in the 1930's. For the past 15 years or so we have paused to catch our breath, to enjoy our comforts and bask in our freedoms. Now we may be poised at the starting gate of a new epoch of social change.

In "The Angry Young Man" a young woman intercedes in an argument between her father and her husband. "Father, don't you see?" she pleads, "You are both angry! You are angry because the world is changing so fast, and he is angry because the world is changing so slowly." Just so, the Constitution contains and controls the anger of both conservative and liberal. It guarantees that each may have his say, but does not guarantee that either will get his way.

Toward the end of the Constitutional Convention in 1787, Ben Franklin pleaded that each delegate "would with me, on this

● 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.

occasion, doubt a little of his own infallibility."

Yes, they were imperfect, as human nature is imperfect. Precisely because it is imperfect, they developed a system capable of accommodating its imperfections and of curbing its excesses. In their delicately contrived balance of powers and their careful delineation of the bounds of each branch of government, the founders of our system fashioned a kind of political flood control project, erecting streambanks and levees and dams to ensure that no one power could overflow its banks to overrun and destroy the rights of others.

Those powers, too, have waxed and waned. There has been an ebb and flow. Sometimes—as in the days following the civil war—Congress has been overreaching and over-assertive. From time to time the ambition and popularity of a charismatic leader in the Executive branch have raised the water line of his authority to a threatening level, sometimes spilling out over its banks. But the flood control system has worked. Soon the levees are reinforced and the streams of political power return to manageable channels. All of that is because of the Constitution.

It has worked, in the final analysis, because we have wanted it to work. With exceptions so rare that they only make the point, we have observed and respected the rule of law. No man and no power—not the President, not the Congress, no, nor in the final analysis, not even the Courts—may be above the law. Each must comply. That is the central message of the Constitution.

It is the responsibility of Congress to write laws. The Constitution commands the President to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed . . ." The founding fathers were most of all concerned that this nation be a democracy, not a monarchy, that we have a President under the law, not a reigning monarch above the law.

The first 10 Amendments to the Constitution are integral to it. Without them, it would not have been ratified. Since their adoption in 1791, it has been amended only 16 times. And since the 18th and 21st are self-cancelling the remarkable durability and lasting relevance of this document comes through in the fact that after the Bill of Rights, the Constitution bears only 14 Amendments for these 200 years.

Imperfect? Yes, it is imperfect. The action it set in motion is imperfect. We still strive for the "more perfect union" it promises. It is good enough, however, that William Gladstone 100 years ago described it as the "most wonderful work" ever created by the "brain and purpose of man." I am persuaded that the Union it formed, with all its human faults and flaws and mortal imperfections still is, just as Abraham Lincoln pronounced it in his day—and may it ever remain—the last, best hope of earth.

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, National Maritime Day is the day set aside each year to recognize the American merchant marine and the seamen who serve on our vessels. It is also a day we remember those merchant mariners

who gave their lives in the defense of this great Nation.

I can recall those days in 1942 and 1943 when our coastal waters were lit by the flaming remnants of U.S. ships destroyed by enemy submarines. I can recall the relief convoys that resupplied our European allies, and traveled the treacherous Murmansk route to rebuild the Russian defense. I can recall the Pacific campaigns and the support missions that were conducted by a proud and ever-present merchant marine. I remember seeing hundreds of vessels anchored off City Island, NY—an area I currently represent—preparing for convoy duty across the Atlantic. We must never forget those dedicated individuals who sailed into the unknown with little or no protection. It is most fitting for a grateful nation to remember the valiant efforts of those who died and those who are still with us.

Unfortunately, all the oratory in the world cannot atone for the 40 years during which we have ignored the needs of our merchant mariners who served in the war. Our civilian and military leaders, both then and now, praised merchant mariners, yet offered nothing beyond words.

It is my fervent hope that 1987 will be the year we change that by passing H.R. 1235, the Merchant Seamen's Benefit Act, and H.R. 1430, the Merchant Marine Decorations and Medals Act. H.R. 1235 will grant the few remaining merchant marine veterans of World War II medical and other veterans' benefits, comparable to those currently available for World War II armed services veterans. H.R. 1430 will assure merchant mariners are recognized with medals and other decorations for service to our Nation.

Today, we are in the midst of a battle as crucial as the great battles of World War II—the battle to save our merchant marine. Recalling the essential role of commercial shipping and the merchant mariner in past wars should renew our firm resolve to insure that when we are again called to defend freedom we will have a strong and healthy merchant fleet.

A viable U.S.-flag fleet capable of meeting the demands of war is the offspring of a competitive industry capable of meeting the challenges of peace.

There are numerous bills before Congress that reject the view that the decline of our merchant marine is part of the natural evolution of life.

We in Congress must give our operators the tools necessary to defend themselves against the unfair practices of their foreign competitors.

We in Congress must make certain that the cost of vessels and cargo-handling equipment parallels our competitors.

We in Congress must provide an operating-differential subsidy that is equitable and will permit our operators to compete against state-supported cartels.

We in Congress must insure that our merchant fleet has cargo, its lifeblood, to keep it alive. This can only be achieved through cargo preference and bilateral agreements.

In recent months, Congress has taken the first steps in this journey. We are moving legislation to make our liner operators more efficient and operating subsidy more realistic. Important bills that will provide the cargo our

U.S.-flag operators need for survival are progressing. The House included in the trade bill provisions that will enhance our ability to fight unfair maritime trade practices.

We must recall the historical reasons for a strong U.S. merchant marine, and resolve to reserve the present decline in our fleet. The words of Santayana are so very appropriate for today: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to fulfill it."

There is no question we have far to go. We must overcome the shortsighted policy that will sacrifice our national fleet. We must recommit ourselves to an invigorated fleet—able to meet our peacetime needs and defend our Nation in time of war.

ARNOLTA WILLIAMS BRINGS DOWN THE HOUSE AT KENNEDY CENTER

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct honor of representing Mrs. Arnolta Williams in Congress. She is a distinguished American and a treasured friend. We all talk a lot here in Washington of sacrifice, courage, and compassion. I know of no one who embodies those virtues more than Mrs. Williams. Mrs. Williams was recently given the United Way of America's Alexis de Tocqueville Award for outstanding volunteerism for Florida. Mrs. Williams is an exceptional human being whose light shines as brightly now as when she began her volunteer work some 67 years ago.

I submit for the RECORD first an article that appeared in the April 27 edition of our local newspaper, the Florida Times Union, which sums up the life of the lady we know as "Mamma" Williams. And then I include another article from the same newspaper's May 10 edition.

ARNOLTA WILLIAMS TO ACCEPT AWARD FOR UNITED WAY

(By Carol L. Lewis)

Listening to Arnolta Williams recount the highlights of a typical day gives you a hint of why she is affectionately called "Mamma" around Jacksonville.

One day last week she showed some land to prospective buyers, paid some bills, received a telephone call from a prisoner (someone she'd known since he was a child) who called to say that he had been transferred to Jacksonville, and visited a bank president to show the resume of a "clean-cut" young man who had been unable to secure a banking job.

As she moves around the city, it's obvious that Mrs. Williams, who turned 90 in December, has the interests of others at heart.

It is perhaps most obvious through her volunteer work, which began in 1920. Mrs. Williams is a founder and lifetime member of the Jacksonville Urban League; she is a founding member and president of the Gateway Nursery and Kindergarten; and she has worked with countless United Way Agencies through the years. And that's just a sampling of her volunteer jobs.

Tonight she will be at the Kennedy Center in Washington, D.C., to accept the

United Way of America's Alexis de Tocqueville award for outstanding volunteerism for Florida during United Way of America's Centennial Volunteer Leaders Conference. Past winners of the national award have included comedian Bob Hope and Vernon E. Jordan Jr., a civil rights lawyer and a past president of the National Urban League.

Although volunteer service is an important part of her life, Mrs. Williams mixes well in political circles, too. Besides serving as inspector of Precinct 10 (Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School) for the supervisor of elections office for the past 40 years, she has supported the campaigns of politicians including Sen. Bob Graham and Mayor Jake Godbold and former President Jimmy Carter. Former first lady Rosalynn Carter is a friend of hers.

"I had a reception for Rosalynn Carter right here, the only house in Jacksonville that she visited when she was here. You should have seen all of those security guards out back," she said.

Although Mrs. Williams knows many politicians on a first-name basis, she thinks her endorsement of a candidate means little.

She has no power in controlling a person's vote, not even that of her own daughter, she said.

"The voting process and the black voter have become very sophisticated. There is no such thing as a black block vote," Mrs. Williams said.

As she paused to watch the local evening news during a recent interview, she recognized some of her "boys."

"That's my boy," Mrs. Williams said as she watched a Jacksonville mayoral candidate on the newscast. "If they are doing something, I call them my sons. White, black, blue or green. I tell them they are my integrated sons," she said a sparkle in her eyes. "I say to them, 'I'm your mamma.'"

In return, politicians, leaders and some blacks and whites affectionately call her "Mamma."

The youngest of three children, Mrs. Williams was reared in Charleston, S.C., by her father and grandmother. Her mother died when she was 9 months old.

"My grandmother was devoted [to the family.] I did not know that she was not my mother until we had grown up. It was a very close-knit family," she said.

Her father, a contractor, who remarried when Mrs. Williams was 13 years old, was a "dear, dear, gentleman," she said.

After she graduated from Benedict College, Columbia, S.C., in 1917 with a bachelor's of arts in education, Mrs. Williams became dean of girls for one year at the Americus (Ga.) Institute. In June 1918, she married Dr. I. E. Williams, a practicing physician, and moved to Jacksonville. Her only child, Hortense W. Gray, was born the following year. She is now a counselor at Florida Community College at Jacksonville. She has one granddaughter, Charlene, who is a junior in Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S.C.

Mrs. Williams' husband, a native of Trinidad, practiced at the old Brewster Hospital. When the hospital evolved into Methodist Hospital, Williams was named chairman of internal medicine.

Williams didn't approve of his wife working outside of the home. After she moved to Jacksonville, she taught for one week at Oakland High School, before her husband asked her to resign.

"He was very brilliant, very thorough and very businesslike. He did not believe in giving money to the wife. He set up accounts for me all over town," she said.

For years, Mrs. Williams wrote The Passing Throng, a column about blacks, for the weekly Florida edition of the Pittsburgh Courier. She did so without her husband's knowledge because she knew that he wouldn't approve.

Since her husband's death in 1970, she has become more involved in volunteer work and community functions.

"I've continued to go, and I like people. I'm very active, completely uninhibited," she said.

Saying that Mrs. Williams is active is an understatement. Her other volunteer service to the community has included work for the Boys Club, the American Red Cross, the Council on Aging, Volunteer Jacksonville and the YWCA. She is a former president of the Ladies Auxiliary of the Jacksonville Medical, Dental and Pharmaceutical Association. She also has served on the foundation boards of Methodist and University hospitals and Florida Community College at Jacksonville. She has been a member of the Mayor's Commission on the Status of Women, the executive committee for the Democratic Party and was a Florida delegate to the White House Council on Aging in 1981.

Her awards have included the Golden Rule Award for outstanding senior volunteer, a finalist for the Times-Union's EVE Award in 1984 and a certificate from the U.S.O. for 5,000 hours of service. On May 9, she will receive an honorary doctorate of humane letters from Edward Waters College.

Dr. Cecil Cone, president of the college, described Mrs. Williams as one of the college's strongest financial supporters. She has also been successful in getting others to donate funds to the college.

Mrs. Williams, who credits God for her longevity, continues to drive and is an avid reader of daily newspapers and the Bible. Her hobbies include writing, crocheting afghans and watching movies. Occasionally, she exercises on her daughter's exercise bike.

Mrs. Gray, who shares the home with her mother on Ribault Scenic Drive, said she has never felt pressure to walk in either of her parents' footsteps.

"I've always been encouraged to create an image of my own and to make a contribution. I'm a person and I'm not a clone," she said. "I wanted to be known as Hortense Gray, the person and not the daughter of. Both of my parents have motivated me. I can't say enough about all the advantages. I have accomplished enough to feel important and proud as a daughter. I'm grateful."

Mrs. Williams said she is enjoying life and can't think of anything that she would change.

When Mrs. Williams is asked to speak at community functions, she often shares one of her favorite quotes with the audience: "To know how to grow old is the masterpiece of wisdom and one of the most difficult chapters in the art of living."

ARNOLTA WILLIAMS BRINGS DOWN THE HOUSE AT KENNEDY CENTER AWARDS CEREMONY

(By Wini Rider)

"All of Washington fell in love with 'Mamma' Williams," said Darleen Unger, about Arnolta Williams' recent appearance on the Kennedy Center stage.

Both women were in the nation's capital for the United Way of America's Centennial Volunteer Leaders Conference. Mrs. Unger was there as chairman of Northeast Florida's United Way 1987 Centennial Celebra-

tion, and Mrs. Williams was there to receive special recognition as Florida's winner of the 1987 Alexis de Tocqueville Award. Former President Gerald Ford and actor Gregory Peck were co-hosts for the evening.

Mrs. Williams, 90 known to many in Jacksonville simply as "Mamma," was selected from hundreds of nominees across the state to receive United Way's highest tribute to volunteerism. She, with other volunteers from every state and some territories, were presented their awards by Peck.

"Gregory Peck introduced her and she brought down the house," Mrs. Unger said. "She walked on stage with her hands clasped over her head like a champion prize fighter."

The Alexis de Tocqueville Award was created in 1972 by United Way of America to recognize volunteers. The award was named in honor of de Tocqueville, the French philosopher and historian, who admired the spirit of voluntary effort for the common good that he observed during a nine-month visit to America in 1831. He recorded his thoughts on the subject in his book "Democracy in America."

Said the Washington Post in a write-up of the event: "If [de Tocqueville] were writing 'Democracy in America' today, you can bet he would write about people like Arnolta J. Williams."

"Mrs. Williams, a volunteer for more than 70 years is president of Gateway Nursery and Kindergarten, a center providing care for 90 underprivileged children in Jacksonville, Fla."

"Only by the good will of the citizens of the city and the state can the country survive," Mrs. Williams declared.

Others who have won the award have been Pete and Carrie Rozelle, George Meany, Vernon E. Jordan Jr., Henry Ford II, and Bob Hope.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL INDUSTRIAL EXTENSION ACT OF 1987

HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Federal Industrial Extension Act of 1987, which I urge my colleagues to co-sponsor. I expect a Senate counterpart to the measure to be introduced shortly.

This bill aims to solve the conundrum that lies at the heart of our economic dilemma: The United States continues to lead the world in research as it continues to fall behind in international trade. Simply put, other nations are better at applying our scientific and technological breakthroughs than we are. Particularly serious is the glacial pace at which many small- and medium-sized manufacturers take advantage of new technology and management practices.

Experts of varied background and political stripe have concluded that State industrial extension programs hold out the best hope of overcoming this obstacle to economic progress. In these programs, experts—usually from universities—work directly with individual companies to improve their ability to compete.

This is not a new idea. It is based, of course, on our venerable cooperative exten-

sion system, which has helped make American agriculture the envy of the world. And the Federal Government has made sporadic attempts at applying the concept to the industrial sector. The State Technical Services Act of the mid-1960's was the most recent and probably the most successful effort to foster State technology transfer programs.

A 1969 review of that act for the Nixon administration by Arthur D. Little, Inc., concluded, "Field services which are oriented toward problem solving should receive increasing emphasis through increased budgets and more personnel." A study by the National Governors Association reached similar conclusions.

Twenty years later that advice is still worth following. The Federal Industrial Extension Act would apply that counsel through two initiatives.

First, the bill would establish an Office of Extension Services at the National Bureau of Standards to provide technical assistance to State extension programs. The Office would act as a single point of contact for State programs to ensure that they had access to all the Federal and federally funded research they needed to help their businesses.

Second, it would establish a 3-year demonstration grant program to help 15 States or regional consortia create, improve or expand, as well as evaluate, industrial extension programs. While many States have recently established such programs, they tend to be too small to provide a full-blown test of the idea. The demonstration grants would fund a variety of extension programs throughout the country, so at the end of the 3 years, States would have diverse, fully tested models to choose among and adapt to their needs.

These programs established under this bill would not give States any marching orders, but would rather encourage and support experimentation and innovation by the States. The States and universities tell us they need this kind of assistance from the Federal Government to give industrial extension the solid, permanent backing that has made the Federal-State partnership in agricultural extension such a success.

Our economic lethargy is a national problem. The modest programs this bill would establish would help energize the economy by using States to help businesses apply the results of research, particularly federally funded research.

I hope my colleagues will join Congressman MACKAY and I in promoting this idea.

AT&T ACCESS BLOCKED BY FRENCH

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article that recently appeared in the New York Times concerning the recent decision of the French Government to reject AT&T's offer to purchase a French switch manufacturing firm.

This recent action came after it looked like AT&T's offer was going to be accepted 2

years ago and after French engineers indicated they considered AT&T's switch technology to be superior to either of the two other competing firms.

This episode points out the need for a new tough approach on trade. Either U.S. companies are going to be granted greater access to foreign markets, or access of foreign firms to the U.S. market must be restricted.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the article follows:

TALKING DEALS: FRENCH DEFEAT FOR A.T.&T.

(By Steven Greenhouse)

PARIS.—When A.T.&T. lost out to L.M. Ericsson of Sweden last week in its two-year effort to buy the second-largest telephone switching company in France, it learned quickly that deal-making in Europe is even more unpredictable than it is in the United States.

In the three-way competition to get French Government approval for the acquisition, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company learned that technological superiority is not necessarily enough to win. A.T.&T. also learned that despite all the talk in Europe about privatization and free enterprise, politics continues to play a powerful role in a sector as important as telecommunications. In addition, the company got some first-hand knowledge of European chauvinism.

It was an unexpected turnabout for A.T.&T. when the French Government selected the Ericsson group to buy Compagnie Générale de Constructions Téléphoniques. A.T.&T. had long been considered the favorite to be chosen. Indeed, a year ago the A.T.&T. consortium, which included some French companies and N.V. Philips of the Netherlands, was on the brink of signing a contract to buy C.G.C.T., which controls 16 percent of France's switching market.

The Government was looking for a strong foreign manufacturer to buy the concern, a weak player in the switching market, so that the French telephone company would have an alternate source to Compagnie Générale d'Electricité, France's other big switching manufacturer.

Just when France was about to approve A.T.&T. for the acquisition, Siemens A.G. of West Germany got wind of it, and the Germans turned up the heat. Compagnie Générale d'Electricité had just grabbed a large share of the West German switching market after it took over ITT's European subsidiaries, so the Germans thought the French should reciprocate by allowing Siemens to get some of the French market by buying C.G.C.T.

Siemens also made another argument. "Siemens was saying Europe has to strengthen forces by keeping the Americans out of the market and promoting a European solution," said an official from the Netherlands, which was backing the A.T.&T.-Philips bid.

Top German officials lobbied heavily for Siemens, and even Jacques Delors, a former French Finance Minister who is now president of the European Commission, spoke out on Siemens' behalf, asserting that the German company should be chosen because that would strengthen the European Community. To heighten the pressure, the Germans threatened to drastically cut purchases from C.G.E. if Siemens were left out in the cold.

Suddenly, the Americans did not like the way things were going. "We always believed we had the best offer from a technology and

business viewpoint," said Wilma Mathews, spokesman for A.T.&T. Network Systems. "When Siemens came in, it became a political football. It became an American decision or a European decision."

Not surprisingly when Edouard Balladur, France's Finance Minister, announced that the Swedish-French group led by Ericsson was the winner, A.T.&T. expressed outrage. According to A.T.&T. and Phillips officials, just days before the Ericsson announcement, the French had assured A.T.&T. that French engineers had found its technology better than Ericsson's or Siemens'. The Americans also protested that the French had reportedly asked Ericsson to sweeten its bid after the deadline to submit offers had passed.

In promoting Ericsson's selection, Mr. Balladur, according to French officials, was trying to pursue a neutral course. He recognized that if he chose A.T.&T., the Germans would be riled, and if he chose Siemens, the Americans would be. That he chose Ericsson instead of Siemens provided some solace to the Americans. One trade official in Washington said he would have been far angrier if Siemens had won because France would then have been brazenly bowing to German pressures and to calls for a European solution.

A few days after Mr. Balladur made his announcement, the rancor had somewhat subsided. "A.T.&T. wants to do business in Europe in the future, and it might not help it if it pushed Washington to take reprisals," said one official in the American Embassy in Paris.

On Capitol Hill, however, some people think there might be reprisals. "Many people here will see the French move as underscoring the need for tougher trade legislation," said Stephen Hilton, a spokesman for Senator John C. Danforth, the Missouri Republican who is sponsoring a bill that would allow the United States to respond in kind to the trade restrictions of other countries.

THE AMERICAN DREAM RESTORED

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, the "American Dream" is back. For the first time in nearly a decade, the typical American family is now able to afford the typical American home.

That's good news for our overall economy and good news for millions of American families looking to buy homes.

Recently, I had the pleasure of speaking to homebuilders in Ohio who are participating in this national revitalization.

It a pleasure to be with you this afternoon to address the Northeast Ohio Homebuilders Association. There are few industries in this country that reflect the free market ideals, the respect for property ownership, and the vigorous devotion to individual freedom as yours. We share a philosophy of freedom that has served America well for more than 200 years.

And what a time it is for that philosophy and for our Nation.

What a time for the home building industry.

Just look at your business today.

You and your industry are living proof that our Nation works best when the people get back to work.

We have unleashed the entrepreneurial spirit of Americans. Now Americans are doing what they do best—build, produce, sell.

Since 1982, 12 million new jobs have been created in America. Just last year, more jobs were created in our Nation than Europe, Africa and Japan created in the past decade. And we continue creating new jobs at the rate of 250,000 a month for the past 60 consecutive months.

Together, we have gotten America back to work: restoring pride in our Nation, confidence in ourselves, hope for the world community, and, to be sure, enhancing the prospects of a better tomorrow for our children.

Members of the Northeast Ohio Homebuilders Association, you and the people of America are going strong.

Nowhere is the American resurgence more evident than in the housing industry. New home sales are skyrocketing. New building permits are at record levels. Construction is booming.

But this was not always the case. We need look back only seven short years ago.

As we entered the 1980's, the American dream of home ownership was in jeopardy.

Prior to 1977, nearly one-third of U.S. families could afford to buy a home. By 1980, four short disastrous years later, that share plunged to less than five percent. So we went from one in every three American families being able to afford a home to less than one in every 20.

The "Affordability Index" compiled by the National Association of Realtors, which as you know, measures the factors required to purchase and maintain a new home, stood at 125.8 in January of 1977. Forty-eight months later it plummeted to 63.9.

Conventional mortgage rates on existing homes stood at 8.5 percent in 1977. After four years they rose to 17 percent.

Today, the American dream of home ownership has been restored. In fact, Americans are on a home-buying spree.

Conventional home mortgage rates have dropped from over 17 percent to 9 percent. The FHA/VA mortgage rate, which reached a high of 17.5 percent before the program for economic recovery began to take effect, is now at 8.5 percent.

New home sales for all of 1986 were at their highest rate in nearly a decade and were 20 percent higher than 1985, which was another record setting year.

Home mortgage activity for last year, in both conventional and Government financed was an unprecedented \$400 billion in mortgages written. This compares with \$250 billion in activity in 1985.

Why the surge?

Last year, for the first time in more than a decade, the typical American family could afford to buy the typical American home.

That's great news for our Nation's families and its great news for you. In fact, the affordability index that I mentioned before has climbed back over 100 and stayed there.

I know what that means to you. And, we both know what this means to families all across our great land—the opportunity to buy, live and raise children in their very own homes.

I'm sure you get a great sense of satisfaction from the happiness you bring home owners.

You're helping to create a secure environment for the family—helping to foster a healthy, nurturing community—adding new strength to the American economy.

Although this certainly sounds good for the housing industry, we must not be complacent and rest on our laurels. We must recognize that the industry is still recovering from the mistaken policies of the last decade. The National Association of Home Builders is projecting about 1.6 million housing starts in 1987. That's almost 600,000 more than were started during the depths of the recession, but it is 200,000 less than last year as well.

As you know, FHA has played a major role in the resurgence of the past couple of years. This is a continuation of a long and illustrious history for FHA. During its 52-year existence, FHA has helped more than 15 million American families achieve the dream of home ownership. In doing so, FHA has been instrumental in raising the nation's homeownership rate from 40 percent in the thirties to more than 63 percent today.

As these figures indicate, FHA has been very successful. This does not mean I favor an expanded role for FHA, but in certain areas, the FHA presence is definitely desirable—especially in areas where private mortgage insurance companies are incapable of filling that role.

In addition, in certain areas of the Nation which were hard hit by energy and agriculture downturns, FHA was the only game in town. Without FHA there would have been no housing market.

I am opposed to any attempts to increase the current 3.8 percent FHA mortgage insurance premium. With a surplus of close to \$4 billion, the FHA fund made approximately \$500 million last year after settling all claims. Moreover, HUD sources, as well as industry analysts, agree that the FHA fund is actuarially sound and that the current 3.8 percent "user fee" is more than sufficient to maintain the actuarial integrity of FHA.

I am not in favor of the Government losing money on Government programs although sometimes it is necessary and that is why we pay taxes. On the other hand, I don't believe the Government should be in the business of being a profit making institution either. If we want to follow a policy of having user fees to maintain programs, that is one thing, but to establish user fees at a level where the Government makes money, it seems to me we crossed over into the area of taxation. And that is what this proposal to increase the insurance fee is—a tax on future homebuyers.

Last year, it was proposed that the mortgage insurance premium not be permitted to be financed through the mortgage. Thankfully, that ill-advised idea was dropped and it was recognized that requiring the prospective homebuyers to pay the premium in cash at closing would force many out of the market.

Another misguided proposal which seems to pose a contradiction to homeownership is the suggestion to increase the minimum downpayment for households earnings more than \$40,000 a year. We do not yet know the impact of such a change would be, but on the surface it appears it would be harmful to the industry.

The deregulation of the FHA interest rate and the direct endorsement program, keeping pace with changing economic times, have enhanced FHA's program structure rather than restricting its effectiveness. These changes have greatly strengthened FHA's public/private partnership as many of FHA's operating functions have been shifted to the private sector and other aspects of FHA's operating functions have been deregulated.

I would hope that any future proposals to change FHA will be carefully structured to preserve FHA's financial strength and to maintain its long-standing commitment to low and moderate income households.

Finally, let me tell you the status of our "war of points" with the Internal Revenue Service.

As most of you are aware, the Internal Revenue Service is again trying to legislate itself some extra revenues out of the recent drop in home interest rates. In fact the tax forms for 1986, include a "red flag" for IRS auditors who want to stop taxpayers from deducting points when they refinance a mortgage.

As you'll remember, last may the IRS shocked millions of homeowners with the news that the deduction for refinancing-related "points" must be taken over the life of the loan (which often, as you know, is up to 30 years), not in the first year.

This was even though the points on a new mortgage or home improvement loan are deductible up-front, and Congress has never—I repeat never—expressed its intent that refinancing points are to be treated any differently.

I have sponsored legislation, along with Congressman SHERWOOD BOEHLERT of New York and RICHARD STALLINGS of Idaho which would present the IRS from going forward with this unfair practice.

I should point out that our bill would cause no major revenue loss—the Treasury has never seen that revenue since taxpayers have routinely deducted home mortgage points for years. It's also worth noting that the Treasury already nets more revenue when homeowners refinance because smaller interest payments mean smaller interest deductions.

The IRS ruling, besides needlessly complicating the alternative minimum tax, is a nasty swipe at the two million Americans who welcomed a dropping interest rate last year by refinancing their homes. The action is an inappropriate and confusing revenue grab that runs against every principle of the newly reformed Tax Code.

We have also contacted Secretary Baker to stop the IRS. Our bill had nearly 200 cosponsors last year, but there simply was not enough time left in the session to complete action. We are optimistic this year and are aiming at an April 15th deadline.

I will keep you apprised of our progress over the next several weeks.

I would like to make a few observations on the Administration's 1988 budget request for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The fiscal year 1988 HUD budget reflects a cut in budget authority from the \$15.2 billion available in 1987 to a \$10.2 billion request for 1988—that's a 30 percent decrease.

Compared to the last HUD budget of the Carter administration, this represents a 70 percent cut. Certainly in view of these figures, Federal spending for low and moderate income housing has had more than its fair share of cuts.

Although I am not in total agreement with the administration's budget request for HUD, I also do not believe that the funding authorization levels contained in Congressman GONZALEZ's housing bill, H.R. 4, is the proper route to take. On the one hand, the Administration's budget request does not fully reflect the unfulfilled housing needs of the elderly and handicapped and the homeless.

On the other hand, the Housing and Community, Development Act (H.R. 4), with

funding levels reflecting a 40 percent increase over the 1987 appropriated levels, does not acknowledge that the number one domestic issue facing the Congress is the Federal deficit. I would suggest that a freeze at last year's levels would be more appropriate.

I remain optimistic, however, that during the 100th Congress we will pick up where we left off in 1986 and draft a federally assisted housing program which establishes a new set of priorities in order to provide the greatest amount of assistance for the least amount of money. I base this contention on a three-tiered approach:

Affordability, housing preservation, and limited involvement in new rental housing construction. This approach is premised on the belief that housing vouchers, coupled with a concerned rental rehabilitation program and a small supplemental new construction program, could meet our unfulfilled housing needs—and could do so at far less cost than emphasizing costly project-based new construction programs.

TAX REFORM RULE ON INSTALLMENT SALES

As you know, the Tax Reform Act significantly altered the rules dealing with the recognition of gain on installment sales of real property. The new rules "impute" phantom income to sellers which has no relationship to any actual payment made by the buyer.

These rules are particularly unfair for investment property and small business sales by nondealers.

Not only are the new rules unnecessarily complex, but in many instances they will result in an immediate tax liability far in excess of the cash received from the buyer. As you remember, prior to the tax bill, sellers could take back financing and pay tax on the gain as the installment payments were received. That was a logical, rational approach that should not have been changed.

I have cosponsored legislation with Congressman Ed JENKINS that would return the rule to pretax reform language. The bill, H.R. 567 returns nondealers to the installment sales rules which existed prior to tax reform. Gain on sales will continue to be taxed, of course, but only as payments are actually received.

THE HOUSING SAVINGS ACCOUNT

I have sponsored legislation which creates a unique opportunity for first-time home buyers to establish a tax-deductible housing savings account. The housing savings account would be similar to individual retirement accounts in that tax deductible contributions to a trust account would accumulate tax free for a period of time and then would have to be used to finance the purchase of a first home.

The bill, H.R. 94, allows a maximum accumulation in the housing account of \$15,000 for individuals and \$30,000 for married couples. That constitutes a reasonable downpayment. These funds can be accumulated over a 10-year period.

I believe that the housing savings account can establish an important new program to help young couples achieve the American dream of home ownership.

DEDUCTIBILITY OF INTEREST ON LAND CONTRACTS

There has been some concern expressed over the ambiguities in the Tax Reform Act on this matter. Most homeowners now deduct the interest on their mortgages on their annual tax returns. However, the IRS has raised the issue of whether this deduc-

tion applies to those homeowners who purchased their houses on a land contract.

The Joint Committee on Taxation is currently preparing a report which is expected to clarify this particular issue, along with several others, where the IRS is seeking to apply their own interpretations. This report is expected to be released during this session of Congress.

THE FAIR HOUSING AMENDMENTS ACT

Under the provisions of this proposal, the Department of Housing and Urban Development would be required to utilize administrative law judges to adjudicate discrimination complaints against landlords. HUD opposes this particular section of the bill, and so do I.

It appears to me that this provision would only add another layer of bureaucracy. In my view, these complaints should be considered and resolved in the courts and not by HUD. This legislation has been referred to the Judiciary Subcommittee civil and constitutional rights. There will be hearings held on this proposal within the next few weeks.

But now is the time for us to act and act decisively. We must effectively communicate our concerns over this provision to every Member of the Congress. Fortunately, this is one thing which the Ohio realtors has done well in the past and must do on this issue.

All in all, I believe the future of your industry is bright. Certainly things are going well now—in spite of the IRS.

But you have always prevailed. Sure, like many other industries, you've had your cycles, but the American dream of homeownership is so strong, so deeply imbedded in our family tradition that the real estate industry will always thrive.

That is a tribute to you and that is a tribute to your honorable profession.

Thank you.

INTRODUCTION OF INDIAN GAMING LEGISLATION

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing another bill on the subject of gambling in Indian country. Since I had earlier introduced a bill on this subject, H.R. 1079, I felt I should explain to the members my reasons for developing this new legislation.

In 1981, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals handed down its decision in the case of Seminole Tribe of Florida versus Butterworth. In that case, the Seminole Tribe sued the sheriff of Broward County, FL, to enjoin him from arresting persons playing bingo at the tribal bingo hall for violation of Florida's gaming laws. Florida had been granted criminal and civil jurisdiction on Indian reservations by Congress in Public Law 83-280.

The court first held that, while Public Law 280 had granted criminal and civil jurisdiction to the State on Indian reservations, it did not make applicable to the Indians the civil/regulatory laws of the State. The court then distinguished between the criminal/prohibitory and civil/regulatory laws of a State. The court found that, where a State permits an activity under its laws and regulates that activity, those laws and regulations are a part of its

civil/regulatory laws and, therefore, not applicable on an Indian reservation even though criminal penalties are associated with a violation of those laws.

The court then analyzed Florida's gaming laws and found them to be civil/regulatory in nature since the State law did permit certain forms of gaming, including bingo, even though that activity was stringently regulated. The court held that, as a matter of Federal-Indian law, an Indian tribe may engage in, or license and regulate, a gaming activity within its reservation free of State licensing and regulation where the State permitted that activity. The court enjoined the sheriff from interfering with the Seminole tribal bingo. The Supreme Court denied a petition for a writ of certiorari.

After the Seminole decision, numerous Indian tribes joined the Seminole in turning to gambling as a means of generating tribal revenues. As the members of the House are aware, there is nowhere in this country where poverty is more rampant and crushing than on the Indian reservations. With the severe cut-back in Federal appropriations supporting programs on the reservations, Indian tribes began a desperate search for revenues to replace those dollars. Most tribes lack economic resources and there is little economic activity on reservations which tribal governments can tax.

Over a hundred tribes have developed gaming enterprises, primarily bingo, as a means of generating badly needed tribal revenue. With any profits, the tribes support their tribal governments and a wide variety of educational, health, social, and economic programs for their members.

In this, they are not unlike their non-Indian brethren. Several States and the District of Columbia run lotteries as a means of generating revenue and other States are considering it. Many States permit and tax parimutuel betting on horse racing, dog racing, and jai alai. Almost all States permit charitable bingo to support charitable works within their States. Two States, Nevada and New Jersey, derive substantial governmental revenues from casino gambling. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the 1976 report of the Commission on the Review of the National Policy Toward Gambling notes that more than 60 million adult Americans gamble, both legally and illegally, and in 1974, \$24 billion was wagered. It states that, in 1976, 33 States had some form of legal gambling and others were considering legalization.

As tribal gaming, primarily bingo, became more widespread in Indian country after the Seminole case, concerns and fears began to be raised by State officials, the gaming industry, and the tribes themselves. Fears about the infiltration of Indian gaming by organized crime and other undesirable elements were expressed by State officials and others. Some tribal leaders became concerned about their ability to deal with opportunistic outside management contractors. And the non-Indian gaming industry has become concerned about a new source of economic competition.

These concerns spawned new litigation in the lower courts. In almost every case, the courts have upheld tribal gaming free of State regulation under the Seminole rationale. And, increasingly, the parties looked to the Congress for legislative protection and relief.

In response to these concerns, I introduced a bill in the 98th Congress. My committee held a day of hearings and no further action was taken on the legislation pending further developments and a further definition of the positions of the various parties.

I and other Members reintroduced legislation in the 99th Congress. During the course of 1985, my committee conducted extensive hearings on the legislation, including a field hearing in San Diego, CA. Those hearings crystallized the positions of the interested parties.

Some Indian tribes strongly and forthrightly opposed any legislation as an intrusion upon their rights of tribal self-government.

Those tribes engaged in or interested in gaming reluctantly supported legislation as a vehicle to protect gaming as a source of revenue. However, they strongly opposed any provision which might subject their governments to State jurisdiction.

Those opposed to tribal gaming indicated their support for legislation only if it did grant jurisdiction to the States over certain forms of gaming.

As the sponsor of a gaming bill and as the chairman of the Interior Committee, I made clear my position that Federal legislation was necessary, but that I could not support any provision which unilaterally imposed State jurisdiction over the activities of tribal governments.

On December 11, 1985, the committee ordered my bill, H.R. 1920, reported with certain amendments. These amendments were offered and accepted in the spirit of compromise in an attempt to reconcile the conflicting interests of the opposing parties. I believe the bill we reported was generally a good bill in light of the then-existing legal circumstances. The committee report, House Report 99-488, was filed on March 10, 1986.

In order to secure passage of the bill under suspension of the rules, I agreed to a further compromise on the legislation. I agreed, reluctantly, to a further amendment which imposed a moratorium on class III gaming, primarily parimutuel betting, with a study provision and a submission to Congress. With that further compromise, the bill passed the House on April 21, 1986.

On April 29, 1986, the Supreme Court docketed the appeal of the State of California in the case of California, et al. versus Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, et al. On June 10, 1986, the Supreme Court granted review in the Cabazon case. This action of the Supreme Court greatly altered the course of the legislation in the 99th Congress and the positions of the parties. The Cabazon case drew squarely into issue before the Supreme Court the rationale of the Seminole case and the right of tribes to engage in gaming free of State regulation.

Many of the Indian tribes, fearful of an adverse ruling by the Court, became more willing to compromise their positions in the Senate in order to secure the enactment of protective legislation.

The opponents of tribal gaming activity, fully expecting the Court to render a decision favorable to their interests, became more insistent that the legislation subject tribal govern-

ments to State jurisdictions in the area of class III gaming.

Negotiations were ongoing in the Senate when the 99th Congress adjourned sine die and the legislation died.

As the 99th Congress opened, oral argument had already been had in the Supreme Court on the Cabazon case and a decision was expected within months. The sense of legislative urgency among some of the gaming tribes was still felt and I still felt that, whatever the outcome, some Federal regulation was necessary in the interests of the tribes and the public if tribal gaming was to continue.

As a consequence, on February 10, 1987, I reintroduced legislation, H.R. 1079, providing for Federal standards and regulation of tribal gaming. This bill was patterned on the legislation which was reported from my committee in the 99th Congress. It still reflected my position that, notwithstanding the impending decision of the Supreme Court in the Cabazon case, I could not support legislation which would unilaterally impose State jurisdiction over tribal governments. At the strong urging of the gaming tribes, I scheduled hearings on the bill for early March.

On February 25, 1987, the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the Cabazon case. The Court's ruling came as a great surprise to both the tribes and the opponents. The Court essentially upheld the Seminole rationale which had been applied by the Ninth circuit in the decision below.

As the decision of the Supreme Court to review the Ninth circuit decision in the Cabazon case clearly impacted on the legislative process in the 99th Congress, so did the ruling of the Court in the case impact on the legislation in this Congress.

Those gaming tribes which have consistently opposed any kind of legislation have only strengthened their resolve.

Those gaming tribes which had previously sought legislation have begun to question the need or desirability for legislation.

Despite the victory of the tribes in the Cabazon case, I still feel that it is in the interests of the Indian tribes, the States and the non-Indian gaming industry, and the general public to secure the enactment of some legislation which will provide Federal standards and regulations to protect the Indians and the public in the conduct of gaming on Indian reservations.

It is for these reasons that I have redrafted legislation and which I introduce today. This bill seeks to recognize the rights of tribal self-government in the area of gaming which were upheld by the Supreme Court while accommodating the legitimate concerns of others in that activity. I have tried to strike a delicate balance to maintain the support of the tribes for legislation and to secure the support of others who have concerns.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to schedule hearings later this year to see if there has been any further crystallization of opinion after the Cabazon decision which will permit us to act in a reasonable, consensual matter. Nevertheless, I must, again, restate my position that I cannot support the enactment of legislation which will impose upon the Indian tribes in their government function State jurisdiction. If accommodations retaining that essential

feature cannot be achieved, we may have to forgo legislation.

A TRIBUTE TO BRIAN CLINEFELTER

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days we have keenly felt the loss of the fine young men serving aboard the U.S.S. *Stark*. However, no one is feeling that sacrifice more than the families of those who have lost loved ones who committed their lives to serving their country. Today, I share the grief with Sandra Clinefelter and her family in the community of Barstow, CA.

Boatswain Mate Brian Clinefelter made the decision to continue an admirable naval tradition in his family by following in the footsteps of his brother, uncle, father, and both grandfathers by joining the U.S. Navy. This week, Brian was listed among those missing after his ship was struck by an Iraqi missile in the Persian Gulf. Brian last spoke with his family on Mother's Day when he telephoned his mom from Bahrain. He told her that he was enjoying his tour of duty and told her not to worry.

Brian was born on December 15, 1967 in New London, CT. He attended junior and senior high school in Barstow, where he lettered in wrestling and junior varsity football. Like many teenagers, Brian also worked at the local pizzeria. Brian enlisted in the Navy last December and in January completed his boot training at the Naval Training Center in San Diego.

I have always been impressed by the level of dedication exhibited by those who commit their lives to the service of our Nation. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me today in remembering and recognizing the ultimate sacrifice made by Brian and his crewmates. Let us never forget Brian or those who serve us all so very well.

DR. SAMUEL M. GENENSKY

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to recognize the contributions and work of Dr. Samuel M. Genensky, founder and executive director of the Center for the Partially Sighted.

The Center of the Partially Sighted, in my district, has achieved tremendous successes assisting legally blind and partially sighted people fully utilize whatever remaining eyesight they and live independently in a sight-oriented society.

Dr. Genensky is himself partially sighted, and has been since birth when someone in the hospital in which he was born mistakenly put the wrong chemical in his eyes. More than 70 percent of the legally blind see better than Dr. Genensky. Yet, he has always been sight-

oriented, earning a bachelor's degree in physics magna cum laude from Brown University, a master's degree in mathematics from Harvard, and a Ph.D. in applied mathematics from Brown. He was designated a Francis Wayland scholar for academic excellence by Brown University and held a university fellowship there.

Dr. Genensky joined the staff of the Rand Corp. in 1958, and began research on the problems of the partially sighted in 1965. He and his colleagues at Rand pioneered the development of the first practical closed circuit television system for partially sighted persons.

Dr. Genensky is a member of the Society of Sigma Xi, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the American Mathematical Society.

Dr. Genensky has received numerous honors and awards including the honorary degree of "Doctor of Humane Letters in Optometry" from the Illinois College of Optometry and an award for distinguished services in human relations from the National Conference of Christians and Jews. He has also received the Paul Yarwood award from the California Optometric Association for his contributions to visual research.

In 1978 Dr. Genensky established the Center for the Partially Sighted, and has provided assistance to thousands of partially sighted and legally blind individuals of all ages. The programs offered by the Center for the Partially Sighted enable partially sighted students to attend regular classrooms and use ordinary printed material rather than Braille, working-age patients to compete in challenging sight-oriented careers, and retirees to live independently and avoid institutionalization.

Under Dr. Genensky's leadership, the Center for the Partially Sighted has contributed to the success, happiness, and freedom of thousands of people across the country. I am very enthused about the work of the Center for the Partially Sighted, and of its founder, Dr. Samuel Genensky. I have been privileged to know Sam for several years, and I know him to be a man of extraordinary talent and courage, a man whose work I know and respect. I am very pleased to commend Dr. Genensky and the Center for the Partially Sighted for the fabulous work they are doing.

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 28, 1987, Americans of Armenian descent throughout the United States and their compatriots all over the world will pause to celebrate the 69th anniversary of Armenian Independence.

After 600 years of foreign domination, the courageous Armenians, although small in number and limited in resources, threw off the yolk of their oppressors and declared their independence from the Ottoman Empire. But this precious independence was destined to be short lived, for the new born Armenian Republic was brutally partitioned less than 2

years later by Russia and Turkey. Today, historic Armenian lands are in the hands of Turkey and Communist Russia, and the independence of Armenia remains an unresolved question.

The gallant Armenians have struggled unceasingly and have died willingly over the turbulent centuries to preserve their nation and their Christianity, and to keep alive the hope for a free and independent Armenia. Their struggle shall continue unabated until the territorial integrity of Armenia is restored, and Armenian Independence is recognized and upheld by the freedom-loving nations of the world.

The late Archbishop of Boston, His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, delivered an address in 1966 on the occasion of the 51st anniversary of Armenian Memorial Day. At that time Cardinal Cushing recognized the Armenian claim as the "oldest unresolved grievance on the agenda of world business" and charged the United Nations to effect a just solution for the Armenians in order to right the wrongs of the past and to demonstrate to the world that international justice is not merely an empty, meaningless phrase.

Cardinal Cushing's words ring as true today as they did 21 years ago. It is, therefore, my pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of Cardinal Cushing's remarks which follow:

ADDRESS OF HIS EMINENCE, RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING, ARCHBISHOP OF BOSTON AND HONORARY PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR THE INDEPENDENCE OF ARMENIA, ON THE OCCASION OF ARMENIAN MEMORIAL DAY, APRIL 24, 1966

April 24th is Armenian Memorial Day. On this day in 1915 the Turkish Government began the first genocide in modern times, massacring one million Armenian civilians and driving out of their historic homeland five hundred thousand more under incredibly inhuman conditions. These numbers become all the more appalling when one realizes that this represented virtually the entire Armenian population in Turkey proper. When we add to this wanton sacrifice of human life the billions of dollars of Armenian property confiscated or destroyed, including the invaluable contributions of the oldest Christian civilization in the world, the true enormity of this horrendous crime is revealed.

But April 24 is more than a day of mourning and remembrance. It is the day on which the Armenian people remind the world that its legal and historic right to sovereignty remain violated. The Treaty of Sevres, signed by Turkey on the one hand and by Armenia and their Allied powers on the other, recognized the independence of the Republic of Armenia within the boundaries therein defined by President Woodrow Wilson.

In 1920 the combined military forces of Communist Russia and Turkey, in violation of this Treaty, overthrew this outpost of democracy. Today a portion of Armenia remains a captive nation under Communist Russian domination and the remainder is illegally retained by Turkey.

As Pope John the XXIII said in his Encyclical *Pacem in Terris*, "The rights of men and governments stem not solely from human consent but from the design of the Creator." Therefore, the crime of 1915, further compounded by the crime of 1920, stand in violation of the design of the Cre-

ator and the inalienable rights of the Armenian people.

The United Nations was established as an international instrument to create a climate for world peace through international justice. The United Nations cannot fulfill its world mission unless it encourages the hopes of mankind by proving that it is truly a forum providing a peaceful redress on the legitimate grievances of all people.

The Armenian claims as the oldest unresolved grievance on the agenda of the world business stands today as a test case, the just solution of which will enhance the prestige of the United Nations and encourage all peoples to seek a peaceful consideration of world problems.

It is my earnest hope and prayer that the United Nations, and all people of good will, will join to bring a justice long delayed to the Armenian people, the worthy descendants of an ancient and noble civilization.

Now is the time for all nations of good will to prove that international justice, self determination, and peace are more than words, that they form the sound and sincere foundation of each government's international policy.

TRIBUTE TO NANCY HILFIKER

HON. DOUGLAS H. BOSCO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. BOSCO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I rise today to honor Nancy Hilfiker, a dear friend and community activist in Eureka, CA, who last week succumbed to cancer following a long and courageous battle with that treacherous disease. I would like to call to my colleagues attention the many outstanding contributions Nancy made to the people of California as I join with her family and friends in mourning this great loss. In our deep sadness we draw closer and remember with pride that Nancy's many achievements and her uplifting spirit far outdistance the tragedy of her untimely death.

A devoted wife, a loving mother, a steadfast friend, and a tireless community leader, Nancy was an inspirator to all who had the good fortune to know her. A native of Eureka, Nancy held a bachelor's and a master's degree in education from Humboldt State University where she also earned a teaching credential. Nancy taught elementary school at Freshwater, Warren Creek, and Grant School. At Hilfiker Pipe Co., where she was vice president, Nancy worked alongside her husband Bill and played a major role in the business' successful operation. Over the years, Nancy was active in a variety of local organizations and was president or chairman of the following groups: Grant Parent-Teacher Association, Humboldt Ski Club, Eureka League of Women Voters, Board of Governors to the Humboldt Area Foundation, Eureka Park and Recreation, the Zoo Advisory Committee, and the Library Construction Committee. In recognition of her hard work and dedication to community service, Nancy was the recipient of a variety of awards including: the Zoological Society's Good Egg Award, the Quota Club's Women of Achievement honor in 1979, the Northern California Park and Recreation Achievement

Award, and the Eureka Mayor's Distinguished Citizen Award.

Nancy Hilfiker was a woman of unique character, talent, and ability. Even when struggling with the physical and psychological pain of cancer Nancy was kind, thoughtful, and filled with good will. Mr. Speaker, Nancy was a very special person and the north coast was fortunate to have been the home of such an exemplary citizen. We will miss her dearly and remember her always.

RAY T. PARFET, JR.: A TRIBUTE

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, in 1947, the Upjohn Co. in Kalamazoo, MI, hired a young man from the eastern Michigan town of Port Huron to work in the firm's financial area. At the time, this hardly seemed like a remarkable event. Of course, Upjohn was a respectable firm with its facilities pretty much confined to a one block square area in downtown Kalamazoo. And of course, the man they hired had a promising resume: He had just received an A.B. in business administration from the University of Michigan and, during the war, he had been a B-25 pilot with the 12th Air Force. But neither the Upjohn officials who hired him—nor he himself—could have had the vaguest idea of where the next 40 years would lead them. For both, it has been a most impressive time, far better than anything they could have dreamt of.

The name of the young veteran was Ray T. Parfet, Jr., after starting in the company's financial area, he steadily rose through the ranks at Upjohn. Eleven years after being hired, Ray was named a vice president and member of the board of directors of Upjohn, then executive vice president in 1960. He became Upjohn's president and general manager in 1962, and finally chairman of the board and chief executive officer in 1969.

Anyone who thinks the American dream of success is dead should look at Upjohn and Ray Parfet, Jr.—the man and the corporation are virtually synonymous. Thanks to the leadership provided by Ray and colleagues like Ted Cooper, Preston Parrish, and Larry Hoff, that modest firm in one block of downtown Kalamazoo has grown to be a \$2.3 billion concern, one of the largest and most respected multinational corporations anywhere. Ray Parfet's Upjohn is a leader in health care, in veterinary care, and in agriculture. It has marketing operations in 45 foreign countries and sales in about 150 countries.

The company that Ray Parfet, Jr., leads has, in a literal sense, made the world a healthier place to live by its contributions to medical science. People who have next heard of Ray Parfet, Jr., or of Upjohn are better off because of Upjohn's development of the first oral antidiabetes agent; its application of fermentation techniques to production of steroid hormones; its discovery and development of useful broad-spectrum antibiotics; and its development of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory agents.

A few days ago, Upjohn had its annual meeting, Ray and other Upjohn leaders could report that the company is, as one newspaper put it, "poised for a period of significant growth." But the most important news of the meeting was the announcement of Ray Parfet's retirement from Upjohn on July 1, which is several months before he reaches the company's mandatory retirement age of 65.

What will happen to Upjohn after Ray's retirement? Fortunately, the company has a wealth of administrative talent in its ranks, so it should continue to prosper. Ray will be succeeded by Upjohn Vice Chairman Theodore Cooper, who will become the chairman and chief executive officer; and by Upjohn President Lawrence Hoff, who will become chief operating officer. I am privileged to know both Ted Cooper and Larry Hoff as personal friends, and I also know that they will provide Upjohn with the same gifted leadership and vision that have been Ray Parfet's hallmark. As Ray himself told cheering stockholders at his last annual meeting, "I leave my position extremely optimistic about the future of this great company."

At the same time, Ray Parfet, Jr., has a special place in Upjohn's history that no one else can ever fill. He has guided it with a steady and wise hand for many years. He will be very much missed.

I know my colleagues join me in paying tribute to one of the most successful and capable business people of this generation, and in wishing him the enjoyable and fulfilling retirement that he so richly deserves.

LEST WE FORGET

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer to the families and friends of those who gave their lives in the line of duty aboard the U.S.S. *Stark* (FFG-31), my most sincere condolences. The loss of a loved one is always terribly difficult to understand, however, in this case, the loss of these young, vital men is unfathomable. My heart goes out to the parents, wives, and children who now must adjust to the tremendous pain the events of the last few days have brought about.

Although none of the 37 casualties are from New York's 19th Congressional District, many of my constituents are currently on active duty, or have loved ones who are. Whether the attack on the U.S.S. *Stark* (FFG-31) was an honest error or an act of aggression, the results have, and will continue to affect the lives of all Americans.

Traditional Memorial Day is celebrated with parades and backyard barbecues. I believe that this year each of us should set aside a few moments to remember all who have fallen in the line of duty, but particularly the crew of the U.S.S. *Stark* (FFG-31). Their sacrifice should serve as a permanent reminder of our country's constant struggle for peace and harmony. In the celebration of this weekend, let us not forget those whom we have lost as well as the surviving members of the ship's

crew; men who remain a credit to themselves and to the U.S. Navy.

THE AIRLINE PASSENGER PROTECTION ACT OF 1987

HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Airline Passenger Protection Act. This legislation would require airlines to provide seating on an availability basis to persons holding tickets issued by bankrupt airlines. Reimbursement to the airlines or passengers would be funded from an account established within the aviation and airline trust fund. 88 percent of which the consumer currently funds through the 8 percent passenger ticket tax.

Since deregulation in 1979, over 160 airlines have gone bankrupt or terminated operations. One quarter of the airlines listed by the Civil Aeronautics Board as national or regional airlines have gone bankrupt.

People who held tickets on these airlines lost valuable time. Now you may shrug and say: "That's the way it goes." But put yourself in their shoes. You've spent several hundred to several thousand dollars planning a trip. The airline goes bankrupt. Your ticket is now worthless. What can you do?

Consumers are among the largest creditors of the airlines, directly holding obligations on the industry of approximately \$3 to \$4 billion in unused and prepaid tickets. As creditors, they are a disorganized group of individuals that will most likely never have their day in court.

Today when a bankruptcy occurs, the consumer is sometimes fortunate to find another airline that will offer transportation. But this is not the standard. Airlines may not decide to offer transportation until days later, sometimes only in certain cities. Sometimes only one or two airlines will offer transportation at an airport serviced by many.

The aviation trust fund has \$5 billion in unobligated funds. The airline passenger account represents only 2 percent of this trust fund. Payments from this passenger protection account would be capped at \$100 million in any fiscal year and the Government would become a creditor of the bankrupt airline, thus reducing—if not eliminating—any cost to the Treasury. It is important to note that there are no new costs in this plan to U.S. taxpayers.

Deregulation of the airline industry has benefited the consumer in many ways. But this problem of "bad tickets" created by bankruptcies must be solved. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

**ALLEN BILDNER, APPOINTED
CHAIRPERSON OF FMI BOARD**

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1987, the Newark Star-Ledger named Allen I. Bildner of New Jersey as the "Jerseyan of the Week." The award honors Mr. Bildner's service to the community and yet another one of his achievements. At its annual convention held recently in Chicago, the Food Marketing Institute installed Mr. Bildner as the chairperson of the FMI.

The Food Marketing Institute is a trade association with over 1,500 members from the food retailing and wholesaling world. The members of this organization have demonstrated an appreciation for the customer and a willingness to make the extra effort necessary to gain the trust of the consumer and to bring nutrition to homes throughout the country.

Allen Bildner, the chairman of Kings Super Markets, Inc., of West Caldwell, NJ, has devoted with enthusiasm and fervor almost 30 years of his life to what began as a family store in Summit, NJ, and has blossomed into a 15-store corporation with plans to expand and a continuing desire to give that tailored touch to the hometown customer.

In his added position as the chairperson of the Food Marketing Institute, Mr. Bildner will be bringing his ideas and innovative approaches to the way that supermarkets operate and meet the demands of the consumer.

Among the many fresh approaches that he is bringing will be building further not only the trust of the consumer in the products of the supermarket but also the role that the supermarket as a business plays in the community.

With the same dedication that he and his family have brought to making Kings Super Markets a successful contributor to the community, Mr. Bildner at the helm of the FMI will also look at ways that the supermarket can deal with unemployment in urban areas by bringing jobs to support the community through recruitment and training programs.

At the same time, the FMI will be developing programs to help employees of supermarkets deal with alcohol and drug abuse, stress, and the growing demands of the marketplace. Through employee assistance programs, the employee will be better served to, in turn, better serve the consumer.

Mr. Bildner's aims are high. But he has demonstrated before that through determination and ideas, a person can, indeed, go far. He began in his parents' store in Summit and gradually progressed through the family business and the FMI.

A theme that Mr. Bildner has repeated is that the "FMI is on the cutting edge of change."

In his new role, Mr. Bildner will bring to the FMI and to the food retailing and wholesaling industry the spirit of determination and innovation that has made his company so successful. His qualities will be an asset to the FMI even as his qualities today are an asset to his own company and the State of New Jersey.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

As he assumes the responsibilities of chairperson of the FMI, I applaud him for continuing the cooperation between the employers, the employees, and above all, the consumers who depend on them both.

**OHIO'S CONSERVATION
DISTRICTS**

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to address the members of the Ohio Soil and Water Conservation Districts at their annual meeting. It was a pleasure to discuss issues of concern to all Americans with this distinguished group.

For the past five decades, conservation districts have played a critical role in protecting and improving our natural resources. In addition to the work these members do to preserve our Nation's agricultural lands, they have been instrumental in programs that include applying conservation technology to problems of water quality, urban expansion, waste disposal, highway and utility planning and maintenance, building construction, recreational facilities, and beautification.

The key to the great success of conservation districts has been the fact that they are managed by local citizens and landowners who know and understand local problems. Today there are over 17,000 men and women involved in this noble pursuit. And while in the beginning virtually all of them were farmers and ranchers, today they have been joined by bankers, housewives, sportsmen, businessmen and many other citizens concerned about our natural resources. This has worked to broaden participation and assure that all local issues are addressed.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments and growth of conservation districts during the past 50 years are an impressive testament to America's traditional belief in representative action at the grassroots level. The work they have done in Ohio has been particularly impressive and I applaud our members on their achievements.

At this point, I would like to insert in the RECORD my remarks before the Ohio Soil and Water Conservation Districts:

REMARKS BY HON. BOB McEWEN BEFORE THE OHIO FEDERATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Thank you.

A little more than 50 years ago, Congress passed legislation establishing for the first time a new and desperately needed national policy. It was a simple declaration of policy brought on by mounting soil erosion, floods and sky-blackening dust storms that swept across our Nation.

That policy?

Simply put was that soil and water conservation and wise land use should be national goals of the United States. Congress passed Public Law 46 in 1935 without a single dissenting vote. It was not only an idea whose time had come, but a policy that once implemented, would work to protect and preserve for generations to come our most precious natural resources.

May 21, 1987

Two years after enactment of the law, President Franklin Roosevelt wrote to the Governors and recommended State legislation permitting landowners to form soil and water conservation districts. Today—at nearly 3,000 strong—conservation districts are the primary source of assistance to private landowners in their resource conservation and development work in the 50 States, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia.

You, as members of the Ohio Soil and Water Conservation Districts, form the foundation of a simple idea that has been working for all of us for 50 years now. You can be proud of your rich heritage and tradition and be secure in the knowledge that the work you do will serve Americans not only today, but future generations as well.

During the waning days of your 50th anniversary year—in December of 1935—Congress passed another landmark measure reaffirming the strong commitment of our Nation toward the conservation of our soil and water resources.

The Food Security Act of 1985—commonly referred to as the 1985 farm bill—contains the strongest mandate concerning the conservation of our natural resources in the history of our great Nation. The package of major new resource conservation initiatives enacted in the 1985 farm bill represent some of the most innovative and effective conservation legislation passed into law since the historic legislation of 1935.

Let me briefly review some of the key conservation provisions in the bill:

1. Highly erodible land conservation—this provision will require a soil and water conservation plan to be prepared on land determined to be highly erodible by 1990 and implemented by 1995 as a prerequisite to participation in commodity price support programs, Federal crop insurance programs, eligibility to receive certain Farmers Home Administration loans, and other farm program benefits.

2. Conservation Reserve Program—this program will provide a landowner with the financial support necessary to convert land which is suffering excessive soil erosion to a land use which better protects the resource base. The new law requires 40 million acres to be contracted under this program during the next five years. Nationwide, the total value of the contracts signed to date equals \$4 billion with a total of 8.8 million acres now under contract.

The Department of Agriculture moved quickly following passage of the bill, to implement the reserve. An environmental assessment was released the next month—in January 1986—which estimated that the cost of the program would be \$5 billion over five years, but would result in a savings of about \$8 billion because of reduced CCC payments over the same time period.

As many of you recall, results from the very first sign-up for the crop year 1986 program in March of last year were not significant. The Department received bids on 4.8 million acres, but was able to accept them on only 838,000 acres, a small fraction of the 5 million acre goal established for last year.

One big reason for the low participation level was the fact that the interim rules were published in the Federal Register on March 13th, just one day before the end of the sign-up period. Many producers in some areas of the country were justifiably confused about aspects of how the program would impact on them.

A second sign-up was then held in May. This time the Department received bids on

4.6 million acres, but accepted them on 3 million. (1.3 million were for the 1986 crop year and the remainder for 1987.)

A third sign-up, solely for the 1987 crop year, was held in August. The Department received bids on 6.4 million acres and accepted them on 5.1 million. So after three signups, the conservation reserve now includes 8.8 million acres. States with the largest amounts of enrolled acres were Texas with 1.3 million and Colorado with 1.1 million.

In Ohio, of the 891,000 acres estimated to be eligible in our State for the program, only 33,000 were accepted and that works out to 786 participants out of a potential pool of 12,000. Dates for the next sign-up, expected to take place in February, will be announced in the very near future, perhaps even this week.

3. A third important farm bill provision was one establishing the acreage conservation reserve. Last year there were 43.6 million acres put into conservation use as a prerequisite to participation in the commodity programs. This idled land provides a real opportunity for the application of proper soil and water conservation practices.

4. Conservation easement—the farm bill established several “help” type programs for Farmers Home Administration borrowers who have delinquent loans. The principal objective is to keep land in private ownership and to return the land to a wildlife or conservation land use. Although not yet fully implemented, these programs can serve a dual purpose: first and foremost, to keep current landowners on the land and, second, to improve conservation of the land.

5. Another Farmers Home conservation program in the farm bill says that any land taken into their inventory must have a conservation plan developed which will outline the necessary conservation practices to be installed. In addition, as you know, anyone who rents this land from the Farmers Home Administration, must implement the conservation practices called for in the conservation plan.

And yet another significant feature of the farm bill is language which reaffirms the need for a strong Soil Conservation Service within the Department of Agriculture.

The basic concept on which the Soil Conservation Service was founded was to provide technical assistance to landowners in an effort to conserve the natural resources. These new conservation initiatives in the farm bill have certainly set the direction for the soil conservation effort and will require a great deal of continued creativity and commitment of resources to accomplish. I believe Congress has sought to give support to conservation that is consistent with and supportive of your mission here in Ohio.

BUDGET

There is good news and there is bad news in the budget submitted to Congress by the President earlier this month. The good news is that funds to implement the crucial farm bill conservation programs have been increased but some existing programs, in effect prior to passage of the farm bill, have been reduced or eliminated. Let me briefly go over some of the budget highlights.

I know that many of you have expressed concern that the 1988 budget would not support the goals of the farm bill and allow proper implementation of its conservation programs to go forward. Quite frankly, I share your concern.

The budget provides \$476 million and 10,542 staff years for the Soil Conservation Service for fiscal year 1988. It reflects the

high priority given to implementing the provisions authorized by the conservation title of the farm bill. In addition to increasing the direct appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service technical assistance and related programs, direct appropriations for use by the Commodity Credit Corporation during the third year of the Conservation Reserve Program are requested at nearly \$1.4 billion. The total level for soil and water conservation is proposed to more than double from 1985 levels.

The Conservation Reserve Program was authorized in December of 1985 with CCC borrowing authority to be used during the first two years and appropriations thereafter. This budget represents the first year for an appropriation request. The \$1.4 billion will be used for rental payments on contracts signed prior to 1988; part of the costs of technical assistance; and, cost-sharing to establish vegetative cover during 1988.

During 1987, the Soil Conservation Service will be providing technical assistance through a nationwide system of direct offices. The 1988 budget proposed a four percent reduction in staff years (330), but that is a direct result of the elimination of funding for programs such as the great plains conservation program and others I'll name later.

The budget demands are such that it is clear—the needs for servicing requests associated with the Conservation Reserve Program and other 1985 farm bill conservation title provisions will take precedence over other work.

For example, project mapping on a county or area basis will be accelerated further with priority given to counties where the soils information is most urgently needed. Without this information, determinations for conservation compliance become more costly. An additional \$10 million is proposed.

That's the good news. Now for the other. Funding for the traditional conservation cost sharing programs of ASCS and SCS are proposed to be rescinded for the remainder of fiscal year 1987. These include: Agricultural Conservation Program (\$164.4 million); Water Bank Program (\$8.2 million); Burial Clean Water Program (\$6.0 million); Emergency Conservation Program (\$10.0 million); and Great Plains Conservation Program (\$8.0 million).

No funds for these programs and the Colorado River Salinity Control Program were requested by the Secretary for 1988. These reductions are similar to those proposed in prior years due to fiscal policy reasons.

In addition, watershed planning and construction programs, including river basin surveys, flood protection and resource conservation and development will be terminated in 1988 following a rescission of financial assistance in 1987 of \$101 million. The justification given by the administration is that these programs have a lower priority for Federal funding in the conservation area because their benefits accrue primarily at the local level and therefore they are most appropriately financed with non-Federal resources.

I'm not sure I agree with that rationale, but rest assured that each of these budget proposals will come under the close scrutiny of the Congress over the course of the next several months. If you feel strongly about any of these proposals, be sure to contact your Congressman and our Senators.

You know better than most that of absolute necessity to a strong conservation ethic is an effective conservation education pro-

gram. An education program which will instill in each generation a sense of commitment to the conservation of our soil and water resources.

In Ohio, I know that you have been active on the county level sponsoring workshops, clinics and field days as well as working closely with the county extension office, schools and municipalities to get your important message across.

These public awareness projects have served a good purpose in generating public support for soil and water conservation principles. With this renewed public support and the new conservation authorities as outlined in the 1985 farm bill, one could say that the “ball is now in your court.” I know you will continue the good work that marks your past.

Let me leave you with these words spoken by one of our world's great leaders. Eight years ago, in 1979, Pope John Paul II traveled to Iowa. He surveyed the rolling fields of Autumn, and he spoke of the future.

At a farm museum near Des Moines, he was greeted by 350,000 people who opened their arms to that man of peace and hope. And he told them of the importance of agriculture and how with agricultural abundance comes special responsibilities to human needs.

He said, “conserve the land well, so that your children's children will inherit an even richer land than was entrusted to you.”

That is your noble pursuit. That is what is entrusted to you. For the sake of all of us, I wish you continued success.

Thank you.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL CLARIFYING CERTAIN RIGHTS OF THE TOHONO O'ODHAM TRIBE OF ARIZONA

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which clarifies the right of the members of the Tohono O'odham Tribe to pass and repass the border between the United States and Mexico.

The aboriginal territory of the Tohono O'odham Nation, formerly known as the Papago Indian Tribe, was a large area in the Sonoran Desert. Prior to the Gadsden Treaty of 1953, all of that territory lay within the Republic of Mexico. With the inclusion of the Gadsden Purchase area in the United States, the new boundary between the United States and Mexico split the Tohono O'odham Nation and its people in half.

At the time of the original boundary survey, the Tohono O'odham were assured by Maj. W.H. Emory, U.S. Commissioner for the Border Commission, that they would be allowed to visit back and forth across the border and carry on the usual relations between the villages as though the boundary was nonexistent.

In a journal prepared pursuant to article I of the treaty, Emory wrote:

I have informed the (chiefs of the Pimas) that, by the terms of the treaty, all rights that they possessed under Mexico are guaranteed to them by the United States.

Among those rights was the right to carry on their intratribal relations freely without hindrance.

When the original boundary fence was constructed, it included gates at all of the places habitually used by the Tohono O'odham and they continued to exercise their aboriginal right of freely moving across their native land.

In recent years, the promise of Major Emory and the rights of the Tohono O'odham have been broken. Incidents have been reported in which members of the tribe were prohibited from entering the United States at the Lukeville port of entry in order to meet hospital appointments at the Indian Health Service Hospital in Sells, AZ, and their hospital appointment records and tribal membership cards were confiscated.

The bill I have introduced will clarify and reaffirm the right which the Tohono O'odham people had aboriginally and which was promised to them in the treaties of Guadalupe Hidalgo and the Gadsden Purchase.

MICHAEL O'KEEFE: A HERO

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in speaking in the House of Representatives today, for I would like to share a truly moving and inspiring act of heroism with my fellow Members of Congress. Mr. Michael O'Keefe was responsible for saving many officers' lives in the aftermath of the tragic attack on the U.S.S. *Stark* on May 17, 1987.

In a telephone call to his family to assure them of his safety, Mr. O'Keefe reported that he was "cut, bruised, burned and broken, but OK." It was through a television broadcast that the family learned that Michael had injured himself by risking his own life in efforts to save others.

Capt. Glenn Brindel, commander of the guided-missile frigate, introduced Mr. O'Keefe as a hero of the attack which killed 37 men and wounded 21. He said that O'Keefe helped many of his shipmates to safety. Mr. O'Keefe, an engineer from Palmdale, CA, said that his concern after the attack was survival, not heroism.

Mr. Speaker, Michael O'Keefe is a truly outstanding individual, and his heroic act deserves the highest recognition. It is reassuring to know that our Nation's defense is in the hands of such dedicated soldiers. It is with great respect that I recognize today Michael O'Keefe, an American hero.

IN HONOR OF KEN SCHONLAU

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay honor to a good friend and renowned Los Angeles leader and westside community activist, Ken Schonlau. On May 28,

1987, Ken will celebrate his 16 year contribution as chief executive of CLARE Foundation.

As tribute to this man of compassion and determination, I would like to share some of the milestones in the life of this community activist, Ken Schonlau.

Ken was a key participant in protesting LAC/USC Hospital's policy not to admit alcoholics for alcoholism. This protest, in 1965, changed the county medical policy resulting in the first LAC-USC alcoholism unit. At the same time, he participated in the initial development of Project ACTION, a Venice poverty project that later became a major developer of Venice low income housing.

Ken served as a member of the board of directors of the largest poverty program in Los Angeles County, the Neighborhood Adult Participation Project (NAPP) during the period of 1969 through 1976. He was president of the board of directors from 1970-71. In 1969, Mr. Schonlau developed the first West Los Angeles/Los Angeles County Alcoholism Resource Directory with support from the State Venice Service Center.

In 1970 he played a major role in the legal action against Los Angeles County, challenging the practice of sending general relief applicant unattached men to county indigent camps. This action resulted in changing general relief policy and the camps were subsequently converted to alcoholism rehabilitation centers. Also at that time, he developed the first all-alcoholics general relief case load of 120 persons, while employed as a Los Angeles County social worker.

The year 1970 was an important year for Ken, at this time he was instrumental in the initial development of CLARE Foundation, a community alcohol program. Ken served as CLARE's first president and as its executive manager for 16 years. In 1971 Ken started the first Alcoholic Recovery Home in Santa Monica and participated in changing a Santa Monica City Zoning Code that prohibited treatment of animals, alcoholics and drug addicts. The next year, he participated in the development of the California Association of Alcoholic Recovery Homes [CAARH], where he served as the association's first president for 3 years. He coauthored the CAARH State position paper, and was instrumental in assembling the first State recovery home certification guidelines.

Under his leadership, the Western Los Angeles Alcoholism Coalition, an active group in identifying needs for community alcoholics and developing alcoholism resources was initiated. He adapted the Phoenix, Arizona drive education classes for Los Angeles County, and organized the first drinking driver education committee in Los Angeles County. In 1974, Ken initiated a women's recovery home committee of the Western Alcoholism Coalition that resulted in Felicity House, a recovery home for women alcoholics. Also at that time, he participated in the development of the Western Los Angeles Health Service Council and was chairman from 1979-86.

In 1976, Mr. Schonlau defied the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism [NIAAA], by not adopting its Case History Management Treatment Data Collection Systems [NAPIS]. This action resulted in a special NIAAA research project on social model alco-

holism programs. The next year, he initiated a movement with the Association of Half-way House Alcoholism Programs of North America, to discontinue its participation in the joint commission accreditation of hospitals in validating its halfway houses/recovery homes. He served 10 years on the AHHAP board of directors and as president from 1982-84. In 1983 he organized and chaired the Los Angeles County Alcoholism Program directors committee for 2 years.

Throughout his career, Ken has been guided and strengthened by his wife, Maria, who has worked with him as a partner on so many endeavors. Their proud terrier, Elke, serves as CLARE Foundation's unofficial mascot.

It is a pleasure to share Ken Schonlau's accomplishments with my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives. I ask that they join me in wishing Ken the best of luck in all his future endeavors.

ILLEGAL ALIENS

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, recently, Salvadoran President Jose Napoleon Duarte requested the administration to permit nearly a half million Salvadoran illegal aliens to remain in this country, in exception to the immigration reform law passed during the 99th Congress.

I commend to my colleagues President Reagan's difficult decision not to permit such a waiver of the law. I know that every Member of this body shares my concern for the plight of illegal aliens from Central America residing in this country, many of whom have come here fleeing overpopulation, grinding poverty, and war in their homeland. No doubt some also seek political refuge as well. Of the latter group, we should render every benefit provided under the laws for asylum.

However, as Georgie Anne Geyer in her commentary attached below said, "the clear intent of the law was to maximize compassion, but in the context of absolute fairness. When you start to create special treatment and special interest . . . you erode that fairness." If we are to preserve our national sovereignty, we must resist the temptation to create exceptions in the newly passed legislation.

I commend to my colleagues' attention the Geyer article, published in the Lincoln Journal of Lincoln, Nebraska on May 4, 1987, and to a similar editorial concerning Guatemala's request for exemption published in the Omaha World Herald on May 21, 1987.

IMMIGRATION LAW: NO EXCEPTIONS

WASHINGTON.—The request itself was startling: El Salvador's President Jose Napoleon Duarte was asking the United States not to respect its new immigration law in order to keep some half a million Salvadorans here illegally.

Duarte's argument, made in an April 10 letter to President Reagan, admitted that 400,000 to 600,000 Salvadorans had entered the United States illegally since 1982 and

that to send them back could be economically and politically deadly for the already overpopulated and war-torn country.

Even more startling is what this watershed plea symbolizes. It shows us starkly that we are living in a new world we had better understand—a world in which the most dangerous geopolitical issues are not nuclear missiles but overpopulation, massive illegal movements of peoples and the breakdown of borders and culture itself.

Duarte, a noble man and great democratic leader, has struggled with all the devilish problems of his country except the most important one: its astonishing overpopulation. That tiny country has a greater population density than India.

Even El Salvador's horrendously brutal civil war can be traced to overpopulation. When the several hundred thousand Salvadorans living in neighboring Honduras were thrown out after the infamous "Soccer War" in 1969, they settled in the slums around the Salvadoran capital, creating grist for revolution's mill in the uprooted young boys who went to the Marxist guerrillas for hope. The relationship of massive unemployment and hopelessness to a tiny land base held by a few was unquestionably the single major reason for the particular horror of the Salvadoran civil war.

History will show in large part that El Salvador was the century's first, but surely not last, "population war."

It is tempting to want to help Duarte, because he has struggled valiantly and successfully. It is tempting to nod one's head understandingly when he argues that Salvadoran illegals send home \$350 million to \$600 million in remittances to relatives each year and that this should be regarded as another kind of "aid" to Salvador.

But the temptation must be resisted. Too much is at stake. With the passing of the U.S. immigration bill, one of the best and most just pieces of legislation in modern history, the United States has declared to the world that it will not be a population patsy for countries that will not rationally control their own populations.

President Duarte's request, sadly, must be turned down. The first reason is that, having declared immigration control in our law, we must observe it as law—no ifs, buts, or exemptions. Ironically, in the face of these small and impassioned nationalist countries' demands, it is now a superpower that must declare some nationalism in its concern for sovereignty.

"The United States is a sovereign nation," Roger Conner, head of the Federation for American Immigration Reform, said last week. "By demanding and getting immigration reform legislation, the American people sought to send out the message that the decision as to who will come to the United States will be made in Washington, D.C., not San Salvador or Lagos, Nigeria."

As well, the clear intent of the law was to maximize compassion, but in the context of absolute fairness. When you start to create special treatment and special interests (don't we have enough of them within the United States?), you erode that fairness.

Furthermore, Duarte is asking, in effect, for an "aid program" to Salvador paid for by the poor of this country, whose jobs are being taken.

And, finally, a refugee subsidy program would discourage what is necessary in more and more countries today: for them to take a hard look at their population policies and do what is necessary within moral limits to measure their populations to their land masses.

Every successful newly developed country—from Taiwan to South Korea to Singapore—has done just that. Without such restraints, there will quite simply be no development and no hope, in particular for a country such as El Salvador. And we will aid them most by helping them to realize it before it is too late.

A BAD IDEA FROM GUATEMALA

The new U.S. immigration law has barely taken effect and already someone wants its teeth pulled. The White House was right, in our opinion, to ignore a request from Guatemala to go easy on enforcement.

Vincio Cerezo Arevalo, the country's president, said he doesn't think his country's economy could stand an influx of Guatemalans returning from the United States. He suggested that the United States exempt Central Americans from the law for two years.

Such an exemption would have rendered the new law almost meaningless. Illegal aliens who were in the country before 1982 could still use the amnesty, but efforts to deport others and to close the borders to illegal immigration would have lost much of their force. The law says that people who entered the country illegally in the past five years are subject to being deported, and the Americans who give them jobs can be fined.

It's not as if the law caught Guatemala by surprise. The need to control the U.S. borders has been debated in Congress for several years. The new law was passed only last fall, but similar legislation came close to passage in 1984 and 1985. Guatemalan officials should have foreseen the possibility of tougher U.S. immigration laws and made preparations sooner.

Furthermore, the amnesty program is generous. Not all of the estimated 300,000 Guatemalans who are illegally in the United States will have to leave. U.S. officials said that a significant percentage will qualify for residency and remain in the United States.

The United States already provides aid to Guatemala. For Guatemala to suggest, in effect, that the immigration law be neutralized for its benefit is too much to ask.

BENJAMIN LINDER

HON. MIKE LOWRY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to let my colleagues know about some statements from my home State on the death of Benjamin Linder, the U.S. citizen who was recently murdered by Contra forces in Nicaragua. Many people in Washington State knew Ben from his student days at the University of Washington, which is located in the congressional district I represent.

Over the past couple of weeks, I have heard from many of Ben's friends. They tell me that he was deeply committed to using his skills to make the world a better place. I believe that this kind of idealism is the best our Nation's young people have to offer. It is a powerful source of good and a great gift that we can give to the world. When U.S.-backed forces kill one of these fine young Americans, there can be no clearer illustration of the tragic waste caused by the Reagan administration's Nicaragua policy.

It is sickening that our government is funding this kind of activity. The United States should stand for something much better than this. The example of Ben Linder—what he was trying to do for other people—shows us that there is a better way.

It is too bad that Ben's parents and friends have had to put up with the recent efforts to cast doubt on his motives and actions. When we reach the point at which Contra supporters find it necessary to attack the character of someone who was building a hydroelectric dam, I think that shows how morally and intellectually bankrupt they are. At this time, I would simply like to share a couple of statements that remind us of the human values that are lost when someone like Ben Linder is murdered.

STATEMENT FROM A MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR BENJAMIN LINDER HELD IN SEATTLE, WA

Ben Linder died on April 28, 1987 in the sovereign country of Nicaragua. Ben was a unicyclist, a clown, an engineer, and a deeply committed believer in society. He brought humor and light to the serious task of protest against the recklessness of the U.S. nuclear power industry. He asserted the necessity for world peace as he rode his unicycle from Washington to California. And finally Ben took his skills as engineer and clown to Nicaragua, where he devoted himself to bringing life and hope to a country he so strongly believed in, against the horror inflicted there by his own country.

As Ben once wrote from Nicaragua, "I plan to keep working in progressive third world countries for a while longer, like many years. Even though I often want to throw in the towel, overwhelmed with the problems of work and life, it is not often that one can say one is doing the right thing. I know I am."

To all of us Ben Linder gives the courage to live in a world where truth and goodness exist only as we stand up to injustice.

WASHINGTON STATE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

House floor resolution No. 87-4690, by Representatives McMullen, Spanel, Moyer, Wineberry, Brooks, Cole, Fuhrman, Cantwell, Lewis, Sprengle, Bumgarner, Kremen, Jacobsen, Gallagher, Vehich, Brekke, K. Wilson, Locke, Scott, Todd, Leonard, R. King, Heavey, Pruitt, Sayan, Cooper, Haugen, Madsen, Grant, Rust, Wang, Unsöld, Lux and Ebersole

Whereas, Benjamin Ernest Linder was raised and educated in the Pacific Northwest, graduated from the University of Washington School of Engineering and lived most of his life in the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas, Ben Linder worked with the Nicaraguan Energy Institute on geothermal energy and low-head hydroelectric projects designed to provide energy for the rural poor in Nicaragua; and

Whereas, Ben Linder worked as a volunteer in the town of El Cua on the Bocay River in Jinotega Province of Nicaragua to develop a low-head hydroelectric facility for an area without electricity, to train the Nicaraguan people to use the facility to develop economic self-sufficiency, and to provide an economic base to bring together peasants in the region suffering attacks in isolated areas; and

Whereas, For nearly four years, Ben Linder worked in this poor and remote rural area of Nicaragua on community develop-

ment projects designed to assist local residents to utilize the electricity generated from hydroelectric projects, such as the establishment of power lines to bring the first electric power to peasant villagers and to establish a lumber mill to provide work for war refugees; and

Whereas, Benjamin Ernest Linder was killed on the Bocay River in Jinotega Province of Nicaragua while working in a restricted military war zone to provide electric power to poor people in rural areas; and

Whereas, Ben Linder was the first American volunteer to be slain while working with the Nicaraguan government to provide community development and humanitarian service to the people of Nicaragua; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extend its sympathy and condolences to the family, friends and colleagues of Benjamin Ernest Linder, and recognize and honor the courage, integrity, compassion and accomplishments of Ben Linder; and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives deplore the continuing violence that ended the life of Benjamin Ernest Linder; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be immediately transmitted by the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives to the family of Benjamin Ernest Linder, including his parents, David and Elisabeth, his sister, Miriam, and his brother, John.

TRIBUTE TO MELISSA WILSON

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to pay tribute to Melissa Wilson, a young lady in my district who recently won the Oklahoma VFW Voice of Democracy Scholarship. Melissa's words speak out loudly for the "Voice of Democracy." The title of her essay is "The Challenge of American Citizenship."

THE CHALLENGE OF AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

American citizenship is like a precious family heirloom which has been carefully tended, lovingly used, and passed from generation to generation. Throughout the history of our nation, many forces have challenged the security of our treasure and every generation has, in some way, been faced with its defense. It is a thing so valuable that many have willingly sacrificed their lives that it might be passed on to their children and grandchildren.

At Lexington and Concord, in the trenches of France, on the beaches of the Pacific, and on the frontiers of space, Americans have faced challenges because they value their citizenship and the freedom it represents.

The treasure is about to pass to my generation, and, with it, the responsibility for its care. We must consider the challenges we face in the safe-keeping of the American heirloom. For, with the benefits of citizenship come immense responsibilities. Assuming these responsibilities is the greatest challenge of our citizenship.

Today, as in the past, Americans have problems to solve. Our country's image abroad has been distorted, productivity and quality of workmanship have declined, and we face a growing trade imbalance. The na-

tional debt continues to soar, and we are in the grips of a war against illegal drugs.

The difference today, is that, like a piece of silver which has been left unattended, our nation's attitude toward challenge and responsibility has tarnished. Americans seem to have fallen into the dangerous habit of taking for granted that our government will solve all of the problems facing our nation. The fallacy of that attitude is that the government was not conceived to solve problems. It was designed to function for citizens who were problem-solvers.

A recent poll showed that Americans believed the reduction of the national debt to be the most important problem facing our country. At the same time, every effort to cut the federal budget meets outraged protest from one or more special interest groups. Yes, we all worry about the national debt, but in the end we, not our leaders in Washington, must take responsibility for its reduction. We must each be willing to make sacrifices, and in some cases to fulfill functions of expensive government programs on a personal level.

The same poll reported that we consider illegal drugs to be almost as great a challenge as the national debt. Drug programs are being instituted at every level of government, and millions of dollars are being channeled into the cause. Yet, the responsibility for winning the drug battle lies in the hands of the ordinary citizen. Illegal drugs will continue to find their way to the street as long as there are citizens who want to buy them.

These and other challenges our country faces are more than shadowy evils outside our reach and control. They are my challenges, my own personal problems and yours. They are problems which threaten our nation's heirloom, and they can only be solved when met with personal involvement by every individual.

In this, the 200th year of the United States Constitution, my generation is about to assume the job of tending our nation's most valuable treasure, American citizenship and the freedom it represents. It has been preserved for us at great cost, and we receive it in excellent condition. Like fine old silver which has been properly used and cared for, it has increased in character and value.

Yes, our citizenship comes to us with many responsibilities. But, I am optimistic that we will overcome the challenges facing us. After all, Americans have traditionally been at their best and most determined when faced by the greatest challenges. And I believe my generation will do no less.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE WILBUR J. COHEN

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1987

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to the Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen, former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and architect of the Social Security system, whose untimely death is a tremendous loss to the people of the United States.

Wilbur Cohen, who was my good friend for so many years, dedicated over 50 years of his

life in service to our country, maintaining an unwavering commitment to the health and welfare of our Nation's elderly, disabled, poor, and disadvantaged. He was one of the most knowledgeable and creative people in the field of social welfare, and his accomplishments contributed significantly to the strength of our country's programs to improve the lives of our citizens.

Serving on the technical staff of the Committee on Economic Security created by President Roosevelt to resolve the problems of the Depression, at age 21 Wilbur Cohen was instrumental in the design of the Social Security Program. He became the first permanent employee of the Social Security Board, and was the director of the Division on Research and Statistics for 21 years.

Wilbur Cohen temporarily left Federal service in 1956, and became a full professor in the School of Social Work at the University of Michigan. However, he returned to Government service in President Kennedy's administration as the Assistant Secretary for Legislation at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

When I began my congressional service in 1965, Wilbur Cohen was serving as Undersecretary of HEW, and in 1968 President Johnson appointed him Secretary of HEW. During these years, Wilbur Cohen played a key role in the formulation of virtually every important piece of social legislation, in such areas as civil rights, child welfare, and vocational training. He also played a major role in the creation of the Medicare and Medicaid Programs.

After serving as Secretary for HEW, Wilbur Cohen became the dean of the School of Education at the University of Michigan, and also held a distinguished chair as professor at the L.B.J. School of Public Affairs in Austin, TX.

Wilbur Cohen was an outstanding public servant and teacher, and a man who embodied the spirit and the social conscience of our country. He devoted his life to improving the social welfare of all of our citizens, and his vision has left an indelible mark on our country in the form of the Social Security, the Medicare, and the Medicaid Programs.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Annunzio and I extend our deepest sympathy to his wife, Eloise, his three sons, Christopher, Bruce, and Stuart, and the other members of his family who survive him.

PROFESSOR PROPOSES TAX ON ARBITRAGE

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, takeover fever is rampant. Speculators intent on short-term profits spend their time trying to destroy productive companies. The employees and the communities that depend on these companies are the losers. Incentives for long-term investment are destroyed and our Nation's competitiveness suffers.

Congress must examine ways to discourage unproductive, short-term stock speculation.

What follows is an article by Prof. Lawrence H. Summers of Harvard University, which recently appeared in the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, suggesting a tax on the purchase or sale of financial instruments:

The article follows:

[From the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, May 9, 1987]

TO DISCOURAGE ARBITRAGEURS: TAX 'EM
(By Lawrence H. Summers)

What is chic in American business changes through time. Major manufacturing concerns were the glamour business of the 1950s and 1960s, drilling for oil was the business to be in during the 1970s, and arbitrage is the darling business of the 1980s.

Huge trading profits have transformed investment banks from cozy partnerships with a few hundred employees into ruthless businesses with thousands of workers. Graduates of leading business schools flock to Wall Street in search of six-digit salaries and dream of the seven-digit incomes pulled down by many an arbitrageur.

The fall of Ivan Boesky, and of his cabal too, has dampened spirits a bit, but the game of short-term trading goes on at all the major investment banks and dozens of smaller firms. This is unfortunate—arbitrageurs are economic parasites. Their existence undermines our prosperity and reduces our ability to meet foreign competition.

The securities traded on financial markets are complex and their prospects are often difficult to evaluate. But the markets themselves are simple—buying and selling stocks is much like playing poker or betting on horses. Those who guess right win and those who guess wrong lose.

Like gambling on cards, horses or anything else, trading on financial markets redistributes wealth between winners and losers, but it does not create wealth. It is a zero-sum game—the gains of the Wall Street winners must be exactly offset by the public's losses.

How does this happen? The pros are in a position to respond more rapidly to new information than is the public. When good news comes, they move into the market and buy from the public. Eventually, when enough investors become aware of the good news, prices rise and those who learned the news first profit. When bad news comes, the pros unload their holdings before others realize that prices must fall. Either way, the public loses.

Trading on illegal insider information, as Ivan Boesky did, is different in degree but not in kind from the standard activity of arbitrageurs. The entire arbitrage business depends on trading on the basis of information that others lack. And it depends on trading with people who do not know that they are being exploited, and would not trade if they knew who they are trading with. This sort of thing is certainly unsavory—by some lights it is theft.

Morality apart, theft and arbitrage impose parallel economic costs. By working at taking things rather than making them, thieves reduce the economy's potential output. Unlike honest workers, their profits come directly at the expense of others.

In the same way, arbitrage is a drain on the economy. Research that enables a Wall Street firm to predict four hours early what will be in GM's quarterly earnings report may help it trade profitably but it surely will not do much for society. Whomever the Wall Street firm trades with will lose as much as the firm gains.

On the other hand, research that produces a better mousetrap yields a real social benefit and the profits of the inventor do not come wholly at the others' expense. If present business school graduates started applying as much ingenuity to creating new assets as they do to valuing old ones, we would all be much better off.

Theft also burdens society because the fear of theft causes people to spend money on locks and security systems that they would rather be spending on goods and services. A further burden comes when persons do not buy valuable objects that they would otherwise enjoy for fear of their being stolen.

In just the same way, the response of Wall Street professionals burdens the capital markets. Outside investors decide that the best defense against being exploited is not to trade. They take their money out of the stock market and put it somewhere else.

To understand this consequence of unbridled arbitrage, imagine a bar where strangers meet to play poker each night. Some win and others lose but a good time is had by all. Suppose word gets out that an extremely skilled professional may enter the game at any time. The poker game will fold up as people recognize that by playing they are more likely to lose than to make money.

Inhibiting a poker game is not very serious. But when Wall Street hotshots deter the public from investing in the stock market, grave consequences ensue. Companies must draw from a smaller pool of capital and so their costs increase and their investment declines. Ultimately, lower investment translates into slower economic growth, reduced American competitiveness and lower standards of living.

What should be done to mitigate these pernicious effects of arbitrage? Wall Street firms claim that no action is appropriate since their activities help information to be reflected in prices and help to allocate risk efficiently. Certainly, investors who carefully study economic conditions and then make long-term capital commitments perform an important social function. And speculators who enable others to hedge against risks grease the wheels of commerce.

But these arguments are absurd as a defense of arbitrage activities that usually involve trades with a horizon of hours or even minutes. Information on which firm will be the target of a takeover bid an hour hence is more privately profitable but socially useless just like information on about who will win next year's Kentucky Derby. When the program-trading activities of arbitrageurs move the value of the entire stock market by several percent within a few hours, economic risks are increased and not decreased.

Some members of Congress have called for restrictions on takeover bids in order to prevent further episodes like the Boesky affair. The merits of restricting takeover bids are arguable, but restricting them in order to curb insider trading abuses makes no more sense than stopping the sale of jewels in order to inhibit jewel thieves.

Almost everyone supports a crackdown on insider trading. This is a good idea, but it does not go far enough. From an economic point of view, trading on inside information leaked by a company executive is not very different from trading on information gleaned locally by posting spies in corporate airports. Both exploit the unwary public and deter it from trading and investing.

One possible solution to the arbitrage dilemma warrants further consideration. A tax of one-half percent on the purchase or

sale of financial instruments would have only a negligible effect on long-term investors looking for income and growth. But it would severely and justly burden those turning over their investment every hour in response to new information.

It would thus discourage arbitrage activities and so improve the functioning of the securities markets. And at a time when the federal government desperately needs revenue it would raise up to \$10 billion from people who can certainly afford to pay.

SERMONS OF PASTOR RUSSELL F. BLOWERS

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest ministers in Indianapolis and I believe in America is Russell F. Blowers of the East 91st Street Christian Church. He just also happens to be my pastor.

He has given numerous sermons and speeches which are outstanding, but today I'd like to draw your attention and the attention of the House to two of them.

The first one deals with Mother's Day and "What is a Mother." The second one he gave last year on Memorial Day.

I hope everyone in America has an opportunity to read these two fine presentations.

WHAT IS A MOTHER?

Mothers come in various sizes: skinny, filled-out, and "oops!" They are found everywhere: in maternity wards, over ironing boards, teaching 3-year olds "Jesus Loves Me", up and around while the rest of the family is down with the flu, championing causes, turning right out the left lane, kissing where it hurts, perspiring over income tax forms, changing her husband's mind, looking daggers at the umpire who has just called her little boy out on strikes, popping corn at the school festival, on her knees with an open Bible, taking away privileges, giving back privileges, pushing piano practice, and sitting in a pew crying while her little girl is being married.

Mothers worry about everything: her daughter's first date, bike riding in the street, her first gray hair, the baby's fever, first day at school, her husband's cholesterol level, her first gray hair, her son's solo drive in the family car, report cards, warmed over suppers, abused children, her first gray hair, and too much sex and violence on TV.

A Mother is happiness with tears in its eyes; love with a firm paddle in its hand; joy watching Dad and the kids devour chicken and noodles; sacrifice taking the neck and wings and leaving the breast and drumsticks; foresight stashing away a little extra for college; faith singing in the choir, herding primaries, serving the church dinner, keep-up the pledge, making a call, and writing a letter to the missionaries.

Being a Mother is such a demanding task that God has entrusted it only to females. There is no experience so costly, so rewarding, so aging, and so exciting as being a Mother.

The day can be a fabulous flop complete with a dented bumper, a collapsed cake, a 6-stitch cut, an upset bowl of chocolate ice

cream on the new carpet, daughter emerging from the bathroom with a new hair shade, and the husband coming home and asking "What have you been doing today?"

But when all is quiet at 4991 Shady Rest, when Dad is home and the baths are over and the homework done and the prayers are said, Mother takes that one last peek into every bed, and seeing the sweet innocent faces asleep, says guiltily: "How could I have screamed at her today?" "How could I have spanked him?"

And full of faith, hope, and love she looks out the window through misty eyes at the night-sky and prays—

"Thank you, Father, thank you
For the privilege of being a mother.
By Your grace and wisdom help me to
Teach them to love You as I do.
In the Name of Your Child, Jesus Christ,
I ask
Amen.

FIVE HUNDRED MEMORIAL SERVICE— MONUMENT CIRCLE

On the 40th anniversary of D-Day, a British couple had a plaque attached to the grave of their only son who died to free Fortress Europe. It reads: "Into the mosaic of victory, this priceless piece was set."

Those priceless pieces of America's wars we remember and honor today.

I have lingered among the lines of white crosses in Arlington; hovered in a plane over the beaches of Normandy where channel winds caress more crosses; scanned all 58,000 names etched in black marble at the Vietnam memorial, knelt beside a battered, flaking tombstone in Crown Hill to read the name of an Indiana boy who fell in the War between the States.

I always feel I am on holy ground in those places. But then it's so easy to forget these who wanted so much to live. Forgetfulness is a national pastime.

Television has created in our time a familiar ritual. A bomb explodes in Lebanon. An air force plane goes down in Newfoundland. A billion dollar house made with hands disintegrates in the Florida skies. There is the temporary interruption or regular programming. There are weeping families, the President embracing widows and children, the spit and polish military contingent and the flag-draped caskets. There is the service band and Eternal Father Strong to Save. A quick benediction, then fade out and into the Oxydol commercial. And it is back to normal. It has always been so. A Presidential proclamation tells us to remember, so in May we leave our lawn parties, put our 33 pampered machines away till Sunday, do our memorial thing, then fade out into the commercial.

Is this all there is to our remembering? Can't we leave this place after all the oratory and the music and the prayers to remember more frequently these priceless pieces in the great mosaic of freedom?

I am not here to exalt war. It is a futile process of attempted problem solving. A temporary and extravagant fix. War was hell long before Sherman came to that conclusion. Ask any of us soldiers in tight uniforms with a flag in our hands. General Patton may have felt good standing over a bloody, burning battlefield and saying, "God, I love it" but for most of the world's peoples who have been terrorized by war, it is ugly and unproductive.

Neither am I up here to lecture humanity on easy solutions to human conflict. As long as man's heart is unredeemed and deceitful there will indeed be wars and rumors of

wars. As long as this is Satan's turf, military defense systems will be as indispensable as police and fire departments. Politicians, preachers, priests and poets can turn phrases like "a just and lasting peace" but until the rebellious human heart surrenders unconditionally, to the God who is love, peace is only a brief moment between wars.

We are here to give thanks to the living God for the men and women whose life-blood was the costly grace that permitted us to stand here free—the Goldbergs, the O'Briens, the Smiths and Rodriguez—all those priceless pieces, precious stones, set into the mosaic of America.

Let us commend them to God, and praise Him that He has given us the love, and the grace, to remember, today and always.

To all those white crosses at home and abroad, let us say as Mark Twain inscribed on the grave of his little daughter:

"Warm summer sun, shine kindly here;
Warm southern breeze, blow lightly here;
Green sod above, lie light, lie light;
Good night, dear heart, Good night, good night."

MEMORIAL DAY

HON. JOEL HEFLEY

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, the first big weekend of summer. It's time for the pools to open in the parks, the clubs and the apartments. Get the boat out, dig out the golf clubs, plant the garden, it's Memorial Day!

Memorial Day! Like so many other holidays this special day has mostly lost its meaning and become just another day when we're off from work, a day for recreation, relaxation, and time with our families. All of these activities are good ways to spend the day but what about the reason for the "day off."

Memorial Day is for remembering. Remembering the important contributions of the millions of patriotic Americans whose service to our country has had a profound effect on history. In the spring of 1866, in the midst of one of our Nation's darkest hours, memorial associations began to be formed throughout our divided Nation. The purpose of these organizations was to care for the graves of both Union and Confederate soldiers.

On April 29, 1866, the citizens of Carbondale, IL, conducted an all-day observance, including a parade, a barbecue, speeches, and the decorating of graves of some 20 Union soldiers. The principle speaker on this first formal "memorial" celebration was Gen. John Logan, the first Commander-in-Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic. On May 5, 1886 northern cities began paying respect by closing businesses, flying the flag at half-mast and decorating the graves of fallen soldiers. On May 5, 1868, after 2 additional years of some of the bloodiest and most brutal conflicts this Nation has ever endured, General Logan declared May 30 as the official day for nationwide remembrance of our Nation's war dead. In 1971, Congress changed the day to the last Monday in May.

The United States has always been a nation that cares for its warriors and this is a true gauge of a nation's price and strength. Memo-

rial Day is one way we can express the appreciation of and pride in what America's soldiers have accomplished over more than 200 years of our Nation's history.

More than 1 million Americans have fallen, never to rise again, in the service of their country. Let's look at the numbers: American revolution; 4,000; War of 1812; 2,000; Mexican War; 13,000; Civil War; 134,000 (Confederate) 365,000 (Union); Spanish-American War; 11,000; World War I; 116,000; World War II; 405,000; Korean conflict; over 58,000 in Southeast Asia; post Vietnam; 11,000; recent attack on U.S.S. *Stark* 37.

These fell in order to ensure the values of a civilized and free society, values which they placed higher than their own lives. It is our responsibility to remember them by further strengthening the values for which they fought; by exercising the rights and liberties for which they died; and by carrying these values into the future for our children and grandchildren.

Remembering and honoring our veterans is not only kneeling before a white marker to plant a tiny flag, donning an old uniform for the annual parade, delivering an eloquent speech or singing a stirring anthem. While all of these are important traditions, remembering is much more. It is family and morals; it is participation, voting and speaking out for our beliefs; it is unchecked movement and unrestricted worship and voice; it is committing to freedom and peace everywhere.

In addition to remembering those who gave their lives so that we may breath free, let's not forget those who came back, many of which need our help now. Unlike many other countries, the United States enjoys the security of peace and freedom. This security did not come easily or cheaply, however. Part of the cost has already been paid by Americans who answered the call to military duty when their country needed them. They served in nine wars from the Revolution to Vietnam, earning the special distinction "veteran."

But another part of freedom's cost must continue to be paid long after the guns of war have been silenced. This debt is owed America's veterans.

Some need their country's help, even as their country once needed theirs, to readjust, recover from wounds, and hardships of age and infirmity. Let us reach out to these veterans with the greatest possible compassion and efficiency.

And for those who have no real urgent needs and ask no special thanks, we can best pay tribute to them this day by recognizing what they have achieved and joining them in their resolve to keep America strong and free.

Abraham Lincoln once said in the fall of 1863: "It has seemed to me fit and proper that they should be solemnly, reverently, and gratefully acknowledged as with one heart and one voice by the whole American People . . ."

It seems only appropriate that we remember these people on Memorial Day with one heart, one voice, and as one people.

MINIMUM HEALTH BENEFITS FOR ALL WORKERS ACT

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, to join my distinguished colleague from California, Congressman HENRY WAXMAN, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 2501, the Minimum Health Benefits for All Workers Act. I want to commend both Congressman WAXMAN and Senator TED KENNEDY, who today introduced a companion measure in the Senate, for their leadership in developing this legislation.

The Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations, which I chair, has already begun to lay out groundwork for a bipartisan comprehensive and long-term look at our health care delivery system and the critical role played by employer-sponsored health plans. We will be examining several approaches to solving the problem of how best to expand our health care system to cover 37 million Americans who today lack health insurance. We intend to work closely with the Subcommittee on Labor Standards, chaired by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman AUSTIN MURPHY, who is also an original cosponsor of the bill, as well as Congressman WAXMAN and Senator KENNEDY. We also intend to work in our usual bipartisan manner.

The bill that we are introducing today would require all employers to provide a minimum package of health insurance to all full-time workers and their dependents. Full-time workers would be defined for this purpose as anyone working at least 17.5 hours a week.

Of the 37 million Americans without health insurance coverage in 1984, nearly 30 million were workers or spouses and dependents of workers. Two-thirds of these families had at least one person in the family working 17.5 hours or more for the same employer. Although the provisions of the bill as written will go a long way toward closing the insurance gap for the working uninsured, the bill does not address the problem of the part-time worker who may have several jobs, none of which involve at least 17.5 hours of work. A number of approaches have been discussed to deal with this question as well as the whole issue of part-time workers and access to health insurance. We would appreciate any input on how best to structure a system that provides the necessary access for workers but limits the burden for employers.

I am sure that a good deal of debate will be heard about what is the appropriate minimum benefit package that all employers should be required to provide. The bill takes one approach—obviously there are many other types of packages that could be developed. As the discussion unfolds, we should not lose sight of the fact that this is a package that is supposed to be "bare-bones"—just the core coverages. Although employers are strongly encouraged to provide more than the minimum and today many do, if Congress mandates that every employer provide a plan, the cost of that plan must be reasonable and cannot contain every services or coverage that might be desirable.

The bill recognizes that one of the major obstacles that many small employers face in offering health insurance is cost. Currently employer-sponsored health insurance is simply not affordable for many small businesses. Many small businesses are marginal: they have a short life span and low profitability. Insurance costs small businesses anywhere from 20 to 40 percent more than large businesses. These costs frequently reflect administrative charges for overhead, marketing, and medical underwriting. In addition, small businesses must buy insurance; it is neither feasible nor prudent for them to self-insure. And the insurance contracts they buy are subject to State mandated benefit laws that also add to the cost.

At the same time that the bill imposes a requirement on all employers to provide a health plan, in order to keep the cost of this requirement down for small employers, the bill would establish a series of regional group health plans. Under these plans, several competitively selected health insurers would offer packages that complied with the minimum benefit requirement and well as more generous packages. Each insurer would be required to offer both a managed care plan and an indemnity plan. Small businesses could buy insurance from these group health plans at a lower cost than is currently available because, among other things, administrative savings could be realized, the size of the pool would make it feasible to negotiate substantial provider discounts, state mandates would not apply to the plans, and no medical underwriting would be allowed.

In addition to the group plan structure proposed in the bill, several alternative methods are being discussed to implement this type of arrangement. We would like comments on how best to structure the group health arrangement for small employers in order to assure the most efficient and effective system while at the same time keeping the cost of the plan as low as possible.

Finally, the overall goal of the bill is to broaden access to affordable health care. In so doing, we do not want to disrupt unduly the existing plans of employers, provided that the plans are in fact delivering good medical coverage. Therefore, the bill permits the use of the concept of actuarial equivalence to demonstrate that the minimum package is being provided. Frankly, I realize there are problems in trying to define what is an actuarially equivalent plan. I recognize it will be difficult for actuaries to establish the necessary procedures to demonstrate actuarial equivalence. We would like more information as to how this can be done and whether there are any other approaches we might consider to reach our goal of broad coverage without seriously disturbing existing health plans.

As the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations considers the bill and the broader question of access to affordable health insurance, we will be focusing on several key issues.

First, we are examining the problems of the uninsured: who they are, why they have no coverage, and how best to assure access to affordable coverage.

Second, we are concerned about the effect of State-mandated benefit laws on the growth

of employer-sponsored health plans. Part of our focus will be on the effect of the preemption of State laws under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 [ERISA]. Despite ERISA's broad preemption language and the intention of its drafters to preclude the States from regulating employee benefit plans generally, the Supreme Court has interpreted ERISA to preclude State regulation only if the plan is self-funded. Thus States can and do regulate contracts of insurance purchased by employee benefit plans. Higher costs for some plans and confusion for all plans has resulted.

Third, we are concerned about how best to reduce the necessary costs of required group health coverage on small employers. We will continue to refine the concept of regional group health plans as well as consider alternative mechanisms for bringing down the cost of compliance for small employers.

Fourth, we must begin to explore solutions to the growing crisis concerning employer-sponsored retiree health plans. Although the bill introduced today does not address that issue, retiree health plans will be an important part of the overall health policy debate.

For several months, the staff of the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations has been discussing all of these issues within the framework of a health policy working group. The group was put together by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator JOHN HEINZ, and I as an outgrowth of our joint efforts in the pension area. In addition to majority and minority congressional staff of both the House and the Senate, the group consists of private sector individuals representing the divergent views of large and small business, organized labor, retiree groups, the insurance industry, health policy analysts, and the Financial Accounting Standards Board. These people have participated in the working group as concerned citizens, and do not necessarily speak for their respective constituencies. The group has also been fortunate to have been able to draw upon experts from the executive branch representing the Departments of Health and Human Services, Labor, and Treasury, as well as the Small Business Administration. Senator HEINZ' staff and my subcommittee staff have prepared a series of working papers and are in the process of developing a comprehensive concept paper summarizing the recommendations of the group that will touch on each of the areas identified above. We expect to have both the working papers and recommendations available for distribution and discussion by early July.

H.R. 2501 should be viewed as a beginning. As Congress considers the critical issue of how to assure universal access to affordable health care, many other helpful proposals will emerge. Although we still have work to do in refining its provisions, the introduction of this bill is an important step forward. I applaud Senator KENNEDY for his leadership and I look forward to working with all interested parties to improve upon the bill and to work toward its enactment.

"REFORMED TAX COULD BACKSLIDE"

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a recent article, "Reformed Tax Could Backslide," by Louis Rukeyser. Mr. Rukeyser eloquently explains that the Tax Reform Act of 1986 has not proved to be as rosy as originally planned. Both Mr. Rukeyser and Mortimer M. Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue under Presidents John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, concur that the Tax Reform Act of 1986 has brought many problems with its solutions. Both envision a failure in the ultimate goals set originally in the act: a 28-percent top tax rate for individuals—by 1988—and a cutback in the number of loopholes and deductions that taxpayers may make.

Just last week, LLOYD BENTSEN, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, was quoted in the Wall Street Journal as saying that "the tax rates are still on the table . . . [and] nothing is off limits." Speaker JIM WRIGHT has also suggested the same. We do not need taxes increased. Taxpayers already ante up too much, and get too little from it. The problem is that there has not been enough "reform" in the 1986 Tax Reform Act. I vociferously believe that we need more tax reform. Recently, I introduced H.R. 111 which would amend the Internal Revenue Code Act of 1954 making a flat rate tax of 10 percent for all individual earned income. While the reduced tax rates in the 1986 Tax Act went in the right direction, the increased burden on business, the elimination of many savings incentives, and reduced incentives for capital formation moved the Tax Code further away from reform and toward a more complex, inefficient, and inequitable code. A bill is thus needed to give guidance to those who truly wish to reform the code and establish a code which does not give lip service to the President's goals of "fairness, growth, and simplicity," but actually achieves these goals. This article, which follows, raises these fears. I strongly urge my colleagues to read, "Reformed Tax Could Backslide."

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 27, 1987]

REFORMED TAX COULD BACKSLIDE

NEW YORK—Whoops! If there was one issue that united the entire Washington establishment—from Reagan to Rostenkowski—last year, it was the drive for what they called "tax reform." Now, with the highly touted new law in place less than a month, the issue threatens to degenerate into what we may have to start calling . . . Taxscam.

Both sides of the alleged great bargain, lower rates versus closing "loopholes," are in trouble. The most immediate threat, though, is to the bill's chief selling point: The 28 percent top tax rate on income.

No less than an authority than Mortimer M. Caplin, commissioner of internal revenue under Presidents John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, confessed in an interview that the prospects of that benefit being delivered as promised in 1988 "are getting shakier and shakier."

Caplin, who said that such reneging by Congress would "undercut" the premise of the 1986 law, noted recent weaseling on the 28 percent rate by the two most powerful Democrats in the House: Speaker Jim Wright of Texas and Ways and Means Chairman Dan Rostenkowski of Illinois. Both have suggested coyly that the 38.5 percent "transition" top in effect this year might have to be extended. By pure coincidence, of course, that was the rate favored in 1985 by the tax-happy House—and rejected by the White House and Senate.

Other parts of the supposed bargain also seem to be in deep trouble; some, deservedly so. Legislators are bracing, for example, to see how much outcry they get from ordinary taxpayers over what may be the most grotesque bookkeeping nightmare in the law: The 80 percent limit on deductions for business meals and entertainment.

As Caplin put it to me: "This is a very complicated way of doing what they want to do. It doesn't hit just the fat cats. It creates tremendous problems for the little guy out there in the streets, trying to earn a living as, say, a salesman."

Business travelers typically put hotel bills in one category, for example. Now, they are faced with the necessity to break out the meals separately, and then do arithmetic on the result.

Congressmen are beginning to hear stiff complaints from ordinary voters on that one and also are being flooded with objections concerning the *ex post facto* rules disallowing large parts of promised writeoffs on real estate and similar limited partnerships.

Those who believed the stories that this law would be set in concrete should be aware that the new chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Lloyd Bentsen, a Texas Democrat, has indicated [in a letter to 140 Texas real estate executives] that he intends to seek changes in the new rules retroactively attacking the so-called passive losses on partnership investments.

The political appeal of "tax reform" was that it would bring fairness and simplicity to a convoluted code. Instead, the realization is growing that many ordinary citizens are being treated woefully unfairly and that the law is more complicated than ever.

Meanwhile, though, keep a close eye on the 28 percent top that's supposed to arrive in 1988. This could turn out to be the litmus test of whether the new law was a conventionally oversold tax revision or something more shameful, Taxscam—a scandal that, in its impact on the average American's pocketbook, could make Abscam and Iranscam look like nickel poker.

"REAGAN CLAIMS INNOCENCE BY PLEADING GUILT"

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration's explanation of its actions in the Iran-Contra scandal was radically altered last week.

After months of vigorous denials, the President unexpectedly announced that he had, in fact, known of the secret, private funding of aid to the Nicaraguan Contras notwithstanding congressional action restricting that aid.

In fact, the President boasted, that the surreptitious aid was his own idea.

The President and his supporters would have the American people believe that there was nothing illegal about this private funding of American foreign policy. Now, after months of clandestine machinations, they are proud of their role.

The duplicity of this strategy is self-apparent. If there was nothing illegal, why was the solicitation of foreign contributions and the channeling of private funds all carried on in secret?

If these actions by the President's staff were not restricted by law, why not conduct them openly and inform the press, the Congress, and the American people of their decisions? Why all the code names, and secret trips to Chinese groceries, and shredded documents?

If they were proud of their actions, why the months of denials of any knowledge or involvement?

All the President's men obviously believe that by pleading guilty to involvement in the Iran-Contra activity, they sidestep the nagging question of whether, and when, the President knew: he knew all along. He thought it up.

But that is not the key question in this very disturbing and constitutionally explosive case. The issue is the circumvention of the constitutional explosive case. The issue is the circumvention of the constitutional process, the sidestepping of both the letter and the spirit of the law, and the undermining of official policy and the credibility of the United States which comes of dealing with terrorists and using the proceeds to finance private wars.

Two columns in this week's New York Times focus on the history of the President's denials, and the dramatic impact of his confession on the entire scandal. They deserve the attention of all Members of the House.

The columns follow:

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1987]

REAGAN'S CONTRA-AID LINE: NEW SHIFT

(By Joel Brinkley)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—President Reagan's new assertion that he was "very definitely involved" in the covert program to aid the Nicaraguan rebels is only the latest in a string of White House reversals on the question.

For the last several months Mr. Reagan and his aides have professed to know little about the private aid to the rebels, known as contras. "I had no detailed information," Mr. Reagan said when asked about covert military aid to the contras just two weeks ago.

Since then, Congressional testimony has demonstrated that Mr. Reagan knew far more than he had been saying, and on Friday Mr. Reagan did an about-face. "I've known what's going on there, as a matter of fact, for quite a long time now, a matter of years," he said, adding that private aid to the contras "was my idea to begin with."

A study of the record shows that during most of the period starting in 1984 when Government assistance to the contras was restricted the White House issued unambiguous denials of any involvement, almost always accompanied by promises that the President and his aides were carefully abiding by the letter and the spirit of the law.

ACTIONS CALLED LEGAL

But each time evidence has been presented showing that the Administration had in fact been aiding the contras in one manner or another, the White House has shifted its ground, saying it was perfectly legal.

The latest reversal of the White House position has effectively short-circuited a central theme of investigation in the special Congressional Iran-contra hearings that began early this month and resume on Tuesday.

Behind almost every line of inquiry at the hearings so far has been the general question: What did the President know, and when did he know it? Now Mr. Reagan has said, in effect, that he knew all about it from the very outset.

That development is likely to make any further questioning on this theme anti-climatic.

FOCUS SHIFTS TO PROSECUTOR

Mr. Reagan's assertion that he did not violate the law, even though he was heavily involved, because the law did not apply to him, also moves the focus of the investigation away from the public hearings, where the purpose is to find out what happened, to the special prosecutor, whose job is to determine if the actions were legal.

Through 1984 and most of 1985, the Administration steadfastly denied any involvement with programs to aid the contras. A statement by John Hughes, the State Department spokesman, in late 1984 was typical. He said private individuals were entitled to help the contras if they wanted, but he added: "Obviously there was consideration of options or alternatives in the Government, but the decision was taken not to play an active role in soliciting either private funding or third-country support. And the fact is, the United States has not done that."

The Administration maintained that position until August 1985, when news reports showed that Lieut. Col. Oliver L. North had been directly involved in raising money for the contras and offering them tactical assistance during the period when Government assistance was the most severely restricted.

Then the White House did its first about-face. Larry Speakes, the White House spokesman at that time, said: "The President was fully aware of the extent of the relationship between N.S.C. members and members of the democratic resistance group, and he has been aware all along." Asked about that then, the President said: "We're not violating any laws."

LINK TO PLANE DENIED

The issue came back to the forefront of public attention again last October, when one of the private contra supply planes managed by Colonel North and Richard V. Secord crashed inside Nicaragua. Then, officials from almost every branch of Government went to great lengths to deny any Government connection to the plane.

"Absolutely not," Mr. Reagan said when asked if there was any United States involvement. "While they're American citizens" on the plane, he said, "there is no Government connection with it at all."

Then for the first time the President used the argument that the White House maintained until Mr. Reagan changed his stance again on Friday. "We've been aware that there are private groups and private citizens that have been trying to help the contras," he said, "but we did not know the exact particulars of what they're doing."

But on Friday, Mr. Reagan said "I was kept briefed" on the private aid program, adding, "It was my idea."

DIVERSION OF PROFITS

Today both Administration and Congressional officials said the new White House position does leave one area where the facts remain unresolved: the question of whether Mr. Reagan was aware that profits from the Iran arms sales were among the funds that went to the contras. Mr. Reagan continues to maintain that he did not know.

Mr. Secord, the former Air Force major general who was the chief operative behind both the Iran arms sales and the contra supply network, said two weeks ago that only \$3.5 million from the Iran arms sales was diverted to the contras.

Many members of the Congressional investigating committees have said they are less concerned by the diversion than by the larger picture: that the Administration set up an elaborate, foreign policy apparatus to carry out covert programs that the Congress was unwilling to accept.

But from the moment the Iran-contra arms deals swelled from a problem to a scandal last November, Mr. Reagan has pinned his defense on not knowing about the diversion. That promoted the diversion issue to one of great significance.

REAGAN IGNITES A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

(By Laurence H. Tribe)

After President's Reagan's former national security adviser, Robert C. McFarlane, testified that he had briefed the President "dozens" of times about the steps that he and various aides were taking to raise funds for the contras' military operations, the White House defense began edging away from the increasingly implausible "factual" claim of no Presidential involvement and toward an even more troubling legal claim of Presidential immunity.

This latest position continues to hold that the President played no role in diverting profits from the Iran arms sale to the contras—a claim that remains to be explored in further hearings.

But the White House also insists that however active a role the President played in efforts to encourage private and foreign assistance to the contras from sources outside the Iranian arms deal, no law passed by Congress either attempted to, or could, restrict his freedom to deploy his own office, or the offices of his National Security Council, to obtain third-party support for the contras.

This was not the Administration's expressed understanding of the Boland Amendment of October 1984 when the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Langhorne A. Motley, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee shortly after Saudi Arabia's King Fahd had met with President Reagan and doubled the Saudis' clandestine aid to the contras, to \$2 million a month.

At that time, Mr. Motley testified that soliciting aid from third countries would violate the amendment's prohibition against "direct or indirect" support for the contras. The Administration was right then; it is wrong now.

First, the Boland amendment bars support for the contras drawn from any "funds available to . . . any . . . agency or entity of the United States involved in intelligence activities."

This amendment's legislative history makes clear that this includes Government

revenues devoted to paying the salaries and expenses of intelligence operatives whenever their actions—such as the solicitation of contributions—"would have the effect of supporting" the contras "directly or indirectly," in the amendment's words.

Second, even if the costs of paying agents were not covered, the funds that such agents raised were indirectly made "available to" agencies that became "involved in intelligence activities," as the National Security Council had certainly become by 1985.

Having covertly turned the National Security Council into an operational intelligence unit in order to sidestep Congressional restrictions on, and oversight of, the Central Intelligence Agency, the White House cannot now invoke the view held by Congress, the Tower Commission and many others that the N.S.C. was not intended to serve as an intelligence agency.

That the funds obtained from domestic and foreign sources circumvented agency coffers and may have gone straight into the contras' hands cannot obscure their availability for intelligence agency purposes and projects.

Third, it is irrelevant whether the Presidential office is deemed an "entity of the United States involved in intelligence activities," because the President—if his latest "recollections" are accepted—either encouraged entities involved in intelligence to circumvent the amendment of, at the very least, did not "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed" by such entities, as Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution requires.

In other words, if the puppets are subject to the law and violate it, the puppet master cannot escape accountability.

Therein lies what appears to be the most serious breach of duty by the President—a breach that may well entail an impeachable abuse of power, however politically unlikely impeachment of this affable officeholder may be.

The Constitution is, after all, indifferent to popularity and blind to personality. Yet, stripped of its technical camouflage the latest White House position ultimately reduces to the claim that this President, being somehow outside the Government, is above the law.

Our entire constitutional system—not to mention common sense—rebels at any such notion.

The carefully crafted requirement of Article I, section 9, that all funds raised by the Government or its agents must enter and leave the federal treasury, and must do so only pursuant to laws passed by Congress, would be rendered utterly meaningless if the President, seeing himself not as an agent of the Government but as an outsider, could preside freely over the creation of a shadow treasury designed to aid his shadow intelligence network in pursuit of his private schemes.

Congress's control over the purse would be rendered a nullity if the President's pocket could conceal a slush fund dedicated to purposes and projects prohibited by the laws of the United States.

When Ronald Reagan was elected on an antigovernment platform, pundits smiled. When incumbent President Reagan was re-elected on such a platform, political scientists were puzzled. But when the President's status as a perpetually bemused and patriotic outsider is transformed from a political stance into a shield against the rule of law, a constitutional crisis is at hand.

AGING IN AMERICA

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Coming of Age" from *Healthcare Forum* magazine. This article addresses the serious problems our country will be facing in the next century as America gets older, and provides suggestions for change.

Key to this article is the theory that we need more attention focused on issues relating to long term health care. The article notes, for example, that: "The pace and rhythm and economics of a hospital are keyed to people under 50" and that hospitals are "structured to deal with acute, infectious diseases * * * which are not the diseases of the old."

Mr. Speaker, this article is especially timely as the House prepares to consider the catastrophic health legislation recently reported from the Ways and Means Committee. It shows that we need to focus on the problems the elderly in America will be facing in the next century. I urge my colleagues to read the article carefully.

COMING OF AGE

(By Joe Fowler)

Age is coming of age. More Americans are living longer. And they are spending those extra years happier, healthier, and wealthier.

Few who study history closely have missed being overwhelmed at some point in their career by the power of the Marxist claim that history is driven by economics. Few who pursue it further can fail to be stunned by the realization that economics is but a small part of the much larger history-driving engine of demographic change.

Individuals make a profound difference in the acute phases of history. It is unlikely that France and Germany would have conquered Europe without Napoleon and Hitler, that Spain would have conquered the Aztecs without Cortez, or Ptolemy become Pharaoh without Alexander. But the broad sweep of history, the stage that brings forth these leaders, has as much or more to do with the population at large—who they are, how old, how educated, how rich, how satisfied, how healthy.

We are in the middle of such a great demographic change. It is frightening, but on one level reassuring, since parts of it can be predicted much more clearly than anything else in the future. The cohorts that will become elders in the next 20 years are not projections. They are living people. As they age, America will age.

America expresses itself in its popular culture—and the signs indicate that aging is "in." Consider the avalanche of articles on aging in the past two years. Joan Collins in her late fifties being voted sexiest woman in America in a *Reader's Digest* poll, the success of "Dynasty," the sudden rise of walking as the "in" fitness sport.

Consider just this one phenomenon: McCall's recently named the ten sexiest American men over 60. They were Paul Newman, 60; Lee Iacocca, 61; Norman Mailer, 62; John Forsythe, 67; Frank Sinatra, 69; Joe DiMaggio, 70; Ronald Reagan, 74; John Huston, 79; and Isaac Bashevis Singer and Cary Grant, both 81.

Could such a list have been published in a major popular magazine even ten years ago? Would anyone have been interested? Would the editors have thought that it would help sell the magazine? All of these men would be admired in any time. But sexy is something different. Sexy is weak in the knees. Sexy is come fly with me. Sexy is be still, my heart. Some of them—Newman, DiMaggio, Grant—would be sexy in any decade. But Iacocca? Or Singer, the bespectacled, gnomic, vulture-headed Yiddishist?

That rumbling is the moving of the demographic earth.

CATALYST FOR CHANGE

Every such change has its prophets and profits. Ken Dychtwald, PhD, has been one of the prophets of this one. Author, president of Dychtwald and Associates consulting firm, national director of the Institute on Aging, Health and Work, he gets some fifty speaking requests a week from everyone who could be affected by the change, which is to say everyone. He has spoken to associations of home designers, underwear manufacturers, and car companies. His closing address at the 1985 AWH Convention was widely praised. The U.S. Commission on Aging has signed him on to train its entire staff.

Now Dychtwald is turning his knowledge into real changes in the healthcare field, starting at one institution. Over the past two years he has worked with one of the country's most progressive hospitals to see how it can profit from the change by serving it.

Neilson Buchanan is CEO of the 164-bed El Camino Hospital in Mountain View, California, deep in crowded, affluent, and future-oriented Silicon Valley. He estimates that some one-third of the hospital's resources go to people over 65. Under his leadership El Camino has already put in place a string of programs for the elderly, and is currently building a 535-unit "continuing care" retirement center. But until recently it had no comprehensive plan for the shift to an older population.

Several years ago, after hearing him speak at a Health Management Services luncheon, Buchanan asked Dychtwald to help him redirect El Camino to meet this new future. "We had already identified the issue," he says. "In 20 years things are going to be very different. It's impossible to say just how, but there are enough winds blowing out there to give some idea. Medicare won't be the same. Social Security won't be the same. It's an obvious issue in strategic planning. The challenge is to recognize the forces operating. We needed to know a lot more about it. Several of us had met Ken. We asked him to be the catalyst."

It was a challenge for Dychtwald. He had spoken to many hospital groups, but he had little experience in the day-to-day workings of a modern medical complex. He didn't know an MIA from a tax-exempt bond. Once the youngest instructor at Esalen, he is firmly rooted in the New Age exploration of alternatives to traditional medicine.

Dychtwald's critique of medicine goes beyond marketing problems to the very structure of its institutions: "The hospital, as it has grown up in this century, is structured to deal with acute, infectious diseases. These are not the diseases of the old, who must deal with chronic, degenerative illness often rooted in lifestyle. If you break your leg skiing, insurance will pay; but it will not pay for healthcare for a chronic problem. The pace and rhythm and economics of the hospital are keyed to people under 50.

"The elderly are being poorly treated by people who are not properly trained. Many mental deficiencies are not properly diagnosed, such as Alzheimer's or dementia. Sometimes the problem is polypharmacy, the overuse of drugs. Many of the drugs most commonly prescribed to the elderly have never been tested on people over 60."

It's a challenge that many hospitals are already faced with, but that most have avoided. Dychtwald cites a discussion he had with one hospital CEO: "I asked him the percentage of his patients over 65. He estimated 65 percent. How many geriatric specialists did he have on staff? None. How many programs specifically aimed at older people? None. It's like having no Toyota repairmen in a town where almost no one drives anything else."

"There are lots of top guys that will say, 'This sounds important. Let's get a task force together. We'll meet Thursday and Friday, and make recommendations Monday.'"

Buchanan's approach was different. He decided to attack the problem full force. He asked Dychtwald how much time it would take to do it right, and told him, "I really want you to provoke these people."

MAKING IT HAPPEN

Buchanan appointed a task force of 20 people. It included himself, the head of nursing, half a dozen doctors, people from patient education, strategic planning, psychiatry, public relations, education and training, health management services, the auxiliary, and the foundation.

Mary Wallace "Mickey" Wheat, executive director of the hospital's foundation, says, "One of the things that made this work was that Neilson gave it his total commitment, without looking for any specific result, and without any specific time limit."

Patricia Aalgaard, the task force coordinator, agrees: "It takes leadership by the CEO. He was very receptive and responsive to information from within the hospital and from the community. I've never known a planning project styled like this. It's not usually appropriate or possible. Here there was time, and commitment. It helps the process if people come regularly. We've met at least one full day each month for a year, and out of the 20 [task force members] we have had 15 to 17 each time."

"It's not my management style to just say this is the way it's going to be," says Buchanan. "A hospital is one of the more complex organizations in which to try to solve problems. So the other way—dictating policy—will get you through quickly. But you may not be where you want to go. Or you may get there, but not have anyone with you."

Being on the task force was not an easy assignment.

The first stage was what Dychtwald called "Consciousness Raising." Dychtwald was concerned that "people often do planning without knowing who they are planning for." The four-month curriculum was prodigious. Besides the monthly full-day seminars, the task force members read some 300 pages each month. They did role-playing as older people. They went into the community to identify bits of daily life that are more difficult for an older person, such as driving, standing in line, getting on escalators, and negotiating "walk" signals timed for quicker people.

They conferred with "key service providers" in the community, professionals from nursing homes, home healthcare organiza-

tions, senior centers, hospices, respite care providers, and the American Association of Retired Persons, to discover "what works and doesn't work." Mickey Wheat says, "We are not out for personal glory, or to reinvent the wheel. We wanted to find out what is being done. We can envision all manner of networks, consortia, and information sharing with these people."

They commissioned a demographic study from Roger Mack, a Stanford economist. They listened to psychiatrist Carl Eisdorfer, then president and CEO of Montefiore Medical Center in New York City, and 79-year-old Gray Panther founder Maggie Kuhn.

Besides the reading that every task force member was asked to do, each member was given customized research packets in his or her area of expertise and interest, pulled by Dychtwald's staff from his extensive research library on aging. According to Dychtwald, what he was attempting with the task force was to "make them all experts." Says Mickey Wheat, "If we had done nothing else, it still would have been extremely valuable."

The process moved synergetically. "If you had asked me what the ideal hospital of the future formed around the aging population would look like," says Dychtwald. "I wouldn't know. I did their homework. They did mine."

Once the homework was done, they started brainstorming. For three months they came up with ideas. "I told them," says Dychtwald, "to forget what the hospital is now. Just ask yourselves what you think elder people need. What do you think they want? What can be done? How do we help these people be as functional and independent as possible?" It was, he says, "a blue-sky session, a skunk works. There was no judgment on the ideas just get them up there."

And gotten up they were, everything from elder dating services to "live" information lines to travel centers. "Some of these things," says Mickey Wheat, "are things that should be done, but not by a hospital." When some 400 ideas had been thrown on the table says Dychtwald, "we began to put them together to ask ourselves how they cluster. It was like trying to outline a book written by a four-year-old."

In the third stage they began to weigh the possibilities to pare the list to the items that they would go after in the coming years as they reshaped their mission to ask how each thing could be done, where the money would come from, what organizations would be appropriate.

SPREADING THE NEWS

While the task force moved through the process itself, it also educated both the hospital staff and the community. Dychtwald spoke to special gatherings of the staff. The task force invited the public to presentations by Dychtwald, Kuhn and Aalgaard, so that the changes in the hospital's mission and operations would not seem to rise out of some Aladdin's lamp. The press was invited, and feature articles appeared that outlined the coming demographic changes, and what El Camino was doing about them.

El Camino took out ads in local publications geared to seniors that spotlighted a fit-looking sixties couple announced the task force and some of its proposed programs then touted the long list of senior programs the hospital already sponsored from health counseling and stress management training to Roadrunners, a volunteer group running free transportation to and from the hospital.

The hospital's quarterly magazine, *Quest*, featured articles by Buchanan and Dychtwald. Its cover story spotlighted an 80-year-old couple talking about their hobbies—jogging and weightlifting.

The most difficult group to reach if only because they are so busy turned out to be the hospital's own doctors. Buchanan went out of his way to see that they were informed. Dychtwald addressed a medical staff meeting. Dr. Diana Koin a gerontologist had meetings with groups of doctors. Aalgaard held regular lunches with doctors on the task force to keep them up to speed. "In retrospect," she says, "we should have had more meetings with the doctors. We can also use questionnaires and brief their office staffs. We need the doctors' input. We need to know what they want and need. We need to know what the hospital can do to help them treat the elderly."

"It's a problem," she says. "How do you communicate basic things like this to 450 doctors? Eisdorfer did an afternoon seminar on his demographic study of our population base. Only 30 doctors signed up and only 15 came. When he did it for middle management almost everyone came."

Many professionals in the hospitals see the coming change as profound.

The task force included five nurses. Mary Smithwick, assistant administrator for nursing at El Camino, says, "Nurses see a trend like this first, and it will have a lot of impact on nursing, on nurses' training and continuing education, and on research. Just to take one instance, we know that pediatric doses are quite different from adult doses. We have to look at the other end, at the effect of multiple drugs on the elderly."

Thomas Havel, MD, medical director of psychiatric services at El Camino, feels the challenge to psychiatry is particularly powerful. "Already as much as 25 to 30 percent of our psychiatric patients are over 65. Some 30 percent of patients with multi-system breakdowns have accompanying depression. We are seeing more evolutionary melancholia, the depression of old age, and more organic brain syndromes, such as Alzheimer's and drug problems. As you age you lose your reserves that help you fight stress."

"We need a greater sensitivity to elders, everything from making our signs bigger to paying closer attention to drug-drug interactions and nosocomial (hospital-generated) disease. The elder patient is more complex, less flexible. More things are going on medically. The senses are more impaired."

"You have to weigh these things as an administrator. How you face them is likely to set the tenor of the whole organization for the next ten or 15 years. Our possibilities here in psychiatry include a special unit for organic brain syndrome, a special geriatric unit, a special geriatric outpatient capacity, and preventive psychiatric medicine—by which I mean attention to lifestyle problems."

TOUCHING A NERVE

These professionals demonstrate a fascinating effect of the process: Expertise rooted in a group dynamic has a different sense of aliveness from expertise picked up in journals or lectures.

A typical recent all-day session took place a mile from the hospital in a comfortable hotel conference room with Spanish-style glass doors opening onto a mission-like arcade paved in big reddish-brown flags. Inside, ivy and arrowhead hang in wall baskets. Jackets are off, phones outlawed (except for the always-and-everywhere beepers of the MDs who pop in for an hour

or two). Coffee, sodas, and juice sit on a table to one side, sandwiches come at noon.

A market researcher reports on 18 hours of focus group sessions, in which a total of 90 people talked issues while researchers and some members of the task force watched from behind one-way mirrors. The groups were male or female, separated into age groups. The 42-to-54-year-old males, says the researcher, were mostly "high tech, low touch, very busy, very interested in mechanical solutions that do not involve them, nonaccepting, defensive, even fearful."

"Sounds like a doctor," someone says. Dr. Dychtwald leaps forward and says, "Aging is a very loaded issue for them. We've touched a nerve here." He goes on to describe a recent seminar he had given for a group of 400 CEOs, men whose lives were about being in charge, making things work. He confronted them with something they could not fix.

"In the middle of my slide presentation I did a series of images about Mom, about Mom getting old and dying. These were very tough, busy men. Half of them were crying. Some of them were running from the room. There was a tornado of emotions let loose."

The marketing research suggests a range of possible programs from skills assessment testing for elders to "Caregiver" programs, from a Citizens Advisory Board on aging to a hearing impairment clinic to a weekend "spa" program that would combine routine physicals, tests, and health classes with social activities.

Over lunch, Aalgaard comments on hospitals' image problem: "When you ask (the focus groups) about hospitals, they respond with comments about physicians."

After lunch, it's down to business, working over the hundreds of suggestions for action produced by the months of brainstorming. One pass has winnowed them considerably, to 179 long-term items. Some, such as hiring a medical director of geriatrics, sensitizing staff and patients to the needs of the aging, and expanding case management, were deemed essential to be developed by management over time. Other items—a mail-order catalog, dental care, a special transportation system, a line of health and exercise clothing—were judged to be too far afield, too expensive, or duplicating other efforts.

Now the question is how to winnow them again, and how to act on them, how to pull some items forward for immediate action and defer others for studies or funding, how to turn live topics into budget lines, how to weave them together into a living part of the hospital. The discussion goes on far into the afternoon.

BUT WILL IT LAST?

Too often, when a corporate body finishes a strategic reassessment, it breathes a collective sigh of relief and goes back to whatever it had been doing before the interruption.

Whether this will happen at El Camino remains to be seen—at this writing the process has just ended. But there are a number of signs that the impact will be lasting. One is local demographics. Already 9 percent of the population of its service area in northern Santa Clara County is over 65.2 percent more than the rest of the country. In the next 25 years, the county's over-65 population is expected to double, its over-85 population to triple. A hospital concerned with maintaining and expanding its market share will have to pay attention to this cohort.

The length of the process will probably contribute to the permanence of the results. This was no weekend retreat. The meetings themselves spread over a year. For many of the top people in the hospital, the issue has been explicitly on the front burner for nearly two years now. That is long enough to change patterns of thought and behavior.

Buchanan has given the project the kind of enthusiastic involvement that will give it continuing life, and he appears to have communicated that interest to key department heads.

Finally, the deep educational process has created a substantial shared body of knowledge and a cadre of experts across many departments. When people "own" knowledge drawn from such an exhaustive process, they are more likely to carry it into their own professional agendas than if they had simply read it somewhere.

When the exhaustive process is finished, what is El Camino left with? The most obvious single result is a Center on Aging, with Patricia Aalgaard as director, and the task force meeting quarterly as what Buchanan calls a "scanning-planning-steering group." It will be both a resource center, for the community and for professionals, and a catalyst for broad future action. If such a broad program can be put into a nutshell, the shell is a "workplan" of 70 specific items already in place, coming online, or projected for the coming two years.

Programs already in place include, for instance, a geriatric core curriculum for the nursing staff, nutrition and dietary counseling, and an Alzheimer's Support Group. Those coming on line include regular liaison with nursing homes through discharge planning, a live non-crisis information and referral phone service, and a public awareness campaign.

The first-year-out list shows line items like a full-time nurse educator for continuing clinical education on gerontology across all departments and staff levels and a scholarship fund for El Camino employees studying geriatrics. Other "high-priority" items—like a CommuniCall emergency response system, a chronic illness management program for older and retired workers, and in-house video patient education programming aimed at older adults—are still looking for funding at this writing.

The second year out includes feasibility studies of home healthcare, hospice care, respite care, and adult daycare services, and health promotion projects in such areas as hypertension, vision, Alzheimer's, and mental depression.

Buchanan's approach to business considerations—to market share and product lines—is slow and deep. "We are part of this community. We're not going to pick up the hospital and move it to Bend, Oregon. What we are doing now is investing in information. It's a slow, organizational phase. Starting in 1986 we will evaluate specific product lines. That's when we will start putting the apples on the trees."

How this "workplan" will change over time, and how many of its projects will turn into people and actions, we shall see. But the plan itself is only a bubbling to the surface of much deeper attitudes shifting with the moving of the demographic earth. The training of key personnel as a cadre of experts in the theory and practice of modern aging, and the knitting of networks with providers in the community will have a more profound effect than any possible list of projects and budgets.

THE BLACK BUDGET

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Tim Weiner "Planning for World War IV," is the second in a series of three articles on the Pentagon's black budget:

[From the Philadelphia (PA) Inquirer, Feb. 9, 1987]

PLANNING FOR WORLD WAR IV (By Tim Weiner)

On Dec. 4, an Atlas-Centaur rocket blasted off from Cape Canaveral. It carried the first space test of Milstar, a multibillion-dollar satellite system funded by the Pentagon's secret "black budget."

Milstar is the centerpiece of a \$40 billion plan to prepare for World War IV.

Four. Since 1981, shortly after President Reagan took office, the fundamental U.S. defense strategy has been to be able to fight and win a 6-month nuclear conflict—World War III—and remain strong enough afterward to strike again.

Long after the White House and Pentagon are reduced to rubble and much of civilization is destroyed, the strategy would call for computers to run a war no human mind could control, orchestrating space satellites and nuclear weapons over a global battlefield.

The strategy envisions generals huddled in underground bunkers, aloft in converted 747s and speeding down interstate highways in lead-lined tractor-trailers. These nuclear-war command posts would harbor computer-terminals linked to space satellites that would help direct nuclear missiles from silos and submarines.

The key to this strategy, the Pentagon maintains, is to build a computerized communications network that can command and control the nation's nuclear forces during and after World War III.

The Pentagon calls this network "C³I" (pronounced see-cubed-eye), shorthand for command, control, communications and intelligence. Part of a \$222 billion plan to modernize the nation's nuclear forces, C³I would become America's central nervous system for nuclear war, the brain that controls the brawn of missiles, bombers and submarines.

Increasingly, major components of the nuclear C³I system, such as Milstar, have been hidden in the black budget, the Pentagon's secret funds for classified projects. Naturally, this has severely limited congressional oversight and public awareness of the new network.

And as billions and billions for C³I disappear into the black budget, less and less is known about the ultimate cost and structure of the nation's nuclear strategy.

New C³I systems hidden in the black budget include:

The Milstar system of satellites, orbiting 70,000 miles above the earth, receiving and relaying commands to launch nuclear weapons.

Satellite sensors designed to track nuclear missiles in flight, track their progress and report back on the damage they inflict.

Tractor-trailers hauling nuclear command posts, dodging Soviet attacks on the open road.

The ultimate cost of these three black budget programs alone may exceed \$30 billion.

C³I projects still in the unclassified Pentagon budget include:

Robots that can gallop like horses and walk like men, carrying out computerized orders as they roam the radioactive battlefield.

A nationwide network of 500 radio stations that could broadcast orders to nuclear-missile silos and underground bunkers.

A search for ways to protect crucial computers from the effects of nuclear weapons.

Take Milstar, just one component, although a crucial one, of C³I. For years the Milstar project gathered dust in the Pentagon's files, it was considered impossibly expensive.

But the Reagan administration's military buildup has brought it from the drawing board to the launching pad.

Since 1984, the administration has spent at least \$1.5 billion to develop the space satellites and other communications equipment for Milstar. Military analysts estimate the ultimate cost of Milstar at between \$15 billion and \$20 billion.

The true cost will remain a secret. Last year, the Milstar satellites disappeared in the Pentagon's black budget, where they are less likely to face scrutiny from Congress and critics.

Milstar would work like this, if it works at all, in a nuclear war:

Imagine two networks, one in space, one on earth. The first is a constellation of eight satellites, strategically placed in orbits around the earth, 70,000 miles or more in space. The satellites connect with the second network, thousands of radios and computer terminals in underground bunkers, missile silos, submarines, tractor-trailers and airborne command posts.

Milstar would be the global nuclear communications switchboard, connecting all the command stations during and after World War III, receiving and relaying the launch orders for nuclear weapons.

This concept—"connectivity"—is the buzzword for the 1980s at the Pentagon and the basis for the C³I network.

All commanders dream of wars to pierce the fog of war, to obtain intelligence fresh from the battlefield, to give orders that will be carried out instantly, to communicate with fellow officers. To command. As Gen. Thomas Power, the legendary head of the Strategic Air Command in the 1950s, put it: "Without communications, all I command is my desk."

Pentagon officials have told Congress that Milstar's satellites and terminals will provide "connectivity" for months after nuclear war erupts.

Milstar would connect the nation's military leaders with the commander-in-chief. If the president escapes from Washington in the doomsday plane, a converted 747 intended to evacuate the president from Washington, he could use Milstar to order nuclear-submarine commanders thousands of miles away to hit Soviet targets in Moscow or Vladivostok.

If Washington is destroyed and the president, vice president and secretary of defense are killed, the new nuclear commander-in-chief will be an Air Force general already aloft in a modified 707 (Continuously, in peacetime or in conflict, a general and battle staff from the Strategic Air Command are in flight over the Midwest in one of several planes code-named Looking Glass.

Messages sent through Milstar would tell the Looking Glass commander-in-chief if Washington was gone. He would then use Milstar to coordinate the nation's nuclear missiles and bombers.

The Pentagon still has not solved one problem that might prevent the "doomsday" and Looking Glass planes from playing their crucial roles throughout a six-month nuclear war: The planes cannot remain aloft for more than 72 hours before their lubricants run out and their engines die.

If the airborne command posts fall, Milstar would transmit that information to generals in the Pentagon's alternative command center, deep underground in the Caectin Mountains near Raven Rock, Pa. Then these generals could take control, using the satellites to transmit orders telling troops to evacuate cities, or to fire MX warheads from silos in Wyoming.

When it is completed, Milstar will join two other nuclear-war-fighting systems in space.

Navstar, also known as the Global Positioning System, was canceled by the Carter administration, but resurrected in 1982. It is expected to be completed by 1990 at an estimated final cost of \$8 billion to \$12 billion.

Navstar's 18 satellites will play a crucial role in a nuclear war. Their computer systems will help nuclear weapons hit bull's-eyes. According to congressional testimony, the satellites can guide nuclear missiles and fix them on their targets with accuracies of 50 feet or closer.

How will the U.S. military commanders know if the missiles have accomplished their missions? A set of sensors that will ride piggyback on Navstar satellites will tell them.

The sensors are called IONDS, for Integrated Operational Nuclear Detection System. Pentagon officials have told Congress, that the sensors are designed to survey the global battlefield, pinpoint nuclear explosions, assess the damage and report the results back to commanders in airborne posts and underground bunkers.

Like Milstar satellites, the nuclear detection technology for IONDS is being developed mostly under black-budget financing. Its ultimate cost is unknown.

While much about the C³I technology's role in nuclear policy remains classified, several aspects seem clear:

The new generation of C³I satellites is a step toward the militarization of space. The C³I network gives computers an evergrowing power over nuclear forces. The technology remains uncertain until tested in nuclear war. And the multi-billion-dollar projects hidden in the black budget still represent only a small down payment on a C³I system that can endure a long nuclear war.

"One reason the black budget is growing so fast is the Reagan administration believes it can win a nuclear war," said Gene LaRocque, the retired Navy admiral who directs the watchdog group Center for Defense Information in Washington. "We've moved away from a policy of deterrence, where you want your enemy to know what you've got. If you want to win a nuclear war, you've got to keep your capabilities a secret."

Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger has told Congress that the C³I network is "perhaps the most urgently needed element" in the Reagan administration's trillion-dollar military buildup. The urgency stems from a shift in the nation's nuclear war-fighting strategy.

Shortly after President Reagan took office, in October 1981, he signed a secret

"finding" called National Security Decision Directive 13. While the text of NSDD-13 remains a secret, its meaning is not. The strategy it proclaimed has been repeated in the testimony of Pentagon officials before Congress and in scores of published works by military analysts.

That strategy says the idea of a one day nuclear war is outmoded. It says that 20 million or more Americans can die in World War III, and the United States will still survive as a nation. It says the United States should have the power to control the escalation of a long drawn-out nuclear war and force a Soviet surrender. And it says the new C³I network must then control a reserve of nuclear forces large enough to allow the nation to fight again.

The strategy relies heavily on space-based C³I platforms such as Milstar and Navstar, international treaties forbid the military use of space. Congress has asked Pentagon officials whether their plans violate these agreements. The Pentagon has replied, in a statement with Orwellian overtones, that the United States interprets "the right to use space for peaceful purposes to include military uses of space to promote peace in the world." And Congress has funded the satellites.

Back on earth, the Pentagon's C³I plans depend on ways to keep commanders alive.

In an all-out nuclear war, Pentagon planners realize, few major command posts would avoid direct nuclear hits. The Soviet Union knows where to find crucial nerve centers such as the Pentagon and the Strategic Air Command headquarters in Nebraska.

Figuring that a moving target is harder to hit, the Pentagon has a \$3 billion investment in mobile command posts under way. The idea, the Pentagon has told Congress, is to have a large number of C³I centers that the Soviets cannot target. This is the thinking, behind a project code-named Island Sun.

It is a plan to create convoys of tractor-trailers in which generals could operate computerized command posts after nuclear war begins, according to congressional testimony by Defense Secretary Weinberger. Just how the trucks would operate—for example, where they might refuel or change a flat tire—is unknown, because the project is classified. However, the Pentagon budget shows that Island Sun has absorbed \$165 million in research and development funds over the past four years.

Island Sun is one of many related C³I projects to create mobile ground terminals, linked through Milstar, that in effect would be tiny Pentagons coordinating the nation's nuclear forces as they dodge Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles on the highways, on freight trains and aboard merchant ships at sea.

But Milstar and its ground terminals are not the only way to coordinate the nuclear arsenal. The Pentagon plans to spend nearly \$1 billion on creating an enduring conventional communications system, one so large and containing so many parts that the Soviet Union could never eliminate it.

The system is called GWEN, the Ground Wave Emergency Network. GWEN is planned as a network of up to 500 unmanned radio towers. At least 50 are already in place near towns and cities including Aurora, Colo.; Mahattan, Kan.; Fayetteville, Ark., and Gettysburg, Pa. Each station has a range of several hundred miles and can relay messages to sister stations, creating a national network, Radio GWEN.

GWEN's programming would include orders to launch nuclear weapons. It would link early-warning radars, missile silos, air bases, submarines, underground bunkers. Strategic Air Command headquarters and the Pentagon.

The genius of GWEN, according to Pentagon planners, is that the Soviets cannot possibly destroy all 500 towers. There will be so many GWEN relay stations and switching routes that the systems should endure during and after a nuclear attack. And if it falters, balloons, carrying compatible radio antennas could be inflated and sent aloft.

Another question the Pentagon is grappling with as it tries to create a nuclear-war-fighting network is the human factor. Would soldiers carry out their roles in the heat of nuclear battle? The Pentagon is researching ways to educate soldiers to "understand the impact of enemy nuclear firepower and to prepare them to cope with operations on the nuclear battlefield," according to congressional testimony.

And where the human mind and body cannot cope with nuclear war, the Pentagon's planners tell Congress, computers will. They will play a very large role in the command and control of nuclear forces.

Thinking machines can supplant privates and generals alike in wartime, according to the Pentagon's Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), which note in its 1987 budget that "computers can assist, advise and/or relieve military personnel in complex decision-making tasks [which are] dangerous or rapidly changing."

"Computers are extremely important," the Pentagon's former director of ballistic missile defense, Jacob Gilstein, has told Congress, "No human being can enter the real-time decision-making loop and control the system, it has to be preprogrammed with logic so the computer can make the decision and run the game."

Just as computers will have to do the thinking in nuclear war, computer-controlled robot soldiers may have to do the grunt work in the nuclear battlefield.

DARPA is working on a variety of robots—"hexapod" that move with a tank's agility and speed, "quadrupeds," that gallop and trot, "walking vehicles," and robot hands and fingers. It is using increasing amounts of money and manpower to develop robot intelligence, focusing on "flexible software systems that show unique promise for solving complex military problems." Commanders will communicate with robots through "a state-of-the-art man-machine interface called IRUS," according to DARPA's budget.

DARPA envisions a robot soldier of the future that takes orders "but does not generate discourse"—no back talk or balking. The new generation of ruled soldiers eventually will give commanders the ability to have their commands carried out in "an enhanced nuclear environment"—the Pentagon's language for a lethally radioactive battlefield.

A multibillion-dollar effort is under way to protect everything from underground bunkers to airborne command posts against the varied effects of nuclear explosions. But the most immediate danger to C³I is not the radiation of nuclear weapons, or the blast, or the firestorm. It is a much-discussed, little-understood phenomenon called the electromagnetic pulse, or EMP.

Nuclear experts disagree emphatically on the effects of EMP, and the possibility of defending against it. They only agree that it is a real phenomenon.

A nuclear blast high in the atmosphere creates an enormous electromagnetic charge, a wave of intense lightning bathing the land below in an electric storm. This pulse was experienced in Hawaii in 1962, when the U.S. exploded three high-altitude nuclear weapons over the Pacific. Although the test took place 800 miles away, street lights went off across Oahu and burglar alarms went haywire in Honolulu.

The implications for C³I are far more serious. The entire structure of C³I rests on computers. If the computers cannot function during nuclear war, almost nothing will. Those who consider EMP a grave threat say it could disrupt every computer chip in the system, overloading low-voltage circuits with a tremendous burst of high-voltage energy. In theory, the network could be undone by a single nuclear bomb.

Realizing that every minute counts in nuclear war, the Pentagon is seeking ways to prevent C³I from being temporarily disconnected by the electromagnetic pulse.

The cables that connect Minuteman missile silos to their launch centers are encased in six inches of lead. At Kirkland Air Force Base in New Mexico, Pentagon scientists shoot 10 million volts of electricity through aircraft and electronic equipment, testing ways to protect them. The president's "doomsday plane" has \$100 million worth of EMP shielding. Every C³I satellite will have some form of EMP armor.

All the parts of C³I—the computers, the Milstar satellites, the mobile ground stations and the rest—appear technologically feasible to the Pentagon. The trick will be in weaving them all together into one durable war machine.

As of now, the Pentagon has told Congress it has "high confidence" that the C³I network will "endure through stress and post-attack phases of a Soviet nuclear strike."

But nobody really knows if the C³I system will work. And no one will, until a full-scale nuclear war erupts.

Skeptics inside and outside the military say neither the tens of billions of dollars already spent nor the tens of billions needed to complete what has begun will buy the C³I network the Pentagon wants.

They say the Pentagon's vision of the ultimate nuclear-war machine is an illusion.

The goal of a durable C³I system—one that would last for weeks and months during a long nuclear war—"will cost tens of billions of dollars over and beyond what we are spending today . . . and it is not clear how long such a system would endure," warned Charles A. Zrakat, executive vice president of the Mitre Corp., the nation's premier C³I think tank.

The Pentagon is undaunted. "They've consistently sent the signal: They want an enduring system. They've told the weapons and systems designers to do it. And they've driven the designers crazy," said John Steinbruner, a C³I expert at the Brookings Institution in Washington.

"The designers don't know how to do it, even spending tens of hundreds of billions of dollars," Steinbruner said. "We do not know how to build a system that could endure a large-scale attack. But the money's being spent, no question about it."

Upon his retirement in 1982, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. David Jones, told Congress that the military was throwing money into a "bottomless pit" by planning for a nuclear war of controlled scale and duration.

"I don't see much chance of nuclear war being limited or protracted," he said.

Very little unclassified information exists about the Pentagon's post-World War III plans. But the question was addressed many years ago by the man who discovered the power of the atom. Albert Einstein once was asked what weapons would be used to fight a third world war. Einstein replied that he really didn't know, but he had an idea what weapons would be used in world war IV.

"Sticks and stones," Einstein said.

INTRODUCTION OF "THE BETTER USE OF HOSPITAL FACILITIES ACT"

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1985, \$167 billion was spent on hospital care in this country, much of it to finance the capital costs hospitals incur to add beds, new high-technology equipment and other facilities. These investments are being made even though 40 percent of hospital bed-space is unused. This percentage has been increasing as powerful new forces have emerged to discourage lengthy hospital stays, including new reimbursement policies, advances in outpatient medical services and other factors.

Fueling the growth of unused hospital facilities is Medicare, which pays hospitals depreciation and interest on capital expenses incurred for buildings and equipment that serve Medicare patients. These payments are made on a cost-based philosophy. The hospitals purchase equipment, the Government pays the bill.

Once the equipment is purchased, payments are made at the same rate whether equipment—such as beds—is used or not. Everyone knows that unused equipment, whether a bed or a CT scanner, doesn't depreciate at the same rate that used equipment does. Yet current Federal policy reimburses both equally.

This outmoded reimbursement philosophy diminishes true need as a factor in hospital purchases. As Douglas Hawthorne, president of Presbyterian Healthcare System in Dallas, said recently, "Need is often secondary in decisions about CT scanners, transplant centers and similar forms of expensive technology."

With the Federal deficit at record levels, hospital capital costs cannot grow indefinitely. Yet projected growth under current policies is enormous. In 1986, according to F.W. Dodge Division of McGraw-Hill, hospitals and other health care facilities awarded \$7.8 billion in building contracts. Other independent analyses project this amount will grow to \$9.2 billion by 1991.

I believe that a hospital's decision to expand should be based on need, not on the Government's willingness to pay. To promote this philosophy, along with Congressman DONNELLY, I'm introducing legislation to link a small portion of each hospital's Medicare depreciation payment to the facility's occupancy rate.

Our legislation reduces capital payments for depreciation expenses if the hospital fails to meet occupancy rates established in the legislation. Hospitals with 50 to 200 beds must

have occupancy of 55 percent. Those with 200 to 400 beds must have 65 percent of their beds full and hospitals with more than 400 beds must have 72 percent occupancy rates. If the facility fails to meet its target, depreciation payments will be reduced by a proportionate amount. Hospitals with under 50 beds and sole community provider hospitals are exempted.

In addition, the bill allows hospitals to take unused beds out of service for a specified period of time—bank them, so to speak—and save part of their depreciation payments and maintenance costs on the beds. Finally, the bill gives hospitals the right to use occupied beds in a more efficient manner—by preempting state regulations that prevent moving beds between wards.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates this legislation could save the Government \$100 million to \$200 million a year, depending on how many beds hospitals retire.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, April 23, 1987.

HON. RON WYDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In response to your request, we are providing you with budget estimates for your proposal to tie Medicare capital reimbursement for depreciation to hospital occupancy rates. Under current law, Medicare reimburses hospitals for a portion of their capital related depreciation expenditures. Your proposal would reduce this reimbursement for hospitals which do not meet a target minimum occupancy rate. Under certain conditions, hospitals which agree to retire beds could have their reduction offset as much as 50 percent. In addition, the Secretary of Health and Human Services could exempt hospitals from this reduction. Based upon discussions with your staff, we assumed the exemption process would be very restrictive.

In order to provide you with an estimate of the potential savings of this proposal, we looked at 1984 data from the Medicare cost reports on capital reimbursement, as well as 1985 data from the American Hospital Association [AHA] on hospital occupancy rates. Based on this data, we estimate that your proposed reduction could lower Medicare depreciation reimbursement by about 7 percent in 1988. This would yield estimated savings of \$200 million in 1988 if no excess beds were retired. If all of the excess beds were retired, estimated savings would be reduced by one-half, or \$100 million. Finally, this estimate assumes that only a minimal number of hospitals would be exempt from the reduction. However, savings would be further lowered if the Secretary chose to make the exemption process less restrictive.

If you have any questions, please call me, or have your staff contact Hinda Rippes Chaikind (266-2820).

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

EDWARD M. GRAMLICH,
Acting Director.

Mr. Speaker, a 1982 study by Arthur D. Little, Inc., showed that for every dollar of capital expenses incurred, hospitals pay \$1.84 over a 10-year period. Under current law, Medicare picks up 40 percent of that \$1.84. These extra costs are passed along—ultimately to health care consumers.

It's time Medicare policy caught up with the market forces that are a major factor in the emptying of our hospitals. I urge my colleagues to join Mr. DONNELLY and myself, the American Hospital Association, and the American Association of Retired Persons in examining this proposal closely as an alternative to the present capital costs payment system.

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, May 20, 1987.

HON. RON WYDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR RON: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your proposal to help solve the problem of unoccupied hospital beds through a method of reimbursement for capital under the Medicare program.

Your concept of providing an incentive for hospitals to bank unused beds for a period of time through Medicare's capital reimbursement structure is indeed innovative and merits further discussion by the hospital field and Congress.

Any approach that provides a positive incentive to close unused hospital beds when occupancy rates fall is of interest to hospitals which must continue to pay debt service on many of these beds. The proposal is of equal interest to patients who pay for hospital services. Our concern about any legislation of this type is that it not become a method for penalizing hospitals for making capital decisions under different rules and regulations.

Capital payments have been the focus of congressional attention for a number of years. These discussions have usually focused on incorporating capital payments in the DRG system. The AHA believes a better approach is possible. Though your bill requires careful study, it should be examined as one alternative to capital payment reform legislation now being discussed.

We look forward to working with you as this legislation progresses.

Sincerely,

JACK W. OWEN,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, the 100th Congress must look at ways to encourage the efficient use of our health care facilities through Medicare. The Better Use of Hospital Facilities Act will do that.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED
PERSONS, LEGISLATION, RESEARCH
AND

Public Policy Division,
Washington, DC, May 21, 1987.

HON. RON WYDEN,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WYDEN: I am writing to state the Association's appreciation for our introduction of The Better Use of Hospitals' Facilities Act today. This legislation identifies issues that are crucial to the administration of Medicare and to the efficient functioning of our health care system.

The Association appreciates your proposals to broaden the debate on payment for capital under Medicare. The debate to date has had a very limited focus on capital payment rates and phase-in dates. The issues raised by capital payment, however, are much broader. Your proposal to encourage hospitals to close unoccupied beds adds important new considerations to the capital debate. AARP would like the opportunity to discuss with you how Medicare capital payments might be partially targeted towards hospitals needing it most.

Again thank you for your leadership on these important issues. AARP looks forward to working with you to address these difficult problems.

Sincerely,

JOHN ROTHER,
Director,

DISTRIBUTE THE SURGEON GENERAL'S REPORT ON AIDS

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday I sent House and Senate offices a dear colleague letter explaining that I am using the congressional franking privilege to distribute the Surgeon General's Report on AIDS to each of the 268,000 households in the Tenth District of Massachusetts. I am taking this opportunity today to ask other Members to consider mailing the Surgeon General's Report to their own constituencies, and to join in a concerted effort to press for a nationwide mailing of the report.

The 13-page report, published last October, is a frank and comprehensive explanation of what AIDS is and how it spreads. It ought to be in every home in the country. If public health officials cannot distribute their own report, I believe we are obliged to do it for them.

I welcome comments on these materials. It is my hope that, after reviewing them, Members will give serious consideration to mailing the report in their own districts and that our joint efforts may help pressure the administration to initiate a national mailing of this crucial report.

Following are editorial comments in response to our mailing from four daily newspapers which cover my congressional district.

[From the New Bedford (MA) Standard
Times, May 20, 1987]

STUDDS PUTS AIDS REPORT WHERE IT
BELONGS: IN THE PUBLIC'S HANDS

For all the talk about educating the public about the risks of AIDS, the federal government hasn't done much about it. Practically nothing, in fact—until now. U.S. Rep. Gerry Studds, D-Mass. broke the impasse this week by mass-mailing copies of the Surgeon General's Report on AIDS to each and every household in his district.

Using his franking privilege and an automatic envelope-stuffing machine, Rep. Studds did what the government should have done months ago. He distributed accurate, readable, and straightforward information in the form of a well-publicized report by this nation's chief medical official. And he's encouraged his colleagues to do the same thing.

The reaction has been far from the uproar that some in the Reagan administration had feared. Just as in England, Sweden, and Switzerland where similar mailings have taken place, people in the United States take serious information seriously. Rep. Studds' action has been widely acclaimed with good reason. It's high time our government leaders acted like leaders when it comes to acquired immune deficiency syndrome.

It's not too surprising that Surgeon General C. Everett Koop's excellent balanced report should have gathered dust for so many months on government shelves. The track record of the federal government regarding AIDS has been extremely poor.

In fact, the surgeon general himself risked political doom by producing this document last year. Dr. Koop, a highly regarded anti-abortion conservative, knew full well that AIDS was a back burner topic at the Reagan White House and there were high-ranking officials there who would have preferred to keep it that way. They thought Dr. Koop would keep his blinders on just as they had.

But Dr. Koop could not ignore that peril and wrote a report that is not just a description of AIDS and how it is transmitted, but a prescription for a sane, clear-headed personal and public policy about it. Perhaps his policy recommendations—in favor of confidentiality and against mandatory, across-the-board AIDS testing—have something to do with the administration's refusal to distribute the report. There is after all, a sharp debate going on in the White House and Dr. Koop's ideas have their detractors including Education Secretary William Bennett.

But while we may debate Dr. Koop's ideas about public policy toward AIDS, that is scarcely reason enough to withhold the vital information contained in this pamphlet.

With all the worry and talk about AIDS, it is incredible that the government would prefer that the public get fragmented and often mistaken information about it wherever they might find it—or, worse not get any information at all because someone thought they might be offended by it.

Rep. Studds mass mailing not only was the right thing to do, it broke the information logjam caused by the federal government's inexplicable near paralysis on the AIDS disaster.

[From the Quincy (MA) Patriot Ledger,
May 20, 1987]

GETTING THE AIDS' MESSAGE OUT

If you live in the 10th Congressional District, you will have access to information about AIDS that ought to be in every home.

Rep. Gerry Studds is mailing copies of a 36-page report from the U.S. surgeon general to every home in his district. It is a step he says the Reagan administration has refused to take. And the information is too important not to get out.

AIDS, acquired immune deficiency syndrome, has no cure. Prevention through education is the most effective way to deal with the spreading epidemic. Accurate data is also the only way to combat the hysteria and misinformation that surrounds this terrible disease.

Surgeon General C. Everett Koop proposed sending the booklet to every home at a cost of \$20 million. The Reagan administration ignored the idea.

So Studds, using free mailing privileges available to all congressmen, is mailing out 226,000 copies. He has also urged his colleagues in the House and Senate to follow his lead.

He wants to generate enough requests so that Congress will require a nationwide mailing.

Arguably, distribution of such sensitive sex-related material should be left to individual states. But many states would likely avoid the issue since the booklet frankly discusses safe-sex practices among the ways of avoiding the disease.

Logically, the federal government should send out the booklet. By not providing the information, Studds charges that the administration has "failed to fulfill its basic responsibilities, in the face of a public health epidemic, to let people know what AIDS is and how it spreads."

If you live in the 10th District, you will find the booklet in your mailbox soon. We suggest you read it and share this information with your family.

You may, of course, choose to toss it in the trash. But you have a choice—one not readily available to other U.S. citizens.

If you live outside Studds district and want a copy, we suggest you call him. Or better, still, call your own congressman and find out why he's not providing the information on AIDS.

[From the Hyannis (MA) Cape Cod Times, May 20, 1987]

THE AWESOME SPREAD OF AIDS

With its male homosexual population estimated at 70,000 and hospitals there coping with 3,500 diagnosed cases of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome, San Francisco is rightly called the AIDS capitol of the United States.

But the crisis in San Francisco may well be a preview of what lies ahead for the rest of the nation in the near future, as AIDS spreads into the heterosexual population and other cases develop from sexual contacts made years before the disease even had a name.

The spread of the thus far incurable disease borders on the incredible. Based on current trends of infection, the Centers for Disease Control estimates that confirmed cases in the United States will increase from the 35,518 known to exist on May 11 to 324,000 by the end of 1991. According to a story in Monday's Wall Street Journal, 1.5 million Americans are presently infected by the AIDS virus. Of that number, between a third and a half will come down with the disease, and will die unless a cure is found.

And medical costs, which are borne by the private sector and state and Federal governments, are expected to increase eightfold by 1991, to \$8.5 billion. Research, blood screening and AIDS-related education costs are predicted to reach another \$2 billion during that same period.

Much of the blame for this startling increase in AIDS can be placed on the paucity of accurate information—until very recently—about the disease, how it spreads, and methods (abstinence, "safe sex," clean needles by which the virus can be avoided).

Just a few years ago, for example, public safety employees of one Cape town were ordered to wear disposable gloves, protective clothing and masks when dealing with an AIDS patient. Other communities have been sued to keep children with AIDS from attending school. Touching an AIDS victim was thought to be a means of becoming infected.

We were, then, about the same level of knowledge about AIDS as were our ancestors who believed that smallpox could be contracted from buried bodies of its victims, and thus ordered special graveyards (there's one on the Lower Cape) for those who died during epidemics of that disease.

Such misconceptions are natural when a population is faced with the inexplicable. As reliable information is developed, panic decreases and common sense returns. This is the role of education, in this case as practiced by government and the medical profession. Education about AIDS, certainly one

of the most fearsome plagues in history is absolutely essential.

And because this is true, the people of this congressional district should feel indebted to Rep. Gerry Studds, who in an unprecedented step this week mass-mailed 268,000 copies of Surgeon General C. Everett Koop's report on AIDS to every household in the district. The small booklet which includes a two page directory of agencies that can offer further information—is an easy read, and is about as close to being required reading as anything in print today. Studds has taken the lead in mailing this information to his constituents. He has urged his congressional colleagues to do the same. They should.

And Congress has another duty, because dealing with AIDS can't be limited to education. That obligation is to join with Senator Kennedy and a group of his colleagues in pressuring the administration to assume the leadership role in the war against a disease that threatens to take hundreds of thousands of lives, instead of floundering in "ideological bickering and paper policies."

A concerned federal effort is called for, including unified research, improved health care, and the development of a vaccine to stop the spread of the epidemic. A bill filed in the Senate calls for the creation of a \$900 million federal program to address the issue. There should be no question in the minds of Congress that this threat to national health must be met with a far greater sense of urgency.

Finally, that sense of urgency must change the American people. Many will have to become less promiscuous; many will have to become more compassionate. The AIDS epidemic was not caused by dollars, and dollars alone will not make it go away.

[From the Boston (MA) Globe, May 21, 1987]

FEUDS THAT DELAY THE AIDS BATTLE (By Ellen Goodman)

Imagine for a minute that you are a citizen of Australia. Population: 16 million. Number of AIDS cases: 442. Turn on the telly down under and you'll be greeted with a government-sponsored ad that shows the Grim Reaper knocking down AIDS victims as if they were pins in a bowling alley.

Imagine next that you are a citizen of Great Britain. Population 55 million. AIDS cases: 750. Just last January, the postman would have dropped you a leaflet from the government. One that warned: "AIDS: Don't Die of Ignorance."

But what if you are a citizen of the United States? Population 243 million. AIDS cases: 35,500. If so, you have seen no federally sponsored television ads and received no national mailings. Indeed, in all likelihood you have heard more from Washington about AIDS feuds than AIDS facts.

In our nation's capital, AIDS and information, health and education, go together about as well as the surgeon general and the secretary of education, C. Everett Koop and William J. Bennett. The people who regard AIDS as a medical disease and those who regard it as a moral dilemma have fought each other and progress to a standstill.

The proposal for a mailing to every household is currently stuck in a holding pattern. The piddling \$1 million that's slotted for national television ads has yet to find its way to an ad agency. The federal government is dealing with AIDS as if the virus was a problem that didn't travel along interstate highways and was none of its business.

It's this lethal national inertia in the face of the most devastating epidemic of the late 20th century that finally prompted one congressman to strike out on his own. Gerry Studds has begun to treat his constituents like foreigners—in the best way. The 268,000 households in his congressional district of Massachusetts are about to receive the first mass mailing of the "Surgeon General's Report on Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome."

Studds' action came out of deep frustration—his own and that of Koop, who authored the report that has been languishing since its fall publication. "When I talked with Koop," said Studds, "he was despairing of ever getting a national mailing out of this administration. Furthermore, if we did get one out of this bunch of ideologies, it would probably be such mush it wouldn't be worth mailing."

"Given the fact that the only defense we have against AIDS at the moment is public education. I can't understand how there is any debate in any national mind about putting the best information in the hands of people. I think its unconscionable, criminally negligent. I get so angry I'm out of adjectives."

Studds asked himself if there wasn't something one member of Congress could do besides dream up new adjectives of outrage. "It occurred to me that we have one tool that is uniquely ours. The franking privilege." It's the way that elected representatives routinely mail newsletters to each "postal patron" in their district, at taxpayers' expense.

The report that each postal patron in the New Bedford and Cape Cod area will get has been alternately described as "frank" or "explicit." It doesn't have zippy copy or catchy phrases. It is not a graphic designer's delight. It is not a reader-grabber. It's unlikely to be as effective as a serious and hip television campaign.

But the report does answer basic questions about AIDS in an intelligible and direct fashion. Is even that likely to be a problem? "Someone asked me," says Studds, "what if it's lying around the house and children read it? Well, I hope they do."

Studds willingness to take on the AIDS-education issue and be out front with this mailing may come in part from his own open identification with the gay community. But he is convinced that others underestimate the public's willingness to accept the "frank" and the "explicit."

His aim is not just to inform one district, but to break the federal logjam. Or portage around it. Studds this week sent a letter to his congressional colleagues asking that they follow suit. If only 50 or 60 of the 435 members do so, the pressure will build for a national mailing.

On June 5, it will be exactly six years since the first report of the disease we now call AIDS. Since then, the surgeon general has said repeatedly that "our only weapon is education." But the administration has spent most of this time fighting about AIDS instead of fighting the disease itself. Now at least some New Englanders will be getting their defense lessons through the mail slot.

WEST FLORIDA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CELEBRATES 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. BILL GRANT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, a 50th anniversary is called "golden" because it is seen as a symbol of something very special, something particularly valued because it has endured.

And the reason things endure is because they prove their worth.

Golden anniversaries are most often associated with weddings; however, this golden anniversary doesn't have anything to do with that subject. It is rather the anniversary of an electric cooperative which brought rural northwestern Floridians into the 20th century. It is a 50th anniversary of electric service for the members of West Florida Electric Cooperative.

In the beginning, long before there was a cooperative called West Florida Electric, another organization existed, directly connected to the Rural Electrification Program. This organization was born on May 11, 1935. It was on this date that President Franklin D. Roosevelt took the first major step in bringing electricity to the rural sections of our country. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 7037 creating the Rural Electrification Administration REA. That order would change the lives of rural people forever. The Government Department, commonly known as REA would be headquartered in Washington, DC, as a branch of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The purpose of the REA was to provide funds for low interest loans so rural people could organize cooperative electric power companies.

Back in the early 1930's the investor-owned power companies would not build lines into the sparsely populated rural areas because it was not profitable and economically feasible to do so. The cry of rural residents for electricity fell on deaf ears. President Roosevelt, however, did listen. On May 30, 1936, Roosevelt signed the Rural Electrification Act. This act established a loan program to finance electric cooperatives willing to provide electric service in rural areas with emphasis on non-profit enterprises. The way was now paved for groups all over the country to form their own electric cooperative utility. A group of 712 dynamic, hard working, rural people in the Graceville, FL, area wasted no time in doing just that. In May of 1937, within 1 year from the time that Roosevelt signed the Rural Electrification Act, these individuals got together and borrowed \$194,000 from REA. This money built the original 262 miles of line. West Florida Electric Cooperative Association was born. It was also during this time that the cooperative incorporated. Most of the original line was erected within a 30-mile radius of Graceville. The town of Marianna was the first headquarters for this new organization.

The cooperative elected its own board of trustees chosen from its ranks. The rural residents that West Florida served in the beginning became "members" of the organization and that term is still used today. These 712

people went out door to door all over the countryside to sign up more members.

The activities of the cooperative during the early years at times is vague because of poor recordkeeping in those days. A considerable amount of information, however, was obtained on the first trustees. These men were willing to go out and collect the names along with various others who helped. They contacted prospective members anytime, anyplace. They did not have a great deal of spare time because most were farmers and the chores were long and strenuous. The men who promoted this dream of electricity sometimes left jobs undone or shifted the responsibility to another family member.

The membership fee was set at \$5. In the 1930's many banks had closed, and many people had lost their money and land. This caused them to be skeptical of new ventures, and some were very much opposed to paying a membership fee for something they would have to wait a year or perhaps longer to receive. Rural people were under great economic strain and in some cases the men collecting the fee had to loan the prospective member the money.

It was a tremendous undertaking, and at times they had so little success, it became very discouraging. They created enough interest to call a special meeting which was held at the old Jackson County Courthouse in Marianna. The project was explained to those who attended and the people who came were encouraged to help in collecting fees. REA required that a certain number of people be signed up for service. After the quota was reached, the next step was the acquisition of right-of-ways. The organizers ran into all kinds of opposition on where the lines and poles would go. A lot of time was lost because of this. However, the great dream of electricity in the country became an obsession with the organizers and they worked even harder than before. In some instances the lines went around farms because the people would not grant right-of-way across their land.

After several months of hard work their dream came true. In the spring of 1939 some members began receiving electricity. It was a day they would never forget. The cooperative at this time began to have an annual meeting. Trustees were elected and a meal was served. The cooperatives original trustees in the late 1930's were a strong-willed, hearty bunch. They all came from different backgrounds but each one had a common goal of bringing electricity to the country. It is important to mention these individuals because they were all pioneers, looking for a better life for everyone. The original board trustees were: Mr. A.J. Crutchfield, president; Mr. Andrew Andresen, vice president; Mr. William Powell, secretary; Mr. Wendell Spence, Mr. A.L. Williams, Mr. Lee Mathews, and Mr. W.H. Leonard.

The cooperative has come a long way since the early days of these pioneers. In the present as of March 1987 the cooperative has over 14,000 members with 21,400 meters in place. There are over 3,700 miles of energized line in the counties of Calhoun, Holmes, Jackson, and Washington. The cooperative now has substations in Alford, Altha, Bascom, Bonifay, Campbellton, Chipley, Dellwood, Gra-

ceville, Grand Ridge, Pittman, and Westville FL. The organization is governed by nine board trustees representing nine districts. The office locations are in Bonifay, Graceville, and Sneads. The average number of members per mile of line is 4.5. The majority of the power is supplied by Alabama Electric Cooperative. Power also comes from Gulf Power and the Southeastern Power Administration. The number of employees now total 98, with a payroll of over \$2 million a year. West Florida has 55 vehicles which travel an average of 58,000 miles per month. The total value of the utility plant is over \$21 million. The annual meeting date is always the second Saturday in October.

What is on the horizon for this people-oriented organization? Plenty. The printing shop offers so much for the future. In addition to doing all the in-house printing the cooperative hopes to do printing tasks for many of the local organizations in the area.

The telecommunications project, when in place, will offer a wide assortment of TV programs to co-op members who have satellite dishes. This project will afford rural people the same benefits that city dwellers have enjoyed. The satellite system will give the co-op the capability to do a wide variety of things involved with rural electric affairs. The possibilities are endless.

The construction of the new Sneads District Office should be finished by the end of 1987. This will mean better service for the members in that area.

West Florida Electric could play a big part in a joint venture with the five local counties in our area of northwest Florida. The project involves the possibility of building a garbage waste incinerator.

Economic development is a top priority for the cooperative in the future. There are several possible industries on the table. The cooperative intends to be more aggressive in helping locate more industry in our area.

The cooperative plans to make its good employees even better through course instruction and hands-on training. A well-educated employee will do a better job and help to provide the best service for the members.

These are but a few of the plans West Florida Electric is working on for the future.

The cooperative has come a long way since its inception in 1937. West Florida Electric must never forget its heritage and history. The members and employees, young and old alike, must always remember the courage, vision, and hard work of those 712 individuals who started the cooperative. Because of them electricity came to many rural people, and their lives as well as the lives of future generations were changed forever.

It is important that we recognize the trustees presently serving on the West Florida board. These men have the awesome responsibility of governing West Florida Electric Cooperative now and in the years to come. The trustees include:

William Ben Floyd, Jr., President, District 3; Woodrow W. Paul, Vice President, District 8; Roy H. Young District 2; Billy Williams, Sec. Treasury, District 4; Henry Prescott, District 9; Amos H. Morris, District 5; Elbert Franklin, Dis-

trict 7; Lamar Shelton, District 1; and John E. Worthington, District 6.

The Trustees listed above are committed to making West Florida Electric a better organization for the members and employees.

WELFARE REFORM

HON. JOHN G. ROWLAND

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, at some point in the near future, the House will take up the issue of welfare reform.

When this happens, I believe we should give credit where credit is due—and that is to President Reagan for singlehandedly bringing this important issue to the fore of public debate.

I also believe that the House should consider any welfare reform measures in the context of how effective they will be in reducing dependence on the system by recipients. While there are a number of elements to welfare reform such as demonstration projects and child support, my personal belief is that the most important issue relates to work and education programs for recipients in the Aid to Families With Dependent Children [AFDC] Program.

There are a number of proposals floating around which relate to this issue. Specifically, we have the major Democratic vehicle for welfare reform—H.R. 1720, the Family Welfare Reform Act of 1987—as well as a proposal put forth by the Ways and Means Committee Republicans—H.R. 1985, the AFDC Employment and Training Act of 1987.

In this same area, I have introduced H.R. 1880, the Greater Opportunities Through Work Act of 1987 [GROW], which was developed by the Reagan administration and the Department of Health and Human Services.

GROW is very simple. State welfare agencies would be required to implement work and education programs for AFDC recipients who are deemed to be able to participate in such activities. Special intensive emphasis is placed on those recipients who traditionally have a tendency to become long-term dependent such as teenage mothers.

Under GROW State welfare agencies would be required to have 60 percent of the nonexempt AFDC caseload enrolled in job training, education or job readiness programs within 5 years. For the traditionally long-term dependent—teen mothers—the minimum participation levels are significantly higher—80 percent—and would generally equate to a requirement that the teenage parent be enrolled in school.

To facilitate the participation of AFDC recipients in the work or education programs, I would point out that the needed support services like day care and transportation must be provided for by State welfare agencies. So, the usual rhetoric and hoopla about how recipients aren't able to participate in activities and gain skills to move off welfare, doesn't apply here.

Quite frankly, if welfare reform means setting up a new system which emphasizes how welfare recipients can become self sufficient

and self reliant, then GROW is pure welfare reform.

In contrast, the Democratic welfare proposal—H.R. 1720—is more fraud than reform. Under that bill, work and education programs for AFDC recipients are doomed to fail given the fact that the legislation exempts from participation the very categories of AFDC recipients who should be required to participate. Add to this the fact that no standards or goals are placed on State welfare agencies to make these programs work, the Democratic AFDC proposal—nicknamed Network—is more net than work.

What is worse, however, are the smoke and mirrors which have been employed by the advocates of H.R. 1720. It should be noted that taken together, all of the mandated benefit increases and program expansions in the bill were estimated originally by the Congressional Budget Office to cost \$12 billion over 5 years.

Now, the bill is purported to cost only \$5 billion. How did this happen? It's very simple. Supporters of H.R. 1720 simply pushed back the initial effective dates of the various benefit increases so that the real costs would not be reflected. I would suggest that those who favor the type of welfare expansions as are embodied in H.R. 1720 should be upfront about its true impact on the budget deficit.

Recently, the Department of Health and Human Services outlined the administration's position on the democratic proposal and I will submit the letter at this point in the RECORD.

THE SECRETARY OF
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 15, 1987.

Hon. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is pending before your Committee H.R. 1720, as amended by the Subcommittee on Public Assistance, a bill entitled the "Family Welfare Reform Act of 1987," on which the Department would like to express its views. In addition to the following general comments, we have enclosed a section-by-section summary and analysis of the bill.

I wrote to you on April 2 to express our concerns about H.R. 1720 as introduced. Although the bill's costs appear to have been reduced substantially in this amended version, many of the most costly provisions merely have been deferred to later years. These unreasonably high costs are particularly troublesome because the bill will greatly increase welfare dependency while failing to help families become independent of welfare.

We note that there have been a number of improvements in the bill since our earlier comments—such as revoking changes to the 100-hour rule and making mothers with children ages three to five subject to participation requirements in NETWORK. However, these changes fall short of producing a cost-effective welfare reform program which will result in decreased welfare dependency.

The two areas of greatest concern continue to be the broad changes in the standards for treating eligibility and income and the design of the National Education, Training and Work program (NETWORK). The establishment of minimum benefit levels, provision of more generous income disregards, mandating of AFDC Unemployed Parent (UP) program, and extension of substantial services to former recipients will in greatly

expand benefits, primarily for those with other sources of income while limiting the States' ability to target their resources to those most in need.

Under NETWORK, the extensive exemptions from participation, optional treatment of teen parents, and heightened emphasis on voluntary participation, result in a work program which fails to establish a firm commitment to serving a large number of teen parents and other potential long-term recipients—those for whom participation is most critical. Even worse, requiring States to serve volunteers first whenever there are insufficient funds to provide work and training opportunities for their entire eligible population virtually precludes States from focusing on the potential long-term recipient even though they judge it best for their welfare population. Finally, numerous revisions made by the Subcommittee, such as the restrictions on assignments to work experience programs and the required use of a burdensome conciliatory process, further constrain State flexibility to design programs which best reflect their economic situation and the needs of their welfare population.

With respect to the child support provisions in the bill, we support the broad policy objectives pertaining to mandatory guidelines and performance standards for States. However, we object to the specifics of these provisions because they will not accomplish our common goals effectively. Current Department efforts in setting performance standards are more likely to result in improved State efforts.

In closing, we reiterate our position that the Administration's approach to welfare reform is more effective and more prudent. The Low-Income Opportunity Improvement Act, introduced as H.R. 1288, would encourage State-sponsored and community-based demonstration projects to test innovative welfare reform approaches. Our innovative work and education program for welfare recipients, known as Greater Opportunities through Work (H.R. 1880) and a year-round program for youth under the Job Training Partnership Act (H.R. 1155), would better ensure that potential long-term welfare recipients participate in activities leading to economic self-sufficiency. Because of these advantages, we recommend their enactment, and we oppose adoption of H.R. 1720.

The President has clearly stated his strong commitment to welfare reform legislation that includes authority for State and community based demonstrations to test new approaches to the welfare system. We would recommend against the enactment of any new legislation that does not also authorize broad-based experiments, as would be allowed under H.R. 1288.

We are advised by the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report and that enactment of H.R. 1720 would not be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

Acting Secretary.

ANTITERRORISM SANCTIONS ACT OF 1987

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill amends 15 U.S.C. 1281 and 1282, approved September 13, 1961, which prohibits the destruction or injury or certain property moving in interstate or foreign commerce.

Section a: Any nation that is listed by the State Department, under provisions of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as a country that repeatedly provides support for international terrorism will be subject to the following actions:

First. Termination, withdrawal, or suspension of any treaty which relates to the most-favored-nation trade status;

Second. The products of that country will be subject to the high rates set forth in column 2 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States;

Third. Nonapplication of the Generalized System of Preferences on imports;

Fourth. Nonapplication of the provisions of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act;

Fifth. Nonapplication of the provisions of the International Travel and Tourism Act of 1961, instructing the Secretary of Commerce to take action to promote tourism and travel.

Section b: The President may waive all or part of these provisions if the President determines that it is in the national interest. The waiver will take effect 30 days after the President submits written notice of this waiver to Congress.

The complete text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2489

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Anti-Terrorism Sanctions Act of 1987".

SEC. 2. The Act entitled "An Act to prohibit the destruction of, or injury to, certain property moving in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes", approved September 13, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 1281 and 1282), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, with respect to any foreign country while it is listed pursuant to section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 as a country that repeatedly provides support for international terrorism—

"(1) the President shall terminate, withdraw, or suspend any portion of any trade agreement or treaty that relates to the provision of nondiscriminatory (most-favored-nation) trade treatment to such country;

"(2) such country shall be denied nondiscriminatory (most-favored-nation) trade treatment by the United States and the products of such country shall be subject to the rates and duty set forth in column number 2 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States;

"(3) the provisions of title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461, et seq.) shall not apply with respect to the products of such country;

"(4) the provisions of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701, et seq.) shall not apply with respect to the

products of such country, during the period in which such identification is in effect; and

"(5) the Secretary of Commerce may not consult with the government of that country under section 3 (a)(9) of the international Travel Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2123(a)(9)) regarding international travel and tourism.

"(b)(1) The President may waive all, or any portion of, the provisions of subsection (a) with respect to any foreign country if the President determines that such a waiver would be in the best interests of the United States. The President shall submit to the Congress written notice of any waiver granted under this paragraph.

"(2) Any waiver granted under paragraph (1) may be revoked by the President at any time.

"(3)(A) Any waiver granted under paragraph (1) shall take effect only after the close of the thirty-day period that begins on the date on which the President submits to the Congress written notice of such waiver.

"(B) The following days shall be excluded in determining the thirty-day period described in subparagraph (A)—

"(i) the days on which either House of Congress is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain or an adjournment of the Congress sine die; and

"(ii) any Saturday and Sunday, not excluded under clause (i) when either House of Congress is not in session."

THE PARENTAL ASSISTANCE FOR TUITION INVESTMENT ACT OF 1987

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by a bipartisan group of my colleagues in introducing the Parental Assistance for Tuition Investment Act of 1987. This bill creates a national program to enable parents to invest in a fund that would pay a significant portion of the future tuition and fees and other related educational costs of attendance at a postsecondary institution. This national program is not affected by State boundaries. Thus, students may apply to any postsecondary educational institution in the country; it affords complete portability. Further, since the many State plans currently being developed may provide different levels of tax treatment or educational coverage, this national plan will ensure that all citizens are treated the same with respect to the tax status of their investment, and also this national plan will encourage American families to save more.

This legislation authorizes the establishment of the national postsecondary education trust as a public body, governed by a board of five postsecondary representatives and five members from the general public, with the Secretaries of Education and of the Treasury serving as ex officio.

The board is responsible for holding the funds, establishing necessary policy and procedures for operating the trust, paying money directly to postsecondary institutions, collecting necessary fees for its operation, imposing reasonable time limits on use of tuition bene-

fits, and for other related administration matters.

This legislation also authorizes the establishment of the advance tuition payment fund into which are deposited payments received from purchasers on behalf of qualified beneficiaries.

The Secretary of the Treasury acts as managing trustee and is charged with investing the moneys in the fund in either interest bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States. Interest earned on the fund's investments becomes a part of the fund.

A parent may elect to participate by entering into an agreement with the trust. The contents of this agreement will determine the amount of money to be periodically invested in the Trust on behalf of a child.

Upon acceptance by an eligible postsecondary educational institution of an eligible beneficiary, and upon receipt of appropriate documentation, the trust will forward money to that institution to pay as much of the eligible educational costs as is allowed by the terms of the agreement.

Such agreements may be terminated and the moneys returned if the qualified beneficiary, first, dies, second, certifies to the trust upon reaching the age of majority that he or she has decided not to attend a postsecondary institution, or third, certifies that he or she has completed as much of the course of postsecondary education as he or she intends but has not used up all the accrued tuition benefits. The trust may identify other circumstances that warrant a refund. In all cases of such termination, the returned funds are treated as taxable income. Also, in all cases except termination due to death, a 10-percent penalty is added.

This legislation authorizes a "such sums" appropriation to provide for the costs of setting up and operating the trust until such time as it becomes self-supporting. These costs are difficult to predict and will likely decline as the number of participants increases.

The legislation provides for favorable tax treatment of funds invested in the trust. Payments of up to \$2,000 per year per beneficiary will be treated as a deduction from income; the maximum amount for all taxable years is \$48,000 per eligible beneficiary. However, in the case of certain individuals with high levels of adjusted gross income—\$100,000 for an unmarried individual—this tax benefit shall be reduced by 10 percent of the excess amount. Also, the interest earned on this investment will be tax free as long as the terms of the agreement are followed.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is needed; it will provide a useful supplement to our existing student aid programs. All of us are aware of the problems our students face when they leave college with high debt. This debt alters their career goals and their ability to plan for a family of their own; it also likely affects the economy in a negative way since funds tied up in student loan repayment will not be available for other purposes.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this legislation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MINIMUM HEALTH BENEFITS FOR ALL WORKERS ACT OF 1987

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. MURPHY today in introducing legislation that will at long last assure that nearly every American worker will have health insurance. We developed this bill jointly with Senator KENNEDY, who is introducing an identical companion bill in the other body. Senator KENNEDY deserves our gratitude for his leadership and dedication in developing this legislation.

The past 40-odd years have been a time of great improvements in health care coverage. The cornerstone of that expansion has been the private sector providing health insurance related to employment. This approach has been very successful. Collective bargaining agreements and tax incentives have led many employers to offer excellent health insurance packages to their workers.

Unfortunately, many people have been left uncovered even as benefits for most workers have expanded.

We always knew that two large groups would be left out when health insurance was linked to employment—persons 65 and over, and people unable to work because they had disabilities or were single parents with small children. The Federal Government recognized this problem over 20 years ago, and enacted Medicare and Medicaid. Neither program has been perfect, but both have provided millions of people with needed health care.

Now we are increasingly aware that there is a rapidly growing number of other people who have no health insurance—37 million by most recent estimates. What comes as an unhappy surprise is how many of these are people with jobs, and their families.

Nearly two out of every three people without health insurance are from families where the head of the household is employed.

It turns out that health insurance coverage is to some extent a matter of luck. If you're fortunate enough to work for a large, unionized, manufacturing firm, you're also likely to have good health insurance coverage. But if you work just as hard and have just as many responsibilities, but happen to work for a smaller company you are more likely to have no insurance.

Being without health insurance is a very serious matter these days. When people without insurance get sick, they get to a doctor and get into a hospital barely half as often as people with insurance. And worst of all, they are more likely to get sick in the first place and then put off seeking care until their illness gets serious.

This situation is intolerable. It is bad health policy and equally bad economic policy. Unless the Congress acts, more and more people will find themselves without adequate health insurance.

The legislation that we are introducing today will go a long way toward correcting these in-

equities. This legislation builds upon our strong private sector tradition of employment-related insurance.

Nearly all workers will be guaranteed basic health insurance coverage for themselves and their families. Employees and employers will share the costs. The most important preventive services—prenatal and well-baby care—will be fully covered. And every worker and family member will be protected against the costs of catastrophic illness.

Even under this proposal, not every American will yet have adequate health insurance. Some people will still have to be incorporated into federally funded programs, and we will continue our efforts to see that they have access to appropriate health care.

This bill has many important features, but several provisions will need to be developed further as it is considered in this Congress. Because we sought to define a minimum, affordable package, not every needed health service is required to be provided in the basic plan. In particular, mental health services and outpatient care by professionals other than physicians are not mandated. While such services are very likely to be incorporated into many plans through the actuarial equivalence option, we will nevertheless want to see what can be done about adding them to the basic package as we consider this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a modest proposal. But, it is a critically important step for the country to take. Its time has long since come. I ask all my colleagues to join with us to assure that all workers and their families will finally be confident that they are covered for medical care when they need it.

HONORING OUR NATION'S VETERANS

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, "let no ravages of time testify to coming generations that we have forgotten as a people the cost of a free and independent nation." In proclaiming May 30, 1868, as a time for veterans of the Civil War to salute their fallen comrades, Gen. John A. Logan, the commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, delivered these remarks. Today, these words seem no less appropriate, even in a country that is not at war.

Out of respect to the more than 1.1 million Americans who died while wearing the uniforms of the armed services of the United States and the 14 million veterans who died after military service, it is fitting that we honor these fallen Americans. There is a special honor, a special meaning, and a special sacrifice associated with those who wear their country's uniform.

Earlier this week, a missile or missiles fired by an Iraqi F-1 Mirage fighter-bomber slammed into the U.S.S. *Stark*, a frigate patrolling in international waters in the Persian Gulf. The ensuing devastation and resulting loss of life reinforce particularly the point about sacrifice. An unfortunate event, thou-

sands of miles from our shores, in the Persian Gulf, clearly demonstrates that defending our Nation's freedoms and interests makes perpetual demands on American lives.

There is no evidence that this is anything but an "accident," and this terrible calamity occurred during "peacetime." However, no one should ever forget that defending our freedom, protecting our liberties, and safeguarding our values does not permit those wearing our Nation's uniform to consider themselves at peace or enable them to relax their vigilance.

Normally, service in the "peacetime" Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force does not include the most serious risks taken for granted when our Armed Forces are engaged directly in combat. Nonetheless, all too clearly the tragedy that suddenly and violently struck the *Stark* illustrates that for our Nation's servicemen and servicewomen danger is never too far removed.

On Memorial Day, as we commemorate and honor our Nation's fallen, let us resolve to help, to comfort, to uplift the living. The millions of living veterans are no less deserving than our fallen heroes of the respect and gratitude of their countrymen.

Thus, I have worked for several years in the successful drive for funding to construct a modern Veterans' Administration [VA] hospital in downtown Baltimore. This is a facility needed to serve the burgeoning population of veterans in the State of Maryland. I eagerly await the ground breaking ceremony to be held on June 22 at the site of the future Baltimore VA hospital. In addition to offering first-rate services, the hospital will provide an outstanding opportunity for teaching and practical instruction because of its affiliation with the University of Maryland School of Medicine. Last year, the Congress provided \$101.2 million to begin construction of the hospital. I will continue my efforts through the House Committee on Appropriations to ensure that the ground breaking is only just one more milestone toward the completion of this project.

Further, I am pleased that the House of Representatives, as part of a supplemental appropriation for fiscal 1987, has approved \$20 million for the aid of homeless veterans. If this measure is approved by the Senate and signed by the President, the money will be used to establish up to 700 additional domiciliary beds at VA medical centers located in large urban areas across the country, including Little Rock, AR; Palo Alto, CA; Denver, CO; Bronx, Brooklyn, and Manhattan, NY; Cleveland, OH; Pittsburgh, PA; and Tacoma, WA. Unfortunately and tragically, in some areas of this country, veterans comprise up to one-third of the homeless population. Many are the victims of mental illness or substance abuse.

At the same time, let us never forget the fallen—the marines who sought to restore a semblance of peace and stability to embattled Beirut; the airmen who plucked fleeing civilians from the rooftops of Saigon and from the storm-tossed and pirate-infested seas of Southeast Asia; the infantrymen who fought, often hand-to-hand and without ammunition, along the frozen perimeter of the Chosin Reservoir; the cavalymen who raised the siege of

the encircled American garrison at Bastogne, who spearheaded the Allied advance against the Siegfried Line, and who liberated the doomed of the concentration camps; and the "doughboys" who led the Allied advance at Chateau-Thierry and Belleau Wood and ended the hopeless, bloody deadlock along trench-crossed France. In honoring our Nation's war dead, we can and must remember back through the more than 200 years of our history to the rag-clad and starving men of the Continental Line who emerged from the hardships of winter at Valley Forge to defend American independence.

Mr. Speaker, let us honor the dead by helping the living. On this Memorial Day, let us pledge to continue working for strong and effective programs for veterans and their dependents. Continuing to care for the living is among the best ways for a thankful country to demonstrate its gratitude to the sailors lost aboard the *Stark*.

INTRODUCING THE "SCHOOL LUNCH, CHILD NUTRITION, AND OLDER AMERICANS COMMODITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1987"

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today, on behalf of myself and Mr. GOODLING, my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, a bill entitled "School Lunch, Child Nutrition, and Older Americans Commodity Improvement Act of 1987".

Mr. Speaker, in one form or another, the U.S. Government has been distributing agriculture commodities and their products, including farm surplus items, to needy families, institutions, schools and other eligible recipients since 1935. Since 1946, when the National School Lunch Program was enacted, donations of commodities of all kinds have gone to the school lunch, and later the school breakfast programs, as well as to other eligible child care and older Americans programs.

Currently, the National School Lunch Program receives two forms of Federal support from the U.S. Department of Agriculture: First, cash subsidies; and second, donated agricultural commodities purchased under price support and surplus removal legislation. During fiscal year 1985, schools in the NSLP served 3.9 billion meals, received Federal cash support of \$2.2 billion, and received commodities donated and valued at \$796 million.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that for more than 50 years the Government has been interested in and concerned about the nutritional well-being of needy people in this country, and particularly its children and its older Americans, who are at higher risk than others.

As the ranking majority member of the authorizing Committee on Education and Labor, I have had occasion to hear, more often than I have liked to over the years, testimony to the effect that all is not well with USDA's distribution program for entitlement and bonus commodities.

As my colleagues know, a few years ago there were scandals across the country having to do with stale, spoiled and contaminated commodity food products in warehouse facilities serving the school lunch and breakfast programs. We have heard severe criticism over the past several years due to the expenses involved in transporting, storing, handling and processing donated commodities into usable products, that the cost of donated foods may actually be higher than the cost of comparable, locally acquired products; that donated foods are difficult to use in preparing meals and increase the cost of operating a food service program; that uncertainty of delivery dates and bunching of deliveries during the school year overloads storage capacity, increases costs and makes menu planning difficult; that donated foods are often packaged in ways that are difficult to use by schools and include items that children simply will not eat, resulting in plate-waste; that foods often arrive in damaged condition; that serving donated commodities lowers student participation and increases waste; that current regulations impose excessive burdens on school districts; and that the agricultural support provided to the American farmer by the commodity program might be achieved by other systems that are better for schools and children.

Such complaints have often led to various proposals for program improvements ranging from small incremental changes to a major overhaul of the existing program.

Mr. Speaker, I will not go into complete detail on the difference of opinion, complaints or recommendations for improvements to the commodity program the Education and Labor Committee has received over the years. If I may, I will just reiterate recommendations made most recently.

About 2 years ago, the U.S. Department of Agriculture was sent a list of 32 ways in which their commodity distribution could be improved to serve these programs better. The list was compiled by a joint task force comprised of representatives of the American School Food Service Association [ASFSFA] and the Association of National Frozen Food Products [NFFA], the latter being an association involved in processing bulk commodities, such as 100 pounds of frozen hamburgers or other forms of beef, into processed, easily used end products. I wholeheartedly supported the Task Force's action to join together in an effort to encourage and assist the USDA in making needed improvements in its commodity distribution program so that schools and other institutions could continue to enjoy the assistance available through commodity donations, but in a manner that was safe, timely, more efficient, and less costly for recipient agencies. It was our belief that within the 2-year period after USDA received the task force's recommendations, that significant progress would have been made in improving the system, and that such progress would be tangible, easily recognized, and evaluated. Regrettably, such has not been the case.

Mr. Speaker, after 50 years of being in the business of distributing commodities to needy families/children, and older Americans through the various feeding programs it administers, the USDA recently advised the joint task force representatives—but not the Con-

gress—that it now finds it does not have, and never did have, a statutory base for its commodity distribution program.

What a surprise it is to learn that USDA believes it might have had implicit authority to distribute commodities to the various programs over the past several decades, it now believes that before it can even begin to make administrative improvements in its commodity distribution program, it would require explicit statutory authority to do so.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what the bill we introduce today will provide. It will give explicit authority to the USDA to improve its commodity distribution program that it has had 50 years to perfect. Not only does this bill give the statutory base that USDA desires and claims to need, it also has enforcement mechanisms in it to require the USDA to implement and begin to operate under these new authorities within specific time frames designed to improve the program quickly and effectively. We do not have another 50 years for USDA to do its job, and do it well, in the service of the children, adults and families, the Congress intends to benefit from commodity distribution programs.

The bill we introduce today contains some other features which we are pleased to offer. Briefly, they include: First, a "Buy America" requirement that all recipient agencies use and purchase only food products produced or manufactured in the United States; second, that the Secretary take into consideration the sizes and forms of packaged commodity and noncommodity foods so that recipients receive commodities in quantities and in forms readily usable to them; third, that the USDA consider recipient ability to store and/or transport commodities received; fourth, that the Secretary provide recipes consistent with dietary guidelines published by USDA and HHS to recipient agencies; fifth, that the Secretary provide to recipient agencies commodity specifications—size/quantity—including nutrient content information with respect to fat, salt, and sugar content of foods USDA intends to purchase for their use; sixth, that the Secretary monitor the State distribution agencies and establish procedures for replacing stale, spoiled or contaminated commodities delivered to recipients; seventh, that the Secretary constantly monitor the condition of commodities stored by or for the Secretary and intended for donation to recipients as to its wholesomeness and fitness for human consumption; eighth, that the Secretary must deliver State orders for commodities within 90 days of the order date—unless a longer period is requested by the State; ninth, that State distribution agencies utilize normal channels of trade for warehousing and distributing commodities, and that systems used will be most cost effective; tenth, that national field testing of products take place to assure that processed bulk commodities are acceptable to recipient agencies; and eleventh, that the USDA survey recipient agencies to determine their preference for package sizes, forms, and quantities of noncommodity foods they use in preparing and delivering meals.

All of these improvements required of USDA have time-frames imposed, by which times the USDA must have implemented, or

must have issued regulations to implement, the program improvements.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill requires that within 12 months after enactment, that local recipient agencies be given the option of using the commodity-letter-of-credit method of delivering school lunches and breakfasts, older Americans' meals, and child care nutrition services. The commodity letter of credit, which has been tested through a congressionally sponsored pilot project since 1981, means a system that provides recipient agencies with letters of credit equivalent to the USDA-assigned value of the donated commodities to which they are entitled. The letters of credit must be spent on the same type of domestically produced commodities that are donated by USDA under the commodity donation program. Further, Mr. Speaker, the letters of credit, while in lieu of entitlement commodities, does not disrupt the USDA program of donating bonus of surplus commodities such as milk, cheese, butter, honey, and other products as they become available under farm surplus removal conditions. Letters of credit may be used to purchase the commodity locally, and in a form most suitable to the recipient agency's needs.

Mr. Speaker, this bill not only gives specific direction to the USDA for improving the commodity distribution program serving the school lunch, breakfast, child care, and Older Americans Act nutrition programs, it also contains enforcement mechanisms to assure that the improvements called for are carried out quickly, efficiently and effectively. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this measure and to assist in facilitating its enactment into law.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES CONTINUE IN SOVIET UNION

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last month we learned with great relief that Anatoly Koryagin, a man of great courage and principle, was recently allowed to leave the Soviet Union. For standing up for his belief that psychiatry should not be abused for political ends, Koryagin suffered through 6 brutal years in the Soviet gulag.

But while Koryagin is now out of the Soviet Union, the political abuse of psychiatry sadly continues. This is precisely the point made in a chilling column written for the Miami Herald by my good friend and colleague, STENY H. HOYER.

In this article, Mr. HOYER describes how psychiatric punishment, which includes crippling drug treatments, has been used to stifle political dissent and crush the will of any political opposition. As he points out, "the Soviet Union stands alone in its widespread use of psychiatry as a tool of political repression." For reform to be meaningful in the Soviet Union, he writes, it must include an end to this terrible practice. As Mr. HOYER puts it, "A medical science meant to open the mind should not be used to close it."

As we know, Mr. HOYER serves as Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe—the Helsinki Commission. Under his Chairmanship the Commission has maintained its strong and deep commitment to human rights.

I commend this article to my colleagues, and reprint it in full for the RECORD.

[From the Miami Herald, Apr. 25, 1987]

SCARS OF SOVIET PSYCHIATRIC ABUSE

(By Steny H. Hoyer)

Soviet psychiatrist Anatoly Koryagin has finally been allowed this month to leave the Soviet Union after six years in prison, to the great relief of the human-rights community. But his release should not divert attention from the cause that made him a dissident in the first place: the continuing Soviet abuse of psychiatry for political purposes. Few things better reveal the underside of the new Soviet spirit of "openness."

Among the nations of the world, the Soviet Union stands alone in its wide-spread use of psychiatry as a tool of political repression. Experts believe that there are at least 1,000 political prisoners forcibly confined to Soviet psychiatric hospitals. Over 100 cases have been documented by the West. The recent well-publicized release of 140 dissidents included very few psychiatric inmates.

The political abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union has little to do with mental illness. Former patients who have been examined by Western psychiatrists are uniformly declared sane. The problem is their politics, or what one Soviet psychiatrist called their "incorrect attitude toward Soviet authority."

In an article written before his 1981 arrest, Koryagin noted that dissidents are presented with a bleak alternative: renounce their views and activities, or face internment in a psychiatric hospital. The KGB, he added, will often influence the diagnosis and the terms of confinement.

KORYAGIN'S RELEASE A PAINFUL REMINDER

As the ultimate weapon of a system bent on conformity, psychiatric incarceration enables the Kremlin to silence and demoralize opponents without risking the potential embarrassment of a political trial. Thus the Soviets can better hide the scope of repression—particularly useful in this time of "openness." As the head of Moscow's notorious Serbsky Institute of Forensic Psychiatry once put it, "What do we need political trials for if we have psychiatric hospitals?"

To justify their actions, Soviet psychiatrists have created a broad category of "socially dangerous acts" that could land a dissident in a psychiatric hospital. In most nations, individuals can be forcibly confined only after they are shown to be physically dangerous to themselves or others. Not so in the Soviet Union.

Examples of punishable acts include independent trade-union activity, religious activism, writing complaints to government authorities, or trying to emigrate from the Soviet Union. Patients are diagnosed as suffering from "reformist delusions" or "nervous exhaustion brought on by the search for justice." In short, Soviet citizens are committed for taking part in activities that we in the West simply take for granted.

Once forced into the psychiatric system, the prisoner faces a protracted nightmare, sometimes lasting for years. Untrained personnel administer drugs that cause severe, crippling side effects. A favorite is Sulfazin, which causes raging fevers, painful joint in-

flammations, and high blood pressure—"like a drill boring into your body," said a former victim.

Other "treatments" include prolonged solitary confinement, immobilizing straps, needless spinal punctures, or insulin-shock therapy to induce hypoglycemic comas. Those considered "especially dangerous" have been sent to prison hospitals for the criminally insane, where they are often subjected to beatings by ordinary criminals working off their probation terms.

To avoid such punishments, dissidents are told they must renounce their political or religious views. But even after recantations they are never fully trusted or forgiven. Once released, all bear a stigma—and many are placed on a psychiatric register as mentally unstable, which frequently results in job discrimination and other legal restraints. Nor is it a coincidence that former victims are often warned to "voluntarily" commit themselves before international conferences, state visits, or events such as the 1980 Moscow Olympics.

In 1983 the Soviet psychiatric union withdrew from the World Psychiatric Association rather than face its expected expulsion. Since then, little has changed except for fewer internments in prison hospitals. In his recent attempts to restructure Soviet society, General Secretary Gorbachev seems to be purging many professional organizations. But he has yet to tackle the leaders of the psychiatric union, many of whom are implicated in the abuse issue.

We in the West should make it clear that meaningful reform in the Soviet Union must include measures to prevent psychiatric abuse and punish its perpetrators. A medical science meant to open the mind should not be used to close it.

THE FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN THE SOVIETS AND INDIA

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call my colleagues' attention to an article commemorating diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and India which appeared in the Soviet Communist Party paper Pravda. This article extols the close friendship between these two countries over the last 40 years. The legacy of Mahatma Gandhi has many Americans believing that India is a natural friend of the United States and the Western democracies. To the contrary, India, the world's largest democracy, has the closest of relationships with the world's most notorious Communist dictatorship.

At a time when we are increasingly asking who our friends are in this region, I think it is critical to note the history of closeness between India and the Soviet Union. I would especially draw my colleagues' attention to the 1971 friendship agreement between the two countries. Although this treaty contains the word "peace" in its title, this document is the basis for extensive military cooperation in southwest Asia. This treaty enabled India to be the first recipient of the Soviet Mig 29 high-performance jet fighter outside the Warsaw Pact. This treaty has also served to deter

India from condemning the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. In spite of the havoc and death created by the Soviets' 7-year-old invasion, the Indian Government has stood alone in the region by refusing to condemn this war of aggression.

Again, I urge my colleagues to take note of the following Pravda article and keep it in mind as we debate the issues of U.S. foreign policy in southwest Asia.

[From Pravda, Apr. 13, 1987]

OUR FRIEND INDIA

Diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and India were established 40 years ago. Here is a story about this and several other truly landmark events in the chronicle of friendship between the two great peoples.

SOURCES

In Paris on September 28, 1946, Indian diplomat and political figure Krishna Menon presented USSR Foreign Affairs Minister V.M. Molotov with a letter from J. Nehru. The letter expressed India's desire to "exchange diplomatic and other representatives with the USSR." In a letter of response three days later, the Soviet side reported its agreement, and on April 13, 1947 an official announcement was made regarding the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and India.

This happened back before India became fully independent. The colonizers were maneuvering at the time. In March of 1946, the government of Great Britain announced that it had granted India the status of a dominion, and in August an interim government was formed, in which Jawaharlal Nehru became vice premier, while the vice regent remained as head of the government. At this stage, the establishment of diplomatic relations with our country, which supported full sovereignty for India, undoubtedly was among the important factors promoting both the success of the national liberation struggle in the country and the fact that only four months later, on August 15, 1947, India was proclaimed an independent state.

COOPERATION

The experience of independent development insistently dictated to the young republic the need to create its own industrial sector, the basis of an independent economy. However, the country did not have enough money, and there was no modern technology or skilled personnel. The Indian government turned to the Soviet Union.

On February 2, 1955 an agreement to the effect that our country would help India build a metallurgical plant in Bhilai was signed. Thus the foundation was laid for Soviet-Indian economic cooperation. Since then, over 60 industrial and other facilities in very important sectors of the economy have been built with assistance from the USSR, and 40 more are in the construction, design, and coordination stages.

Enterprises built with our help produce 36 percent of all Indian steel, 32 percent of the aluminum here, 77 percent of all metallurgical equipment, 47 percent of all power production equipment, 43 percent of all mining equipment, almost a tenth of the country's electricity, extract 23 percent of the oil here, and refine 47 percent of it. Over the years, more than 165,000 Indian engineers, technicians, and workers have been trained.

Last year the USSR and India signed a new agreement on economic and technical

cooperation, the most extensive such agreement in the entire history of our relations.

A FIRM FOUNDATION

In 1971, international ties between the Soviet Union and India were raised to a qualitatively new level as the Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation was signed on August 9.

"An important landmark in Indian Foreign policy," "A treaty that reflects the will of the Indian people," and "An important day in the history of India"—that is how deputies to the Indian Parliament characterized the signing of the treaty. The treaty, wrote *Pravda* in a lead editorial devoted to the event, is not aimed against any third party and has no other goals besides the further development of friendly cooperation between the two states and imparting dynamism to their joint peaceful efforts.

This document successfully performs its role and serves as a reliable foundation for the entire complex of diverse Soviet-Indian relations, which have become a factor in the everyday lives of our people.

APPEAL TO MANKIND

"On behalf of the more than one billion men, women, and children in our two friendly countries, who make up one-fifth of all humanity, we appeal to the peoples and leaders of all countries to take immediate actions, which must lead us to a world without weapons of mass destruction and without wars," states the Delhi Declaration on Principles of a World Free from Nuclear Weapons and Violence, which was signed in November of last year during CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's official friendly visit to India.

It is no coincidence that this historic document, which sets down the noblest of ideas, responding to the hopes of all people on Earth, comes from the USSR and India. In many ways, relations between our countries set an example of the practical embodiment of these ideas. They represent a vivid manifestation of the policy of peaceful co-existence by states with different socio-political systems and a model for international ties in the future.—V. SHURYGIN.

VERBATIM

"It (Soviet Russia) is today the greatest fighter against imperialism, and the things it has done for the peoples of the East are just and magnanimous. Russia approaches the East as an equal, and not as a conqueror or a higher race. It is hardly surprising that the country is being welcomed."—JAWAHARLAL NEHRU. (1928)

"If I had not gone to Russia, the pilgrimage of my life would have been incomplete. . . The call of the Russian revolution is also the call of the entire world. At least this nation is the only one out of the nations in today's world that is thinking of the interests of all mankind and considering them above their own national interests"—RABINDRANATH TAGORE. (1931)

"The Soviet Union helped us create a heavy industrial sector at a time when other countries weren't helping us . . . It has stood with us in periods of trials and difficulties, during aggression against us, during times of drought, and so on. And nothing has been asked of us in return except friendship."—INDIRA GANDHI. (1976).

GIANTISM DOESN'T EQUAL COMPETITIVENESS

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to submit an op-ed piece written by Prof. Walter Adams and Prof. James W. Brock in the April 27, 1987 New York Times. Mr. Adams, a distinguished economist, is the former president of Michigan State University and a leader in antitrust economic theory. He, along with Mr. Brock, an economist at Miami University in Ohio, have written this piece relating to mergers and corporate bigness in the American economy. I ask that it be reprinted in the RECORD for my colleagues' consideration.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 27, 1987]

GIANTISM DOESN'T EQUAL COMPETITIVENESS

(By Walter Adams and James W. Brock)

EAST LANSING, MICH.—In the face of America's declining competitiveness in international markets and the successive accumulations of record foreign trade deficits, antitrust laws are again under fire.

The critics—ranging from Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige and Attorney General Edwin Meese 3d on the right to the economist Lester Thurow on the neo-liberal left—charge that our antimerger statutes block desperately needed efficiency and innovation-enhancing corporate consolidations. They say that euthanasia of the antimerger laws—by nonenforcement or by outright repeal—would cure America's competitiveness malaise.

Nonsense.

A growing body of evidence suggests that megamergers and corporate giantism undermine good economic performance and retard, rather than advance, the United States' competitiveness in world markets.

It is not true that antitrust laws have done anything to stem the merger mania. Since 1980, the annual number of mergers has more than doubled and the annual dollar value of mergers has more than quintupled. Every year, new records are set in the number and size of corporate acquisitions. All told, 75 of the 100 largest mergers in American history have occurred since 1981.

Academic studies and the media have indicated that megamergers and the bloated bureaucracies that follow in their wake undermine production efficiency. For example, Business Week has carried cover stories titled "Small Is Beautiful in Manufacturing" and "Do Mergers Really Work? Not Very Often."

There is evidence that more often than not elephantine corporate size significantly retards, rather than advances, technological innovation. A multitude of acquisitions of small high-tech firms by giants such as Exxon and Burroughs have ended in disaster, primarily because layers of bureaucracy paralyze entrepreneurship in the acquired concerns.

Corporate bigness more generally seems to have sabotaged—not promoted—international competitiveness in key industries such as autos and steel. Indeed, if merger-induced giantism were truly conducive to world-class performance, General Motors and U.S. Steel (USX)—originally created through mergers and acquisitions—should

be the efficiency and innovation marvels of the world. Clearly, they are not.

Giant firms like I.T.T. and Gulf & Western, which gorged themselves on conglomerate acquisitions in the 1960's and 1970's, today are divesting scores of previously acquired businesses and operations. They are concentrating on what they know best and jettisoning the rest—and significantly boosting their financial and economic performance. As Martin S. Davis, president of Gulf & Western, was recently quoted as having said: "Bigness is not a sign of strength. In fact, just the opposite is true." His observation is corroborated by the fact that upward of 40 percent of all corporate marriages of the 1960's and 1970's have ended in divorce.

Megamergers impose an enormous, ultimately debilitating "opportunity cost" on the economy. The \$190 billion spent on mergers and acquisitions last year is \$190 billion not invested in new plant and equipment, new technology or new product research and development. In 1984, corporate America spent two and one half times more on mergers and acquisitions than on research and development—a dubious priority if reindustrialization and international competitiveness are national aims.

Meanwhile, as the Federal Reserve chairman, Paul A. Volcker, has warned, the staggering debt loads built up during the merger madness are a ticking time bomb, waiting to explode when the next recession inevitably rolls around.

In sum, megamergers and corporate bigness are not the answer to our woes. If efficiency, innovation and world-class competitiveness are national goals, we should revitalize our antimerger policy to combat what Richard G. Darman, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, calls "corpocracy." By that, he means "largescale corporate America's tendency to be like the Government bureaucracy that corporate executives love to malign: bloated, risk-averse, inefficient and unimaginative."

Walter Adams and James W. Brock are professors of economics at Michigan State University and Miami University (Oxford, Ohio), respectively.

HEALTH BENEFITS FOR AMERICA'S WORKERS

HON. AUSTIN J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the legislation being introduced today to provide minimum health benefits for America's workers.

The fact that there are over 37 million people in the United States with no public or private health coverage is a sad commentary on this Nation's priorities. For these people, financial ruin will compound any common medical problems and result in personal tragedy.

It is absolutely unacceptable, however, that many of these people are working Americans, contributing to this country's growth and prosperity. Fifty-five percent of the uninsured, 19 million Americans, worked but had no health coverage in 1985. Most of these workers had jobs in the low-wage service industries where the majority of jobs have been created. While 8 million service sector jobs have been cre-

ated in the Reagan administration, 2 million manufacturing jobs have been lost.

The former steelworkers and former coal miners in my district understand fully the myth of the Reagan economic recovery. While jobs have been created, the American economy has shifted employment from manufacturing industries to service industries. American workers have paid the price for a failed trade and economic program in lower wage jobs with no benefits or medical security.

All American workers are entitled to the very basic protections that health insurance provides. These people, trying to support their families on low wages in the first place, should not be forced to choose between a trip to the doctor or food on the table.

ORGANIZATION FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION SOVIET-AMERICAN PEACE PRIZE

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to your attention an organization located in my congressional district which is committed to promote peace and support the objectives of the United Nations.

The Organization for International Cooperation is a New Jersey-based, non-profit group established in 1984. The organization's projects thus far have included public seminars and media interviews on various peace initiatives. Currently the OIC is developing a project for the purpose of demonstrating the importance of resolving international conflicts through peaceful means.

The Shore Area Soviet-American Peace Prize is intended to be an annual competition for high school students living in Monmouth and Ocean Counties in the shore area of central New Jersey. The students will be asked to create innovative projects to enhance Soviet-American friendship. The competition will be based on creativity, life of the project, originality, and the degree of success it achieves in promoting the qualities of appreciation, compassion, understanding and magnanimity. By the promotion of this project OIC hopes to accomplish, along with the students, parents, and community businesses involved, a strong commitment at the grassroots level to peaceful coexistence and Soviet-American friendship.

The peace prize is also intended to provide benefits for the participating students, namely a greater appreciation of their academic subjects, a new understanding of friendship and peacemaking, new interests in world affairs, a greater sense of public responsibility and patriotism, a deeper sense of personal peace, and a chance to impact their community. These benefits would extend throughout the community, and hopefully strengthen the dedication Americans have to achieving a lasting peace the world over.

I commend Mr. Arnie Keiser, founder and president of OIC, for his commitment to these goals. I wish the OIC a successful project, and

anticipate that this work will become even more important as we forge ahead to improve relations with the Soviet Union.

WIPP LAND WITHDRAWAL ACT OF 1987

HON. JOE SKEEN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation along with my distinguished colleague, MANUEL LUJAN, to permanently withdraw certain Federal lands located in New Mexico from the operation of certain public land laws. This withdrawal is necessary before the waste isolation pilot plant [WIPP] becomes operational.

This legislation is of extreme importance to the Federal Government. The State of New Mexico supports this bill and Senator JEFF BINGAMAN along with Senator PETE DOMENICI of New Mexico will offer similar legislation in the Senate. It is one of my top legislative priorities during the 100th Congress.

WIPP, located near Carlsbad, NM, has been designated to become the Nation's first permanent repository for defense-generated transuranic waste, and is scheduled to receive the first shipment of transuranic waste in late 1988. The WIPP Land Withdrawal Act of 1987 not only addresses the need to withdraw certain lands, but careful consideration has been given in this legislation to ensure the safety and welfare of the public and to address the concerns of the State of New Mexico.

The legislation would withdraw approximately 10,240 acres of land—approximately 8,960 acres are federally owned and the remaining 1,280 acres are State owned—and reserve them for the continued construction, operation and maintenance of the WIPP project. Administrative jurisdiction over the 10,240 acres would be transferred from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Energy.

Because the State of New Mexico will not be able to receive mineral royalties due to the withdrawal of Federal lands, this legislation provides for the compensation of lost royalties. After estimating the total of risked royalties, bonuses and taxes, adjusted to net present value, that would be lost, it was determined the Department of the Interior will be authorized to pay the State of New Mexico a sum of \$10,091,233 for each of the next 5 years.

The legislation establishes the procedure by which the Secretary of Energy may acquire non-Federal lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of WIPP. Management responsibilities of the land have been established to ensure that grazing will be allowed, wildlife habitats on the land are maintained and sportsmen will continue to have access to certain areas.

Sections have been included in this legislation to ensure proper safety and environmental guidelines are followed. The Secretary of Energy will be required to submit a plan on how the WIPP project will be managed after decommissioning, report to the State of New Mexico detailing plans to conduct experiments

with high level waste at WIPP and ensure that certain Environmental Protection Agency standards are followed.

Finally, the mission of WIPP, both the permanent storage of defense-generated transuranic waste and the temporary storage of high-level defense waste for research and development purpose, is outlined.

The process of finding an adequate method of disposing of radioactive waste has led to the authorization of WIPP. After years of study, scientists concluded that deep salt beds can provide one method for the safe, permanent isolation of radioactive waste. The WIPP site was selected as having the geologic characteristics thought suitable for the project. The waste will be disposed of in salt approximately 2,200 feet below ground, located near the center of a salt bed that is between 1,750 and 2,000 feet thick.

This facility was authorized by Congress in the Department of Energy National Security and Military Applications of Nuclear Energy Authorization Act of 1980. This act authorized WIPP for the express purpose of providing a research and development facility to demonstrate the safe disposal of radioactive wastes resulting from defense-related activities and programs exempted from regulation by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Department of Energy's plans for WIPP are consistent with the project's authorization. Those plans include providing for the initial retrievability and the eventual permanent placement of low-level transuranic waste and to provide a research and development facility for defense high-level waste.

For this important project to proceed the land withdrawal must be finalized. Congress has committed itself to the WIPP project, and I ask that my colleagues join me in seeing that this legislation moves quickly through the House.

LIBRARIAN EMERITUS

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my distinguished colleagues; Chairman FRANK ANNUNZIO, Congressman BILL CLAY, Congressman AL SWIFT, Congressman BILL FRENZEL, Congressman NEWT GINGRICH, Congressman ED JONES, and Congressman PAT ROBERTS, to introduce a joint resolution conferring the honorary status of Librarian of Congress Emeritus on Daniel J. Boorstin.

Dr. Boorstin, a historian, educator, and author, was sworn in as the 12th Librarian of Congress on November 12, 1975. He had previously been the Director of the National Museum of History and Technology, and Senior Historian of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC. And, prior to both these prestigious positions, Dr. Boorstin was the Preston & Sterling Morton distinguished service professor of history at the University of Chicago where he taught for 25 years.

Dr. Boorstin's tenure as Librarian, which he sees more as a cultural post than as a technical job, has been marked by several de-

partures. He has made an effort to make the Library more inviting to the public and counteract the image of stuffiness by opening the long-locked doors to the entrance of the Library's main building, by promoting lunchtime concerts on the Library's plazas, and by putting on exhibits about everything from the Apollo Moon mission to a retrospective on Disney animation.

Dr. Boorstin has set up many special programs, including a council of scholars to help the Library spot weaknesses in its collections, and a center for the book to promote reading among the general public.

The position of Librarian of Congress is one of distinction; one that requires the highest leadership and political insights. As the Nation's ambassador of culture, the Librarian must also have strong diplomatic skills. Dr. Boorstin is a man of many talents, along with the above mentioned he has also been a dynamic and charismatic leader, one who has inspired knowledge, as well as given of his own. He has provided intellectual stamina to the Library that will carry on for generations to come.

Dr. Boorstin will be missed indeed when he retires. But, by making him Librarian of Congress Emeritus, we can minimize the loss. Passage of this simple and straightforward resolution will provide Dr. Boorstin with the much needed access to resources that will allow him to continue his outstanding work as a historian and an author. The bill simply creates the position—no salary or additional funds are required. This is a well-merited reward, allowing the Congress to thank Dr. Boorstin for his outstanding accomplishments to the Library and consequently to the Nation and the world of literary sciences.

Dr. Boorstin once said, "You hope to grow and develop as long as you're alive. You can't fondle your past. The best book is always the next book."

With these words in mind, I am certain that the next Librarian of Congress will fill the position with the same professionalism as the present. And that Dr. Boorstin will move on, gracefully into the future, onto the next book.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

NEAL HANSEN PRESENTED THE PRESIDENT'S "E" AWARD

HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with "World Trade Week," I am honored to have this opportunity to commend the efforts of a constituent of mine from Nebraska's Second Congressional District. Mr. Neal Hansen, the president of Omaha-based Applied Communications, Inc., was presented the President's "E" Award for excellence in exporting at a White House ceremony on Monday.

Applied Communications develops, markets, and installs software for electronic funds transfer systems. The company tried both the wholly owned subsidiary and distribution approach to foreign market penetration and

found distributorship agreements the most profitable approach. Distributorships were established in Australia, Singapore, Argentina, Venezuela, Peru, Mexico, Taiwan, France, and the United Kingdom. As a result, the exports of Applied Communications increased from 6 percent of total sales in 1982 to 35 percent in 1986. Exports are now shipped to 34 countries around the world.

Mr. Speaker, as the 100th Congress debates legislation to address the trade deficit, I cannot think of a better time to recognize the exemplary efforts of American entrepreneurs who have been successful through hard work and ingenuity. It is absolutely essential for American businesses to adapt to the ever-evolving world marketplace, and the actions of Applied Communications is a shining example in this regard.

I want to congratulate Mr. Hansen and the workers at Applied Communications. Their business is an example for Nebraskans—and for the Nation—to emulate with respect to penetrating foreign markets.

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO CLYDE E. DODSON, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PORTS COUNCIL AFL-CIO MARITIME TRADES DEPARTMENT'S "MAN OF THE YEAR" FOR 1987

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding labor leader in my district, Clyde E. Dodson. Clyde is being honored as the Southern California Ports Council AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department 1987 "Man of the Year" on June 5 at S.S. *Princess Louise Pavilion* in San Pedro. Clyde currently serves as the secretary-treasurer of the National Maritime Engineers Beneficial Association [NMEBA], AFL-CIO, and as executive vice-president, District No. 1—Pacific Coast District of the NMEBA.

Born in Philadelphia, PA, in 1923, Clyde graduated from the Fort Trumbull Officer Candidate School in New London, CT, May 1945. He then amassed over 20 years sailing experience before joined Local 13 of the NMEBA as business manager in 1960.

Clyde's career with NMEBA would prove to be a long and distinguished one. From 1961 to 1982, he served as branch agent in the ports of Philadelphia, Norfolk, and Los Angeles for NMEBA's District No. 1—Pacific Coast District. During these years of service, Clyde was also elected vice-president of the Los Angeles Federation of Labor [AFL-CIO], and served in that capacity from 1981 to 1986. Clyde effectively merged these duties with others he had assumed as president of the Maritime Trades Department of Southern California from 1979 to 1982.

Clyde continued his climb up the ladder of union leadership. In 1982, he was elected executive vice president of the union's largest district, District No. 1—Pacific Coast District, which represents licensed engineering and deck officers in the ocean-going U.S.-flag

fleet. To cap an illustrious career of service in and around my district, he won the election for NMEBA secretary-treasurer. In addition, he has selflessly lent his time and experience in service as a member of the District No. 1 negotiating committee and as Trustee of the four MEBA benefit plans. His considerable skills in administration and leadership are known throughout the maritime labor community through his service as executive director of the MEBA affiliate, Engineers and Scientists of California, and as chairman of the South West Marine Pension Plan. Cofounder of MEBA's training program, Clyde currently serves on the executive committee of the board of governors for the Association for the Restoration of the Presidential Yacht *Potomac*.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to recognize the achievement and civic spirit of Clyde E. Dodson on the occasion of his receipt of MEBA's "Man of the Year" award. My wife, Lee, and I congratulate and thank Clyde for all he has done for our community, and wish him and his wife, June, their children, Harry, Clyde Jr., James, June and Sharon, their grandchildren, Harry, Greg, Kathleen, Liane, and Monique Dodson, and Jennifer Pratt, and their great-grandchildren, Rachel Dugan, and Amy and Anthony Dodson all the best in the years ahead.

CONGRATULATIONS MATTHEW T. SAMPSON

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Matthew T. Sampson on the occasion of his graduation from the U.S. Naval Academy yesterday.

Mr. Sampson is a long-time resident of Watertown, MA. He graduated from Watertown High School in 1980. During his high school career, he received a varsity letter for football. Throughout his youth he was active in the Watertown Chapter of De Molay and received the honor of master counselor. He attended the Naval Academy Preparatory School in Newport, RI.

Mr. Sampson served active duty in the U.S. Marines from September 1980 to July 1983 and achieved the rank of sergeant. His primary assignment was with the Marine detachment, U.S.S. *Independence* (CV-62). During his enlistment in the Marines he was awarded a good conduct medal.

He will achieve the rank of second lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps Officer's Basic School in Quantico, VA, and from there go on to pilot training at the Naval Air Station in Pensacola, FL.

I congratulate Matthew on his assignment and his academy career and I look forward to his accomplishments in the future which will make Watertown and the Eighth District of Massachusetts proud of him.

TRIBUTE TO REV. RAYMOND J. JASAITIS

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 31, residents of my Eighth Congressional District and the State of New Jersey will join the parish community of St. Stephen's and Rev. Raymond J. Jasaitis in celebration of the 25th anniversary of his consecration into the sacrament of holy orders.

Mr. Speaker, the faith and devotion of our people in a full communion of understanding—ever caring and respecting the individual religious beliefs of our fellow man has been the lifeline of our democracy—ever inspiring our people with hope and urging the individual on to great achievements and purpose in fulfillment of his or her dreams and ambitions. The exemplary leadership and outstanding efforts of our citizens so important to our quality of life are in the vanguard of the American dream and today we express our appreciation to Rev. Raymond J. Jasaitis whose esteemed dedication and unselfish devotion in promulgating spiritual guidance, good will, fellowship, and brotherhood in service to God have truly enriched our community, State, and Nation.

Reverend Jasaitis has maintained the highest standards of excellence throughout his lifetime and we are pleased to share the pride of his family, many, many, friends, and parishioners in the distinguished achievements, so unselfishly dedicated to the betterment of mankind. There is so much that can be said of the love, affection, and reverence with which Reverend Jasaitis is held by all who have had the good fortune to know him.

Mr. Speaker, we are so proud to have Reverend Jasaitis with us in Paterson, NJ. He is the co-pastor of St. Stephen's Church. Preceding his pastorate at St. Stephen's his parish assignments were at: St. Christopher's, Parsippany; St. Cecilia's, Rockaway; Holy Rosary, Passaic; Sacred Heart, Dover; and St. Joseph's, Passaic.

Reverend Jasaitis was born in Paterson, NJ, the son of Joseph and Mary Jasaitis. He completed his theology studies for the Diocese of Paterson at the Immaculate Conception at Darlington, NJ. He received his B.A. degree from Seton Hall University.

As a priest, he extends his love to all and is particularly devoted to the land of his parents, namely Poland. He is proud of his heritage, a supporter of Free Poland, and most of all a proud and staunch American.

In St. Stephen's he was instrumental in setting up a Senior Citizen Nutrition Center. He is a moderator of St. Stephen's Home School Association and various church affiliated organizations. A naval veteran, he is a member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Knights of Columbus.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to present this brief profile of a distinguished man of God who has dedicated his life's purpose and fulfillment to helping others and guiding them in the pathway of life. The quality of his leadership is mirrored in the security and dignity that his parishioners have found in the

comfort and aid he unselfishly and willingly gives to those who seek his helping hand and spiritual guidance.

Mr. Speaker, as Reverend Jasaitis celebrates the 25th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood, I know that you and all of our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations for the excellence of his service to the church, our Nation, and all mankind. We do indeed salute an esteemed pastor, exemplary clergyman, and great American—Rev. Raymond J. Jasaitis, pastor of St. Stephen's Church, Paterson, NJ.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on official business during rollcall votes 122 through 126 Monday, May 18. Had I been present on the House floor, I would have cast my votes in the following manner:

Roll No. 122: "Yea," Journal approval.

Roll No. 123: "Aye," Schumer amendment.

Roll No. 124: "Aye," Boxer amendment.

Roll No. 125: "No," Boxer amendment.

Roll No. 126: "Aye," Callahan amendment.

BEST WISHES AND SINCERE THANKS TO MS. SUMIYE KOMURA

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my best wishes and sincere thanks to Ms. Sumiye Komura upon her retirement after 27 years of service to the State of California. Ms. Komura's hard work, dedication and compassion in a variety of capacities has earned her the respect and admiration of friends and colleagues.

Ms. Komura began her long career in State service in 1960 with the Department of Public Works, Division of Highways. After contributing her time and talents to agencies such as the Department of Navigation and Ocean Development and the Department of Consumer Affairs, Ms. Komura assumed the position of personnel assistant with the Department of Parks and Recreation in 1976.

Recognizing that the success of an organization is, in part, measured by the level of employee morale and satisfaction, Ms. Komura's tenure as a personnel assistant appropriately enabled her to utilize her greatest assets—patience, compassion and understanding. Not only have these qualities proven Ms. Komura to be a consummate professional dedicated to serving the public, but also, endeared her to her associates. I am certain that her presence will be sorely missed.

Ms. Komura's compassion and genuine concern for others has also benefited Fujinkai, an organization of the Sacramento Buddhist

Church, of which she is a member, which devotes its resources to community services, especially in assisting ill members of the Asian community.

Mr. Speaker, while it is not possible to adequately thank Ms. Komura for her exemplary service to the people of the State of California, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my sincere thanks as well as my warmest wishes for a happy and successful future.

A TRIBUTE TO KROTZ SPRINGS

HON. CLYDE C. HOLLOWAY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. HOLLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute today to a distinguished Louisianian, public official and community leader called to God's side earlier this month.

Robert Moran served as mayor of Krotz Springs, LA, for less than 6 months, but his record of service to family, church, community, and State extends over many years. For many years a successful merchant and businessman, Mr. Moran served as a church deacon and civic leader. Likewise, Robert Moran unselfishly served his country as a member of the Louisiana National Guard.

In the final months of his life, Mr. Moran demonstrated particular courage, character, and distinction. Despite the debilitating illness which ultimately took his life, Mayor Moran took bold and aggressive actions to prepare the town of Krotz Springs, LA, for the future.

Robert Moran was unafraid of facing death. His spirit, dignity, and grace inspired everyone who knew him. His passing is indeed our loss.

ENGLISH IS THE OFFICIAL U.S. LANGUAGE

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution, expressing the sense of the Congress that English is the official language of the United States. Thirteen of my colleagues have joined as original cosponsors.

Earlier this year, I again introduced legislation (H.J. Res. 83) providing for a constitutional amendment to designate English our national language. That measure now has more than 50 cosponsors. Diversity and tolerance have typified America's history, and have made our Nation great. As a nation of immigrants, we have made a common commitment to freedom from many backgrounds, and have witnessed individuals from all walks of life and all ethnic backgrounds work together for worthy, common goals.

Strength has been forged from our rich, cultural diversity by common bonds; perhaps the most critical of these is our language in common, English.

My resolution is not intended to discourage linguistic or ethnic differences. I strongly sup-

port preservation of one's cultural heritage, and also encourage all Americans to learn at least a second language. However, preserving the past and preparing for the future do not preclude the need to read, write and speak English. Newcomers to our shores cannot hope to avail themselves of America's many opportunities without fluent knowledge of English.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this measure.

AIR CARRIER PASSENGER PROTECTION ACT

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join Mr. BOEHLERT in introducing the Air Carrier Passenger Protection Act. This legislation would help restore confidence in airlines by establishing an account to reimburse consumers for "bad tickets."

Instability in the airline industry has put the traveling public at great financial risk. Today's air traveler stands to lose both money and time when an airline goes bankrupt.

Consumers, namely, traveling businessmen and tourists, are among the largest creditors of the airlines, directly holding an estimated \$3 to \$4 billion in prepaid tickets. Before deregulation of the airline industry it was common practice for an airline to honor tickets from a bankrupt airline. Today, with keener competition in the airline industry, the consumer is left with little recourse in the event of a bankruptcy.

As creditors, consumers are ill-situated to press claims in the event of an airline financial collapse. The Air Carrier Passenger Protection Act would establish a fund from which airlines providing seats to individuals holding tickets on bankrupt airlines will be reimbursed. An amount not exceeding \$100 million would be transferred from the airport and airway trust fund to an air carrier ticket account. Solvent airlines honoring tickets from airlines who have filed for bankruptcy or terminated operations would be compensated from the air carrier ticket account.

While the magnitude of "bad ticket" losses is difficult to determine, the best estimates are that of the 16 largest carriers which went bankrupt between 1981 and 1985, there were outstanding liabilities of \$151 million.

As we celebrate "National Tourism Week," it is important to note the benefits of the Air Carrier Passenger Protection Act for the travel and tourism industry. This legislation provides a vital safeguard to the consumer, and is essential to preserve the growth in our domestic tourism industry.

The travel and tourism industry is the third largest retail industry in the United States, generating in excess of \$220 billion annually. Tourism directly employs 5.9 million Americans, including 107,000 people in my home State of Wisconsin. In 1984, Wisconsin received \$100 in State tax revenues for every dollar budgeted for tourism promotion.

Domestic air travel has increased dramatically from 62 million people flying in 1960 to a

projected 450 million in 1987, 55 percent of whom are tourists. With 160 airlines having terminated operations or gone bankrupt since 1979, stories of passengers stranded between destinations have become commonplace.

To continue to expand our travel and tourism industry in the United States, greater efforts must be made to ensure adequate consumer protection. The Air Carrier Passenger Protection Act ensures that the air traveler will get what he pays for in good faith. As a frequent flyer myself, I commend the efforts of Mr. BOEHLERT and urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this needed legislation.

TRIBUTE TO THE TURKISH AMERICAN SOCIETIES

HON. JOSEPH J. DiOGUARDI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. DiOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Turkish-American community and to the Federation of Turkish American Societies.

On Saturday, May 23, Americans of Turkish heritage will be holding their sixth annual Turkish-American Day Parade in New York City. The parade will bring together thousands of people from the United States and Canada to celebrate a day of friendship and unity, and to help to foster a feeling of warmth, goodwill and brotherhood in our towns and cities.

Mr. Speaker, I have often talked about the many wonderful contributions the Turkish people have made; not only to America, but around the world. Their pride and strong ethnic ties are easily witnessed on the faces of the many Turkish people who have come to America to enrich our country's strong ethnic melting pot.

Turkey has been an invaluable NATO ally for many years and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to join me today in honoring our close ties with this beautiful country.

OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

HON. FRED GRANDY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize May as Older Americans Month, a time to express gratitude for our senior citizens and to honor them for the significant accomplishments they continue to make in our society.

Senior citizens make invaluable contributions to our communities by volunteering in our schools, assisting in the growing field of child day care, contributing to community beautification, or volunteering in a host of other community improvement projects.

In addition, many senior citizens continue to contribute to our economy by remaining on the job for many years beyond age 65. They have a wealth of practical knowledge from which we can all benefit if we only listen.

This is also a time for Congress to commit itself to resolving the many problems older Americans face in maintaining their health and independent living to the fullest extent possible. It is imperative that we explore alternatives to premature institutionalization and enable our senior citizens to maintain their independence. The development of in-home health services, particularly in rural areas, must be explored even further.

We have taken a great step forward by exploring catastrophic health care. However, it would be a serious oversight on our part if we ignored the great need in financing the growing costs of long-term care. We cannot continue to ignore this program.

The most fitting way to honor our senior citizens is to address the issue of greatest importance to them, namely, protecting their income and ensuring access to health care.

Senior citizens have given so much to their children, and now it is time to return the favor.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN SOUTH KOREA, MAY 21, 1987

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, last year on a visit to South Korea, I had the opportunity to meet with Kim Dae Jung at his home in Seoul to discuss the problem of human rights and democracy in South Korea. Were I to visit there today however, the police would not allow me into Kim Dae Jung's home. He has now been under tight house arrest for the past month.

Nothing better dramatizes the problems in South Korea than the wall that the South Korean Government has constructed outside of Kim Dae Jung's home. The wall symbolizes the growing polarization between the people of South Korea, who want true democracy to go along with their economic emergence, and President Chun, who wants to assure that a new president will not be directly elected by the people.

The United States thus far has refused to challenge the status quo and weigh in on the side of democracy. Last year, we witnessed with joy the triumph of democracy in the Philippines. The United States played an important role in that triumph. Let us play the same role in South Korea, by encouraging President Chun to speak with his opponents and listen to his people. President Chun must be made to realize that throwing people in jail does not extinguish but only nurtures their yearning for democracy.

REPRESSION OF CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS IN SOUTH KOREA

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, last February the opposition to the Government of the Re-

public of Korea launched a petition campaign to support its demand that the Constitution be amended to provide for direct popular election of the next President. President Chun Doo Hwan, however, revoked his promise to revise the Constitution before February of 1988.

His government has misused the criminal justice system to suppress the growing calls for political reforms. In doing so, it has violated internationally recognized human rights of assembly, expression and association, fair public trial, and freedom from torture.

Mr. Speaker, the people of South Korea yearn for democratic change. This was particularly evident in 1980 after the assassination of Park Chung Hee when one survey reported that 90.8 percent of the people desired democracy even if it meant slowing down economic growth and 69.1 percent wanted a new constitution while only 13 percent favored the current one.

In an attempt to stifle demand for reform, the South Korean Government has taken harsh action against members of popular reform movements and against opposition party [NKDP] efforts to build a political alliance with the Government.

Existing law provides for "protective surveillance," "residential restriction," and "preventive custody" of certain persons considered "likely" lawbreakers. In response to opposition movements the Government has violated provisions that require arrest warrants. On many occasions warrants have not been produced at the time of arrest in politically related cases. Opposition leader Kim Dae Jung has been placed under house arrest, and it will not be lifted apparently until he forswears politics. He has been confined 53 times since he returned from exile in the United States in February 1985.

The South Korean Constitution prohibits torture, and the Government insists that it has issued and strictly enforces injunctions against it. The death by torture of South Korean student Park Chung-chul in January is clear evidence of a policy that was designed to stifle, through brutal means, political opposition to the Chun regime.

Clearly, the most convincing evidence of political oppression has been the student uprisings that have occurred within the last few months. By citing increased radicalism and violence, the Government continues to take a hard line toward dissident political activists, and students in particular.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has a strong and continuing interest in the Republic of Korea. We have 40,000 troops stationed in that country as a reflection of our commitment to defend democracy and freedom in Korea.

It is essential that officials of South Korea understand that our commitment to democracy includes a firm and unshakable commitment to democratic rights for the Korean people. A climate of reconciliation will only be a beneficial step in restoring civil and political rights to Koreans.

LAZARD FRERES' CONTRIBUTION TO THE CONRAIL SALE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished friend and colleague from Washington, AL SWIFT, for his thoughtful remarks in yesterday's RECORD regarding the sale of Conrail. While I appreciate his kind words directed at me, he correctly and more importantly noted the invaluable assistance rendered to the Energy and Commerce Committee by its financial adviser, Lazard Freres & Co. I believe that without Lazard's help, the Conrail public offering would never have occurred.

The privatization of Conrail was a very complex transaction. The many proposals considered by the committee required the analysis of enormous volumes of data and the sorting out of conflicting financial claims in an atmosphere charged with intense political pressures. Lazard Freres and its senior partner Frank Zarb, his colleagues Josh Gotbaum, Gene Keilin, and Michael Carmody, and Lazard associate Ron Bloom and analyst Tom Kissinger, enabled the committee to understand the facts and to reconcile the claims.

Their professional approach and technical competence provided us with the financial advice and analysis essential to making a successful sale possible. For more than a year, they met with the interested parties, toured the railroad, consulted outside experts, and studied the numbers. When they were done, they offered their conclusions in a comprehensive presentation to the Members, both majority and minority. They shared their work with Members of the Senate and with the administration. They spent days with other members of the investment banking community, arbitrating differences that could have been damaging not only to the sale but to the prospects for passing the needed legislation.

Lazard Freres put the success of this transaction and the best interests of the Nation above all other considerations. I am sure that I speak for the entire Congress and not only my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee when I say that the Nation owes Lazard Freres & Co. a special thanks.

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

HON. GEORGE J. HOCHBRUECKNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, 168 years ago tomorrow, the SS *Savannah* left America on the first successful steam powered voyage across the Atlantic Ocean. This trip ushered-in the era of modern shipping. Today we honor our maritime heritage by commemorating that voyage on this, the 55th Annual Maritime Day.

In the 19th century, international commercial shipping helped the United States to become a world industrial power. Throughout our history, the merchant marine has protected these vital national interests around the world. In addition, the maritime industry has promoted our economic well-being and our ability to defend ourselves. With our country virtually surrounded by water, sealanes are in effect economic lifelines. The merchant marine has helped keep these lifelines open for over 200 years.

American merchant seamen have a distinguished history of service. They assisted the armed forces in the American Revolution and in every war thereafter. In World War II, these men and their ships were called upon to perform dangerous missions. The U.S. Government recognized that the merchant marine was protecting vital American interests. Accordingly, merchant vessels were placed under the command of the U.S. Navy. The bravery displayed by these men in active war zones is testimony to the seriousness of this mission. I and other Members of the 100th Congress are now promoting legislation to appropriately recognize and honor the merchant seamen who served in the U.S. merchant marine during wartime. This legislation is more than 40 years overdue.

Mr. Speaker, the future will present new challenges on the seas for our Nation. The competitiveness of American business is a concern of all who serve in this body. The merchant marine will have a vital role in improving our competitiveness. We cannot hope to retain our standing in international trade

without the continued vigilance of the maritime industry. One need look no further than the tragic story of this week, involving the death at sea of 37 American heroes, to understand that oceans remain forums of critical international concern.

Today we honor all those who have served America in the merchant marine. These men and women are patriots in every sense of the word. We owe them our respect and our gratitude. We also owe the maritime industry our continued support. It is only by keeping our maritime service strong in times of peace that we will be able to depend on its effectiveness in times of war. Today, let us honor a distinguished past and look to a future that will continue this proud tradition.

CHINABERRY CUP RETAINED BY MARIETTANS

HON. GEORGE (BUDDY) DARDEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1987

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, for still another year the city of Marietta, GA, has retained one of the most coveted prizes of amateur tennis, the Chinaberry Cup. At the 10th Annual Chinaberry Cup Tennis Tournament at prestigious Litchfield Racket Club near Myrtle Beach, SC, the Mariettans once more displayed their winning form and established their tennis superiority. The final competition was held Saturday, April 25, 1987.

The Cheraw, SC team, coached by industrialist W. Glen (Bud) Anderson, and textile manufacturer Malloy Evans, never were a serious threat to win the trophy although they won occasional sets. While the Cheraw team had marginal ability, they lacked the discipline and determination required to recapture the cup. In short, they were ill prepared for the competition. The list of losers in addition to Messrs. Anderson and Evans, consists of the following players: Frank Andrews, injured, did not play; Dr. Walter Crosby; W.F. (Ricky) Baker, disqualified; Jackie Furr; Fred Craft; Jimmy Spruill, Esq., disqualified; M.B. Godbold, C.L.U.; Dr. B.E. Coggeshall, Jr.; Ted Thompson; and Frank Exum.

Marietta's team hosted by the venerable and durable A.D. Little was coached by Dr. Dan Norris. This winning Marietta team exhibited its usual good sportsmanship in congratulating the losers from Cheraw.

Other members of this year's winning team were Terry Segars, D.R. Shamblin, Charlie Waters, Ron Francis, Jon Burke; Buddy Darden, Paul (Matty) McCabe (Agent Orange), and the aging Wallace Montgomery, who was unable to play due to injury. Many spectators observed that had Mr. Montgomery been able to play, the margin would have been even greater.

Mr. Speaker, once again we congratulate the fine, determined team from Marietta, who were able to provide this winning effort. To the losers from Cheraw, we say "better luck next year."