

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HAVE WE FALLEN SHORT OF  
OUR FOUNDING FATHERS'  
VISION?

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to consider a question that has been brought to my attention: "After 200 years, have we allowed self-government to fall short of our Founding Fathers' vision?" Mr. Louis Dehmlow cogently advances the theory that we have indeed fallen short. He believes that self-government is in jeopardy due to three primary reasons, "overtaxation with misrepresentation," "the lawyering of America," and the rise of a "less interested, less informed electorate." I would like to submit Mr. Dehmlow's articles as an alarming perspective to be considered in conjunction with the celebration of the bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. Dehmlow astutely points out that modern politicians have not only created an omnipotent bureaucracy, but that they have, in fact, colluded with these bureaucrats in a refusal to control Government spending. This overspending has resulted in what Mr. Dehmlow terms "overtaxation with misrepresentation." Mr. Dehmlow alerts Government officials to the fact that they are spending funds that are not available, and are then misusing their powers by placing a tax burden on their constituents in an attempt to counterbalance their own misappropriations.

Another area where Mr. Dehmlow is correct in his belief that we have failed our Founding Fathers is in the "lawyering of America." In Mr. Dehmlow's view, the politicians and the bureaucrats cooperate with the lawyers toward the inevitable end of litigating America. Mr. Dehmlow warns that "ignorance of the law is the great blindness in our land \* \* \* in this way our lawyers have become our rulers." In the present litigious and complicated system, the lawyers have the upper hand, for they are the only members of society who can "pretend to know what should be done." Thus, the majority of the public sector must acquiesce to those who seemingly possess all of the answers.

Finally, Mr. Dehmlow accuses the American Government of alienating the populace, and thus producing among the American people increased apathy. The power of the Government has so increased that a distrust of the powers that be has developed among the citizenry. In fairness, Mr. Dehmlow does not place blame exclusively upon the Government. He also expresses intense dissatisfaction with voters who are ill-informed as to the issues that are before them, as well as with a system of education that makes accommodation to mediocrity. He goes on to suggest that

miseducation and ignorance are weakening not only the American system, but are indeed jeopardizing the values upon which our Founding Fathers built this great Nation.

Ironically as it might seem, while we are in the process of celebrating the 200th anniversary of our system of government, we should also consider those areas in which we have dangerously strayed from our Founding Fathers' constitutional blueprint. Before it is too late, Americans must examine the present state of our Nation and determine if we have indeed failed to meet the challenge "to give meaning to our God-given rights by advancing our free society." Mr. Dehmlow's articles follow:

[From Channels, National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, July 1987]

WE, THE PEOPLE—PART I

(By Louis H.T. Dehmlow)

Okay, first, a pop quiz: Who was president of the United States during the Civil War—Joseph Stalin or Winston Churchill?

Such a question would have been laughable not so long ago, but, nowadays, I'm not sure. A recent survey found that two-thirds of American eleventh-graders could not place the Civil War in the correct half-century, and half of them could not identify Joseph Stalin or Winston Churchill. Another study revealed that twenty percent of American sixth-graders could not locate the United States on a map.

We've all had moments when we have felt that "Ignorance is bliss," but I don't think that any of us would like to see that become our new national motto.

John Adams never had heard of Stalin or Churchill either, since they hadn't been born yet, but he understood that ignorance about such things in the future would undermine America's new form of government. "Liberty cannot be preserved," he warned, "without a general knowledge among the people."

As millions of Americans prepare for a gala celebration of the two hundredth year of our Constitution, I must admit that there are some very un-festive questions bothering me. I don't wish to spoil anyone's party, but, is there, in fact, "a general knowledge among the people" so that our democratic republic is secure? Is our constitutional system of checks and balances still successful in limiting the power and growth of government?

Before I buy a single bicentennial souvenir, or get misty-eyed from a thirty-second TV spot on our national heritage, I really want to think about these questions honestly. Maybe you agree with me that there couldn't be a better time to re-examine our system of self-government than right now \* \* \* in this Bicentennial year for our Constitution.

After all, the founding fathers did not risk their lives and reputations to create a document that would be celebrated as something symbolic and sentimental. They wanted just the opposite; they wanted to devise a new form of government that would live on as a challenge to each succeeding generation. To

achieve that, they did something revolutionary—they made each of us a member of the ruling class. They made citizenship the most important political office under the Constitution.

But are we living up to our responsibility as self-rulers—to keep this a government of, by, and for the people?

Nearly everyone is familiar with Ben Franklin's wry statement that nothing is certain but death and taxes. But I recently discovered that this observation was part of a larger, more serious statement, expressed in a letter he wrote to a friend in France in 1789:

"Our Constitution is in actual operation; everything appears to promise that it will last; but nothing in this world is certain but death and taxes."

If Franklin were alive today undoubtedly he would be impressed to learn that America's new republic has become the oldest existing government in the world. It has survived and prospered through all kinds of change because the central truths upon which it was based have not changed. Its Constitution has proven resilient because it was based on both sides of human nature: On the reality of self-interest as man's principal motivation, and on the ideal of virtue as man's proper goal.

Yet even as our founders showed tremendous insight into principles—understanding which ideas worked and which didn't—they knew they could not anticipate the inevitable economic, political and social changes to come. That is why they were careful to include a provision on how the Constitution itself could be amended, and that is why they devised a system of checks and balances to allow time for patient deliberation before a final judgment was made.

Most importantly, that is why they placed as much power as possible not with the government but with that agency in human history most responsible for change and improvement: the individual.

In placing individual freedom above the convenience of the state, the founders set in motion an individualism that would transform the world. In the two succeeding centuries, America's inventors and entrepreneurs have made unprecedented breakthroughs in science, transportation, medicine, communications, education, business, and the arts.

It is now our challenge, as individual citizens, to ask ourselves if we have made similar progress in improving government itself. Or have we allowed self-government in this country to fall short of our founders' vision?

## OVER-TAXATION WITH MISREPRESENTATION

Probably the most obvious case of our government not living up to the hopes of our founders is the current burden of taxes on the average citizen. That burden not only is far beyond what our founders could have imagined two centuries ago, it is far beyond what anyone could have imagined two generations ago. After the "temporary" federal income tax first was proposed, an opponent of the tax was ridiculed in Congress when he warned that its adoption

● 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.

could ultimately lead to people being taxed as high as ten percent of their income!

The American Revolution, of course, was fueled partly by outrage over such taxes as the one imposed on tea. The Declaration of Independence made clear that "the history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having a direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these states . . . He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance."

If only they had known the IRS.

In modern America, the amount of our earnings that goes to the government is hidden in all kinds of ingenious ways to diminish our pain—payroll deductions, sales taxes, license fees, Social Security—even inflation, the most insidious form of taxation. The average taxpayer works more than four months of the year to pay for government—one-third of his life, and growing! And now leading politicians are pushing yet another form of taxation: ordering businesses to provide their employees "mandated benefits" as dictated by the government.

The reason for over-taxation is overspending. Liberals like to point to unnecessary spending at the Pentagon. Conservatives like to point to the skyrocketing costs of "entitlements." Both are right. And the number of people receiving a check from the government will, at this rate, eventually exceed the number of people who do not receive a check.

The reason that spending has gotten out of control is to be found in the liberals' eagerness to address social problems, and in the conservatives' eagerness to strengthen our national defense. Both have willingly given enormous power to new bureaucracy, far beyond anything envisioned by our founders.

Our founders wisely devised a system of checks and balances to keep government fighting itself so it wouldn't "eat out our substance" instead and take away our liberties. But modern politicians have given us bureaucracy more powerful than any branch of government. It can act as a legislative branch in creating new regulations, as an executive branch in enforcing them and as a judicial branch in interpreting them.

I remember being involved in an effort to fight some ridiculous regulations that were harming my wholesale distribution commodity line in 1974. I talked with several congressmen who agreed the regulations were foolish and injurious, but said they couldn't do anything about it. Years later, I happened to sit next to a high-level bureaucrat at a dinner and discovered that he worked in the agency responsible. I told him the story of what happened and he said, "The mistake you made was to go to the elected officials. We bureaucrats really run Washington."

The American writer, Mary McCarthy, shed light on this problem when she wrote, "Bureaucracy, the rule of no one, has become the modern form of despotism." And that is the difficulty of fighting the cancerous growth of bureaucracy—it's faceless. It is, indeed, "the rule of no one," so who can you fight? Who can you organize public opinion against?

The cry of the American people two hundred years ago was that "taxation without representation was tyranny." But what is over-taxation with misrepresentation?

Surely we have not deliberately elected representatives who would make a mockery

of Jefferson's principle that government is best which governs least. So why do we elect people who refuse to control spending, and who, in effect, collude with other politicians to over-tax and over-regulate us?

The facts seem paradoxical: According to opinion polls, Americans don't have a very high opinion of Congress as an institution. Yet 95% of incumbent House members seeking re-election are re-elected! Think about that. We say that generally we don't trust Congress, yet we all believe our own congressman is an exception. Why is that?

Well, each incumbent congressman has tremendous tax-paid advantages over any challenger. Incumbents can use tax money to mail correspondence telling their constituents all the wonderful things they are doing for motherhood and apple pie . . . but rarely anything indicating how they actually vote on controversial issues. They have tax-paid staff helping them, in effect, campaign. And any time a new federal project is to be announced for their district, the relevant government agency makes sure the incumbent can announce it first so voters assume it's his or her accomplishment.

How appalling this would be to men like Madison and Jefferson. Their complaints about King George seem like nitpicking by comparison. They never could have imagined that "porkbarrel" spending of the taxpayers' money would be used by elected representatives to influence voters. They conceived of public service as a temporary sacrifice that people would make for the good of their country, and then they would return home to their chosen profession and live with the effects of their decisions.

"Career politicians" did not fit into their vision. But then, to be fair, neither did they imagine that taxpayers would turn into a "silent majority."

[From Channels, National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, August 1987]

#### WE, THE PEOPLE—PART II

(America celebrates the bicentennial of the Constitution in 1987. In September, millions of people will be attending parties and buying souvenirs to commemorate this wondrous event. But, before the fireworks begin, we should honestly try to answer History's unspoken question to us: "After 200 years, have we allowed self-government to fall short of our founders' vision?"). In last month's column, Louis Dehmow made the case that we indeed have fallen short. He said we have allowed career politicians and an ever-expanding bureaucracy to impose "over-taxation with misrepresentation." In the second half of his essay, "We, the People," Louis Dehmow says there are two additional areas where self-government is in jeopardy: first, we suffer "the lawyering of America"; second, we have a less interested, less informed electorate.)

#### WE, THE LAWYERS

Another area where we have allowed our democratic republic to fall short of our founders' vision is in the lawyering of America.

If career politicians and professional bureaucrats have hurt America's productivity, keep in mind they couldn't have done it without their partners, the litigious lawyers. Together, these three comprise a kind of Bermuda Triangle, wherein countless entrepreneurs and liberties sink without a trace.

Two-thirds of all the world's lawyers practice here in the United States. Some 40,000 new graduates come out of law schools each

year to join the more than 700,000 already practicing. Compare that to a country like Japan, where there are only 13,000. We have one lawyer for every 360 people; they have one for every 9,300. Is it any wonder that Japan can boast a spirit of cooperation rather than contention?

American lawyers have taken the idea of the adversary process in the courtroom and applied it to everything outside the courtroom, too. Adversary law certainly is legitimate, but when you have 700,000 people engaging in it, you're asking for trouble. Indeed, we're now spending more than \$30 billion annually in legal fees in this country. That kind of "competitiveness" stifles the economic competitiveness America needs.

In the private sector, lawyers keep busy by litigating us into a worsening liability crisis. In the public sector, though, lawyers have kept busy trying to regulate us from the cradle to an early grave. The daily Federal Register, which records most government regulations, will total about 60,000 pages this year. That is more than twice the Encyclopedia Britannica. Yet Congress will spend more than \$1 billion this year drafting more laws.

Our founders understood that individual rights were only safe if ours was a system of laws, not men. But they could not have imagined it would evolve into a system where things would become so complicated and litigious that only lawyers could pretend to know what should be done. "Ignorance of the law is no excuse," we are warned. But, in truth, ignorance of the law is the great blindness in our land. The proverb says, in the land of the blind the one-eyed will be king. In this way, our lawyers have become our rulers.

#### A LESS INFORMED ELECTORATE

Self-government falls short of our founders' vision in a third way: the electorate does not have the "general knowledge" John Adams said was essential to a free society.

The percentage of eligible American voters actually voting has been in decline for a number of decades. Now, only one-half of eligible voters vote. Perhaps part of the reason fewer citizens try to be well-informed has to do with apathy. A certain amount of apathy and alienation is to be expected in a democracy, since it is a form of government based on skepticism, doubt, self-criticism and distrust of power. But it goes beyond that. A great many voters in the last two generations have put their hopes in a great leader coming to rescue us. Such hopes inevitably crash, whether in a democracy or a dictatorship, because true progress comes from individualism and community, not from politics and demagoguery.

Part of our alienation from politics also is a result of the federal government growing more and more distant as it has become more and more powerful. Americans long ago decided "you can't beat City Hall," but how much truer that seems about Washington. Sadly, our own government has come to seem as distant to most Americans as the British Parliament seemed to colonial Americans two centuries ago. Perhaps more so.

Yet all of this shouldn't really matter. No matter how powerless we may feel, millions of Americans have fought and died for freedom and self-government. It is our duty, is it not, to exercise that privilege?

But, wait . . . Do we really want people to vote if they don't care about or understand the issues. A voter may think his ignorance

is bliss, but frankly, on a mass scale, it scares the hell out of me.

Clearly, our country is suffering from serious mis-education. It's not just a matter of our students not knowing who Joseph Stalin was; they also don't know about his politics of liquidating his enemies. Our children have been taught a great deal about all of the injustices in America, but they don't know why the boat people left Vietnam and why there is a Berlin Wall. Is it any wonder that in opinion polls Gorbachev rates more trustworthy than many Western elected officials?

In popular curriculum materials, democratic values are characterized as "ethnocentric." In other words, all cultures and political systems are equally valid. No one is better or worse, only "different." But this value-free-education goes beyond our schools. The mass media is an equal part of it. Television, movies, video cassettes and rock music have produced what a Harvard sociologist called "sensate culture." The message is: Feel good. It doesn't really matter what you think.

Few classroom teachers can compete with this bombardment of sounds and images. And the values they need in their students—like integrity and industry—are under attack in this mass culture.

Recently, in scandal after scandal, we have seen the destructive power of what I call "the noose media." The resulting disillusionment of the American people—"a second malaise" was the way The Washington Post described the new mood—shows the power of the press. But where is that power in helping to inform people about the nonsensational? When we look past the superficial "news," what do we find that will improve our "general knowledge"?

Marshall McLuhan observed in the 1970s, that instant electronic communication was so powerful that the world was, in effect, shrinking into a "global village." He said the power of television was so great that the printed word was becoming obsolete. Yet he made another observation, little known, that should make us pause before welcoming this "brave new world." He said, "America is the only country ever founded on the printed word."

Will our grandchildren learn what those printed words were? Will they learn about a Constitution not created at the end of a thirty-minute TV show but as the capstone of thought beginning with a battle in Runnymede, England in 1215? I want them to know . . .

The English king found himself embattled back then. His noblemen said, wait, before we would risk our lives for you, there are certain concessions you must make. You may claim to have the divine right to rule, but we want you to guarantee us some rights as well. And so the Magna Carta, "the great charter," was negotiated. It established that the power of the king was not supreme. Later, the charter would be interpreted as the guarantee of many other liberties, including trial by jury.

The next date our grandchildren should know is 1679, when England formally recognized the writ of habeas corpus. This required a prosecutor to bring the accused into court to answer the charges against him. This safeguard against illegal imprisonment was highly revered by American colonists and was one of their grievances against the British.

Finally, they should remember 1689, when the British Bill of Rights was declared. It placed the monarchy upon a constitutional

and parliamentary basis, removing from it any aura of divine right.

In these three documents, our founders saw vital principles about man's relationship to government, which they clearly defined in our own Constitution. And to make sure that relationship was clear, the first thing they did after the Constitution was ratified was to add the Bill of Rights, guaranteeing that "the rights of the people shall not be infringed."

The founders believed that God did not give any ruler a right to govern, but rather gave to all of us the right to be free. So, in America, we recognized for the first time that "rights" began with citizens, who then constituted government to protect those rights. This was the American Revolution—the triumph of an idea. It remains our challenge, as individuals, to give meaning to our God-given rights by advancing our free society. In this age, it is not a challenge easily met. Thomas Paine could just as accurately have been describing our own generation when he wrote, "These are the times that try men's souls. . . ."

But in this visionary document, the American Constitution, we have principles to guide us and sustain us. Let us draw from those principles the hope and inspiration to truly keep alive this spirit of "a new nation, conceived in liberty."

COMMUNIST SANDINISTA  
BACKED PR FIRM SPEAR-  
HEADS ANTI-CONTRA CAM-  
PAIGN

HON. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues revealing two-part articles from the Washington Times, October 19 and 20, 1987.

The author examines why history's most popular modern President has been unable to solidify support for Contra aid. He concludes that a group called Fenton Communications has successfully "romanced and manipulated" the U.S. media to support leftist, anti-Reagan, anti-Contra policies.

The group's founder, David S. Fenton, boasts a history of radical leftwing activities. He was a former member of the White Panther Party, a radical 1960's group modeled after the militant Black Panther Party. Their motto was "Rock 'n' roll, drugs and [sex] in the streets."

Clients of Fenton Communications include: Maurice Bishop, Former Prime Minister of Grenada; Miguel d'Escoto, Nicaraguan Foreign Minister; Oliver Tambo, President of the African National Congress; and Guillermo Ungo, Leader of the Salvadoran Marxist Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front.

It distresses me to know how the likes of a David Fenton has succeeded in brainwashing so many of my colleagues.

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 19, 1987]

PR FIRM SPEARHEADS ANTI-CONTRA  
CAMPAIGN

(By Don Kowet)

Sometime between Nov. 7 and Thanksgiving, the Reagan administration will begin an uphill battle in Congress for an additional

\$270 million to aid the Nicaraguan resistance.

Why has the most popular president in modern U.S. history been unable to muster broader public and congressional support for his passionately pro-Contra policy?

Part of the answer may be a small public relations firm, Fenton Communications, with offices here and in New York City.

Fenton Communications—the brainchild of David S. Fenton, a former '70s radical and Rolling Stone magazine staffer—has a history of left-wing advocacy.

Between 1982 and 1984, the firm served briefly as the registered foreign agent of the Nicaraguan Sandinista government, Andreas Papandreu's Greece and Maurice Bishop's Grenada. Since June 1986, Fenton has been registered with the U.S. Justice Department as a foreign agent of Marxist Angola, currently receiving a retainer of \$16,500 per month.

Fenton has organized news conferences and U.S. publicity tours for such icons of the left as African National Congress President Oliver Tambo and the Salvadoran Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front's Guillermo Ungo. It also arranged British Labour Party leader Neil Kinnock's latest U.S. visit and CIA renegade Philip Agee's recent book tour.

Perhaps most significantly, however, interviews with more than a dozen sources—including activists for and against Contra aid, plus former radicals—suggest that Fenton is the pivotal coordinator of a successful, ongoing nationwide campaign to massage the U.S. media with good news from Managua.

Fenton Communications' pro-Sandinista connections include links with:

A shadowy, non-profit group that possibly funds some of Fenton's for-profit activities.

A San Francisco-based organization targeting with television ads members of Congress considered "swing" votes on Contra aid.

A network of anti-Contra aid activists with ties to the Washington-based, leftist think tank the Institute for Policy Studies.

In 1986 alone, Fenton was hired to focus media attention on three of the West Germans allegedly "kidnapped" in Nicaragua by the resistance; the Christie Institute-backed lawsuit charging resistance leaders with a criminal conspiracy involving drug-smuggling, gun-running and murder; the pro-Sandinista "Quest for Peace" coalition's fund-raising campaign, and the four Vietnam veterans' "fast for life" on the steps of the Capitol.

This year, Fenton Communications has been publicizing the efforts of a coalition called "Countdown '87," which has sponsored rock concerts in Washington, Los Angeles and New York to fight further funding to the Nicaraguan resistance and has announced a \$1 million anti-aid television ad campaign.

Despite repeated requests, Mr. Fenton, the 35-year-old president and founder of Fenton Communications, refused to be interviewed for this article. Nick Allen, director of Fenton's Washington office, also declined to be interviewed.

The relationship between Fenton Communications and the tax-exempt Central America Media Education Project—an organization that channels "information" on political and military developments in Central American countries to national media outlets—is a curious one.

According to a fund-raising letter written by radical film-maker Haskell Wexler, the

media projects "works with" Witness for Peace, Medical Aid for El Salvador, the Washington Office on Latin America, the National Sanctuary Defense Fund, the Christic Institute, the Institute for Policy Studies "and dozens of others."

Mr. Wexler writes further that Mr. Fenton and Mr. Allen "directly" supervise "the day-to-day work of the media project," which Fenton Communications "carries out."

The media project, notes Mr. Wexler, isn't burdened by "all the usual organizational overhead of an office staff, phones, etc."

Every day, "media project staff" members meet with journalists, "pitching our story ideas," he says. Every week, "the media project" telephones reporters based in Nicaragua, Honduras and El Salvador "to urge them to cover stories that are not being covered," the letter continues.

Mr. Wexler touts the media project's triumphs, including "major stories" on all three nightly network newscasts and "Donahue" and "front-page articles in The New York Times, The Washington Post and other major newspapers."

Mr. Wexler's fund-raiser ends with a collage of major articles—several of them front-pagers—sparked by the media project, including Don Shannon's 1984 Los Angeles Times piece titled "Exiles Linked to Salvador Death Squads."

"The Central America Media what?" said Mr. Shannon in an interview. "I have never heard of it, and I have no idea what that is. The way I got that story was I got a call from someone at Fenton Communications who told me [former U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador] Robert White was giving a news conference."

Several other reporters denied knowing about the media project, instead citing Fenton Communications as the catalyst of their stories.

Gary Moore, a former Atlanta Constitution newspaper reporter writing a book about Nicaragua, said he recently heard about the media project for the first time when he telephoned to ask who had paid Fenton's fees for a Fenton-arranged March 7, 1985, press conference releasing the "Brody Report," cataloging alleged Contra abuses.

Mr. Moore said he was told by a Fenton staffer that the "money for that press conference was paid out of Central America Media Education Project funds."

"Heather Foote [Washington Office on Latin America]" is listed by Mr. Wexler as a media project advisory board member. In an interview, however, Miss Foote (now with the Presbyterian Church's Washington Office) said she did not have a telephone number for the media project and, for that matter, wasn't even sure if she was a board member anymore. "It's done out of Fenton," Ms. Foote said.

Advisory board member William Leo-Grande of American University said he didn't even remember when the last board meeting took place.

Margery Tabankin, director of the Washington-based Arca Foundation, is a media project board member. Arca's 1985/86 annual report lists a \$15,000 grant to the media project, donated through The Youth Project. Miss Tabankin confirmed in an interview that until 1977, when she became director of the Carter administration's VISTA (Volunteers In Service To America) program, she was executive director of The Youth Project.

The Youth Project—a left-leaning, Washington-based tax-exempt organization that

characterizes its role as "working for social justice and peace by supporting grass-roots groups and building citizens' movements"—is a major source of funding for the Central America Media Education Project.

According to its annual report for the 1985-86 fiscal year, The Youth Project contributed "\$95,000 in supplemental funds committed from 12 sources and \$51,500 from individual contributors" to the media project. This total of \$146,500—by far the largest total Youth Project grant to a single organization—was supplemented by another \$20,000 from the Circle Fund, directly administered by The Youth Project.

The Youth Project and its donor-advised funds are perennial contributors to the Institute for Policy Studies and IPS spinoffs. IPS Direc-media project board member.

Mr. Wexler and IPS Fellow Saul Landau co-produced the 1983 film "Target Nicaragua" about alleged CIA covert action aimed at overthrowing the Saninistas. Sources said that Fenton Communications represented Mr. Wexler and Mr. Landau on their publicity tour.

"David Fenton has very good connections, especially at The New York Times with [oped page editor] Robert Semple," said Scott Powell, a conservative critic of IPS whose book about the think tank, "Covert Cadres," is about to be published. "Semple was a good friend of William Sloan Coffin, and IPS man," Mr. Powell said.

Mr. Semple failed to return several telephone calls.

Fenton's Washington director, Nick Allen, also has IPS links.

Until he joined Fenton Communications in October 1986, Mr. Allen was executive director of the San Francisco-based Project Neighbor To Neighbor (now called Neighbor To Neighbor Action).

Neighbor To Neighbor is a spinoff of San Francisco's Institute for Food and Development Policy, which in turn is a spinoff of IPS.

The food institute's co-founders—Joseph Collins and Frances Moore-Lappe—have been listed as Neighbor To Neighbor advisory board members along with Cora Weiss, wife of IPS Chairman Peter Weiss.

Mr. Allen used to be the food institute's projects director. In 1982, he helped Mr. Collins and Miss Moore-Lappe write a book about Nicaragua called "What Difference Could a Revolution Make?" The book portrayed the independent Nicaraguan newspaper La Prensa as a blend of "rumors" and "virulent attacks on the government," under "the CIAs influence."

Neighbor To Neighbor is a principal sponsor of the current "Countdown '87" campaign. The executive director of "Countdown '87" is Rosa DeLauro, former chief of staff for Sen. Christopher Dodd, Connecticut Democrat.

And, to complete the circle, Mr. Allen is now, through Fenton Communications, a "Countdown '87" official spokesman.

While there is no direct evidence of a link between the two, the Fenton public relations effort overlaps—and sometimes smoothly interlocks—with the work done by Agendas International, a small New York firm that serves as a registered agent of the Nicaraguan government.

In addition to arranging meetings between visiting Sandinista dignitaries and U.S. newsmen, Agendas lists among its services holding "meetings with U.S. support groups to keep advised of and make recommendations for collaboration with them."

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 20, 1987]

#### IT'S A LONG CLIMB THROUGH THE LEFT FOR SANDINISTAS' U.S. PRESS AGENT

(By Don Kowet)

Washington-based Fenton Communications is critical to the success of a national campaign to massage the media with "good news" from Managua.

Although the firm has provided spokesmen for several leftist regimes, an important part of its business now is promoting anti-Contra causes—in collaboration with its tax-exempt soulmate, the Central America Media Education Project.

The media project funds some of Fenton's activities, often on behalf of clients with close ties to the Institute for Policy Studies, the left-wing think tank just off Dupont Circle.

Fenton Communications, which also has offices in New York, is the latest product of 35-year-old David S. Fenton's evolution through radical ranks from the anti-Nixon, anti-Vietnam politics of the late '60s to the anti-Reagan, anti-Contra politics of the '80s. Mr. Fenton declined to be interviewed for this article, but several persons who knew him during the '70s recall his rise through the radical movement.

David Horowitz, an ex-editor of the radical Ramparts magazine who has since rejected his earlier allegiance to the left, for one, identified Mr. Fenton as a former member of the White Panther Party.

The White Panthers, a radical group formed in the '60s, was based in Ann Arbor, Mich., and modeled after the militant Black Panther Party. The group's official motto, said Mr. Horowitz, was "Rock'n roll, drugs and [sex] in the streets."

Another person, who asked not to be named, said he knew Mr. Fenton intimately during the early-to-mid-1970s.

A former left-wing activist close to the White Panthers, he said Mr. Fenton joined the radical Liberation News Service (LNS) in New York City in his mid-teens. "He was the LNS official photographer, the LNS 'wunderkind,'" said the source.

Mr. Fenton subsequently moved to Ann Arbor, joined the White Panther Party, became editor of its newly revamped newspaper, rechristened The Ann Arbor Sun.

"The White Panthers needed a new newspaper," said the man, "because the Panther Party was changing its name to the Rainbow People's Party."

But Mr. Fenton left the newspaper and the White Panther/Rainbow People's Party after a "strenuous" dispute over a plan to move the paper to Detroit.

In 1973, Macmillan published Mr. Fenton's book of New Left photographs called "Shots." Later, he became publicity director of Rolling Stone magazine.

In 1987, he joined two other former Rolling Stone staffers—ex-associate editor Howard Kohn and ex-staff writer Susan Kellam—to solicit help from rock celebrities for the defense fund supporting the lawsuit filed in behalf of the late Karen Silkwood against Kerr-McGee, the nuclear fuel producer.

Daniel P. Sheehan, one of the Silkwood attorneys, is now chief counsel of the Christic Institute, whose lawsuit against the Nicaraguan resistance leaders is a client of Mr. Fenton's firm.

On May 9, 1978, Mr. Fenton and Miss Kellam co-produced a Silkwood benefit concert at New York City's Palladium.

In November of that year, Mr. Fenton reportedly met in California with singer Jackson Browne and other activists. A corporation called MUSE—Musicians United for Safe Energy—was formed for the purpose of producing a series of five anti-nuclear power concerts held in September 1979 at New York's Madison Square Garden.

The successful rock concerts not only established Mr. Fenton's credibility as a publicist and promoter of left-wing causes—cementing his contacts at major television and print outlets—but also forged his first pipeline into powerful sources of left/liberal funding.

Reportedly, MUSE obtained no-interest loans totaling about \$350,000, primarily from philanthropist Stewart Mott and a pair of New York City foundations—the Stern Fund and the Morris L. Levinson Fund. Mr. Mott and the Stern Fund are major funders of the Institute for Policy Studies and several IPS spinoffs.

The former left-wing activist once close to the White Panthers said that Mr. Fenton's anti-nuclear efforts led to his "big break" in 1980, when anti-Vietnam War activist Abbie Hoffman emerged from his Thousand Islands hideaway in New York state. Hoffman had jumped bail in 1974, charged with selling cocaine. Mr. Fenton, by this telling, helped arrange Barbara Walters's Sept. 2, 1980, ABC interview with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Fenton organized his public relations firm on Jan. 8, 1982. By Feb. 18, he had signed a letter of agreement with Nicaraguan Ambassador to the United States Francisco Fiallos for a "short-duration project," publicizing Sandinista Commandante Jaime Wheelock's tour of the United States.

On July 1, 1982, Fenton Communications registered as a foreign agent of the leftist Papandreu Greek government—the relationship ended in 1984—and in 1983 as a foreign agent of the government of Grenada to publicize the U.S. visit of the island nation's prime minister, Maurice Bishop.

Fenton arranged for Mr. Bishop to appear on ABC's "Nightline" on May 31, 1983.

"Bishop," said a person familiar with events that night, "had been totally prepared to spend a half-hour telling the American public how great Grenada was."

Instead, the broadcast focused on tales of a CIA plot to overthrow the government of Suriname and Mr. Bishop's role in taking that country to the brink of chaos. Carl Bernstein, in a filmed report, and Ted Koppel cited Mr. Bishop's advice to Suriname strongman Desi Bouterse to "eliminate your enemies or they will eliminate you."

"One night six weeks later," Mr. Bernstein reported, "Bouterse moved against leaders of the opposition, brutally."

"After the show," said the man familiar with the incident, "Bishop just stormed out. He was furious." For a while, he said, "David's credibility dropped among the people who do the major fund-raising for the guerrillas in El Salvador and for the Sandinistas."

But Fenton Communications continued to represent the government of Greece, and by the spring of 1984, a few days before the presidential election in El Salvador, the firm was sending reporters press releases giving locations and telephone numbers where Salvadoran Marxist rebel political leaders could be reached for interviews.

Meanwhile, in September 1983, a small New York City public relations firm headed by Donald J. Casey and Darryl L. Hunt—both former Maryknoll priests and ex-semi-

nary classmates of Sandinista Foreign Minister Miguel d'Escoto—had registered as a foreign agent of the Nicaraguan government.

That firm, Agendas International, still represents the Sandinistas, receiving in the past four years payments from the Nicaraguan government totaling \$1,242,000. The agency also has reported expenses of \$1,233,000 in Nicaragua's behalf, incurred in the course of presenting Sandinista officials—and their message—to the U.S. public.

Although there is no conclusive evidence of a direct connection between the two public relations agencies, Agendas and Fenton often work closely with both the U.S. media and the network of Sandinista support groups, complementing each other's efforts.

While Fenton and the media project put media representatives together with the support groups, Agendas arranges meetings between visiting Sandinista dignitaries and U.S. newsmen.

A recent curious meeting at Managua's Intercontinental Hotel witnessed by former radical leftist Ron Radosh and two colleagues illustrates the overlapping connections of the pro-Sandinista network.

Mr. Radosh, now a college teacher, the Puebla Institute's Nina Shea and the Smith-Richardson Foundation's Devon Gaffney found a meeting in progress between a group of Sandinista officials and a prominent pair of Central America Media Education Project board members.

Mr. Radosh said the trio saw—and overheard—IPS Director Robert Borosage and William Leogrande, an American University professor, "reporting and commenting on the U.S. press and political organizations and their attitudes toward the Sandinistas" with Alejandro Bendana, secretary-general of the Sandinista Foreign Ministry, and other Nicaraguan officials.

Miss Gaffney and Miss Shea, in separate interviews with The Times, confirmed Mr. Radosh's account.

Miss Gaffney also confirmed Mr. Radosh's assertion that Mr. Leogrande told Mr. Bendana: "You don't have to worry. In two years, the U.S. will be out of Central America, and you can do what you want."

In a telephone interview, Mr. Borosage listened to a reading of the account provided by Mr. Radosh.

"It's total and complete balderdash," he said. "It's the problem of a historian turned fantasist. He doesn't lie very well."

Mr. Leogrande could not be reached for comment.

In 1984, during the visit of Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega to the United States, Agendas International worked closely with the Committee of Concern for Central America, a group of anti-resistance Hollywood celebrities, headed by former M\*A\*S\*H star Mike Farrell, said to have been founded by "theater and literary contacts" of Mr. Ortega's live-in companion, Rosario Murillo.

The Committee of Concern handled the Los Angeles end of Mr. Ortega's Agendas-arranged tour, including a fund-raiser for the organization at the home of Robert Foxworth, star of CBS's "Falcon Crest," and his wife, actress Elizabeth Montgomery. The guests were said to include Jackson Browne and Sen. Christopher Dodd, Connecticut Democrat and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

A San Francisco-based anti-Contra group called Neighbor To Neighbor—whose advisory board includes to Central America Media

Education Project board members—has worked closely with the Committee of Concern, producing in 1985 a controversial documentary called "Faces of War."

The Washington-based Arca Foundation, a prime funder of the media project whose head is also a project board member, provided funding both for the Committee of Concern and "Faces of War."

Until he joined Fenton Communications in October 1986 as director of its Washington office, Nick Allen was executive director of Neighbor to Neighbor. He also was executive producer of the "Faces of War" documentary.

In January 1986, Agendas International prepared a plan for the Nicaraguan government, later leaked to the press, that proposed "targeting" certain key congressmen in a media campaign designed to sway their "swing votes" against Contra aid.

Agendas never put the plan into action, but in February 1987 Neighbor To Neighbor initiated such a campaign targeting with television ads three key senators, including Nancy Kassebaum, Kansas Republican, who "flip-flopped" on Contra aid.

Sen. Kassebaum's press secretary, Larry Shainman, recalled Fenton "running a press conference in Washington where Neighbor To Neighbor aired their [anti-Kassebaum] ad."

Now the Fenton/Neighbor To Neighbor-led "Countdown '87" coalition is launching a far more ambitious reprise of the Agendas plan, targeting with television ads six "swing vote" senators and 23 House members to combat congressional aid to the Nicaraguan resistance.

David Fenton and his tax-exempt allies continues to successfully romance and manipulate the U.S. media to support leftist policies. The measure of their success is the fact that the most popular president in modern U.S. history faces long odds in his fight with Congress over further aid to the Nicaraguan resistance.

## NICARAGUAN RUSH TO THE BORDER

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 20, 1987]

SPEAKING OF WHICH

The latest word from the Nicaraguan-Costa Rican border confirms that Daniel Ortega's offer of amnesty to the hundreds of thousands of bewildered Nicaraguans who fled his regime has backfired. Agency France-Press reported yesterday that "at least 550 Nicaraguans" took advantage of Mr. Ortega's refugee repatriation plan Sunday "to do the opposite of what the program intended—flee into Costa Rica."

AFP said the Nicaraguans "took advantage of the confusion" at the Penas Blancas border post and sneaked to the Costa Rican side, where they informed a Red Cross official "they would not return to Nicaragua under the current conditions for anything in the world."

"They said they did not want to be forced to join the [Sandinista] army," the official

said. "Others spoke of repression, of food shortages and of persecution."

Reuters news agency, meanwhile, quoted unidentified sources in San Jose, the Costa Rican capital, as saying "as many as 5,000 refugees were expected to stream across the Nicaraguan-Costa Rican frontier in the next few days" because of last week's heavy fighting between Sandinista forces and anti-Marxist Nicaraguan resistance troops.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 21, 1987]

#### COSTA RICA STRUGGLES TO AID REFUGEES

(By Julia Preston)

LA CRUZ, COSTA RICA, October 20.—Harried Costa Rican authorities here are struggling to feed and shelter 636 Nicaraguans who surged across the border Sunday in the largest single-day influx of Nicaraguan refugees to this county.

The exodus came as President Oscar Arias, who recently won the Nobel Peace Prize, is busily promoting a regional peace plan that he wrote in part to lessen the flow of Nicaraguan exiles into Costa Rica.

Since early September the two governments have allowed family members living on opposite sides of the border to mingle on Sundays at the Penas Blancas crossing point. Nicaragua's leftist Sandinista government sponsored the reunions hoping relatives would meet with rebel fighters, called counterrevolutionaries or contras, and urge them to return to civilian life in Nicaragua.

But many Nicaraguans here said they heard Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega speak of the border openings for the first time in a Sandinista Radio broadcast last week. The announcement came at a time when Sandinista recruiters were stepping up a new conscription campaign in southern Nicaragua, they said. Thousands of Nicaraguan young men have left the country to avoid being drafted.

A first group of 100 or so Nicaraguans pushed past a handful of Sandinista border guards early in the morning and clambered over a chain-link border fence, witnesses said. The Sandinista guards tried to stop them by shooting in the air, but no one was injured.

At midmorning Radio Impacto, a pro-contras Costa Rican station, broadcast to southern Nicaragua that some Nicaraguans had already made the crossing, according to refugee William Mercado who heard the newscast in his home. Mercado said he sped out the door and hopped a bus to the border with nothing more than the clothes on his back.

Refugees said guards on both sides finally left the border open most of the morning so they could cross freely. Several dozen Nicaraguans paid truck drivers to drive them across, refugees said.

The Nicaraguans said they were tired of severe shortages, starvation wages and a recent military draft call.

"There's no rice, there's no soap. If I feed my children twice a day, I can only eat once myself," said Marta Alicia Grillo, an emaciated woman carrying a 2-year-old son, Grillo's husband, who also sought refuge, was called up to the Army in early September and had been in hiding for a month in their home town of Rivas, she said.

Another recent draftee, Jorge Antonio Quiroz, said he heard of Arias' peace plan but did not believe it would succeed soon enough to help him avoid military service.

"As long as that Sandinista government stays in power, it's a lie to say there will be peace," Quiroz said.

Student Melania Cordero said she left her sobbing mother at the border gate in Nicaragua to look for work as a maid in Costa Rica.

"In this country you can buy what you want and the stores have what you want to buy," Cordero explained.

In La Cruz, 15 miles south of the Penas Blancas border station, frantic Costa Rican Red Cross volunteers prepared a tent campsite for the 452 men among the refugees, being held temporarily in the cramped Sea Gull discotheque. Health workers hurried to interview and vaccinate every Nicaraguan, fearing the spread of disease.

Costa Rica now hosts about 25,000 Nicaraguans registered with the United Nations as refugees. But tens of thousands of others are living here on their own. Arias has sounded an alarm, saying a total of 100,000 Nicaraguans live in Costa Rica's national integrity.

Three weeks ago Costa Rica and Nicaragua signed an agreement with the United Nations to repatriate Nicaraguan refugees who wish to go home. The first 33 Nicaraguans returned to their country Oct. 14 under the plan, a U.N. spokesman said.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 27, 1987]

#### SANDINISTAS' BORDER CLOSING OPENS NICARAGUAN WOUNDS

(By Charles McCoy)

PUNTE LAS LAJAS, NICARAGUA.—Here at one of the last lonely bridges on the road to Costa Rica, the Nicaraguan government is learning that a closed border can quickly become an open wound.

On Friday, the Sandinista government canceled a program that for the previous four weekends had allowed thousands of Nicaraguans to cross into Costa Rica for a few hours to see relatives who have taken refuge there. Officials gave many reasons, but the real one seemed to be that many people who crossed the frontier kept on going, seeking asylum themselves.

The border troubles are an embarrassment for the Sandinistas and an indication of the unexpected problems being caused by the peace accords signed in August by the Central American presidents. Allowing cross-border visits wasn't specifically called for in the accords, but it seemed a popular goodwill gesture. To draw back now is "quite unfortunate timing for the peace process," says a Western European diplomat in Managua.

The closure order didn't altogether stem the impulse to leave. By 7 a.m. Sunday, a strange parade of more than 1,000 poor campesinos was marching from the town of Rivas toward the border about 15 miles away, some beating sticks on the ground, some swinging machetes lazily. They got as far as this bridge, where two dozen soldiers behind barricades trained automatic weapons on them. Before the morning was over, there would be a bit of blood and an eloquent display of some of the pressures clawing at Nicaraguan society.

#### APPEAL TO ANGELS

"So it has gotten this bad," sighs Marta Elena Alvarez, a peasant woman balancing a bag of corncobs on her head and a baby on her shoulder, as she watches the crowd inch toward the soldiers. "When will the angels come to save this forsaken country?"

The events at the border indicate that, less than two weeks before the deadline for completing some of the accords' conditions, thousands of Nicaraguans are more eager to

flee than to wait around to see if peace and democracy break out. On Oct. 18, an estimated 1,200 Nicaraguans took advantage of the border program to stampede into Costa Rican refugee camps. Another 3,000 people were pushed back by Sandinista troops.

"These people feel they have no future here," says Mario Rappacioli, a right-wing opposition politician in Managua. "They don't believe the present government is capable of bringing peace."

The Sandinistas say they closed the border because Costa Rican officials were encouraging Nicaraguans to seek sanctuary, a charge the Costa Ricans deny. Over the weekend, the Sandinistas also accused the Honduran army and U.S.-backed Contra rebels of interfering with an identical border program at Las Manos, along the Honduran frontier near several Nicaraguan refugee camps. Many diplomats in Managua viewed the charges as a prelude to closing that crossing, too.

#### CIRCUMVENTING RED TAPE

Technically, Nicaragua permits its citizens to emigrate. But they must have a passport, and fighting the bureaucracy to get one can take months. Young men can't leave without proving they've completed their military service. Thus, the open-border program was an opportunity to short-cut the regulations. The Nicaraguans who flocked to do so Sunday were simple people who have always been poor. Politics has little meaning for them, but war and hunger do, and they are sick of both.

"I am a campesino," says Augusto Diaz, a weathered herdsman in a battered straw hat, whose palms are scarred with rope burns and cuts. "I don't like the government. I don't like la Contra. I just want to live in peace and have beans to eat, but I can't do that here any more."

Heading out from Rivas, the pilgrims are an odd collection: old women with cloth bundles across their backs, teenagers full of bluster and a few men pushing wood-wheeled carts.

"What can they do against the thousands we have with us here?" shouts 17-year-old Luis Henriquez, who has walked and hitchhiked the 100 miles from Managua to visit his mother and two brothers in Costa Rica. "We can die of hunger or we can die of bullets."

#### UGLY RUMORS

Suddenly, shots, Sandinista police, quickly reinforced by a small squad of army regulars, have driven from behind, parked their jeeps at the head of the procession and begun firing more or less into the air. They tell the marchers to go home. A teen-age boy is propelled by a surge in the crowd toward a young, frightened-looking policeman. The policeman cracks the boy with a rifle butt across the cheek, opening a bloody gash. Later, rumors ripple through the crowd that the teen-ager died from the blow.

The police and the troops issue more warnings and withdraw further south, toward the bridge. Soon, the crowd again begins to move in that direction. "They treat us like dogs," roars Mercedes Lopez, who has come from Leon.

According to government statistics, about 400,000 Nicaraguans—15 percent of the nation's population—have fled since the Sandinistas brought down dictator Anastasio Somoza in 1979. That is one of the greatest population flights in modern Latin American history. The wealthy and professional classes got out first, but now a lot of ordi-

nary people, including youths trying to dodge the draft, are leaving.

The bitterness found in this crowd isn't universal. The Sandinistas still have support in much of the country, though the war and a ruined economy have eroded their popularity. Even here on the road to the border, hatred of the government doesn't translate into support for the U.S.-backed Contra guerrillas.

**TWO SIDES, ONE FATE**

"I won't fight for the government, and I won't fight for the Contras," says a 16-year-old named Humberto Ruz. He has had brothers killed fighting for both sides. "Either side you fight for, you end up just as dead."

About 25 yards from the foot of this bridge, the parade halts. A local Sandinista political official with a bull horn exhorts the crowd to turn back. He is jeered. "The soldiers on the bridge have orders to not permit you to pass—that's the way it is, comrades," the official says.

The crowd mills. Enterprising businessmen wheel ice cream carts through it. Slowly the people advance to the bridge entrance, about 10 yards from the wall of soldiers. "What's going to happen to us?" ask a worried Anna Maria Castro.

Nothing. This crowd isn't looking for a fight. People chant and taunt for a few minutes, then clamber aboard trucks sent by the Red Cross to take them back to Rivas. "But we'll be back next week," says Luis, the youngster who earlier talked about the distinction between starvation and death by bullets. "Today, I prefer to die slowly."

**NATIONAL FORMER PRISONER OF WAR RECOGNITION DAY**

**HON. DOUGLAS APPLIGATE**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. APPLIGATE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution which would establish next April 9, 1988, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day." Joining me as original cosponsors of this measure are Representatives BOB McEWEN and WES WATKINS.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I introduced a similar resolution, House Joint Resolution 155, which designated last April 9 as "National Prisoner of War Recognition Day." Over 130 Members signed onto this measure. On March 31, a similar measure, Senate Joint Resolution 47, was passed by the House, due much to the help of Representative MERVYN DYMALLY, chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Census and Population, and Representative CONNIE MORELLA, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. I'm pleased that we were able to find a day to recognize America's former POW's.

Next April 9 will mark the 46th anniversary of the fall of Bataan in the Philippines during World War II, an event that is remembered by thousands of American veterans who were taken prisoner and imprisoned for nearly 4 years. I would like to continue the tradition that we established this year by creating, once again, a special day for recognizing America's former POW's. I kindly request the support of my colleagues on this measure.

**A TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH KILLINGER**

**HON. C. THOMAS McMILLEN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate an individual in my district who has exemplified the spirit of giving to others.

This lady is Elizabeth Killinger, a neighbor of mine, who was recently selected as Crofton Citizen of the Year. Mrs. Killinger has lived in Crofton for over 20 years. During this span, she has served admirably in a number of civic organizations.

As membership chairwoman of the Crofton Swim and Tennis Club, Mrs. Killinger was responsible for a membership roster of over 2,000. She has also been the president of the Federated Woman's Club and the Crofton Village Garden Club.

From her work in these organizations, those of us who live in Crofton daily enjoy the fruits of Mrs. Killinger's labors. She was personally responsible for the flowers and shrubbery at the Back Lake in Crofton. Her work has also beautified the common areas of Crofton. In addition to her work in the community of Crofton, she has also taken an active interest and leadership role in preserving portions of historic Anne Arundel County, MD.

The work of Elizabeth Killinger has been enjoyed by many in my district and my community, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure to call the attention of the House to her selection as Crofton Citizen of the Year.

**A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO ROBERT J. TARLTON**

**HON. GUS YATRON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Robert J. Tarlton of Lansford, PA. On November 14, 1987, Mr. Tarlton will be honored by the Panther Valley Chamber of Commerce as its "Citizen of the Year."

Robert J. Tarlton is clearly deserving of this award. He is well known in our area for his business achievements and his commitment to public service. Mr. Tarlton has had a long and successful career in radio and television. From 1933 until he volunteered to serve in the Army during World War II, Mr. Tarlton operated a successful radio sales and service business. Upon returning from the war, he quickly recognized the many benefits of a new technology—television. In the late 1940's, Mr. Tarlton developed and installed in the Panther Valley the first multichannel coaxial cable system to be operated as a viable business. Mr. Tarlton built on his success in the Panther Valley by helping establish cable systems in a number of States. His system was the precursor of the cable television systems now used throughout America.

Robert Tarlton has received many well-deserved honors for his contributions to cable

television. He was a founding member of what is now the National Cable Television Association and the Pennsylvania Cable Television Association. In recognition of his many achievements, both organizations have honored Mr. Tarlton for his invaluable work in the development of cable television.

Mr. Tarlton also remains active in local community affairs. He is a member of the Lansford AMVETS, the American Legion, the VFW, the BPO Elks, the Lansford Volunteer Fire Co., and the local Rotary Club. He is also now serving as coordinator of the Carbon-Schuylkill Community Hospital Association. He remains dedicated and committed to helping his fellow citizens.

I can think of no individual more deserving of selection as the Panther Valley Chamber of Commerce's "Citizen of the Year." Robert J. Tarlton is an outstanding individual who has made invaluable contributions to the Panther Valley and to the development of cable television throughout our Nation. I know that my colleagues will join me in honoring Robert J. Tarlton on this important occasion and in wishing him continued success and good fortune in the years to come.

**COURAGE**

**HON. DON RITTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, courage, especially in time of conflict, is a great virtue. When that courage is manifest in the midst of great fear, the value and worth of the courage are proportionately enhanced.

Airman, the magazine of America's Air Force, recounted the story of the sixth combat mission of Francis Gallagher, B-24 radio operator-gunner, in its issue for September 1987. Cpl. Frank Gallagher kept a diary of his 35 combat missions from October 1944 through April 1945 for his daughter Barbara who was 2 years old at the time. He wrote a prologue for his diary "just in case" he would never see her again.

Throughout these 35 combat missions, Frank admitted that he was "scared most of the time." On his sixth mission, November 5, 1944, in a B-24 nicknamed Lonesome Polecat, Frank was terribly frightened. He had just been promoted to buck sergeant.

On this mission, to clear out a large concentration of German troops who were harassing a unit of guerrillas in a Yugoslav valley, no one reckoned on the Germans' mobile antiaircraft guns. Frank wrote: "Their fire was the most accurate I've seen to date." With the deputy lead plane shot down, carrying two majors, two captains, and a lieutenant along as observers, Sergeant Gallagher endured fire, bomb-bay doors that would not close, his plane tossed like a toy and a small fire which he put out on his own flight deck.

The Lonesome Polecat limped back to base, late and alone. Frank Gallagher wrote in his diary that he wanted no more days like this. But in terrible fear, he remained at his post, carried out his duty and responded to emergencies. Mr. Speaker, it is quite fitting

that the House of Representatives bestow the honor of acknowledgment on this man of courage.

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO  
STEVE G. PODESTA

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished business and civic leader in my district, Steve G. Podesta. Steve will be honored on November 13, 1987 by the Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce at their ninth annual "Salute to Industry" Awards Banquet. Steve was chosen as this year's honoree based on his dedicated service to the South Bay area over a long period of years. This auspicious occasion gives me an opportunity to express my appreciation for his work on behalf of the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles as well as the surrounding community. Steve Podesta epitomizes the image of the dedicated community servant.

Born in Los Angeles, CA, Steve has proven over the years his commitment to the overall commerce of the South Bay Area. He started his career working for the Douglas Aircraft Co. in Long Beach during World War II, and continued with the company until he became self-employed in 1961. Since that time, he has been involved in a whole host of business endeavors and commercial organizations. Among the long list of Steve's impressive accomplishments: board chairman of the BSP Development Corp.; director of the Bank of San Pedro; coowner of Helitrans; coowner of Podesta-Moller and Associates; senior vice president of Professional Satellite Imaging Corp.; as well as board chairman and director of Renergy International Corp. Steve has also served as a real estate developer and an industrial/manufacturing consultant.

While dedicated to a career in financial and business organizations, Steve has given an enormous amount of his time and energy to various civic duties. In addition to his participation in professional organizations, such as the San Pedro Community Development Advisory Committee, and the Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce, which he served as president and director, Steve has also been active in the Rotary Club of San Pedro and the Harbor Occupational Center Citizen's Advisory Committee. He has made significant contributions of time and energy to the Bay Harbor Hospital, Port of Los Angeles-Long Beach Marine Square Club, and the San Pedro Chamber of Community Development and Commerce. Clearly, Steve's numerous accomplishments highlight the truly remarkable contribution he has made toward the betterment of our community.

My wife, Lee, joins me in extending our warmest congratulations to Steve G. Podesta on this special occasion. His many years of community service and civic duty are an inspiration to us all. We wish Steve and his wife Doris, whose own accomplishments are equally impressive, all the best in the years ahead.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WAR POWERS AND THE  
PERSIAN GULF

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there have been numerous calls in Congress for application of the War Powers Resolution of 1973 to the situation in the Persian Gulf. Under the War Powers Resolution, the President would be required to withdraw United States forces in 60-90 days from situations abroad in which there are hostilities or in which imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, unless Congress authorizes continued deployment.

In politics as in military operations there is always a tendency to fight the last war. Unfortunately, the consequences in politics can be equally severe.

The War Powers Resolution was a belated reaction to the involvement of United States forces in Indochina. Having permitted successive administrations to expand and extend the United States combat role in Indochina, Congress attempted to prevent such a commitment of forces from occurring again without explicit Congressional authorization.

The War Powers Resolution thus attempts to shift the action to Congress. But Congress has seldom shown an ability or willingness to act in such circumstances. Look at where we are today. Months after commencement of United States naval operations to protect the reflagged Kuwaiti tankers, the Congress has still not acted to resolve the War Powers issue with regard to Persian Gulf operations.

The fact is that the President must have the authority to commit United States forces in order to support United States foreign policy and defend United States national security interests. Attempting to require congressional authorization stands the matter on its head.

I commend to my colleagues an excellent column on this subject by Edwin M. Yoder of the Washington Post, which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution on October 20, 1987.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION DOESN'T APPLY IN  
GULF

(By Edwin M. Yoder)

WASHINGTON.—Ever since the Reagan administration agreed last spring to put American flags on Kuwaiti oil tankers and provide them with an escort of U.S. warships, Congress has fumed that the 1973 War Powers Resolution is being ignored.

The reasons vary. Some senators claim that Congress really wants to share responsibility if something goes wrong—a claim too incredible to take seriously. Others seem to say that this dubious "act" should be enforced because it is there, like Mount Everest.

In the War Powers Resolution, Congress said in essence that a president who puts U.S. armed forces in danger of "imminent hostilities" must give notice to Congress. Then Congress has 60 to 90 days to approve or not.

The resolution was, in effect, an ex post facto comment by Congress upon the origins of U.S. involvement in Vietnam—just as the obstructive Neutrality Act of the 1930s (which, until amended, kept Franklin Roo-

October 28, 1987

sevelt from selling arms to the anti-Hitler forces in Europe) was an equally misguided comment on how we got into World War I.

But the implication that Congress was dragged unwarily and unwillingly into Vietnam is silly. Congress was a willing, even eager, collaborator from the start—from the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution to a very late stage of the debate.

In today's Persian Gulf policing exercise, it is hard to believe that even Congress, meddlesome as some of its members like to be in foreign policy, would ever require a president to pull U.S. naval forces out of the Persian Gulf, where they have been active since the late 1940s.

Another difficulty is that the terms of the War Powers Resolution are vague. "Hostilities," for instance, are not defined. The enforcement mechanism—a joint resolution, without presidential signature—has been cast in some constitutional doubt by the Supreme Court decision on legislative vetoes. (The court said that acts having the force of law must—unlike joint resolutions—be submitted to the president for his signature.)

Every president since Richard Nixon, who vetoed the act, has questioned its constitutional validity. It has been formally invoked only once in the deployment of U.S. Marines at the Beirut airport Congress then "gave" President Reagan 18 months. But that did not silence a running commentary that finally intimidated the administration and forced a sudden, shameful pullout.

Jimmy Carter did not bother to invoke the War Powers Resolution when he tried the rescue mission in Iran. Nor did Reagan when he invaded Grenada or bombed Libya. These operations were far more clearly "hostile" than escorting tankers in the Persian Gulf, but were short-term operations not likely to exhaust a 60-day limit. Another puzzle.

The fixation on the War Powers Resolution is hard to understand. Congress, after all, is at liberty to express its view of any presidential use of U.S. forces, anywhere, without waiting for the War Powers Resolution. Congress has ample powers of the purse to put an end to any expedition it wishes to. And it can impeach any president who flagrantly disregards its will on the expenditure of public monies.

In practice, of course, no one expects any such bruising showdown. Two hundred years of pushing and shoving between presidents and Congresses have left the question of war-policy paramountcy in suspension. That was true of arguments stretching from Washington's neutrality proclamation in the war between France and Britain to the dispatch of U.S. armies to Korea and Vietnam.

Congress no doubt finds its frustrating that presidents always have the upper hand, because they can act expeditiously and because the movement of troops or ships is inherently an executive function.

In its nature, the Persian Gulf question is for those reasons and others a presidential judgment call. Congress' best option, unless it wants to wheel out the really big guns, is to observe and grumble: a familiar function, if not so constitutional as it might wish.



## NATIONAL FOOD BANK WEEK

## HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 368 which designates the week of November 8 through 14 as "National Food Bank Week." For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to share articles published by both the Christian Science Monitor and USA Today regarding contributions by food banks to feed the hungry in our country. With Thanksgiving on its way, it is time not only to count one's own blessings but to support those who are extending a helping hand to the less fortunate. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor House Joint Resolution 368 and give food banks the recognition they deserve.

[From USA Today, Oct. 27, 1987]

USA'S FOOD BANKS FACE BELT-TIGHTENING  
(By John Bacon)

Lunch is on the house at the Gospel Church of God on the Bronx's Grand Concourse in New York.

Each day more than 500 people dig in to spaghetti, chicken or "whatever we can get our hands on," says Edwin Curley, retired airman and volunteer lunch monitor.

The program is one of hundreds supplied by Food For Survival, New York's regional food bank. But Food For Survival, like many food banks across the USA, is scurrying for winter stocks in the face of increasing need.

Adding to collection woes, corporate belt-tightening and an unfriendly tax law. Food banks are fighting back.

A bill in Congress would declare Nov. 8-14 National Food Bank Week—in time for Thanksgiving collections.

St. Louis Boy Scouts try next month to collect more than 1 million pounds of food for the area food bank.

Raley's grocery store chain in California and Nevada is selling \$1 and \$5 tax-deductible coupons to shoppers. Raley's will use the money to buy food at wholesale prices for 32 non-profit food banks.

Food banks are suffering from cuts in corporate generosity—a main source of food and money.

Federal tax revision trimmed breaks for donations.

High-priced corporate takeovers put new pressure on the "bottom line."

Production is more tightly controlled, meaning less excess to give food banks. And food with packaging flaws, once ticketed for food banks, now is sold through intermediaries to prisons, hospitals and other institutions.

"Companies are under tremendous pressure to squeeze more out of every dollar," said Phil Warth, director of Second Harvest, the nation's food bank clearinghouse. "There's not much we can do about it—we don't make the food."

"What hurts is that so often in pays for the companies to just throw the food away," said Sandra Lewis, Food Lifeline director in Seattle. "We're competing with the trash can."

Second Harvest expects to increase collections by 15 percent this year—down from last year's 28 percent growth.

Many regional food banks are more severely hit. The Los Angeles Regional Food

Bank, among the USA's largest with distributions of 2 million pounds a month, reports a 50 percent drop in local donations.

"With companies becoming more bottom-line oriented, they just don't have so many leftovers" says Charmeen Wing, director of the Los Angeles effort.

Winter's approach has some cities in colder areas shuddering. "People need cash up front to pay the oil man, the coal man, or whoever," says Jean Machenberg, director of the Central Virginia Food Bank in Richmond, Va. "When it's heat or eat, people heat."

That sends people to agencies supported by Machenberg's food bank, which distributes up to 4 million pounds of food annually. This year, donations are down 20 percent.

Food For Survival, like food banks in Seattle and St. Louis, expects 1987 donations to match 1986. All, however, had hoped for increases.

In St. Louis, food bank spokesman Bill Donovan estimates that need will rise 15 percent this year.

[From USA Today, Oct. 27, 1987]

SECOND HARVEST GREW INTO A NATIONAL  
EFFORT

(By John Bacon)

John van Hengel started Second Harvest, now the USA's largest charity food program, because he saw a lot of wasted food and a lot of people who needed it.

Van Hengel was working in a Phoenix soup kitchen in the early 1960s, collecting leftovers from local grocers in a battered truck.

"We brought in more than we could use, so we would drop it off at other missions," says van Hengel, a retired sporting goods representative. In 1967 he obtained a small warehouse to store supplies so other local missions could pick up their supplies.

Soon organizations in Seattle and Pasadena, Calif., were asking for van Hengel's help. The idea spread. In 1976 the federal government funded the start-up effort to make Second Harvest the national food bank clearinghouse.

Now Second Harvest collects food and helps food banks nationwide organize collections from national corporations such as Campbell Soup Co. and General Foods Corp. It also certifies food banks, monitoring storage facilities and bookkeeping practices.

In 1979 Second Harvest distributed 2.5 million pounds of food. This year the group and the 200-plus certified food banks nationwide will distribute more than 350 million pounds of food.

Van Hengel said he became involved in hunger programs out of a "horrible need to be needed."

Today, van Hengel, 64, operates International Foodbanking Service Inc. He recently returned from a consulting trip to Paris and Brussels: "I got treated like a king over there. Not bad for a retired old goat."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 27, 1987]

## AMERICA'S BOUNTY KEEPS FOOD BANKS BUSY

(By Mary B.W. Tabor)

BOSTON.—"If it's not fresh, it's not legal." That's the motto of the Legal Seafood restaurants, promising just-caught fish for finicky palates. Unfortunately, it also means that what's not eaten at the end of the day must go.

Across the country, restaurants, farmers, grocers, and manufacturers face tons of surplus, slightly damaged, or unwanted food that US standards deem "edible but unmarketable." Although a portion of the food will be redistributed by food banks or relief groups, most of it—approximately 137 million tons of it each year—will go into trash.

Who's to blame? Everyone, says Westy Egmont, head of the Boston Food Bank. In the food business, he says, "waste happens at every stage."

Not only do statistics show that 20 percent of the food produced in the US is lost between the field and the table, but Mr. Egmont says approximately 20 percent of the food prepared in America's kitchens is never eaten. Reports from a study at the University of Arizona say about \$11.7 billion worth of edible food is wasted in US homes each year. That's enough to feed all of Canada, the report says.

Meanwhile, with federal food-program funding cut by more than \$12 billion since 1980, at least 20 million Americans—ones who could have turned to foodstamps or school lunches for a square meal a decade ago—are now insufficiently fed, according to government figures released yesterday.

In a nation where plates are, more often than not, piled high with food that no one is expected to eat, malnourishment is absurd, says Egmont. So his organization—affiliated with some 200 other food banks in a network called Second Harvest—is trying to put a little sense back into the system.

Tucked back in an old warehouse in the Roxbury section of Boston, the six-year old Boston Food Bank serves as a non-profit clearinghouse for food solicited from the private sector. Food made unmarketable as a result of mislabeling, overproduction, or other superficial flaws is donated to the Food Bank. It is then stored, triply checked, and redistributed on a daily basis to some 600 qualified charitable groups.

So far this year more than 4 million pounds of donated and surplus food have passed through the BFR, valued at approximately \$8.5 million. And in keeping with Second Harvest's policy of "tight-ship" management, BFB, which charges its shoppers 12 cents per pound of food, spends only \$1 for every \$121 worth of food distributed.

Food banking can help solve the problem of redistribution, but as Egmont suggests, one of the basic causes of waste is lack of responsibility. There are, however, some exceptions to this rule.

For example, Legal Seafood's owner, George Berkowitz, developed a "quick chill" system to help redistribute the unused food. Some of Legal's chefs volunteer Saturdays to prepare high-protein meals. The meals are extremely popular with the soup kitchens, says Kristin Stangeby, who runs the selling floor.

On the college level, Smith College in Northampton, Mass., has a system in which a student can notify the college dining services when she is going to miss a meal during vacation periods. Smith then donates 10 cents for that meal to the Western Massachusetts Food Bank and at the same time, avoids wasting a helping.

Tufts University, outside Boston, has also adopted a program to help students take responsibility for food waste. Excess prepared food is taken daily from the dining halls to a local soup kitchen.

Egmont says that while the food bank concept may be "the most logical, immediate 'band-aid available' for food waste, there is no substitute for government pro-

grams. And the problems of overproduction, poor distribution, and hunger will continue until the US has a more economically just society, he says.

Other problems, he says, are that in a culture oriented toward highly processed food, serving sizes are predetermined by the packager. A single-serving package can sometimes hold enough for two, and most Americans, he says, tend to throw out leftovers after a day or two. He also attributes excessive waste to American trendiness. As long as a product is in vogue, he says, retailers can not keep enough on the shelf. When the fads change, a surplus is almost inevitable.

That's when the food bank comes to the rescue. "[At BFB,] we just watch for the trendy ads and then wait for the food to come in."

### A TRAGIC CASE

#### HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues attention the tragic case of CWO Martin F. Gaffney, U.S. Marine Corp, and his wife and family.

Tragically, Mrs. Gaffney, and their infant son, John Martin Gaffney, have died of AIDS. Martin Gaffney tests positive for the HIV or AIDS virus. Only the daughter Maureen Gaffney has not been infected with this virus.

Currently, Chief Warrant Officer Gaffney and his family have a claim filed against the United States pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act, and are seeking damages. They charge that this tragedy resulted from a blood transfusion Mrs. Gaffney received as a result of mismanagement of her first pregnancy by the naval medical system.

Mrs. Gaffney first became pregnant in late 1980, with a projected due date in August 1981. However, her pregnancy was allowed to go beyond her due date, the claim states, despite inquiries by Mr. Gaffney regarding inducing labor. I wish to note, Mr. Speaker, that it can be medically unwise to allow a pregnancy to progress indefinitely, because the placenta can begin to deteriorate, and fail to provide adequate support for the fetus.

Almost a month after her due date, Mrs. Gaffney began to experience pains, and Mr. Gaffney took her into the emergency room at the local naval medical facility. The claim states that after being examined by a nurse, who apparently consulted a physician by telephone, Mrs. Gaffney's pains were diagnosed as a false alarm and she was released. At that time, the nurse noted that there were fetal heart tones, indicated that the infant was alive. Two days later Mrs. Gaffney again experienced pains and went into the emergency room. During this second visit to the emergency room, there were no fetal heart tones, and after unsuccessful attempts to induce labor, the infant was delivered stillborn by cesarean section. At this time, Mrs. Gaffney was given two units of blood, including the unit believed to be infected by the HIV virus.

The Gaffney's claim charges that Mrs. Gaffney's pregnancy was not properly monitored, and that if it had been, and she had been delivered in accordance with generally accepted

standards of medical practice, the infant would have lived, and Mrs. Gaffney would probably not have required the transfusions. However, according to the claim, as a result of the delay in delivery, the infected blood was administered to Mrs. Gaffney, infecting her, Mr. Gaffney, and a future child, John Martin Gaffney.

In addition to successful resolution of his families' claim, Martin Gaffney would like to see changes made in the military medical system which will protect other individuals and families from tragedies such as his family has suffered.

The Department of Defense is making progress in improving the military medical system, and the Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation has held several hearings across the country examining this problem. I wholeheartedly commend these important actions.

One important change in the system would be to encourage rigorous monitoring of the quality of medical care by allowing active duty personnel to bring claims directly for medical malpractice. Under current law, active duty personnel cannot file claims against the Government for malpractice. For example, the Gaffney's claim is based on the medical care that Mrs. Gaffney, a dependent, received. However, active duty personnel who claim to have received substandard care do not have this vital recourse to the courts.

H.R. 1054 and S. 347 would make this important change. The House Judiciary Committee has conducted hearings on H.R. 1054, and the bill has been placed on the House Calendar. Additionally, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation, which does not have direct oversight, conducted a hearing this summer, at which the Department of Defense proposed a compromise plan which would allow for adjudication of claims by active duty military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, we must do everything possible to ensure high quality medical care for those who protect our country. I strongly support H.R. 1954, and urge its passage.

### UNITED STATES-CANADIAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

#### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Foreign Affairs Newsletter for October 1987 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### UNITED STATES-CANADIAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

On October 3, the U.S. and Canada concluded a Free Trade Agreement (FTA). The two economies, closely intertwined, are the world's largest trading partners. Almost 80 percent of Canada's exports come to the U.S. and 20 percent of U.S. exports go to Canada. Trade has built strong ties between our two countries but has also created frictions: Since 1983, the U.S. has run a major trade deficit with Canada. Rising protectionism has led to numerous trade disputes which have threatened to escalate into an all-out trade war.

The FTA is meant to remedy these problems and to prevent new ones. By halting protectionism and opening trade opportunities in goods, services and intellectual property, the FTA could provide a stimulus for the new round of global trade negotiations now underway, and make our close trade ties with Canada even closer. The FTA will increase competition. The hope is that over time it will strengthen both the U.S. and Canadian economies and create thousands of new jobs. My sense is that the FTA will create more winners than losers.

Under special "fast track" procedures, the President has until January 3, 1988 to sign an agreement which he must then submit to Congress for approval, probably early next spring. The House and Senate will have 60-90 days to consider the pact and vote on it, up or down; no amendments are permitted. The treaty is likely to be approved both by Congress and the Canadian Parliament, but not without contention.

**Tariffs:** The heart of the FTA is the removal of tariffs. Eighty percent of Canadian exports to the U.S. and 65 percent of U.S. exports to Canada are already duty-free. Existing Canadian tariffs average double those in the U.S., and some are much higher. The FTA will phase out all remaining tariffs. Some will be eliminated in January 1988, others within three years, and the remainder by 1998. The longer phase-in period will allow time for industry adjustment. Some short-term dislocation may result, but tariff elimination should boost long-term efficiency and growth.

**Non-Tariff Barriers:** Limited progress on remaining non-tariff barriers is perhaps the FTA's single largest shortcoming. Negotiators were unable to bridge the gap between widely varying U.S. and Canadian views on subsidies. Nevertheless, some important progress was made. Canada agreed to tighten the 1965 U.S.-Canadian Auto Pact guidelines to prevent foreign auto producers (largely Japanese and Korean) from receiving duty-free concessions. Unofficial Canadian auto content rules will be replaced with a 50 percent North American provision which will benefit U.S. suppliers. In services, each country agreed to give the other the same treatment they provide their own nationals. Substantial progress was made in financial services where differing banking regulations presented a barrier to competition. These concessions will help the U.S., which enjoys an advantage in service trade with Canada.

**Energy:** Canada's proximity and vast resources make a stable energy supply relationship a major U.S. objective. Under the FTA, Canada will guarantee less volatility in energy exports to the U.S. In return, the U.S. will allow Canada limited access to Alaska's North Slope oil. This trade-off has raised concerns in both countries. Many Canadians believe it is one-sided; some Americans insist that exclusive U.S. access to Alaskan oil must not be relinquished. National security interests in Alaskan energy are important, but the gains from long-term U.S. access to Canadian energy resources should not be overlooked.

**Investment:** Nearly half of all Canadian industry is owned by foreigners, three-fourths of whom are American. Concern with foreign ownership led Canada to enact numerous investment restrictions, including "performance undertakings" (requirements for exports, local sourcing and domestic content) and limitations on foreign holdings. The FTA will eliminate Canadian minimum equity rules and performance undertaking requirements. U.S. companies will receive

the same treatment for new acquisitions as Canadian companies. Canadian "cultural" industries, such as broadcasting media and publications, will be exempted. The Canadians remain deeply sensitive about issues of sovereignty and fear that their cultural identity will be overrun by a surge of Yankee influence from the south.

**Dispute Settlement:** The FTA creates a controversial binational dispute settlement mechanism to replace review by national courts. The tribunal will consist of five experts—two U.S., two Canadian, and a mutually agreed-upon fifth party, who will review contested trade dispute rulings by U.S. and Canadian authorities. The national laws of each country will be applied, but the binational tribunal will have the final say. Constitutionality questions raised by this provision must be addressed before the FTA is sent to Congress.

The FTA is not perfect. It has shortcomings as well as positive aspects. Many non-tariff barriers will remain, especially in agriculture where progress must await developments in the new round of global trade negotiations. However, U.S. trade with Canada is likely to increase significantly. Winning U.S. industries will include autos, telecommunications, computers, financial services and many small manufacturers now hurt by trade barriers. Losers may include metal and energy-extraction industries, and U.S. shippers, who fear the FTA could expand Canadian maritime opportunities in the U.S. market.

Canada is a close ally and neighbor with whom we share the world's longest undefended border. Over the years we have enjoyed unequalled cooperation on a broad range of issues. The FTA represents an ambitious new frontier for our relationship. The coming debate will focus not only on the FTA, but on the future of overall cooperation between the U.S. and Canada. The broader question is whether the FTA will move the world in the direction of competing trade blocs or set a precedent for a new round of trade liberalization.

## BUILDING A NEW PARTNERSHIP FOR THE AMERICAS

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to alert my colleagues of a speech by Presidential candidate Gov. Michael S. Dukakis, "Building a New Partnership for the Americas." This excellent speech calls for strong foreign policy. It calls for support of the Arias peace plan. It calls on this country to promote human rights and democracy around the world.

### BUILDING A NEW PARTNERSHIP FOR THE AMERICAS

(Speech by Gov. Michael S. Dukakis)

I am an internationalist.

I believe that the United States must be deeply and actively engaged in what's going on in the world.

That we must be tough and strong and involved—in our hemisphere, in our relations with the Soviet Union, in the Middle East and Far East, and in the world economy.

Of course, it's easy to talk about being tough and strong and involved. We've been

getting that kind of rhetoric from the White House for nearly seven years.

But it's another thing to be tough; to be strong; and to use our strength for the right reasons and the right goals and the right objectives and the right values.

And wandering around the world like a lonesome cowboy is no substitute for a strong and coherent foreign policy that respects the rule of law; that works in concert with our allies; and that reflects American values.

We can't afford another four years of a foreign policy that talks tough and collapses under fire.

We can't afford more Lebanons; more Iran-contra scandals; more ill-conceived adventures in the Persian Gulf; more missed chances to stop the arms race.

We can't afford a \$170 billion trade deficit.

And we can't afford a failed and illegal policy in Central America.

During the next weeks and months, I will be setting forth my vision of America's place in the world: my views on how we strengthen our national security; on how we can build a competitive America; and on how we pursue what I believe is the best opportunity for meaningful arms control and arms reduction we have had in our lifetimes.

It will be an optimistic vision. A vision of an America that is proud and strong and confident; an America with a foreign policy that gives life to the principles and values upon which our nation was founded.

America must have a strong national defense. We must also have a strong and growing economy; quality schools for our children; a safe and wholesome environment; and new leadership in the White House that will make sure we get a dollar's worth of security for every defense dollar we spend.

Our nation was born in rebellion; we were raised on the frontier; and we came of age in the industrial revolution. We are not a nation that fears change. We expect it. We embrace it. And we have always understood that we must make change work for us, not against us.

The times now demand new leadership; leadership with a deep understanding of history and a clear view of the future—its dangers and its opportunities.

Leadership that understands we are stronger when we work together—with our allies; with our neighbors; with the international community. Leadership that knows we are stronger when we respect the law and the Constitution and live up to our own principles and values.

This afternoon, I want to apply these ideas to a specific challenge: to our relations with those who share with us the proud badge of "Americans": the people of Central and South America. For our neighbors to the south do not refer to us simply as "Americans". They call us "norteamericanos": Americans of the north.

During the summer of 1954, I had the opportunity to live with a wonderful family in Lima, Peru and to study at the oldest university in our hemisphere. That's where I learned to appreciate and respect the Latin American people and their history and culture. It's where I learned to speak Spanish. And it's where I first confronted the inconsistencies in our policies toward our neighbors to the south.

For it was in 1954 that the United States government, operating right out of the U.S. Embassy in Guatemala City, engineered the overthrow of the democratically elected government of Guatemala. And the curious

thing about what happened in Guatemala in 1954 was that nobody here in the United States seemed to know what was going on while everybody in Peru knew exactly what we were doing. The result of that U.S. directed military coup in Guatemala was thirty years of the most brutal repression any country in this hemisphere has ever endured.

In this century, the United States has mounted nineteen major military expeditions to Latin America. Five times, we sent troops to Honduras. The Marines occupied Nicaragua for twenty years. And we have helped overthrow a democratically-elected government not only in Guatemala in 1954, but in Chile in 1973.

Every time we intervened, we did so in the name of democracy and freedom.

And almost without exception, the legacy of our intervention has been tyranny, not freedom.

The lesson in this is not that our announced goals were wrong, but that we chose the wrong means. We put ourselves above the law. We tried to go it alone. We tried to impose our views, instead of helping to build a democratic tradition. We showed our neighbors a fist, when they needed a helping hand.

This is a lesson that the current Administration has not learned. Since coming to office in 1981, it has carried out a policy towards Nicaragua that has ignored the counsel of our Latin American allies, flouted international law, violated treaties which we ourselves helped to draft and sign and ratify; undermined our Constitution and fueled the flames of violence and instability throughout Central America.

As a result, it has been a weak policy; a policy that has failed to unite our people at home, failed to win support from our allies abroad, failed to reduce Soviet and Cuban influence in Nicaragua, and failed to serve the best interests of our country or of our neighbors.

The next President will have the opportunity—and the responsibility—to restore U.S. leadership. Not by seeking to dominate our neighbors or to dictate regional events. But by building a strong and durable partnership with a new generation of democratic leaders in Latin America.

A partnership that will recall the spirit of FDR's Good Neighbor policy and build on the best elements of JFK's Alliance for Progress.

A partnership: to restore economic development and economic opportunity; to ensure peace and security; to promote democracy and human rights.

Not long ago, most Latin American countries were governed by military dictators.

Today, democratic elections have given the region its best group of leaders in at least a quarter century. Leaders like Alfonsín in Argentina \* \* \* Arias in Costa Rica \* \* \* Barco in Colombia \* \* \* Cerezo in Guatemala \* \* \* de la Madrid in Mexico \* \* \* García in Peru \* \* \* and Sanguinetti in Uruguay. These are strong, practical, progressive, democrats; they are good neighbors; and they will be good partners.

And if we listen to those leaders, we will understand that the greatest danger we face in this hemisphere is not Nicaragua or Cuba; it is the desire of those in Latin America who are poor, jobless, landless or malnourished to lead a better life.

For economic weakness leads to weakness elsewhere; by undermining the democratic promise; by sowing the seeds of radical revolution; by strengthening the appeal of prof-

its from trafficking in drugs; by disrupting communities, breaking up families and driving tens of thousands northward each year in search of opportunity.

We in this country are proud to be a land of opportunity. But the people of Latin America want and deserve opportunity at home.

And today, Latin America is in the middle of its worst economic crisis since World War II.

The military left behind huge debts in Argentina and Brazil and Guatemala. Peru must cope with a \$13 billion debt and a rural infant mortality rate of 25 percent. The per capita income in every country in Central America has declined by ten percent or more since 1981. The average annual inflation rate in Latin America during that period has been an incredible 134%. A decade of growth has evaporated. Unemployment has risen and wages have gone down.

Unfortunately, we have not responded. Instead, we have turned a blind eye to poverty and a deaf ear to the debt crisis. And in so doing, we have extended an open invitation to those who would cause trouble in our hemisphere.

In Cuba, schoolchildren chant anti-debt slogans to visiting dignitaries. And the Soviet Union has not failed to notice that on two dominant issues—the debt and Central America—our policies are opposed by Argentina, Brazil and Mexico, the three giants of Latin America. It should be no surprise that Secretary Gorbachev soon plans to visit those countries; the first visit a Soviet leader will have ever made to the mainland of Latin America.

That's why we need a partnership for progress in the Americas; a partnership that will fulfill John F. Kennedy's vision twenty-six years ago of "a hemisphere where all men can hope for a suitable standard of living, and all can live out their lives in dignity and freedom." A partnership that must begin with Mexico, a nation whose future is of far greater importance to the United States than our misbegotten adventure in Nicaragua.

Mexico is a valued and important neighbor—our third biggest trading partner and our number one supplier of oil.

But it is a neighbor in trouble.

Its population has doubled since 1960, and the real wages of the Mexican people have declined by forty percent in the last five years alone.

We have much to gain by helping Mexico to get back on its feet.

And much to gain by building a new partnership for progress throughout Latin America.

For while Mexico's recession has cost 200,000 U.S. jobs, the Latin American debt crisis, as a whole, has caused a forty percent decline in our exports to the region. That means \$14 billion less in sales each year of soybeans and grain, steel and automobiles, construction equipment and farm machinery; and thousands of lost jobs for American workers and lost opportunity for American farmers.

It means dollars that should be going to buy John Deere tractors and Iowa feed grain and South Dakota beef being used for interest payments to New York banks.

The region's external debt is now more than \$380 billion. And for five straight years, there has been a net transfer of financial resources out of Latin America—a total of \$131 billion since 1982. That's more than twice the relative size of the 1920's war

reparations that destabilized German democracy and paved the way for Hitler's rise to power.

Sooner or later, the constant demand that Latin Americans "tighten their belt" will tie a noose around democracy.

And the next President of the United States must understand the link between our security and Latin America's economy.

He must sit down with the leaders of Latin America, with the international banks, with commercial lenders, and with private voluntary organizations to develop a joint plan of action—based on the knowledge that if Latin American democracies are to grow, they must have access to foreign capital, they must have easier access to foreign markets, and they must be challenged to create opportunity not just for some, but for all their people.

We must begin by seeking an increase in capital for multilateral lending institutions, especially the Inter-American Development Bank—capital to come not just from the United States, but from Japan and Europe and Canada.

We should recognize that the burden of debt relief must be shared fairly—by borrowers and lenders.

We should act on the principle that debt service payments must leave sufficient funds within a country to allow adequate investment and growth.

We should recognize that what may work in one country will not work in another.

We should encourage innovation and experimentation: debt for equity swaps like those used in Chile and Mexico, and agreements like the Conservation International's deal with Bolivia to exchange six hundred fifty thousand dollars in debt relief for expanded environmental protections in the Amazon rain forest.

We should encourage Latin American governments to address not just the symptoms, but the causes of underdevelopment, by responding to the needs of the poor, and by seeking to involve all their citizens in the economic life of their countries.

The United States will have a key role to play in this partnership; a role we cannot play unless we get our own fiscal house in order. A lower deficit in Washington will mean a stronger domestic economy; it will make it easier for us to help others; and it will mean lower interest rates and easier access to capital for Latin American governments.

We should seek to increase trade by bringing down tariff and nontariff barriers—between North and South America, between our hemisphere and Asia and Europe and Africa. We should oppose new barriers, such as an oil import tax, that would hurt our economy and destroy Mexico's, a country which depends on oil exports for almost half its foreign exchange.

And we should direct our foreign aid dollars to where they will do the most good.

What sense does it make to spend \$75 million to send advanced fighter aircraft to Honduras, a country where only one rural child in five is born healthy; where less than half the population has access to safe water; where almost half the adults cannot read; and where 56 percent of the workforce is without a full-time job?

And what could we possibly be thinking of when we provide Haiti with millions of dollars in military aid when those same funds could be used to help private voluntary organizations or the Inter-American Foundation to meet the basic human needs of the Haitian poor?

But no program of economic development will succeed in an atmosphere of civil or regional violence. And today, violence is encouraging capital flight, producing thousands of refugees, squandering public resources and disrupting the economic life of much of Central America.

That's why we need a partnership for peace and security, as well.

As the Americas' strongest and most powerful nation, it is our responsibility to reply firmly and forcefully to any serious military threat from the Soviet Union.

There is no place in this hemisphere for platforms from which the Soviet Union can project offensive military power against the United States, or our allies and friends.

But regional peace and security are not solely a U.S. concern; and they are not solely a U.S. responsibility.

And that is why forty years ago we helped write the Rio Treaty and the Charter of the Organization of American States. Those treaties provide a solid foundation for regional security. Under our Constitution, those treaties are the law of our land. And those treaties explicitly prohibit what we are now doing in Nicaragua.

We've had enough law breaking in high places in Washington. We don't need any more.

And make no mistake about it. What we are doing in Central America today is a violation of U.S., as well as international, law.

U.S. aid to the contras must end. For contra aid is not a lever that will foster democratic change in Nicaragua; it is, instead, a wedge separating the United States from our democratic neighbors.

Because there isn't a democratic nation in this hemisphere that supports our policy in Nicaragua.

That's why they've been trying to get us to pay attention to the Contadora process for the past five years.

And as a result of their efforts, in the words of Costa Rican President Oscar Arias, "the hour of peace" for Central America has come. Last month in Guatemala City, the leaders of that region signed a historic agreement based on Contadora and the Arias plan; a plan to stop the killing and start the talking in Central America.

The United States should be supporting this agreement—not reluctantly, but enthusiastically—for its goals are our goals: a ceasefire with amnesty for those who have taken up arms against their government; an end to outside intervention, whether by the United States or Cuba or the Soviet Union; respect for international borders; a halt to regional militarization; progress toward democracy; and protection for human rights.

The agreement reached in Guatemala City is only a framework for peace; it is not peace itself. But it is a serious document that makes demands and imposes obligations that can and must be met—by Nicaragua, by guerrilla groups, by outside powers and by every government in the region. And we should seize the opportunity to help translate this plan's promise into the reality of peace and security for Central America.

We should be willing to negotiate directly with Nicaragua to resolve our legitimate security concerns. The Central American governments expect and desire that we do so.

We should be offering whatever technical and financial support may be needed to help monitor and verify the provisions of a more detailed plan for peace.

And we should be welcoming President Arias as a hero when he arrives in Washington next week, not lecturing him about the

dangers of Communist subversion. He and his colleagues are well aware of the dangers. They put their lives on the line for democracy every day. And they want contra aid to stop.

The courage and creativity of Central America's leaders reminds us that we should never underestimate the determination of our fellow Americans to be free.

On the last day of last month, a quiet and peaceful man named Antoine Thurel burned himself to death on the steps in front of the State House in Boston. Antoine Thurel, like my own parents, was an immigrant. He came from Haiti, the poorest nation in this hemisphere. And he sacrificed his life in frustration and despair over the agonizing struggle for freedom and justice in his homeland.

His death should help us to remember that poverty and repression are not abstractions; they have a human face; their image is reflected in the eyes and stamped in the hearts of millions of Haitians and Salvadorans and Guatemalans and Cubans and Nicaraguans and Chileans who have sought refuge in neighboring countries, or who have come to our shores in search of freedom, but who have kept alive within themselves the hope—the dream—of returning to find freedom and prosperity at home.

It is a dream our nation can help come true.

Not by overthrowing governments we don't happen to agree with; not by cozying up to Latin American dictators as we have so often over the past century; but by demonstrating every day and every week the powerful force of our ideals; by pointing to the strength and success of the democratic partnership we will build in this hemisphere; and by building an alliance for freedom; for economic opportunity; and for social justice throughout this hemisphere.

We should use our aid dollars to help civilian leaders, especially in Central America, to establish control over their military, to build strong democratic institutions and to translate the democratic promise into a better life for their people—through better schools, better health care, better housing and better jobs.

We should help to initiate a Pan-American exchange program—a two way exchange of students and teachers and tradesmen and professionals and farmers and just plain citizens—to teach and to learn from each other and about each other, and to build a partnership among the Americas that will go deeper and grow stronger than ties based simply on government to government relations.

We should increase student scholarship programs so that Latin American students will have a better chance to develop the kind of sophisticated technical and management skills that will help them to grow and give something back to their countries.

We should expand and strengthen the Peace Corps.

And we should restore America's leadership in the struggle to increase respect throughout the world for basic human rights.

Listen to the words of Jacobo Timerman: "Of all the dramatic situations I witnessed (while a political prisoner in Argentina), nothing can compare to those family groups who were tortured often together, sometimes separately but in view of one another, or in different cells, while one was aware of the other being tortured. The entire affective world, constructed over the years \* \* \* collapses with a kick in the father's genitals,

smack on the mother's face, an obscene insult to the sister, or the sexual violation of a daughter."

Listen to the Witnesses and to the surviving victims of torture in El Salvador, the relatives of the disappeared in Guatemala and Chile, the political prisoners in Nicaragua and in Fidel Castro's Cuba.

Listen and understand that nothing justifies the theft of human dignity. Nothing. Not leftwing or rightwing politics. Not personal or economic or religious differences. There is no rationale for torture. No excuse for murder or kidnappings or disappearances.

The United States cannot impose respect for human rights, but we can place strict conditions on our military and economic aid; we can support the Inter-American Commission and the Inter-American Court on Human Rights; and, I must add, the International Court of Justice; we can encourage and protect human rights monitors; we can speak up for the silenced; we can insist on liberty for the unjustly imprisoned; and we can demand—even during civil conflict—that international humanitarian standards be observed.

We are a strong nation not so much because of what we possess, but because of what we believe.

And we are strongest when we meet the standards we set for others—not when we mine harbors, teach political assassination, or break the laws of our country to conduct a secret war.

The great liberator, Simon Bolivar, had it right when he said that the Americas are the greatest region in the world, not so much by virtue of our area and our wealth, but by our freedom and glory.

We need leadership in the white House that will understand that.

Leadership that will understand what Mexican writer Carlos Fuentes meant when he said that the "the great weakness of the Soviet Union is that they are surrounded by satellites, and not by friends."

Because our friendship with the people of Latin America can be one of our greatest strengths. If we respect each other. If we respect the law. If we work together to produce the kind of sustained economic growth that will create opportunity for all the people of this hemisphere.

That won't happen overnight.  
But Poco a poco. Little by little.  
Paso a paso. Step by step.  
Juntos. Together.  
Vamos a ganar. We shall succeed.

**JACK K. WESTBROOK: AFA MAN OF THE YEAR**

**HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jack K. Westbrook from Knoxville, TN, was recently honored as "Man of the Year" by the Air Force Association, the highest tribute one can receive from that organization.

The association recognizes that "under his guidance, the highly successful 'Greater Knoxville Committee on American' was created to bring local civic and community groups together to better understand the Nation's military requirements by hearing top-level speakers on

key issues." He thus has enhanced the objectives of the AFA.

As State president, Jack led over 2,000 members in five chapters across Tennessee in highlighting the goals of the AFA, and the Air Force. He has also served as president of many other groups which include the Tennessee Association of Life Underwriters, the Knoxville Association of Life Underwriters and the local chapter of the American Society of Chartered Life Underwriters. In short, Jack has been a strong and respected State leader.

Jack is to be highly commended for his widespread and active support for the AFA throughout the years. He greatly deserves the special recognition which goes with the AFA "Man of the Year" award.

**WELCOME TO OUR NEWLY NATURALIZED CITIZENS**

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere pleasure that I congratulate the residents of New York's 22d Congressional District who have chosen to become citizens of the United States with all the privileges, freedoms, and responsibilities that American citizenship entails.

Our beautiful Hudson Valley region in New York State is proud of its newest citizens, and I invite my colleagues to join me in welcoming the following newly naturalized Americans and extending to them our best wishes for a happy and prosperous life in their new homeland:

**NEWLY NATURALIZED AMERICANS**

- Noel Abrigo Aborda.
- Mr. Geoffrey O. Agard.
- Francois Alexander.
- Solange Aristil.
- Jennifer Lee Attick.
- Mr. Mauricio Jaime Aufgang.
- Richard Vieira Azevedo.
- Renate Elisabeth Bammert.
- Mr. Filippo Basile.
- Lucy Bellone.
- Ms. Eva Bickel.
- Mr. Zippora Bickel.
- Ichak C. Bikel.
- Maria Bischoff.
- Mr. Nirys Boursiquot.
- Ester Brach.
- Ms. Hilmer C. Brown.
- Ms. Jean-Claude Cadet.
- Ms. Irene O. Calkin.
- Ana E. Cano.
- Ms. Lucy Chua Castaneda.
- Robert Chen-Ro Chang.
- Victoria Heui-Tai Chang.
- Phyllis D. Charles.
- Mr. Vasile Ciriac.
- Crismely A. Climes.
- Nolly Climes.
- Pedro Climes.
- Domenico Cortese.
- Marie Elena Cracolici.
- Ms. Angela M. Crawford.
- Mr. and Mrs. Anna & Felice DeFilippis.
- Anatoly Dekhtyar.
- Irina Dekhtyar.
- Carlos Mauricio Del Pozo.
- Catherine Elizabeth Doherty.

Hit Dominy.  
 Ms. Silvia Donates.  
 Mr. Eddy Dorestan.  
 Ms. Marie Carmel Dorestan.  
 Mr. Phillippe M. Doucet.  
 Maria Drago.  
 Keri K. Dreyer.  
 Fred Fariborz Ebrahimi.  
 Ildio F. Elias.  
 Flora Espallat.  
 Batja Feigel Kroser.  
 Pierre Gerard Fleurimond.  
 Rebecca Freund.  
 Ms. Carmela Frustaci.  
 Ms. Tova Gluck.  
 Susan Goldenberg.  
 Ms. Ekaterini Gouviss.  
 Mr. and Mrs. Moshe & Schochana Gratt.  
 Ms. Monika Greene.  
 Rachimboi Haknasar.  
 Eunice P. H. Hamilton.  
 Mr. Rogelio A. Hamilton.  
 Mr. Simon D. L. Haysom.  
 Antonio Zamora Hernandez.  
 Moise Fouad Holly.  
 Margaret Hurley.  
 Housien Ahmed Ismail.  
 Mr. Toaby Isrol.  
 Mr. Stephan Ivaseczko.  
 Serge Jean-Baptiste.  
 Rocky Jean-Louis.  
 Jacqueline A. Jones.  
 Andrea Patricia Junor.  
 Yvon Kavanagh.  
 Percy Ruston Kavarana.  
 Ms. Mary B. Keegan.  
 Ms. Josephine Kent.  
 Ms. Lydia Khosdeghian.  
 Bong Ho Kim.  
 Lila Yunok Kim.  
 Aneta Klein.  
 Devorah Kleinberger.  
 Sushma Kumar.  
 Mr. Daniel P. Lacroix.  
 Minh Q. Lam.  
 Phillip L. Lanigan.  
 Talanat Asenat Lapid.  
 Richard Laput.  
 Steven Egbert Lawrence.  
 Hallie Lewyta.  
 Hazrah Lin.  
 Ms. Socorro Llado.  
 Jose R. Lopez.  
 Federico Lostumbo.  
 Van Quoc Luu.  
 Yen Tuyet Luu.  
 Zenaida Manoj.  
 Rosanna Marcotullio.  
 Mr. Archibald C. Marshall.  
 Caesar Martone.  
 Sergio Maturana.  
 Kenrick J. McBean.  
 Beryl McDonald.  
 Rosalia Mermelstein.  
 Ms. Monika Michalik-Lobaudo.  
 Lillian Minh.  
 Mr. Isaac Mizrachi.  
 Luis Mogollon.  
 Gilda Moliterno.  
 Sorin Ioan Mortun.  
 Virginia Mortun.  
 Mr. Howard NGuyen.  
 Francois J. Negri.  
 Ms. Maria Olivares.  
 Orlando Pacifico.  
 Iuminada Manuel Pagayunan.  
 Mr. Garineh Panossian.  
 Mr. Abinash Parida.  
 Patricia Park.  
 Marie Parker.  
 Amit S. Patel.  
 Rachel Perl.  
 Geraldine Pierre-Fleurimond.  
 Mr. Gaetano Pinto.

Wlodek Piotrowski.  
 Ms. Suk Yon Porter.  
 Francisca G. Powell.  
 Samuel A. Powell.  
 Kari O. Preston.  
 Gerda Probst.  
 Mr. Marcelo L. Quarantotto.  
 Alfredo B. Rabino, Jr.  
 Gilma Ramirez.  
 Paula Reisman.  
 Elida Dolores Reyes.  
 Sandra Elizabeth Reyes.  
 Hubert Fitzroy Roberts.  
 Adher Rodriguez.  
 Griselidys M. Rodriguez.  
 Jose A. Rodriguez.  
 Mr. Jose Rodriguez.  
 Samuel Salamon.  
 Sofia Salamon.  
 Hernando Salazar.  
 Judith N. Samet.  
 Ms. Maria Santos.  
 Claudia Schirripa.  
 Nicholas Siraj Schneller.  
 Ursula Scholz.  
 Carlyle Emanuel Sheppard.  
 Ms. Carol Ann-Marie Sheppard.  
 Mun Hui Sin.  
 Julio Sousa.  
 Adria Pauline Subbiondo.  
 Mr. Nong Duc Ta.  
 Ms. Jenny Tan.  
 Mary Tashjian.  
 Mr. Whitley Thomas.  
 Eleni Toromanides.  
 William Ernest Trevor.  
 Leonie Tugman.  
 Jean Emmanuel Turnier.  
 Gayle M. Unhjem.  
 Ambrogio Bruno Vippolis.  
 Arun K. Vohra.  
 Benjamin Weber.  
 Rosalind I. Winkler.  
 Ahmet Yilmaz.  
 Douglas Robert Young.  
 Jose Rolando Zapata.  
 Jonathan A. Zwart.

**SALUTE TO THE POETRY OF  
 BETH WILSON**

**HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 28, 1987*

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the printing and publication of an outstanding and historic scroll written by a constituent of the Eighth Congressional District, Mrs. Beth P. Wilson. Ms. Wilson is the notable and acclaimed author of many children's books, including biographies of Martin Luther King, Jr.—that won the CATE Award—Muhammed Ali, Stevie Wonder, and a tome entitled "Giants for Justice", which addresses the lives of Mary McLeod Bethune, A. Philip Randolph as well as Martin Luther King, Jr.

With the publication of the "Crispus Attucks Scroll," Beth Wilson has created a striking rendition of the life of Crispus, embellished in poetry and rendered on parchment. It is an educational tool of extraordinary dimensions, and one which we are proud to identify as having been a product of the intelligence, creativity and commitment of one of the outstanding citizens of the district we represent.

Beth Wilson was born in Tacoma, WA, and has lived in Berkeley, CA since the early thirties. Her late husband, W.D. Wilson, practiced

dentistry for many years in the West Oakland neighborhood where I grew up. Beth Wilson is a former teacher, the second black teacher in Oakland, CA, and became an educational consultant in the Berkeley public schools. She abandoned this career to become an author. Beth is a former board member of the California Writers' Club. Her poems have been published in the Christian Science Monitor, the Open Court Publishing Series, the African-American Studies Program and other periodicals. A copy of "Crispus Attucks" hangs in my Washington and district offices as a tribute to this great individual who has worked so prodigiously to document the lives of others for the benefit and education of our youth.

**NATIONAL IMMIGRANTS DAY**

**HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 28, 1987*

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as cochairman of the Democratic Council on Ethnic-Americans, I rise to inform my colleagues that today is the day we set aside to honor our Nation's rich ethnic and immigrant heritage. Today also marks the 101st anniversary of the dedication of the Statue of Liberty.

Immigrant Americans have always distinguished themselves and added to our diversity through their determination to preserve their customs and values. However, they have at the same time been recognized as patriotic Americans willing to defend their new homeland with their lives, if need be.

Mr. Speaker, diversity has always been at the root of our strength and our prosperity. Immigrants from all over the world have given our Nation a special place in the world. No other country in the world shares such a combination of ancient cultural heritage with the experience of the New World.

For over 100 years, the Statue of Liberty has been a symbol of the old meeting the new and the promise of freedom that allows us all to live in harmony and genuine opportunity to build a better life for all who have come to share in this promise.

On National Immigrants Day, we pay tribute to those who have braved turbulent times in their own countries and chose to become Americans. In order to remind the present generation of our rich past, we must rededicate ourselves to insuring that future generations of immigrants will have the opportunity to come to America and prosper.

**THE NEW KOREAN  
 CONSTITUTION**

**HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 28, 1987*

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Korean people voted overwhelmingly in support of the new Korean constitution. The tremendous pride of the voters echoed throughout the day as 93 percent of the

Korean electorate went to the polls. This is a truly historic occasion and one which sets the foundation for the presidential election to be held this December.

The road to democracy in Korea has been a long and difficult one. The reforms which were adopted this summer are a tribute to those Koreans who have worked peacefully for democratic change. The renewed respect for human rights, freedom of the press, and the restoration of the civil liberties of several hundred dissidents send a clear signal of Korea's commitment to democracy. I support these efforts and encourage continued reform.

A new era in Korean history has begun. For the first time in 16 years, the Korean people will be able to choose their next president in a free and open forum. Likewise, elections for the National Assembly next spring will further cement the new democratic pact between the government and the people. I would like to congratulate all Korean citizens on this momentous occasion and urge my colleagues to take note of the dramatic changes taking place in Korea.

#### THE NEW MEDICO REHABILITATION CENTER

**HON. RALPH M. HALL**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a new facility, the Medico Rehabilitation Center, opened earlier this year near Tyler, TX. It is a very modern facility and is to focus on the treatment and rehabilitation of head injury victims.

There are 400,000 people a year who sustain head injuries. Seventy to ninety thousand of those people are disabled for the rest of their lives. The New Medico Rehabilitation Center of Texas will take care of their demanding problems. The 432-acre facility will serve Texas and a five State region.

In the past, head injured people were often forgotten by society. Their care was less than adequate and rehabilitation was virtually nonexistent. A major problem with the care of head injured victims is expense. The cost of extended care can be astronomical, as the recovery period for the head injured patient is unpredictable. The new medico facility is committed to the care of these patients.

I wish to commend Mr. Jim Harrington, executive director, Dr. Barry Rath, clinical director, and Ms. Judi Levy, clinical evaluator and associate of the New Medico Rehabilitation Center of Texas; Mr. Charles Haynes, president and executive director of the Texas Head Injury Foundation; Ms. Kathleen Rowe, public information officer and Mr. Peter Miller, deputy director of post acute division of New Medico Combined; and Ms. Claire Giuseffi, director and rehabilitation nurse of Texas Employer's Insurance Association—and all the men and women associated with this facility—for their dedication to help the head injury patient learn to overcome their deficiencies and provide opportunities to use the skills they have.

I especially want to applaud Ms. Claire Giuseffi, director and rehabilitation nurse with

Texas Employer's Insurance Association, who has shown great dedication in behalf of those victimized by head injuries in industrial accidents. Her findings reveal that 80 to 90 percent of clients who are head injured do not have the funding they need for their care. Ms. Giuseffi said when insurance companies began to consider the cost of lifelong care of head injured clients, "they looked to rehabilitation as a means of cost containment." Yet she said "the objective isn't always for them to go back to work. The bottom line is to give them a much better quality of life."

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly proud of this facility and of those who make it possible.

#### MAJORITY RULE?

**HON. TRENT LOTT**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, much has been made in this bicentennial of our Constitution about our system of majority rule. Ironically, here in the people's House, the concept of majority rule is being increasingly ignored, violated or waived. A few years ago House rules were changed to permit as few as one-third of a committee's members to transact all business, including the markup of legislation. Left in place was the longstanding requirement that a majority of a committee's members actually be present at the time a measure is ordered reported to the House.

However, there is increasing evidence that this requirement is being ignored by committees which are hardpressed to muster a majority quorum. Last week one such dispute arose on the House floor. It was settled by the Chair, in accordance with the precedents, by taking the word of the bill's manager that a majority of members were present. This week, rather than risk another such fight over a bill, the Rules Committee took the extraordinary step of simply waiving the majority quorum rule. This is an outrageous precedent that other committees are sure to take advantage of in the future.

To avoid any confusion over the importance of the majority quorum requirement, and to ensure strict compliance and enforcement, I am today introducing an amendment to House Rules to require that the committee report on any measure reported by a committee either include a list of those Members voting for and against the measure, including those voting by proxy; or, in the case of a nonrecord vote, the names of those members actually present at the time the measure is ordered reported.

Obviously, a bill could not be considered unless the report contained this information. And the lists of members actually present as contained in the report would serve as the evidence of compliance with the rule should a point of order be raised that a quorum was not present. In this way we can avoid the questionable practice of relying on the word of a bill's manager in those instances in which the committee transcript does not clearly show the names of those present at the time of reporting.

While this may seem a niggling rule to some, I would submit that it is essential to our

legislative process that a majority of a committee's members actually participate in reporting legislation to this House. To the extent that bills do not reflect the will of an informed and participating majority at the committee level, the more the measure is likely to be unacceptable to and rewritten by the House membership when it reaches the floor.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution. At this point in the RECORD I include the text of my proposed rule change:

H. RES. 297

*Resolved.* Rule XI of the rules of the House of Representatives is amended in the following ways:

Clause 2(1)(2)(B) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) With respect to each rollcall vote on a motion to report any bill or resolution of a public character, the total number of votes cast for, and the total number of votes cast against, the reporting of such bill or resolution, together with the names of those members voting for, and those members voting against, reporting the resolution (including a designation of those members voting by proxy), shall be included in the committee report."

Clause 2(1)(2) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(C) With respect to any nonrecord vote on a motion to report any bill or resolution of a public character, the names of those members of the committee actually present at the time the bill or resolution is ordered reported shall be included in the committee report."

#### TIME TO TIGHTEN SANCTIONS

**HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, it has been 1 year since Congress enacted the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act over the veto of President Reagan. The Anti-Apartheid legislation was our Nation's first real effort to address the abominable human rights violations occurring in South Africa. The Reagan administration's failure to advance an effective United States policy toward South Africa requires that Congress renew our efforts. As we in this body continue to assess the situation in South Africa and to promote an effective anti-apartheid policy, I commend the following editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 8, 1987:

#### TIME TO TIGHTEN SANCTIONS

President Reagan has followed the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 the way a mischievous child obeys his mother: selectively. The law, passed over a veto, required Mr. Reagan to report on the impact of economic sanctions against South Africa. In complying, he noted that no lessening of apartheid can be seen. That being the case, the law then requires additional punitive measures. Mr. Reagan declines.

He acknowledges that the state of emergency has been reimposed along with other draconian repression of blacks and that the Botha government has failed to meet with black leaders. But the administration blames the sanctions, saying their "impact has been more negative than positive."

The initial sanctions, however, were intended as a message that the United States was willing to back up economically its advocacy of an end to apartheid. Should that word be disbelieved or unheeded, as is the case, the plan was to increase the sanctions. Such incremental tightening of an economic vise was designed to push toward peaceful change while leaving some time for the United States to lend whatever auspices might bring about a new order, including all races, in South Africa.

In short, one year's sanctions were not expected to end apartheid abruptly. The president's recalcitrance on increasing sanctions is matched by the undercutting that has occurred this year. Randall Robinson, head of the anti-apartheid group, TransAfrica, points to several administration deficiencies: The act provided for convening a conference of industrial nations to try to reach an agreement on sanctions—no attempt was made to call such a conference. South African uranium was to be banned—a loophole was created administratively. The same thing happened with barring iron, steel and iron ore.

Economic sanctions pose difficult moral questions for countries imposing them because strict bans will mean hardship for the very people they are designed to help. Writing in *The New York Times*, longtime apartheid foe and member of the South African Parliament, Helen Suzman, notes that the response to U.S. and European sanctions was a surge of support for ultra-conservatives. Says Mrs. Suzman, "If there were any chance that sanctions would dismantle apartheid, I would be the first to support them. But reducing South Africa to a wasteland would lead not to a nonracial democracy but to more oppression and misery. No one should be under the delusion that things are so bad in South Africa that they could not get worse."

But what is the alternative? Diplomacy and pleading can only go so far; at some point a country must stand firmly against a system of government that allocates basic rights by the color of citizens' skin. Phased-in sanctions, at least, keep the dialogue going in the hope that a wasteland—or worse, the devastation of civil war—can be averted. Congress must, again, direct the president to take a firm stand against apartheid. It should close the loopholes the administration opened this past year and increase restrictions so there can be no doubt of U.S. resolve to oppose apartheid.

## BEYOND SANCTIONS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, under the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986, the President is required annually to review the sanctions placed upon South Africa by the United States. After recently reviewing the act, President Reagan concluded that the United States should not implement additional sanctions. This conclusion comes in light of the fact that current sanctions have not led to an improvement in conditions for black South Africans. It may be further argued that sanctions have not only failed to promote improvements, but have, in fact, led to increased hardships for black South Africans.

The tragedy of sanctions is that they undercut one of the most effective weapons blacks in South Africa have against apartheid: their growing economic power. In fact, as former Assistant U.S. Secretary of State Alan Keyes points out, blacks have achieved their greatest victories over apartheid in the economy. The recent mining strike and the pass-law repeal demonstrate the growing economic leverage blacks have. Sanctions, however, threaten to halt this progress.

Secretary of State George Shultz recently praised the accomplishments of black schools, unions, and entrepreneurs in undermining apartheid and convincing whites that blacks can prosper if given the necessary freedom. The United States should go further and redirect foreign aid to help blacks push for nonviolent change. However, blacks can exert such power only if the South African economy grows. This necessary economic growth is possible only if the United States realizes that sanctions are indeed a failure. Rather than working to increase the severity of sanctions against South Africa, the United States should correct its previous mistake by repealing the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986.

I would like to submit the following article enumerating the inconsistencies of sanctions for the careful consideration of my colleagues.

### WHY SANCTIONS ARE A FAILURE (By Simon Jenkins)

As soon as America's General Motors Corporation bowed to sanctions pressure and pulled out of South Africa, its local management moved fast. Renamed Delta Motors, the auto company removed 500 workers, dropped off the "Sullivan list" of firms enforcing intergrationist work practices and reversed the policy of not selling to the apartheid regime. GM thus joined some 80 American firms that have left South Africa in the past 18 months. As Congress begins a review of sanctions legislation, the results are hardly contributing to the anti-apartheid cause.

South Africa, in fact, is changing from being a classic case for economic sanctions to a classic case against them. As a tool of foreign policy, sanctions always have been easier to advocate than to impose, let alone succeed.

Succinctly put, sanctions are one of the most ineffective forms of aggression, vulnerable on at least four fronts:

The free-trade market has ways of finding new sources of supply or new conduits for old ones. Someone, somewhere, will always strike a bargain, undermining the embargo.

Sanctions are notoriously ineffective in securing real political change. The few successes almost always involve actual or implied military intervention. When such a threat is implausible, sanctions may do no more than entrench the targeted regime.

Sanctions, where implemented, tend to hurt the wrong people. Such bans are the ultimate form of economic warfare and to work fast require a total siege. Yet that action is indiscriminate and tends to harm those least able to guard against it—the poor.

Finally, sanctions develop a political life of their own, raising unrealistic expectations of success. When the embargoes fail, the result is disillusionment and bitterness.

### THE IMPACT ON SOUTH AFRICA

A year after South Africa's state of emergency triggered a series of American, Euro-

pean Community and Commonwealth embargoes against that country, every one of the weaknesses of the strategy has been encountered. The economy, rather than suffering, is hesitantly improving. The internal anarchy of 1985-86 has died down. President P. W. Botha has survived a general election that marked a shift to the right. The government has shown its ability to continue to control dissent, if not suppress it. In short, another South African trauma seems to have passed.

Firms fleeing the moral complexities of South Africa include most of the giants of American world trade: General Motors, Ford, IBM, Exxon, Eastman Kodak, Honeywell, General Electric, Coca-Cola, and, most recently, Citicorp. Most have defied U.S. lobbyists and avoided a scorched-earth policy. Instead, they have sold to other multinationals or, more often, to local management. Factories have continued to benefit from franchises, licenses and component supplies. But the new bosses, many from the rising Afrikaner bourgeoisie, have been freed from conscientious American monitoring and have rationalized and sold where the market is best.

The Johannesburg stock market has boomed as fleeing firms have sold off at bargain prices. As Tony Bloom of the Premier Group notes: "South African companies have been able to acquire technology, management skills, brand names and market share that would have taken years to build."

Trade sanctions have had scarcely greater impact than disinvestment. Restrictions on overseas purchases of coal and steel and certain metals could threaten the jobs of up to 40,000 Transvaal miners. A boycott of sugar and fruit industries, which employ up to 150,000 people, in theory also could cause immense hardship. Neither threat has yet materialized.

South Africa's economy certainly suffers from problems familiar in Africa—inflation, shortage of foreign credit, an excessive public sector. Unlike most African countries, however, it runs a big current-account surplus, manages its economy reasonably well and has renegotiated a phased repayment of its foreign debt. Both the gold price and the terms of trade have moved in its favor. And last year's collapse of the rand more than wiped out any effect sanctions may have had.

Inside South Africa, enthusiasm for economic sanctions is waning. Black leaders were only won over to the policy in a belief that it was the "final push" to topple apartheid. This toppling refuses to happen. Now, many nonwhite leaders are conceding that the prosanctions stance has done little except harm their own people. Even the Rev. Allan Boesak, the outspoken Colored (mixed race) leader, noting deepening misery in the depressed industrial areas of the Cape, is one of those now questioning sanctions.

Ford is a case in point. With an excellent record in South Africa but under "investor responsibility" pressure at home, that corporation was holding back on selling its 42 percent holding in Samcor for fear of the potential hardship on Mamelodi township near Pretoria, where many of its workers live. The pressure, however, proved too much and Ford is departing.

One South African diplomat has reflected: "American liberals came to South Africa determined to refight the American Civil War. They fought well, but now they seem afraid they might lose and only want to scramble back home." To others, the saddest feature



of the Americans' pullout is that the hesitant progress South African blacks are making arises from precisely the union and community institutions promoted by American companies. Ironically, South Africa has recently become one of capitalism's more credible shows. Now, that show is closing down.

### SOUTH AFRICAN SANCTIONS HAVE LEFT THE UNITED STATES DEPENDENT ON THE SOVIET UNION FOR STRATEGIC MATERIALS

HON. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I am reprinting for the RECORD an article from the August 3, 1987 issue of *Barron's* which describes how dependent America has become on vital strategic materials from the Communist bloc. This dependence is both frightening and angering. How can the United States depend on its strongest adversary for the very materials of defense?

Sanctions against South Africa have not worked and—even worse—they are endangering our own Nation. It is time to end a policy which harms both those it is intended to help and ourselves.

#### ANTI-APARTHEID OR PRO-SOVIET?—SANCTIONS RAISE U.S. DEPENDENCE ON U.S.S.R. FOR STRATEGIC MINERALS

(By Shirley Hobbs Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—Among other things, the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act, which Congress overrode a Presidential veto to pass last October, prohibits U.S. imports of any "article" from any firm connected in any way with the South African government. The law also threatens to prohibit currently legal imports of strategic minerals from South Africa one year after passage, if "significant" progress hasn't been made in establishing a nonracial democracy. While few lawmakers (and almost none of their constituents) seem to realize it, such provisions already have succeeded in sharply curtailing the flow of strategic and critical materials from South Africa. At the same time, they have made the U.S. increasingly—some say alarmingly—dependent for such imports on the Soviet Union and its satellites.

The statistics are jolting. For instance, U.S. imports of chrome ore from the Soviets surged to a whopping 6,440 gross tons per month on average for the six months ended March 31, compared with a mere 479 gross tons on average during the legislatively designated base period, 1981 through 1985. Chrome, of course, is essential to the manufacture of stainless steel and superalloys; hence, it is vitally important in the aerospace, chemical, defense, power-generation and transportation industries. And the U.S. is heavily dependent upon imports to meet its needs. Small wonder then that upon passage of the Anti-Apartheid Act, the Soviet Union, the world's second largest source of chrome, started developing a new mine with annual capacity of two million tons.

And chrome is only part of the shocking story. Imports of antimony from Russia have risen to 98 times the total in the base period. The U.S. also lacks adequate domestic sources of antimony, which is essential for

such items as bullets, computers, radar and sonar. Anticipating the new demand, Russia also is rapidly expanding production of antimony in the Soviet Central Asian republics of Kirgiziya and Tadzhikistan.

The list goes on—more Soviet ferrosilicon, manganese, industrial diamonds, rhodium, platinum and silver bullion, all critical materials. Strategic imports also are up from Soviet bloc countries. Ferrosilicon and ferrosilicon manganese are essential for alloyed and specialty steels used to make hull plates for Navy ships and in the bodies of military vehicles and tanks. Under the first six months of the law, monthly imports of Soviet ferrosilicon averaged 2,814,527 gross pounds, compared with 692,970 for the 1981-85 average.

Again, monthly imports of ferrosilicon manganese from Yugoslavia averaged 3,270,157 gross pounds, against the base of 2,168,352. Imports of industrial diamonds from Russia were up 100 times the base average; platinum bars and plates, up five times; rhodium up three and a half times and zinc up four and a half times. Six different categories of Yugoslav aluminum imports rose.

The law says that the President may lift any of its provisions if he determines after six months that it is causing increased U.S. dependence on Soviet and Soviet-bloc countries for strategic and critical materials and reports his finding to Congress. Even though the newly compiled figures are so startling, President Reagan has no plans to do so. The reason is painfully clear. In the current climate of opinion, Congress and the media would go for his throat.

To its credit, the Commerce Department has carried out the act's mandate to give monthly reports to Congress on growing U.S. vulnerability to the Soviets or Soviet-dominated countries in terms of strategic and critical materials. But nobody on Capitol Hill seems to be paying the slightest heed.

Queried about this, Secretary of the Interior Donald P. Hodel, who also serves as chairman of the National Critical Materials Council, replied, "I don't have the answer. If you ask somebody should we buy a major component of a weapons system from the Soviet Union, they would say, 'Of course not; that's crazy.' Then should we buy the raw material that is necessary to make that weapons system from the Soviet Union? Of course not. Because of the sanctions against South Africa, we are increasingly dependent on the Soviets and Soviet-bloc countries for raw materials that are essential to the defense establishment, at the very least."

To make matters worse, the House Foreign Affairs Africa Subcommittee plans hearings this fall on HR 1580, a bill by Rep. Ronald V. Dellums, California Democrat. It would repeal the Anti-Apartheid Act and substitute a much more drastic measure. Among other things, it would ban imports of any mineral from South Africa essential for military uses unless the President certifies to Congress that domestic supplies are inadequate and "substitutes for such minerals are not available." It says nothing about importing from Communist countries. Moreover, it does away with the requirement to report to Congress on such imports.

HR 1580 also would get rid of a little-noticed part of the Anti-Apartheid Act, which states, "The United States . . . recognizes that some of the organizations fighting apartheid have become infiltrated by Communists and that Communists serve on the governing boards of such organizations."

Incredible as it may seem, during the last Congress, the House passed the Dellums bill. The only change in the current version is an addition which would prohibit any form of cooperation, direct or indirect, with the government of South Africa by U.S. military or intelligence agencies. HR 1580 has 53 co-sponsors, including Rep. Peter W. Rodino, Jr., a New Jersey Democrat and chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Sen. Alan Cranston, a California Democrat, has introduced S. 556, a nearly identical measure, on behalf of himself and Democratic Senators Ted Kennedy of Massachusetts and Carl Levin of Michigan. It differs from the Dellums bill only by deleting authorization for the President "to limit the importation into the U.S. of any product or service of a foreign country to the extent to which such foreign country benefits from, or otherwise takes commercial advantage of, any prohibition imposed by or under this Act." S. 556 now is pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Meanwhile, ostensibly because the findings of the Anti-Apartheid Act for the first six months may be criticized as seasonal, the Administration is planning to continue the monthly reports for a full year. But if both houses of Congress pass the Dellums-Cranston bills, they may end abruptly.

Secretary Hodel, however, is considering having the National Critical Materials Council report on increasing imports of strategic materials from the Soviets. The 1984 law which created the Council calls for it to make public such critical materials "issues and concerns . . . as are deemed critical to the economic and strategic health of the nation" and to make policy recommendations to the President concerning them.

Will Hodel recommend that something be done about this country's mounting reliance on the Soviets for strategic materials owing to the Anti-Apartheid Act? First, he replies, Congress and the country must understand what's at stake. "Right now, when we start talking about solutions, people usually say, 'What's the problem?'" he notes.

"The last time I checked," adds Hodel pointedly, "the Soviets were still engaged in killing, mutilating and bombing innocent people in Afghanistan in a clear war of aggression."

If the sanctions against South Africa were working, the Rev. Leon Sullivan (civil rights activist and General Motors director) wouldn't find a need to call for all companies to pull out of that country. Indeed, the South African Catholic Bishops Conference, which initially supported sanctions, now has published a report finding that they are ineffective. In fact, they are counterproductive. By leaving South Africa, some companies are greatly enriching the Afrikaners who take over the divested enterprises.

At the same time, several land-bound black African countries are dependent on exporting through South Africa. Sen. Kennedy is so concerned about the harm which the sanctions he has pushed for are inflicting on them that he has proposed giving them \$700 million of American taxpayers' money over half a decade.

One must ask why the U.S. should believe that racial injustice in South Africa warrants action drastic enough to harm this country, but should embrace trade with the Soviet Union, which puts millions of its own people in gulags and commits untold atrocities abroad. U.S. foreign policy should have two objectives: to achieve its intended aims

and to advance the nation's interests. On both counts, sanctions against South Africa have failed.

### NICARAGUAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS STRUGGLE AGAINST COMMUNIST DICTATORSHIP

#### HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to events that have just taken place on the Nicaraguan border with Costa Rica—events that demonstrate the intense desire among Nicaraguans to rid their country of its Communist dictators.

In early September, the Communist Sandinista regime began allowing Nicaraguans to cross the border for short periods, thinking that they would persuade their relatives in the resistance to desert their struggle.

But, as a French news agency reports, many Nicaraguans took advantage of this program, not to talk their relatives into returning, but to flee and join them.

News leaked out that the border was open in mid-October, and within a few days, 1,200 people had fled to Costa Rica and Communist troops had to turn 3,000 more back from the border.

Just this last weekend, 1,000 more Nicaraguans were turned back at gunpoint by Communist troops.

Mr. Speaker, up to 400,000 Nicaraguans—15 percent of the country's population—have fled their country since the Communists took power.

If we in this Congress don't understand the meaning of this, listen to what one of last week's new refugees said after crossing the border:

As long as that Sandinista Government stays in power, it's a lie to say there will be peace.

Mr. Speaker, we must act to ensure that the Nicaraguan freedom fighters remain ready to resume their struggle against this Communist dictatorship.

### IN HONOR OF CLARKE HINKLE

#### HON. DOUGLAS APPLGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. APPLGATE. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to have the honor to speak of a man who has devoted his life to hard work and determination. Mr. Clarke Hinkle, not only a Pro Football Hall of Famer for his 10 years with the Green Bay Packers, but a citizen of Steubenville, OH, whose inspiration has touched many American youths. In honor of the 10th year of the Clarke Hinkle Scholar/Athlete/Citizen Award, Clarke is being honored today, Wednesday, October 28, 1987, for his outstanding life achievements.

Clarke Hinkle is best known for his years with the Green Bay Packers. His outstanding athletic abilities is best exemplified by the fact

that he played on both the offensive unit and the defensive unit. As a fullback on the offense, he was a scoring threat everytime he carried the ball. But it was as a defensive line-backer that his head to head clashes with the great Chicago Bears fullback, Bronko Nagurski, became legendary.

Clarke Hinkle, born April 10, 1912, in Toronto, OH, where he attended Toronto High School and then went on to Bucknell University in Lewisburg, PA. During his years in school, Clarke led Bucknell to its finest football years. In 1964, in fact, Hinkle was named, along with Christy Mathewson, as the greatest athlete in Bucknell history.

In January of 1932, Green Bay Packers Coach Curly Lambeau signed Clarke to a Packer's contract for \$125 a game. Coach Lambeau was quoted as saying, "Hinkle was the greatest all around fullback ever to play in the National Football League." At the end of his career in 1941, Hinkle had carried 1,171 times for 3,860 yards, scored 373 points and averaged 43.4 yards on punts. He was all NFL in 1936, 1937, and 1938 and then again in 1941. He was inducted into both the NFL Hall of Fame and the College Football Hall of Fame.

In continuing honor of Clarke Hinkle, Mr. Speaker, the Fort Steuben Mall of Steubenville, OH, has awarded the Clarke Hinkle Award to a senior from each of the 20 area high schools each year for the past 10 years. Those students receiving this award have excelled in academics, athletics, and good citizenship, all qualities embodied in Clarke Hinkle.

### TRIBUTE TO ORLANDO LAGMAN

#### HON. C. THOMAS McMILLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge Orlando Lagman, a great artist whose work has been admired by many.

Perhaps the most telling example of Mr. Lagman's talent as an artist is his relationship with the Sultan of Brunei, considered by many to be the world's richest man.

Mr. Lagman had recently painted the portraits of the Sultan of Brunei and his two wives. The paintings now hang in the Sultan's palace in Brunei.

The Sultan of Brunei so admired the painting that he asked Orlando Lagman to be his palace guest and paint the rest of his family.

The Sultan of Brunei is estimated to be a billionaire many times over. His palace cost \$300 million, and has 1,788 rooms and used 16 acres of Italian marble in its construction. I think it is fair to say that the Sultan could afford the services of any artist in the world. That he chose Orlando Lagman is a testament to his skill as an artist and the outstanding quality of his work.

### HERBERT ANAYA, HUMAN RIGHTS ACTIVIST

#### HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, Monday's brutal murder of human rights activist Herbert Anaya once again demonstrates the violent tendencies of those committed to subverting Salvadoran democracy.

Mr. Anaya, the coordinator of the nongovernmental human rights commission [CDHES] in El Salvador, was gunned down by two unidentified gunmen after he dropped his children off at school. This reprehensible act was strongly condemned by President Jose Napoleon Duarte whose personal commitment to human rights and peaceful reconciliation in El Salvador is symbolized by his endorsement of the Arias peace plan. This most recent killing is relevant to the Central American peace plan. It represents a direct effort by rightwing extremists to undermine President Duarte's credibility, while at the same time eliminating by force those individuals whose views differ from their own.

The irony of this tragedy is the death squad which committed this heinous crime probably thought that it could find itself protected under the very plan it so strongly opposes. The Government of El Salvador, in a controversial decision, had indicated that it planned to apply the amnesty provisions of the Arias plan to rightwing human rights violators, as well as the Marxist guerrillas of the FMLN.

While I have concerns about the application of a comprehensive amnesty, I have learned that El Salvador's National Assembly has just passed legislation which provides for an amnesty for politically motivated crimes prior to the 22d of October. This decision would exclude the murderers of Mr. Anaya from protection under the new law.

Mr. Speaker, as a supporter of President Duarte in his valiant crusade for human rights, I think it is incumbent on the Government of El Salvador to bring to justice those responsible for Mr. Anaya's murder as a tangible sign that it is genuinely committed to establishing a credible, civilian court system based on the rule of law.

Further, the Reagan administration and the United States Embassy should make it very clear to the Government of El Salvador, and in particular the Defense Ministry, that the escalation of rightwing death squad activities could have serious implications for continued United States assistance and training for El Salvador's security forces.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST WINDISH FRATERNAL BENEFIT SOCIETY OF AMERICA

**HON. DON RITTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania is proud to celebrate the 75th anniversary of the First Windish Fraternal Benefit Society of America.

At the turn of the century, the first pioneer Windish brothers migrated from Austria-Hungary and arrived in this community. As the Vedic population—Austria-Hungary—of the Lehigh Valley expanded in the early 1900's, the uppermost thought in their minds was to help the sick, widowed, and orphaned of their community. The fraternal society was formed for the purpose of filling these needs.

In 1912, the first meeting of the First Windish Fraternal Benefit Society was held. Present were 41 members of the community. Beginning in 1913, branch offices were opened in Palmerton, PA; New Brunswick, NJ; Steelton, PA; Bridgeport, CT; Pittsburgh, PA; and Allentown, PA. These branches served the same purposes as those of the home office.

In 1916, the home branch moved into their present quarters at 321 East Packer Avenue, Bethlehem, PA. Since that day in 1912, the society has grown to a membership of over approximately 1,700 members.

From the beginning, the First Windish Fraternal Benefit Society of America has looked toward the welfare of its membership and that of the communities its serves. One fine example of this participation, even in our national interest, is the record of more than 100 members serving in the Armed Forces to defend the United States in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent on this House of Congress to acknowledge and praise the efforts and history of this First Windish Fraternal Benefit Society of America. The purpose of this society reflects admirably the best intentions of our local communities and our Nation.

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO MATSUI OSK

**HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise today to pay tribute to Matsui Osk on the occasion of the opening ceremony for their new container terminal. The opening ceremony will be held November 2, 1987.

In 1964, Matsui Osk was established by a merger of two companies that had a long history of trade with the United States, Matsui Lines and Osk. Since its inception, Matsui Osk has been in the forefront of innovations concerning shipping. A firm commitment to excellence, and the determination to be the best has propelled Matsui Osk to the heights of the shipping industry.

Matsui Osk is the first Japanese steamship line to offer Container Service between the United States and Japan. It is the largest liner operator, running more regularly scheduled routes in the world and is the second largest steamship line in Japan. It is also the first company to develop automobile carriers. Matsui Osk has built the first technologically advanced, state of the art terminal of its kind in the Port of Los Angeles.

Matsui Osk maintains approximately 300 ships operating 40 trade routes, between 300 ports, throughout 100 different countries. It operates 10 eastbound and westbound double stack rail networks which form an intricate intermodal transportation network linking the east coast to the west coast. In 1986, Matsui Osk founded Transpacific Container Service Corp. [TRAPAC].

Mr. Speaker, as you can see Matsui Osk is a successful, thriving business, and due to its leadership, Matsui Osk will continue to succeed and maintain its hold in the shipping industry. I would like to recognize the men who make up the Matsui Osk leadership; Minoru Nishioki, president; Matsuhiko Nakano, president of TRAPAC; John Maddox, vice president; George Marshall, Sr., vice president; Kiichiro Aiura, president of Matsui Osk Lines International; and Shizuo Konduh, chairman of the board.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating these men, their company, and their great accomplishments, and wish them continued success in the future.

GRENADA: A VICTORY FOR FREEDOM

**HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend marked the fourth anniversary of the United States rescue mission to Grenada. I want to commend the administration for its prudent decision to send U.S. forces to that island so that future generations of Grenadians would be able to enjoy the fruits of freedom.

That brave decision saved a nearby island nation from falling under the control of Cuba and other "internationalist" nations that are dedicated to forcing their failed revolutions on nearby states. Cuba has become the model in this hemisphere of the sad and dismal police states which have little to offer to the common man other than failed economies and empty promises. Nicaragua is clearly following the Cuban model. The Nicaraguan people want democracy and deserve it. America must do everything we can to help those who struggle for the freedom of that country.

Grenada has won a place in history as a living symbol of the victory of liberty over totalitarianism. During a visit to Grenada in 1986, President Reagan has cheered by the people of that island who called him "Uncle Reagan." He told them that "in the cause of liberty, all free people are part of the same family. We should all stand together as brothers and sisters."

I encourage the administration to continue to help Grenada as that new Government tries to build a better future for its people.

With these thoughts in mind, I commend the following New York Times article to my colleagues in the House:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 25, 1987]

SINCE U.S. LANDING, A NEW GRENADA

(By Joseph B. Treaster)

ST. GEORGE'S, GRENADA, October 24.—In the churches of Grenada on Sunday they will be saying prayers of thanksgiving to mark the day four years ago when American troops swept ashore to quell a spasm of violence that threatened to consume this beautiful Caribbean island.

For most Grenadians, the anniversary of what they refer to as "the rescue mission" is expected to pass quietly. Time and money and advice from the United States and other countries have begun to heal the wounds. As one businessman put it, Grenada is "reverting to being a normal country."

No one has forgotten the execution of Maurice Bishop, the popular leftist Prime Minister, by his own soldiers. Nor have they forgotten the fear of more violence, possibly even civil war, as other hard-line leftist leaders made people prisoners in their own homes under a 24-hour curfew for nearly a week. The thunder of American bombs also remains vivid.

But the soldiers are gone now, the barbed wire has been rolled up and Grenadians are working out their differences on the floor of Parliament and in the pages of half a dozen papers.

"DEMOCRACY WITH FOIBLES"

"Grenada is now a functioning democracy with all the foibles," said one of the handful of United States diplomats who still monitor events in the country from a makeshift embassy in a cluster of resort cottages.

Grenada, with about 92,000 people, is a conservative and mainly Christian country. Most people acknowledge they had a love affair with Mr. Bishop, but they say they never subscribed to his Government's Marxism. And they say they doubt Mr. Bishop himself was a Marxist.

Some Grenadians say they yearn for the excitement of the Bishop rallies and the national pride they felt when he spoke. But most were happy to trade that for the calm that came after the American invasion and deepened as Herbert A. Blaize, 69 years old, a lawyer, took office as Prime Minister in late 1984.

For most Grenadians there was never any debate over whether the United States had a right to intervene. When the leftist government disintegrated, the country was in tatters. The farms had shriveled. Tourists had stopped coming.

GOOD ROADS AND ELECTRICITY

Some \$90 million in United States aid poured in, and Grenada now has some of the smoothest roads in the Caribbean, fairly reliable electricity and water, a powerful radio station, a new mental hospital, replacing one that was accidentally bombed, and a small industrial park.

The big international airport, which President Reagan pictured as a launching pad for Communist subversion when it was being built by Mr. Bishop's Government and Cuban construction crews, has been finished with American, British and Canadian help.

Unemployment is still high, estimated somewhere in the 20 to 30 percent range. But there has been a lot of local spending

on the aid projects and you can almost hear the money jingling in Grenadian pockets. There are many new cars and refrigerators.

Grenadians have sunk their money into small hotels, gift shops and restaurants, and many are building houses.

The bonanza expected from the United States has not come. But the economy grew more than 5 percent last year. The country's crops—nutmeg, bananas and cocoa—have rebounded and world prices are up. Tourism, which jumped 31 percent from 1984 to 1985, has leveled off at about 57,000 stay-over visitors this year and last, and about 200 cruise ship visits for each of the two years.

In some ways, Grenada is experiencing democracy with a vengeance. Kendrick Radix, the former Attorney General of the People's Revolutionary Government, holds occasional rallies. Although he does not seem to have much of a following, he says he does not rule out violent rebellion.

Sir Eric Gairy, whose repressive style as Prime Minister led to the leftist takeover in 1979, is publishing a weekly newspaper and contemplating a comeback. The moderate coalition supported by the United States as a means of blocking a return to power by Sir Eric in the 1984 elections has fallen apart and many Grenadians say he has reason to be hopeful.

Urged on by American and British experts, Mr. Blaize abolished Grenada's income tax and created several new taxes. But he has had trouble collecting them and has borrowed heavily.

Last year, 17 soldiers and officials of the former leftist Government were convicted of killing Mr. Bishop and several friends and Cabinet members. Most were sentenced to death; all are appealing the verdicts.

The other evening, two teen-agers leaned against a roadside fence talking about their country and its leaders. They had been charmed by Mr. Bishop, but they did not fault Mr. Blaize.

"You'll find that the majority of the people just want a system that's sort of mixed, not too much capitalist, not too much socialist," one youth said.

"Just something to try to develop the land and keep down the chances of an uprising, a revolution. Grenada has had too much struggling for power. There's been too much emphasis on politics in Grenada. If we could put that behind us and just develop the land, that's what's needed."

**ELECTRONIC NETWORK OF CALIFORNIA ORGANIZATIONS TO IMPROVE SERVICE TO HUNGRY AND HOMELESS**

**HON. MICKEY LELAND**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, the establishment of a unique electronic network that will substantially improve the delivery of services to hungry and homeless people was announced yesterday. HandsNet, as the innovative project is called, was made possible by grants from Apple Computer, Inc., and Hands Across America. It links 48 organizations in California by computer enabling them to share information and benefit from each other's research and resources.

The idea for HandsNet was proposed to Apple by the California Organizing Committee, whose charter was to distribute \$1.2 million in Hands Across America funds and coordinate the programs and resources of service providers within the State. The resulting collaborative effort brought together a combination of public, private, and corporate resources to solve the serious and continuing problems of hunger and homelessness.

Hands Across America has shown wisdom in its fund distribution approach which leverages relatively small amounts of money by combining them with local energies, initiatives, and funding sources to make a big contribution. Apple has made its largest single donation to date with the package of personal computer systems, printers, and telephone modems. Seven other corporate donors have also made grants to the network.

The participating agencies include a balance between urban and rural areas, equally divided between small and large groups. For example, a homeless coalition of 500 shelters and a food network of 80 food pantries, food bank, and gleanings groups are represented as well as smaller church-operated organizations.

The types of valuable information that will be shared on HandsNets include:

Maintaining participation, waiting list, and other pertinent data on programs such as Food Stamps, Women, Infants, and Childrens Special Supplemental Feeding [WIC], and Elderly Nutrition;

Posting lists of available surplus food, thus permitting foodbank operators to coordinate trucking and distribution;

Centralizing county data so that agencies can make better use of census figures, local poverty statistics and cost-of-living indexes to help people to find jobs and permanent housing.

In addition to the telecommunications network, HandsNet staff will set up a parallel network for use as an interactive data base for the collection of demographic and statistical information. HandsNet will be linked with two private Washington, DC, agencies who lead in national research on problems of poverty and hunger—Food Research and Action center and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

HandsNet demonstrates that the American people can apply their traditional inventiveness and creativity in solving problems even one as seemingly intractable as hunger. It also shows their generosity and compassion in directing talents and resources to those who need a helping hand.

HandsNet has great potential for improving the quality and timeliness of food and shelter assistance. It is the hope of all concerned with alleviating hunger, particularly the program's organizers, that the success of this program will lead to its replication throughout the country. Thus, the benefits of modern technology may in the near future enhance service to those who live below the margin of poverty in all parts of the Nation.

IN HONOR OF ADRIAN E. SCHARLACH

**HON. MEL LEVINE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Adrian E. Scharlach, a good friend and civil leader, on the occasion of his 70th birthday. On that date, November 10, 1987, his family and friends will gather to celebrate this joyous event.

Adrian E. Scharlach was born in San Francisco and attended Lowell High School and the University of California at Berkeley. During his teens he became responsible for running the family men's clothing business.

Adrian served when his country called during World War II and attained the rank of captain of the infantry in the Army. Adrian Scharlach saw service at Normandy and in Belgium, and was awarded the Bronze Star for bravery.

Shortly after entering the real estate business, Adrian became the head of a corporation which owned a string of hotels, including the Leamington Hotel, up to that time the largest in Oakland. Through his work he was elected to two terms as president of the East Bay Hotel Association. He gave this association new direction and modernized its procedures, helping bring Oakland to the forefront of bay area communities.

Adrian Scharlach is a long-time member of the Concordia Club, one of the oldest and most important Jewish social organizations in the West. Adrian served as chairman of a number of committees and was elected vice president of the club.

Mr. Scharlach served as president of the Northern California Division of the American Jewish Congress, an organization founded by Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis to strengthen human rights and promote civil liberties.

While president, Adrian Scharlach organized a task force to investigate the quality of care in San Francisco nursing homes which has enabled hundreds of senior citizens and their families to select the facility which best meets their needs. Subsequently, Adrian Scharlach was elected national vice president of the American Jewish Congress.

Adrian Scharlach is the father of my dear friend Edmund Scharlach, producer and writer for network television, and Andrew Scharlach, professor at the University of Southern California; stepfather of Stephen Cohen and Cynthia Cohen Taylor. He resides in the San Francisco Bay area with his wife, Jacqueline.

I am pleased to ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in wishing Adrian Scharlach and his family a warm and happy celebration now and for the future.

THE ECONOMY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, October 28, 1987, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE ECONOMY

The recent record-breaking convulsions in the stock market came as an unwelcome surprise. The great concern is that a recession or, even worse, a depression may follow, just as the Great Depression followed the stock market crash of 1929. Fortunately, this is not likely to happen. Today's economy is better equipped to handle financial shocks. The Federal Reserve has announced it will not allow a monetary contraction as occurred in the Depression, and numerous economic reforms have been instituted since the 1930's to protect the economy. Federal deposit insurance, unemployment insurance, social security and other elements of the so-called safety net now guarantee against widespread destitution and help prevent financial panic. The Federal Government today takes much more responsibility in managing, regulating and stabilizing the economy than it did in the 1930's.

But no one can predict what the impact of the stock market decline will be on the economy. The key factor will be the extent to which confidence in the economy has been shaken. Consumer confidence, which is the pivotal factor in driving trillions of dollars of spending decisions, must be watched very closely in the days ahead. My suspicion is that even if the market recovers substantially, the basic confidence in the economy has been shaken. Even if the market crash does not precipitate a downturn, it still signals a pressing need to get our economic house in order.

I do not agree with the assurances that the economy is being guided by sound economic policies. The basic conditions of the economy certainly are in better shape than they were in 1929, but there is obviously plenty wrong that needs to be corrected.

Looking back over the 1980's, the American economy has posted some solid achievements. We have had almost five years of economic growth—the longest peacetime expansion on record—with an inflation rate that has averaged less than 4 percent per year. Interest rates, while rising recently, are still much below their levels in 1980 and 1981. The unemployment rate is now 5.9 percent, the lowest level in eight years. Despite a loss of 1 million manufacturing jobs, more than 12.5 million new jobs have been created since 1982.

Yet these economic achievements have made it possible to overlook growing signs of economic mismanagement, both here and abroad.

For months the so-called "twin towers," the huge stubborn U.S. trade deficit and the Federal Government's budget deficit, have cast a shadow over the Nation's economy. The Federal Government and the Nation have been living far beyond their means, with both borrowing heavily to make up the difference between what they spend and what they take in. The United States has become a debtor nation for the first time since World War I, now owing more than \$300 billion to foreign investors. Though in-

flation is down, the recent decline in the value of the dollar could bring a new bout of rising prices, led by imported goods. This renewed threat of inflation has induced the Federal Reserve to raise interest rates in recent months, which has been depressing homebuying and business investment across the country. The Wall Street gyrations may remind us that deficits are dangerous policies. These debt levels have certainly contributed to the concern about the economy and the instability of the dollar.

Japan, Germany and other Western European countries have also mismanaged their economies. With high unemployment and large trade surpluses, policymakers aboard should be expanding their economies in order to create new jobs and absorb more of their own production, as well as more exports from the United States. But their efforts have been only half-hearted, contributing to the world imbalances.

That stock markets fell all over the world suggests that investors everywhere are losing confidence in the current management of the world's major economies.

The stock market tremors arise from great strains and imbalances in the American economy. They must be addressed vigorously, or we will be in deep trouble. The message on the stock market decline is that it is time for a change in economic policies. It is that we should not be running these huge deficits, and that we should now do what we should have been doing all along to take care of the imbalance in the economy. The required repairs are obvious. They include a much smaller federal deficit; a better balance between consumption and production, leading to a lower trade deficit; lower interest rates and more investment. My own view is that we have done ourselves a lot of damage in the past several years with our economic policy and have made much more difficult the long run prospects for the U.S. economy.

Japan, Germany and the rest of Western Europe will have to make their contribution by stimulating growth and importing more from the United States. In turn, the U.S. will have to reduce its dependence on foreign lenders by getting its budget deficit under control.

The changes will not come easily. Although Congress and the President recognize the necessity of reducing the federal deficit, there are fundamental disagreements over how it should be done. The paramount task is to break the stalemate between the President and the Congress on the major budget issues.

We simply cannot postpone all action on the budget deficits for another year or two, just because we find it difficult to make decisions. In the shadow of the economic crisis, congressional leaders and the President have agreed to begin discussion about a compromise budget package with all disputed issues on the table. There is an immense opportunity in this crisis of political will and economic confidence. In many respects, the world economy has never been more solid. The economic prospects before us are incredible, if only we can meet the challenges.

THE EMPLOYEE POLYGRAPH PROTECTION ACT

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD my testimony before the Rules Committee explaining my amendment to the Employee Polygraph Protection Act:

TESTIMONY OF BILL RICHARDSON, OCTOBER 28, 1987

Mr. Chairman, when the House of Representatives considers H.R. 1212, the Employee Polygraph Protection Act, I plan to offer an amendment to counter the problems of theft and diversion of controlled substances into the illegal drug market.

Specifically, my amendment exempts those companies authorized by the Federal Government to manufacture, distribute, or dispense controlled substances from the polygraph ban. The intent of the amendment is to minimize the diversion and theft of dangerous drugs and narcotics from legitimate sources in the United States. The exemption is narrowly drawn: The test can only be administered to employees or prospective employees who would have direct access to the manufacture, storage, distribution, or sale of controlled substances. The amendment also explicitly prohibits polygraph test results from being used as the sole determining factor for hiring, disciplining, or firing an employee.

Mr. Chairman, I believe my amendment will provide an important and needed exemption to the Employee Polygraph Protection Act. Both the Drug Enforcement Agency and the General Accounting Office estimate that 250 to 270 million dosage units of legally manufactured drugs are stolen or diverted into illicit channels annually. These losses are not only incurred by manufacturers but occur throughout the retail chain including retail pharmacies, warehouses, and trucks in transit. The methods by which controlled substances are diverted for illegal purposes vary from outright employee theft to computer fraud, illegal sales, shipment thefts, and stolen prescription pads.

Finally, my amendment is the exact word for word language adopted by the House in the 99th Congress when we debated a similar bill restricting polygraph tests. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I respectfully ask that my amendment be considered in order under the rule.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1212, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. RICHARDSON OF NEW MEXICO

Page 8, after line 13, insert the following new subsection:

(d) EXEMPTION FOR DRUG SECURITY, DRUG THEFT, OR DRUG DIVERSION INVESTIGATIONS.—This Act shall not prohibit the use of a lie detector test by any employer authorized to manufacture, distribute, or dispense a controlled substance listed in schedule I, II, III, or IV pursuant to section 202 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812) to the extent that—

- (1) such use is consistent with—
  - (A) applicable State and local law, and
  - (B) any negotiated collective bargaining agreement,

that explicitly or implicitly limits or prohibits the use of lie detector tests by such employer;

(2) the test is administered only to an employee who has, or a prospective employee who would have, direct access to the manufacture, storage, distribution, or sale of any such controlled substance; and

(3) the results of an analysis of lie detector charts are not used as the sole basis upon which any employee or prospective employee is discharged, dismissed, disciplined in any manner, or denied employment or promotion.

IN MEMORY OF B. RAY  
THOMPSON

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, with the death of B. Ray Thompson, Knoxville, and indeed all of east Tennessee, loses a good friend and respected businessman. He died after 81 years of hard work and philanthropic activities.

As a child, Thompson worked with his father in a sawmill located on Cumberland Mountain in Tennessee. Thompson later decided not to go to college because he was ready to go to work full time and make something out of himself. One of his first jobs was that of a salesman with a coal brokerage firm. Other business interests in timber and banking made him a multimillionaire, one of the wealthiest individuals in Tennessee. To Thompson's credit, however, he generously contributed to hospitals, schools, and cultural programs throughout the State, sharing his wealth to improve his community.

Because of his contributions, the Fort Sanders Regional Medical Center in Knoxville will be establishing the Thompson Cancer Survival Center. Such a center would be capable of providing services to individuals with cancer, and their families, enabling them to receive the best treatment and counseling available in their own community. Thompson established the center so that cancer victims could receive good care close to home. Both he and his second wife, who died in 1953, suffered the effects of bouts with cancer. He wanted to spare others as much pain as possible.

Other organizations in Knoxville which benefited from Thompson's philanthropic nature include the University of Tennessee theater program, the Knoxville Symphony, and the Knoxville Civic Opera Co. The university has also named its new basketball arena for him; an arena which otherwise would have been impossible to construct. The following Knoxville News-Sentinel editorial, October 23, further outlines his life and accomplishments, as does the Kaye Franklin Veal article of the same date.

B. RAY THOMPSON

To B. Ray Thompson, vast wealth had a special meaning; he used much of his for the benefit of others.

Thompson, 81, died Thursday of cancer, a disease that also took the life of his second wife, Mary Louise Moore Thompson. Because of her battle with the dread disease, Thompson gave more than \$7 million to establish the \$30 million Thompson Cancer

Survival Center now under construction across Clinch Avenue from Fort Sanders Regional Medical Center.

Thompson, who amassed his fortune in the coal, timber and oil business, was a native of the mountains of Scott County. He skipped college because he said he wanted to start making it in the world. Make it he did. He became a multimillionaire. He came to Knoxville in 1941. He also had a ranch in Louisville, Tenn., where he raised Charolais cattle.

His business organization, Elk River Resources Inc., composed of about 20 companies with 10,000 employees, was sold in 1979 to Sun Oil Co. for about \$300 million in Sun Oil stock. He also had been in the banking business, first as a director of the old Hamilton National Bank and later the United American Bank.

This sentimental man with a gruff exterior was a supporter of various organizations, such as the University of Tennessee's theater program, the Knoxville Symphony and the Knoxville Civic Opera Co. He was a strong backer of Harrison-Chilhowee Academy, and he gave \$75,000 toward the goal of \$200,000 for new pediatric neurology laboratory at Children's Hospital. He made many other financial gifts during his later years. He had served as a trustee of Tusculum College, Greeneville. He was a member of Sequoyah Hills Presbyterian Church, and of the Development Council at Fort Sanders hospital.

In 1981, Thompson was presented the Human Relations Award of the Knoxville Roundtable of the National Conference of Christians and Jews for outstanding contributions to his community.

One such contribution was revealed recently when he was identified as the donor of \$5 million in 1983 to help build the \$30 million, 25,000-seat UT basketball arena.

He reluctantly agreed to use his name in connection with the arena as long as the name of retiring UT president Ed Boling was also included. So the arena was named the Thompson-Boling Assembly Center and Sports Arena.

B. Ray Thompson will be missing as a generous, caring member of this community, but he won't be forgotten.

ET'S GREAT BENEFACTOR DIES AT 81

(By Kaye Franklin Veal)

"Robert Browning once said a man's reach should exceed his grasp, else what is heaven for. Someone who has never settled for less than he could is B. Ray Thompson, who has made the dream for the finest cancer center come true."—Dr. Archer Bishop, chairman of the board, at the cornerstone ceremony for the Thompson Cancer Survival Center, July 24, 1987.

Multimillionaire B. Ray Thompson, though as the men who dug his coal and felled his timber, was being remembered today by his friends and fellow citizens.

The 81-year-old Thompson died Thursday of cancer, a disease he hated so much he had given at least \$7 million to establish the \$30 million Thompson Cancer Survival Center.

It is under construction across Clinch Avenue from Fort Sanders Regional Medical Center in Knoxville, where Thompson died early Thursday morning.

It was May 31, 1953, that the multimillionaire stood at a window of the Fort Sanders Hospital room of his young second wife, Mary Louise Moore Thompson, who grew up in Clinton, and watched her die of colon

cancer after seven operations in a three-year battle.

He called her the bravest person he had ever known and vowed one day to do what he could to save others.

He did not know four years ago when he started the Survival Center project that he would soon find himself victim of the same disease.

He underwent cancer surgery at Baptist Hospital about two years ago. In recent months, he had been in and out of Fort Sanders several times. He was returned to Fort Sanders early Saturday.

Earlier this month, he went home to his Blount County ranch knowing there was little else the doctors could do for him.

He wanted to go home to his 400-acre ranch on Fort Loudoun Lake, where he raised Charolais cattle. There he found sanctuary from the business world and once said it was his "favorite place on earth." More than 150 geese live on the waters of the farm. In June, his last birthday was celebrated there with close friends. Barbecue and live bluegrass music kept the host happy as he blew out 81 candles on his cake.

He had wanted to die at home, he said, looking out at his ranchland and cattle.

He had beamed with pride on July 25 as the ground-breaking and cornerstone-laying of the cancer center launched his dream. However, his health quickly declined after that.

Before his death, Thompson allowed the University of Tennessee to reveal that he was the anonymous donor of \$5 million in 1983 to help build the \$30 million, 25,000-seat UT basketball arena.

UT officials had often asked Thompson to let them announce his major gift and name the arena in his honor. He reluctantly agreed after his condition worsened last month, on the condition that retiring UT President Ed Boling's name was included, too. The facility will be named the Thompson-Boling Assembly Center and Sports Arena.

President Boling said Thursday, "B. Ray Thompson believed in the University of Tennessee. . . . Ray preferred that his support of the university remain anonymous.

"But I must say that his acts of generosity enabled the university to achieve levels not otherwise possible in many programs, particularly in business, engineering and agriculture."

John Moxham, president of the Fort Sanders Foundation, the parent corporation of the hospital, said "the most fitting tribute we can make . . . is to see his dream of a top-notch cancer survival center here come true."

Alan Guy, president of Fort Sanders hospital, termed Thompson "an absolute treasure . . . not just in terms of money . . . but his enormous energy."

Thompson made substantial other financial gifts during his later years, many of which are unknown.

He was a strong backer of Harrison-Chilhowee Baptist Academy and gave \$75,000 toward a goal of \$200,000 for a new pediatric neurology laboratory at Children's Hospital in honor of his good friend, the late Dr. Bill Hill, a pediatrician.

He was chairman of the executive board of the defunct United American Bank when it was closed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. as the banking empire of Jake Butcher crumbled. He reportedly lost about \$2 million.

His company, Elk River Resources Inc., with about 10,000 employees, merged into

Sun Oil Co., based in Radnor, Pa., in late 1979, with Thompson receiving about \$300 million in Sun Oil stock.

At the time, the Sun company was the 10th largest oil company in the country. Elk River comprises about 20 companies. After the sale, Thompson continued as president and chairman of the board.

Thompson's first company was Shamrock Coal Co. in Kentucky. He also owned Jewell Smokeless Coal Corp. in Virginia and the Oneida Coal Co. in West Virginia.

Thompson first came to Knoxville in 1941 from his native Scott County. He laughed when he said his birthplace in Elgin, Tenn., was so deep in the mountains "that daylight had to be piped in."

He skipped finishing high school, saying he wanted to get started making a success of himself in this world.

Thompson was an active supporter of the UT theater program, the Knoxville Symphony and the Knoxville Civic Opera Co. He was a member of the development council at Fort Sanders hospital, supported Children's Hospital and served as a trustee of Tusculum College in Greeneville.

He was a member of Sequoyah Hills Presbyterian Church. He belonged to Cherokee Country Club, was an avid golfer and played in the same foursome of pals for many years.

The Thompsons had wintered for years in Naples, Fla., the last few years in their new penthouse atop a condominium complex. He played golf almost every day.

In 1981, the Knoxville Roundtable of the National Conference of Christians and Jews presented its Human Relations Award to Thompson.

In 1956, he married the former Lucille Stansberry Kohlhasse, of Clinton and Fort Lauderdale, Fla. Besides his Blount County ranch, the couple also maintained a home in The Westlands condominium in West Knoxville.

The oldest children, B. Ray Thompson Jr. and Jack Thompson, are children of his first marriage to Jessie Jackson Thompson, a native of Oneida, who died giving birth to Jack.

His stepdaughter, Sandi Kohlhasse Bishop, was born to his present wife, Lucille, during an earlier marriage, but she was a daughter to him, family friends said. Sandi Bishop's husband, Dr. Archer Bishop, an orthopedic surgeon, is chairman of the Thompson center.

"He was gruff on the surface and a tough, tough businessman," said one friend, "but underneath he was a very sentimental person." He adored his three children and doted on his 12 grandchildren and five great-grandchildren, the friend said.

In addition to his wife, the two sons, the stepdaughter, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, he also leaves two sisters, Maxine Tittsworth, Knoxville, and Imogene Cheely, Clinton, and a brother, John Thompson, of Decatur, Ala.

A memorial service will be held at 10:30 a.m. Saturday at Sequoyah Hills Presbyterian Church, with the family receiving friends there after the service.

The family has asked that contributions be made to the Thompson Center.

Mann's Heritage Chapel is in charge.

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S REMARKS TO THE CORPS OF CADETS, WEST POINT, OCTOBER 28, 1987

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege to accompany the President to the U.S. Military Academy, in New York's beautiful mid-Hudson Valley, at West Point.

The President could not have chosen a more appropriate setting to address the Cadets and the Nation with respect to our arms control negotiations.

I believe that our colleagues would welcome sharing the President's thoughts. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I request that the President's remarks be printed in full at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE CORPS OF CADETS OF THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

Secretary Weinberger, Congressman Gilman, General Palmer, General Gorden, members of the staff and faculty, ladies and gentlemen of the United States Military Academy:

I want to thank you for all your hospitality, especially since I'm an old Army man myself. It was back in the thirties that I joined the Army Reserves as a member of the 14th Regiment of the—get ready—Horse Cavalry.

In 1778, George Washington erected a fort high upon a granite point overlooking the Hudson, to guard the region of New York in the event of a British attack. And now for more than 180 years, the United States Military Academy here at West Point has in effect extended and carried on that first mission. For here we train the men and women whose duty it is to defend the Republic—the men and women whose profession is watchfulness—whose skill is vigilance—whose calling is to guard the peace, but if need be, to fight and to win.

More than 180 years, West Point in this time has established and added luster to a proud story—a story of courage and heroism, of sacrifice, and yes, very often the ultimate sacrifice. It is the story of men like Ulysses Grant, the son of a humble tanner in Ohio who went on from West Point to save the American Union. It is the story of Dwight David Eisenhower, a Kansas farm boy who learned the skills at West Point that enabled him to command the mightiest invasion force in history; and of Douglas MacArthur, an acknowledged genius in war, who showed himself during the occupation of Japan to be a genius in peace as well.

And if I may, it is the story of men like General Fred Gorden. The only black cadet in his class, today General Gorden has come back to West Point as commandant—setting an example for you, and indeed for all young Americans, of what hard work and devotion to duty can achieve.

These last two names I mentioned—General Gorden and General MacArthur—call to mind a special moment in the history of this Academy. For it was 25 years ago that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur stood in this spot and addressed the cadets of West Point. And General Gorden—at the time cadet Gorden—was sitting where you are today. It was a moment cadet Gorden would never forget. Just days from gradua-

tion, he looked around this mess hall and saw war-hardened officers moved to tears by the power of MacArthur's words.

"The long gray line has never failed us. Were you to do so, a million ghosts . . . would rise from their white crosses, thundering those magic words: Duty, honor, country."

Then MacArthur added: "This does not mean that you are war-mongers. On the contrary, the soldier above all other people prays for peace, for he must suffer and bear the deepest wounds and scars of war."

General Palmer, ladies and gentlemen of West Point, it is because you above all other people pray for peace—but must bear the burden, should that peace fail—that I have come here today. For I want to speak about relations between the American Republic and democracy's main competitor, the Soviet Union—relations that are likely to shape the whole course of your careers as professional soldiers. I want in particular to discuss our present efforts for arms reduction—efforts that may soon be yielding historic results.

But first, some essential background. From the beginning, our Administration has insisted that this country base its relations with the Soviet Union upon realism, not illusion. This may sound obvious. But when we took office, the historical record needed restatement. So restate it we did:

We told the truth about the massive Soviet build-up. We told the truth about Afghanistan and Poland. We told the truth about economic growth and standards of living—that it is not the democracies that have backward economies, that it is not the Western World in which life expectancy is actually on the decline. We told the truth about the moral distinction between their system and ours.

When our Administration took office, we found America's military forces in a state of disrepair.

Today the situation is very different. Pay and training for our Armed Forces are up. The Navy has been expanded. Weapons systems of all kinds have been modernized, making full use of the technological revolution—as a result of our efforts, you in the Army will see the fielding of more than 400 new systems. And we have begun work upon a dramatic new departure, both in military strategy and technology, our Strategic Defense Initiative which offers the hope of rendering ballistic missiles obsolete and of ensuring deterrence by protecting lives, not threatening them. In brief: We have replaced weakness with strength.

To turn now from background to specific substance: The agenda of our relations with the Soviet Union has focused upon four critical areas. First, human rights, because freedom is what we stand for as Americans. Second, negotiated settlement to regional conflicts. Third, expanded exchanges between our peoples. And fourth, arms reduction.

In some areas of this four-part agenda, we have seen progress. Cultural, scientific, and other bilateral exchanges have shown a dramatic increase since my 1985 meeting with Mr. Gorbachev in Geneva. In human rights, too, we have seen some positive developments. Some political prisoners have been released.

Emigration figures are up somewhat. And of course there is talk of reform in the Soviet Union—of some liberalizing changes in Soviet laws and of economic reforms that

could give greater scope to individuals initiative.

We harbor no illusions: While changes have taken place in the Soviet system, the one-party system unchecked by democratic institutions remains unchanged. Yet we welcome such changes as have taken place. And we call upon them to make still more.

It is in regional conflicts where Soviet performance has been most disturbing. Anyone searching for evidence that the Soviets remain expansionist—indeed, imperialist—need look no farther than Nicaragua or Afghanistan.

Our policy in these regional conflicts is straightforward. We will continue to engage the Soviets seeking to find political solutions to regional conflicts—solutions that eliminate foreign troops and return the fate of nations to their own people. In Nicaragua, we support the peace plan agreed upon by the Central American presidents last August—insisting upon the establishment of full and genuine democracy in Nicaragua. Moreover, Soviet-bloc and Cuban forces must leave that nation; this is essential to protect our own security.

As for the democratic resistance in Nicaragua: Year upon year for 7 years now, they have fought and sacrificed and endured. It is the resistance—the brave members of the resistance, many of them no more than teenagers—who have kept the Communist Sandinistas from consolidating their power and forced them into the current peace plan. It is the resistance, in short, that has given Nicaragua at least a chance for true freedom.

My friends, I know you agree: We must not abandon these courageous men and women, these soldiers. So let me promise: Nicaragua will have its freedom. And we will help the resistance carry on its brave fight until freedom is secure.

This brings me to the final area on our agenda for U.S.-Soviet relations, arms reductions. For here our realism and commitment are close to producing historic results.

It was in 1977 that the Soviet Union first deployed the SS-20. The SS-20 was a qualitatively new and unprovoked threat against our friends and allies, a triple-warhead nuclear missile capable of striking anywhere in Western Europe and much of Asia mere minutes after being launched.

You must remember that NATO had no comparable weapon in its arsenal with which to counter this new force.

By 1979, the Soviets had deployed some 130 I.N.F. missiles, with 390 warheads. General Secretary Brezhnev declared that "a balance now exists." In March 1982 they declared a "moratorium" on the deployment of new I.N.F. missiles in Europe. But this was only a cover, and by August 1982, the number of Soviet INF missiles had climbed to over 300, with more than 900 warheads.

How did the West respond? In 1977, Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany led the call for the deployment of NATO's own INF missiles to counter this new Soviet threat. And in December 1979, NATO made a two "track" decision.

First, the United States would negotiate with the Soviets, attempting to persuade them to withdraw the SS-20s.

Second, as long as the Soviets refused to do so, the United States would indeed deploy a limited number of its own I.N.F. missiles—Pershing II and ground-launched cruise missiles—in Europe.

It is important to stress that the aim of this decision was not in itself the deployment of American missiles. That was only to

be the means to an end. In the words of Valery Giscard d'Estaing, President of France at the time of the 1979 NATO decision, " . . . the deployment of Pershing IIs in Europe . . . was a tactical exercise, whose preferred goal was to compel the Soviet Union to eliminate the SS-20s."

No doubt the Soviets wanted to test NATO resolve. And indeed, the deployment of our I.N.F. missiles had to be carried out in the face of sharp political protests and even mass demonstrations.

I remember speaking in Bonn in 1982. Thousands of demonstrators chanted and marched. And I couldn't help thinking: What irony. For it was to secure the peace they sought and the freedom they were exercising, that we were deploying the missiles they protested.

Yet NATO held firm. And yes, it was when we showed strength that if need be we would ensure the credibility of our deterrent posture, by meeting force with force, that the Soviets—after first walking out of the negotiations—eventually returned and began to talk seriously about the possibility of withdrawing their own INF missiles.

I am pleased to say that the agreement we are nearing is based upon the proposal that the United States, in consultation with our allies, first put forward in 1981—the zero option. The class of U.S. and Soviet INF missiles.

According to this agreement, the Soviets will be required to remove four times as many nuclear warheads as will the United States. Moreover, the Soviets will be required to destroy not only their entire force of SS-20s and SS-4s, but also their shorter-range ballistic missiles, the SS-12s and SS-23s. As I said, all these missiles will be eliminated. How will we know that the Soviets have actually destroyed their missiles? As you know, the Soviets have an extensive record of violating past arms control agreements. So, frankly, we're not going to take their word for it.

Any treaty I agree to must provide for effective verification, including on-site inspection of facilities before and during reductions, and short-notice inspections afterwards. All in all, the verification regime we have put forward is the most stringent in the history of arms control negotiations. I will not settle for anything less.

At the same time that we have been moving forward on INF missiles, we have attached the highest priority to achieving deep reductions in U.S. and Soviet strategic arms. Even Mr. Gorbachev has described strategic weapons as the "root problem" in arms control, and we agree. To that end we have expedited the strategic arms negotiations in Geneva. Much progress has been made in reaching accord on our proposal of cutting strategic arsenals in half. The Soviets must, however, stop holding strategic offensive reductions hostage to measures that would cripple our S.D.I.—particularly since the Soviets are already spending billions on a strategic defense program of their own.

And this brings me to what happened last week in Moscow.

As Secretary Shultz has reported, he had lively, sometimes heated discussions with Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and General Secretary Gorbachev. That was no surprise. The whole range of issues on our agenda was covered. There was important positive movement toward an INF agreement and there was progress in other areas as well, not only in arms reduction. As I announced earlier today, Foreign Minister Shevardnadze will come to Washington Friday to

meet with me and Secretary Shultz to continue these discussions.

Let me repeat what I have said before. Summits can be useful for leaders and for nations—occasions for frank talk and a bridge to better relations. It would be good for Mr. Gorbachev to see this country for himself. I am ready to continue and intensify our negotiations but a summit is not a precondition for progress on the agenda at hand.

When the General Secretary is ready to visit the United States, I and the American people will welcome him.

Let us remember that we've reached this point only as a solid alliance—an alliance made up of NATO, Congress, and the American people. If we are to continue to see real results and to convince the Soviets to bargain seriously, this cohesion must continue.

Now, some have argued that when the I.N.F. missiles have been removed, our commitment to Europe will have been weakened. Yet, this is simply untrue.

We maintain our firm commitment to the NATO strategy of flexible response, ensuring that the Alliance is capable of blocking aggression at any level. In Europe itself, we will retain a large force of nuclear weapons of many types, including ground-based systems—and aircraft and submarines capable of delivering nuclear weapons. And in consultation with our NATO allies, we have agreed that further nuclear reductions can take place only in the context of a substantial improvement in the balance of chemical and conventional forces.

During the years of these negotiations, new realities have come into play—new realities that present new opportunities. In particular, in recent years we have seen the emergence among some of our European allies of a willingness, even an eagerness, to seek a larger, more closely coordinated role for Western Europe in providing its own defense. We Americans welcome this.

For these four decades, NATO has in effect represented an alliance between a number of partners and one very senior partner. Yet today our European allies have risen from the ruins of war to vitality, prosperity, and growing unity as a continent. And so I would submit that now the Alliance should become more and more among equals, indeed, an alliance between continents. In the words of former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, the time has come for our country, quote, ". . . to . . . welcome a European identity in defense, which in the end is bound to spur Atlantic cooperation."

This, then, is the accounting that I have come here to give you. For, ladies and gentlemen, of West Point, I believe that from time to time we who are your civilian leaders owe that—an accounting—to you who bear the burden of our decisions.

But I have come not only to inform you. I have come to enlist your help.

If we do reach an INF agreement with the Soviets, when its provisions have been fulfilled and the INF missiles destroyed, you will be assuming your posts as platoon leaders and troop commanders—and even then, when I and the members of my Administration will already have been some years out of office, your careers will only be beginning.

So I ask you to guard the future of the Republic. Use the courage and steadiness that this Academy is teaching you in dealing with our adversaries. Employ all your skill as a soldiers and goodwill as Americans in preserving and strengthening the emerging relationship with our friends and allies.



And always—always remain true to the values for which this Academy and our country stand: Duty. Honor. Country.

As Commander-in-Chief these seven years, I have been struck again and again by the professionalism of our military officers and by the dedication of the soldiers I have met in the field. But one who impressed me most deeply is a member of the United States Army, I never met.

His name was Sean Luketina, and he was 23 years old. He did not have the privilege of attending this Academy. He was a sergeant, a soldier like those you will command.

In this month of October, 4 years ago, Sean Ludetina fought in the invasion of Grenada. He was wounded—badly wounded. He was evacuated to a hospital in Puerto Rico, where his father, a retired Army officer, joined him. He slipped in and out of a coma. During a moment when he was conscious, his father asked him: "Sean, was it worth it?"

"Yes, Dad", he answered.

Then his father asked: "Son, would you do it again?"

Sergeant Luketina looked into his father's eyes and said simply this: "Hell yes, Dad."

Duty. Honor. Country.

Sean Ludetina died for the cause that the Army of this Republic has always served, from the hunger and bloody snow of Valley Forge to the heavy demands of vigilance upon the borders of Germany and Korea. It is the cause of life as God meant life to be lived. It is the cause of human freedom.

And so the proud words again today as they did 25 years ago, as they will at this Academy 25 years hence, and 25 years after that.

Duty. Honor. Country.

Permit me to say as well that I feel something today of what General MacArthur must have felt. Your youth, your optimism—they give me strength. And as I look out upon your young faces, I feel as one who will depart the stage almost before you have made your first entrance—I feel in my heart a great confidence in the future of our country.

For I know that you will defend the future.

And it is true.

"The long gray line has never failed us."

Thank you and God bless you all.

**WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION**

**HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important legal resource for individuals and organizations interested in preserving the rights of those who protest governmental policies concerning the nuclear arms race.

Western States Legal Foundation was formed by a group of concerned lawyers, community organizers and individuals who believe that people demonstrating nonviolently for sane environmental and socially just policies should have the legal resources to defend themselves from attack which is leveled at them simply because they choose to exercise their first amendment rights.

I have come to know of their work over the 5 years of their existence and appreciate very much their efforts in providing timely information as well as the unique approaches that they have taken in representing the due process rights of demonstrators, as in the Livermore Labs demonstration case of 1983.

I particularly want to join with others who are sponsoring a fifth anniversary celebration for Western States Legal Foundation on November 10, 1987, in honoring the board of directors and current staff members Jacqueline Cabasso and Andrew Lichterman for their relentless efforts on behalf of those wishing to exercise their right to nonviolent protest.

**EAGLE SCOUT GREGORY A. MILLS**

**HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I call to the attention of my colleagues an exemplary young citizen, Gregory Mills. He will be recognized on Sunday, November 22 for achieving the highest rank in scouting, "Eagle Scout."

In becoming an Eagle Scout, he will join the ranks of a very select group. The individual tasks which he had to complete are impressive alone. These tasks challenged every facet of his personality—mental, physical, psychological and more. His accomplishment becomes even more notable when it is viewed cumulatively. That is, the entire sum of achievements and the perseverance of character demanded illustrate just what high caliber young man Gregory is.

In today's society, our youth are truly bombarded with a variety of lifepaths to choose from. While the freedom of choice is in itself good, too often we hear of young people who are led astray by the ignorance of their years to a lifestyle they do not deserve. It is always refreshing to recognize young men who choose a constructive way of life and also excel at it. Though some credit should be given to the family of this young man and to the Scout leaders who provided support, Gregory today knows that he can participate in society in a manner that will benefit himself as well as his community.

The achievement of attaining the rank of Eagle Scout lays an excellent base for a productive future. I'm sure my fellow Members of Congress join me in wishing Gregory the best of luck in his future endeavors.

**VETERANS DAY, 1987**

**HON. LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge all Americans to join me in honoring our veterans on Veterans Day, November 11.

Throughout our history, men and women have fought and died to preserve our Nation's

liberty and freedom. Veterans Day should be the occasion to remember the sacrifices these patriots have made in the 212 years since a ragged group of Minutemen challenged the British at Lexington and Concord and changed the world. In nine major wars since then, over 40 million of our fellow citizens have taken up arms to defend our land and its ideals; over 1,177,000 gave up their lives in these struggles.

Veterans Day is an opportunity for all of us to recognize our deep debt to these brave fighters. Not only do we honor the heroes who died, we honor their children, mothers, fathers, husbands, and wives. Each of those who has fallen has left an unfilled void. Our challenge every day is to be worthy of their sacrifice and to aid and comfort their friends and loved ones.

We also honor on Veterans Day those who returned from war. In the 30th District of New York, over 65,000 men and women served in the military and have returned to resume their lives in the community. Each gave a measure of their lives so that we can live in freedom. These veterans have earned our gratitude and respect. As a nation and as individuals we have a responsibility to recognize their service and to recompense them as best we can for the hardship and suffering they endured for us.

Veterans Day should be both a day of remembrance and day of dedication to the ideals veterans have fought for. President Abraham Lincoln expressed this most eloquently as he spoke at the consecration of the National Cemetery at Gettysburg:

... It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

A century later we can best honor our veterans by rededicating ourselves to the values for which they fought and died. We must be prepared to continue their struggle to safeguard liberty and freedom. In addition we should commit ourselves to efforts to build a lasting peace so that our children will not be required to suffer through the ever-escalating horrors of war.

Veterans Day is a special opportunity for citizens to remember the sacrifices required to build our great Nation. I urge all Americans to unite in honoring our veterans and join them in the continuing struggle for liberty, peace, and freedom.

**THE LIFE INSURANCE LOOPHOLE**

**HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, on October 7 Congressman PETE STARK and I introduced a

bill, H.R. 3441, that would change the way that loans or predeath distributions from life insurance contracts are taxed. Because of the broad effect the bill could have on a large number of policyholders, the bill has aroused considerable interest from many fronts. It has also generated some misinformation. Therefore, I wanted to take this opportunity to detail the circumstances and reasoning that have led to our introduction of this legislation.

The life insurance industry is the beneficiary of a significant tax advantage—the tax-free inside buildup of investment income earned on premiums paid. This advantage ensures that people will be able to provide for the financial difficulties created by premature death. Life insurance becomes more expensive to provide the older the policyholder becomes; this only makes sense, as the risk of death becomes greater with age. Therefore, the earnings from paid life insurance premiums are not taxes on a current basis to the policyholder, as they would be in, say, a mutual fund. In part from “inside buildup,” a reserve for each policyholder builds up to fund the greater risks that come later in life. The result is life insurance protection that people can continue to afford.

But because of the inside buildup of earnings, life insurance contracts can become quite attractive investments for reasons that have little to do with risk protection. In fact, the practical effect of our current tax laws allows people to pay a single premium for life insurance protection and receive the investment income on that money tax free.

These single premium policies have been around for some time without attracting much attention. After all, shouldn't someone be allowed to buy their insurance, a car, or any other product in one payment if they wish? But with the Tax Reform Act of 1986, and its wholesale closing of tax loopholes, the popularity of the tax avoidance offered by investment oriented life insurance has skyrocketed. In fact, sales of single premium policies in the first 6 months of 1987 equaled their entire 1986 sales. And the 1986 figure was more than twice that of 1985.

That the sales of these policies is driven by tax considerations is clear. Advertisements and articles in investment magazines characterize the opportunities as “legal tax evasion” and “the last tax game left in town.” While advertisements are not always the most objective judge of a product, they do tell us something about its character.

The problem with the growth in sales of investment oriented life insurance contracts is the threat they pose to tax revenues, and thus the deficit. The bill that Representative STARK and I have introduced is not a shortsighted response to the immediate need for revenue; in fact, the bill raises little money in the short term because it would grandfather all premiums paid by policyholders as of the date of its introduction. The problem is the long run. If the volume of money going into life insurance continues to accelerate in order to avoid current taxation of investment income, it will result in substantial revenue loss to the Government. While providing an unfair tax shelter to some investors, these policies would increase the pressure on other parts of the Tax

Code, from which the Government would need to find additional revenue.

The challenge, then, is to find a way of preserving the good of affordable life insurance while maintaining equity in the Tax Code. The problem is not that there is inside buildup; the problem is the ability of investors to get at the earnings of the policy without paying taxes, an opportunity they do not have with other tax favored investments such as IRA's Keogh plans, pensions plans, and annuities.

Thus, H.R. 3441 would bring the treatment of early distributions or loans from all life insurance policies into line with that given other tax deferred vehicles. The money paid into these policies would still build up tax free, thereby providing for retirement or death benefits. But if investors choose to use the money early, the money would be taxed as investment income, just as with IRA's and pension plans.

Mr. STARK and I do not presume that our bill is the only way to prevent tax abuse in the life insurance area; we look forward to hearing suggestions from the insurance industry and others on how best to resolve the situation. We do think, though, that our approach makes sense, and is consistent with the goals of the Tax Reform Act of 1986—only by plugging up loopholes that we can keep tax rates low and the Tax Code fair.

#### THE REGULATORY FAIRNESS ACT

#### HON. BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I commend the House today for unanimously agreeing to pass H.R. 2858, the Regulatory Fairness Act.

The current regulatory process works against consumers seeking utility rate reductions. Despite declining costs for producing electricity, many utilities have failed to lower their rates.

Under the Federal Power Act, wholesale suppliers of electricity receive prompt response in seeking rate increases before the Federal Energy and Regulatory Commission [FERC]. The parallel provision of the act governing efforts of wholesale purchasers to lower rates does not provide the same expedited treatment. This represents a gross inequity and deters wholesale electric consumers from seeking rate reductions.

All electric consumers benefit when the regulatory process is responsive and when utilities can only charge rates that are just and reasonable.

More than 900 public power systems and several hundred rural electric cooperatives purchase power from FERC-regulated utilities. Retail customers of investor-owned utilities will also benefit. This bill will help lower electric rates for consumers.

When wholesale electric suppliers ask for a rate increase, they get to take the elevator. If FERC's current regulatory practice is not changed, consumers seeking rate decreases will have to continue to take the stairs.

#### PREVENTION OF OCCUPATIONAL DISEASE

#### HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, today PAUL HENRY and I are introducing the “Occupational Disease Prevention Act of 1987.” This bill is identical to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered during the debate on H.R. 162, the High Risk Occupational Disease Notification and Prevention Act.

The substitute is being introduced in bill form because, as I have stated numerous times on the floor of this House, I strongly support the concept of worker notification and right-to-know but do not believe that the approach set forth in H.R. 162 will prevent disease. I also do not believe that H.R. 162 will be enacted into law. Should Congress find itself in the position of having to consider a reasonable approach to notification, our bill will be available.

The legislation being introduced today will prevent disease by building on the existing programs of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA], adding new programs in OSHA and requiring the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health [NIOSH] to begin a more measured approach of risk notification than is set forth in H.R. 162.

Now that the rhetoric and hyperbole of the floor debate are behind us, I hope that my colleagues will take a close look at our proposal. It is not a legislative ploy, nor is it a killer amendment. It is, in my opinion, the best proposal for actually doing something in the 100th Congress to prevent occupational disease.

A summary of the bill follows:

Requires the Secretary of Labor, within 1 year, to extend the coverage and expand the rights of employees under the OSHA hazard communication standard;

Requires the Secretary, during rulemaking, to consider whether the standard should be amended to include appropriate medical monitoring information, whether the training requirements should be expanded, and whether summaries of material safety data sheets [MSDS's] written in simple, nontechnical language would be useful;

Requires the Secretary, within 6 months, to promulgate a standard requiring employers to notify employees who have been exposed to an OSHA-regulated substance in excess of the OSHA-recommended permissible exposure limit [PEL]. Such notification shall also include steps that employers are taking to rectify situation.

Requires that, within 6 months, all Federal agencies that are responsible for establishing health and safety standards for workers are to promulgate a standard consistent with the OSHA hazard communication standard;

Requires that the Secretary, through use of public service announcements, notify workers of their rights to information regarding their workplace and any hazards they might have worked with;

Establishes within OSHA an Office of Hazards Communication;

Requires OSHA, within 1 year, to update the Z-tables;

Increases the penalties to employers who violate the hazard communication standard;

Requires the General Accounting Office [GAO] to evaluate the effectiveness of the OSHA hazard communication standard;

Authorizes OSHA an additional \$20 million to carry out its expanded authority;

Requires NIOSH begin an interim program to provide notice to workers who participate in its studies until the establishment of a more general notification program;

Authorizes NIOSH \$5 million for notification; Creates a 15-member Commission to conduct a comprehensive study of the effectiveness of the NIOSH notification program and to report its findings to Congress within 2 years; and

Authorizes the Commission \$1 million to carry out its responsibilities.

### YUGOSLAVS APPEAL FOR DEMOCRACY

#### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the issue of the "democratization" of Yugoslavia. A diverse group of Yugoslav dissidents and emigres have signed an appeal to the Government of Yugoslavia to "democratize" the country, release all political prisoners, and permit freedom of expression. The appeal was arranged by Freedom House, the New York-based organization that monitors political rights and civil liberties worldwide.

I would like to praise the actions of Freedom House, and to submit the appeal to "democratize" Yugoslavia for the consideration of my colleagues.

**154 YUGOSLAV DISSIDENTS AND EMIGRES OF DIVERSE BACKGROUNDS SIGN SINGLE APPEAL TO "DEMOCRATIZE" YUGOSLAVIA**

**NEW YORK, September 14.**—An unusually diverse group of 154 prominent Yugoslav dissidents and emigres—Croats, Serbs, Slovenes and Albanians—have signed a single appeal to the government of Yugoslavia to democratize the country, release all political prisoners, and permit freedom of expression. The appeal was arranged and released by Freedom House, the New York-based organization that monitors political rights and civil liberties worldwide.

While the signers represent widely divergent objectives for the future structure and policies of the country, they agreed that "the democratization of Yugoslavia can peacefully resolve the monumental social, economic, political and national problems which increasingly plague that country."

This was believed to be the first time such a broadly diverse group had agreed on a single appeal to the government of Yugoslavia. The signers, addressing "other governments," urged them "to make all credits and aid to Yugoslavia commensurate with the degree of freedom Yugoslavia permits its citizens, and the degree to which it abides by international human rights agreements to which it is a signatory."

The statement was signed by "people of different political and religious persuasions and ethnic backgrounds living inside and outside Yugoslavia." In addition to Yugoslavia and other European countries, the signers live in North and South America, and Australia. Many are prominent intellectuals, writers, scientists and religious leaders reflecting virtually all of Yugoslavia's ethnic groups.

The text of the statement and the list of signers are being sent to the President of Yugoslavia and his ambassador in Washington.

Among the signatories are writers and former prisoners of conscience in Yugoslavia, Mihajlo Mihajlov and Momcilo Selic, who live in the United States; Vladimir Mijanovic, a prominent Yugoslav dissident; writers Gojko Djogo and Rastko Zakich, who live in Yugoslavia; Jaksa Kusan and Gvido Saganic, editors of Nova Hrvatska (the New Croatia) based in London; Michael Radenkovich, chairman of the Serbian Heritage Foundation (U.S.A.); Bishop Basil Veinovich (U.S.A.); writer Branko Salaj (Sweden); dissident Pavle Rak (presently in France); Professor Sami Repishti, an ethnic Albanian and former prisoner of conscience in Yugoslavia (U.S.A.); and Professor Cyril Zebot, an economist and author of books on Slovenia (U.S.A.).

The statement was initiated at a day-long Freedom House seminar on June 6. Fourteen Yugoslav dissidents and emigres of widely diverse views discussed the situation in Yugoslavia. That discussion will be published shortly by Freedom House as a paperback book under the title, "Yugoslavia: The Failure of 'Democratic' Communism."

The full text of the appeal follows:

#### AN APPEAL

We, the people of different political and religious persuasions and ethnic backgrounds, living in and outside Yugoslavia agree that the democratization of Yugoslavia can peacefully resolve the monumental social, economic, political and national problems which increasingly plague the country.

To that end we address the following appeals to the Yugoslav authorities and other Governments which are instrumental in maintaining the status quo in that country.

*To the Yugoslav Authorities:*

Release immediately all political prisoners including those held in psychiatric wards.

Annul Article 133, the so called "hostile propaganda" provision of the Criminal Code of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

End intimidation and harassment of numerous individuals and groups struggling for the rule of law outside the ruling party. Establish dialogues with these groups and permit public discussion of their ideas and proposals.

Allow the freedom of public expression to all individuals and groups which struggle for human rights and democratic alternatives, freedom of expression, press, assembly, speech and publishing.

*To other Governments:*

All credits and aid extended to the present government must be commensurate with the degree of freedom it permits its citizens and the degree to which it abides by the international human rights agreements to which Yugoslavia is a signatory. Progress in democratization can be gauged by the degree to which the proposals addressed to the Yugoslav authorities are implemented.

Signed:

Vladimir Adzemovic, Sotir Akimovski, Borislav Anunovic, Brahimir Anzulovic,

Josip Asic, Kata Asic, Mandica Asic, Ivan Bachan, John Bambi Slavica Barovic, Bishop Basil (Veinovich), Elizabeth Bevanda, Nilolas Bevanda, Violet Bevanda.

Danny Betor, H. Bitor, Matt Bittor, Petra Brbich, Ivan Botic, K. Burevicius, Jakov Burmaz, A. Popovic-Cawley, Pero Cerovic, Frano Cetinic, M. Cordas, Vladimir Cosic, Rudolf Cujes, G. Cvjetan.

Milovan Danojlic, Joseph Derk, J.M. Divic, Gojko Djogo, Bransilav Djokic, Bora Dragasevic, Draga Dragasevic, Drago Dremetic, Vojin Durkovic, Ante Goko, Oskar Gruenwald, John Gunning, John Hasek, M. Hess, Katarina Hueter.

Goran Ivanic, Josip Ivanic, Olga Ivanic, Dobrila Ivkovic, George Ivkovic, Midrag Ivkovic, Maria Ivusic, Ivan Jakic, Des Jakovac, Jerome Jareb, S. Jasar, T. Jovanovic, O. Jovic.

Dragas Keseljovic, Ante Klobucar, E. Klobucar, F. Klobucar, B. Kochovic, Raoul Koenig, A. Knezevich, Mary Knezevich, Babetta Kralj, J. Kralj, Michael M. Kovac, Lucian Kovodic, M. Krstic, J. Kurtovic, Jaksa Kusan.

Father John Lavrih, Maria A. Levic, Nenad Medzarac, Gjuro Malvic, Diane Maric, Mary Maric, Mirko Maric, A. Markulin, Sime Maruna, Rusko Matulic, Rev. Joseph Mavsar, Midrag Mihailovic, Mihajlo Mihajlov, Vladimir Mijanovic, Michael Milenkovich, M. Milicevic, Marko Milunovic, Nicholas Moravcevic.

Dragisa Nesic, Frank Orazem, Slava Orazem, Ivan D. Pajic, Predrag Pajic, Tom Pang, Nikola R. Pasic, Svetomir Paunovic, Vladimir Pavlovic, Andree Pavlovic, Dusan Pavlovic, Jure Petricevic, D. Petrovic, Lucjan Piekarsky, Stojan Popov, M. Prpich, Drago Prpich, Gojko Prutich.

Michael Radenkovich, Tihomil Radja, M. Radocaj, Milan Radovic, D. Radovanovitch, Negovan Rajic, Pavle Rak, Matej Roesmann, Vitomir Radotivic, Borivoje Radonich, Bernardino Barbeta, A.J. Raudkwi, Sami Repishti, Dusan Roller, Vera Roller.

Gvido Saganic, Branko Salaj, M. Sekulic, Momcilo Selic, Petr Senkovic, B. Selubijn, Michael Shaskevich, Mile Smitran, M. Spasojevic, Charles D. Sporer, B. Stankovic, S. Stefanovic, B. Stevanovic, A. Stukel, J. Sulef, Tomislav Sunic, Mary Szkambala.

S. Tint, Marie Trenzova, Peter Urbanac, Mirko Vidovic, S.R. Vlahovic, R. Vorkapic, J.Z. Vuckovic, Vladeta Vuckovic, Branko Vukobrat, M.M. Vokasinovic, Rastko Zakich, P. Vukovic, Cyril, A. Zebot, J. Zekovic, D. Zivanovic.

The addresses of the signatories are on file at Freedom House.

### CORNELIO ROYBAL CONSTRUCTION CO. OF LAS VEGAS, NM, RECEIVES NATIONAL AWARDS

#### HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the Department of Energy presented National Awards in the National Awards Program for Energy Innovation. I am pleased to advise my colleagues that the Cornelio Roybal Construction Co. of Las Vegas, NM, was recognized for its project, the Las Vegas Passive Solar Homes Program. The Public Service Co.

of New Mexico and the Luna Vocational Technical Institute were cosponsors of this project.

The Las Vegas Passive Solar Homes Program is a unique project promoting the design and construction of cost-effective, energy-efficient homes suitable for low-income families. The three organizations developed a design package which includes: low-energy performance standards, design worksheets, and reference materials. Builders of energy-efficient housing can follow these simplified guidelines.

The results are astonishing. Mr. Roybal's construction company builds and sells inexpensive solar homes. Each solar house, including land, sells for approximately \$50,000. The houses average 1,400 square feet in size. Heating bills have averaged only \$8 per month. Water heating bills have averaged only \$19 per month. These rates are especially attractive to low-income families.

The solar guidelines used were developed according to the climate in Las Vegas, NM. However, these guidelines can be adapted to any place in the country by incorporating local climatic data. The Las Vegas Passive Solar Homes Program is a fine example for solar heating across the country.

My congratulations to the Cornelio Roybal Construction Co., the Public Service Co. of New Mexico, and the Luna Vocational Technical Institute.

#### LEGISLATION TO MAKE TAMPERING WITH A SMOKE DETECTOR A CRIMINAL OFFENSE

### HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to make tampering with an airplane smoke detector a criminal offense. Passage of this bill would provide an important deterrent to any person who may be tempted to tamper with this important safety equipment.

The recent incident in which a Piedmont plane was forced to make an emergency landing due to a fire that was apparently caused by a person smoking in the restroom has demonstrated the importance of smoke detectors on commercial aircraft. At 35,000 feet and 550 miles per hour there are no emergency exits to allow passengers to escape a fire. The lives of the passengers depend on the ability of the flight crew to take prompt action. An inoperative smoke detector could result in the loss of precious seconds which would jeopardize the lives of hundreds of passengers.

Despite the potential for a major disaster due to a fire on an airplane, I was surprised to learn that there are currently no specific penalties for tampering with a smoke detector on an airplane. My bill would correct this omission. The bill provides that a person convicted of tampering with a smoke detector would be subject to a fine of not more than \$50,000, or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. I will also ask the Administrator of the FAA to promulgate regulations requiring air carriers to display a sign in airplane lavatories advising passengers of this Federal penalty.

I believe passage of this legislation is needed to improve the safety of commercial air travel for airline passengers and crews. The importance of this legislation and the need for prompt congressional action is demonstrated by the fact that 47 Members of the House have joined me as original cosponsors of this bill.

H.R. 3564

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. App. 1301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### "TAMPERING WITH SMOKE DETECTION DEVICE

"(r)(1) It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly and without authority tamper with a smoke detection device of an aircraft used for air transportation.

"(2) Whoever violates this subsection shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$50,000, or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both."

#### ORIGINAL COSPONSORS OF H.R. 3564

Mr. Glickman, Mr. Lehman of Florida, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Gray of Illinois, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Grandy, Mr. Wilson of Texas, Mr. Dornan, Mr. Mrazek, Mrs. Boxer, Mr. Smith of Florida, Mr. Oberstar, Mr. Lipinski, Mr. Blaggi.

Mr. Feighan, Mr. Owens, Mrs. Collins, Mrs. Johnson, Mr. Shumway, Mr. Stallings, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Weldon, Mr. Nielson, Mr. Fautroy, Mr. Beville, Mr. Espy, Mr. Panetta, Mr. Valentine, Mr. Bates.

Mr. Kildee, Mr. Hochbrueckner, Mr. Fazio, Mr. Davis of Illinois, Mrs. Roukema, Mr. Richardson, Mr. Skaggs, Mr. Penny, Mr. Visclosky, Mr. Donnelly, Mr. Baker, Mr. Hayes, Mr. Slattery, Mr. Sawyer, Mrs. Bentley, Mr. Edwards of Oklahoma, and Mr. Fields.

#### HANS WILBUR WELCH: THE MEANING OF THE CONSTITUTION

### HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of millions of people call this country home, but relatively few of us—only a handful, really—can call ourselves native Americans. The vast majority of us are immigrants or descendants who came to this land from someplace else.

America continues to grow as people come from all over the world to make a home here. These newcomers bring different cultures, viewpoints, and talents which add to our diversity and strength. Every American, old or new, has his or her own idea of what this country stands for, and I'm sure each of us has reflected from time to time on our Nation's history, its purpose, and its future.

I recently had the opportunity to hear the thoughts of Hans Wilbur Welch on these matters. Hans is 10 years old and is a fifth grader at Vineland Elementary School in Dade County. He is a native of Korea who came to this country in 1981. He lives in Miami with his parents, George and Ynskje Welch, and his

sisters, Tamara, Tetske, Tatiana and brother, Alexander.

Hans wrote a poem entitled "What America Means to Me" and recited it before a distinguished audience of North Dade business and political leaders. Afterwards, he led the group in the pledge of allegiance.

Mr. Speaker, I was present when Hans made his presentation, and I know that everyone there, including me, was deeply moved by his heart-felt sincerity and honesty of expression. I would like to share his poem with my colleagues:

#### WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

(By Hans Wilbur Welch)

America means a lot to me,  
Because in this country we are free.  
The Constitution is a set of rules,  
Over which the delegates debated,  
And a quill pen was the tool  
That they used to write what they created.  
One man who saw the emblem of the sun  
Carved on the back of Washington's chair  
Asked if it was a rising or setting one  
And whether the weather would continue fair.

I'm so glad that the sun did rise,  
All the delegates should win a prize.  
Madison was a very smart man,  
I can see him working under a fan.  
Benjamin was very wise,  
He discovered electricity in the skies.  
Washington was the boss,  
And the Constitution was not a loss.  
Over the laws the Supreme Court presides  
By reading the rules the Constitution provides.

All the countries copy our Constitution,  
For governing it is the best solution.

#### BIRMINGHAM-SOUTHERN COLLEGE NAMED "THE BEST"

### HON. BEN ERDREICH

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, a sound education for our young people remains our Nation's best hope for future economic growth and prosperity. I would like to share some good news with my colleagues about an institution of higher learning in my district that has received outstanding recognition for its commitment to our youth and the pursuit of excellence in education.

In its October 27 issue, "U.S. News & World Report" highlighted America's best colleges and among Southern liberal arts schools, Birmingham-Southern College in Birmingham, AL, was selected as the best.

According to the article, "America's Best Colleges:"

In 1975, (Birmingham-Southern) had 727 students and an uncertain future. Bucking the trend to abandon liberal arts and push vocational study as a way to lure students, President Neal Berte instead gambled on strengthening liberal arts at the same time that the school stressed its many preprofessional programs and added a computer-science major. Today, the school boasts 1,633 undergraduates and a reputation for excellence.

We all know the importance of quality education to our Nation's economic future. Our competitive stance around the world and future job growth depend on our improving our educational institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I often have the opportunity to visit the Birmingham-Southern campus, and can tell you that its reputation for excellence is certainly warranted. I congratulate Dr. Neal Berte and the faculty and staff of Birmingham-Southern for having garnered this outstanding recognition. Birmingham-Southern knows the importance of providing its students with a quality education, and its successful effort has been rewarded with this designation as one of the Nation's best. In the ongoing quality effort it achieves, Birmingham-Southern is a major force for Alabama and, indeed, our Nation's future growth.

Following is an editorial in the Birmingham News congratulating Birmingham-Southern on this latest recognition for its excellence in education:

**MORE LAURELS FOR 'SOUTHERN**

Birmingham-Southern College, recognized in several national surveys as one of the top liberal arts colleges in the country, has now been identified as the best in the South.

We congratulate President Neal Berte, who has led the renaissance of this fine college, and all the staff and students who have participated in making it the best.

The latest feather in 'Southern's cap, reported in U.S. News & World Report, is especially meaningful because it reflects the judgments of college presidents. About 760 presidents responded to the survey, which asked them to select the 10 best schools in their own category.

Among the 161 Southern liberal arts colleges, Birmingham-Southern was named most often. Over half the presidents included it in the top 10. In 1985, 'Southern ranked seventh in the region in the liberal arts category.

Dr. Berte has made Birmingham-Southern a leader not only in education, but in the community as well. We salute him and his school on the well deserved recognition.

**GORBACHEV'S FOLLY**

**HON. DOUG BEREUTER**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, evidently the leadership of the Soviet Union felt that President Reagan wants or needs a summit so bad that he would agree to concessions on the strategic defense initiative [SDI] simply for the privilege of meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev. They are gravely mistaken. Summits are most successful when they confirm agreements already made; they are least successful when attempts are made to force consensus where none exists. The Soviets have wasted much time, effort, and international good will on the intermediate nuclear forces [INF] negotiations if they have come this far but really have no intention of signing an accord. We are no worse off not undertaking the charade of a summit if the Soviets are not in agreement on intermediate steps to benefit our two nations' mutual security.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from a newspaper in the heartland of America, which I am confident expresses widely held American sentiments. The editorial appeared in the Omaha World Herald on October 28, 1987.

[From the Omaha World Herald, Oct. 28, 1987]

**MAKING UNITED STATES "EARN" A SUMMIT**

It wouldn't be a disaster if Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev broke his commitment to attend a summit meeting with President Reagan in the United States. The importance of a U.S.-Soviet summit meeting in the United States in the next few months can easily be overestimated. \* \* \*

Gorbachev, in backing away from his commitment to visit the United States, seemed to be suggesting last week that the United States should have to "earn" the favor of a Gorbachev visit by making concessions on SDI development and testing. If the Soviet leader sincerely believes that U.S. leaders put that much importance on the possibility of a U.S. summit, he is grossly out of touch with the U.S. position at the current stage of U.S.-Soviet diplomacy.

Summit meetings and other state visits are symbols of a working relationship between two countries. If Gorbachev decided not to go through with his visit, it would indicate that his working relationship with the United States left something to be desired—not because the United States had changed its position on any issue of substance but because Gorbachev attempted to change the rules at the last minute and was quite properly rebuffed.

**THE ARIAS PLAN: FOUNDATION OF FALSE HOPE**

**HON. PHILIP M. CRANE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, recently the five leaders of the Central American countries agreed on a regional peace agreement known as the Arias Plan. This plan raises the false hope that peace will soon find its place in the Central American region. While the United States supports the movement for peace, the Arias plan cannot be accepted as it stands. It contains omissions, flaws, and vagaries. Serious doubt is cast as to whether the Arias plan can produce effective and lasting solutions to the problems in the region. As a result, the Arias plan must be modified and the following criteria must be met in order to bring lasting peace and stability to the Central American region.

Perhaps the most profound issue of the Arias Plan which demands direct and immediate attention is that of freedom. It is undoubtedly the fundamental criterion required of the Sandinista regime. Since the Arias Agreement, a number of concessions have been made by the Sandinistas, however, they must be considered with caution. Their actions in accordance with the agreement include allowing La Prensa to resume publishing. But after allowing the opposition access to the media by permitting Radio Catolica to air, the Communists reversed their position. The Sandinista government announced a cease fire and a partial

withdrawal of their troops from designated areas. Yet these developments cannot be accepted at face value. Freedom of the press is exercised not by all people but rather only by those who support the revolution. To date, since Daniel Ortega assumed power, there have been no real elections as promised. He has stated that elections will not permit the people to choose their leader. Instead, power will always belong to him, his colleagues and their successors. Free elections must be a cornerstone to any true peace plan for Nicaragua. We cannot be fooled by these misleading, superficial actions which have taken place so far in Nicaragua. These actions are, in fact, only the bare minimum needed to demonstrate loyalty to democratic ideals. They are not true to democratic ways and therefore must be questioned in every aspect of an agreement. Without specified steps outlined to secure an open and pluralistic democracy, any agreement would be worthless.

The Arias Plan does not consider the interests of U.S. security in the region. There are 3000 Cubans and 150 East Bloc Communist advisors in Nicaragua, all of whom are allowed to remain there under the Arias Plan. They have virtually penetrated every sector of the Sandinista regime. It is imperative that they be removed to ensure peace and freedom not only in Nicaragua, but in the entire Central American region. Sandinista assistance of various Marxist groups seeking to overthrow freely elected governments in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras should also be stopped. There is no other alternative if peace and stability are to last in the region.

This peace and stability also depends upon the creation of a National Army with loyalties to a constitution rather than a political party as in the present situation. Moreover, as it now stands, the Sandinistas will implement only partial amnesty for political prisoners. There must be a firm plan which allows the 17,000 freedom fighters to fully reintegrate into the Nicaraguan society; this includes complete amnesty. Furthermore, it would be a prerequisite that the resistance participate in negotiations with the Sandinistas. Thus, the resistance will uphold the status of being legitimate.

Finally, the free market system must be adopted in Nicaragua. The current Sandinista-imposed socialist economic system is failing. If implemented, the free market system would fill the needs of a country with the unique diversity of Nicaragua. It is quite possible and even probable that the Sandinista regime would use American economic assistance to build up their ailing economy. Yet we must be wary that a country so willing to accept military aid from a communist country might use U.S. money to actually supplement a failing communist economy.

In the past, the Sandinistas have made similar commitments to freedom and democracy; commitments which have not been followed through. They have stated, to the effect, that they were willing to concede to the opposition, however, this was only when Congress considered the continuation of financial assistance to the freedom fighters. This raises doubt concerning the credibility of the Sandinistas and their willingness to abide by any peace agreement. The aforementioned criteria

are the basic fundamentals necessary to bring about the change promised to the Organization of American States in 1979. These criteria should be nonnegotiable, and represent the only chance that peace and freedom will ever have to thrive in Central America. In sum, we must question the logic of adopting a peace plan which relies on the questionable good will of the Sandinistas, is endorsed by Castro, and involves the abandonment of the very group that brought Nicaragua to the bargaining table.

In a recent editorial in U.S. News & World Report, chief political correspondent, Michael Kramer, provides additional insights into the shortcomings of the Arias plan. I commend the article to my colleagues' attention:

#### A CENTRAL AMERICAN YALTA

(By Michael Kramer)

And now we're told that Ronald Reagan is the Problem; that he, not Daniel Ortega, needs watching; that out of the goodness of their hearts and a reverence for Thomas Jefferson, the Sandinistas can be trusted to bring democracy to Nicaragua and abandon their commitment to a "revolution without borders." Why else would Ortega have flown to Havana last week? Who better than Fidel to instruct Managua about creating an open society? How could we have been so blind? Daniel Ortega, democratic statesman. Of course! Danny, we hardly knew ye.

It has become clear that the White House was outmaneuvered by the leaders of Central America. It is also true that the administration has only itself to blame for the Great Guatemalan Gaffe. Imagine for a moment that you are President Napoleón Duarte of El Salvador, the leader of a fragile democracy almost totally dependent on Washington for protection. You awaken one morning to hear that "peace" has broken out up north. You and the Contras, it turns out, are the last to know that Jim Wright and Ronald Reagan have cut a deal. How do you respond? You do what he did: You strive to avoid further proof that you are merely an American puppet and rush to sign an "indigenous" peace agreement.

There's much to learn from the latest folly—it will soon be a case study at the foreign-policy schools—but for now, it is more important to relearn exactly what we're dealing with. Consider just some of the key elements of the "peace" proposal drafted by Costa Rican President Oscar Arias—and the likelihood of Sandinista good faith.

Arias wants freedom of the press without prior censorship. In Nicaragua, this means reopening *La Prensa*. But it is simply too easy to conjure a reopened but censored *La Prensa*—a "balance" the Sandinistas may conclude is "concession" enough, especially when one remembers how the commandantes really feel about the media. Here is Bayardo Arce, a former journalism professor who is now one of Nicaragua's nine all-powerful rulers: "We support freedom of the press, but, of course, the freedom of the press we support [is] a freedom of the press that supports the revolution."

Free elections are a centerpiece of the Arias plan. Not surprisingly, the Sandinistas claim their rigged 1984 election was itself free. Golly gee, deadpanned Foreign Minister Miguel D'Escoto last week, "our revolution is very much committed to democracy." What can we really expect from future elections in Nicaragua? More of the same. Elections, Daniel Ortega has said, will "in no

way—like a lottery—decide who is going to have power. For this power belongs to us."

Everyone should cease supporting the region's insurgencies, says Arias. The Sandinistas would have to walk away from the Salvadoran guerillas and close the guerillas' headquarters operation in Managua. We ain't doin' nothing', say the Sandinistas—but their true feelings were on display a few years back. "We will never give up supporting our brothers in El Salvador," said Arce. "We are not ashamed to be helping El Salvador," said Ortego's brother Humberto, who happens to be the Sandinista Defense Minister. "We would like to help all revolutions."

I haven't even mentioned some other—quite major—problems with Arias: What will the proposed cease-fire look like? Will the Contras have any role in their own disappearance? How can there be peace if the Soviet bloc is still permitted to aid the Sandinistas? What good at all is a document that doesn't punish noncompliance?

Oscar Arias obviously took too much psychology in school. He actually believes in behavior modification. But the fact is that the promises he wants the Sandinistas to make are the same ones they made to the Organization of American States before the *comandantes* took power in 1979—the promises they broke. It's wise to recall how blatantly the Sandinistas have lied—so blatantly that Jimmy Carter suspended American assistance to the new regime long before the Contras were born. Yes, it was Carter who did that, not Reagan.

Given the Sandinistas' sorry record, one would assume that Arias's verification procedures would have real teeth. They don't. The outside compliance group—a sterling outfit on paper—will almost surely rely on the internal National Reconciliation Commission for its opinion of Sandinista compliance. That *sounds* good, but Arias's fine print permits the internal commission to be stacked by the Sandinistas themselves.

#### IN THE VIET CONG'S FOOTSTEPS

As Ortego & Company go through the motions, one can only marvel at how well they are employing the old Viet Cong rule for guerrilla warfare: *Danh va dam, dam va danh*—"fighting and talking, talking and fighting." Who knows, they may even go the distance; the Arias treaty may become reality. Nicaragua's ravaged economy (the product more of mismanagement than of war) may cause the Sandinistas to so mute their rhetoric that they win U.S. economic aid. They may be smart enough as *Comandante* Jaime Wheelock has said, to "use the money of the imperialists to build socialism," smart enough to lie low until the danger of renewed Contra aid is past.

But they can't seriously change their stripes and remain, in the words of Daniel Ortega, "profoundly anti-Yankee and Marxist-Leninist." There is nothing in the dialectic that demands action tomorrow—but sooner or later they must march again. Not to worry, says Oscar Arias. If they do, "they will be morally isolated by the whole world." Arias should read George Orwell, who wrote: "Despotic governments can stand 'moral force' till the cows come home; what they fear is physical force."

What happens when the cows come home? Will the U.S. and the Latin democracies have the stomach to reimpose military pressure when the Sandinistas cheat? Can a Central American Yalta really work without a Central America NATO in the wings? Until these questions are satisfactorily addressed, the future under Arias will be

bleak—a disaster postponed rather than avoided.

## NATIONAL RECYCLING MONTH

### HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce, along with Congressman DAVID DREIER, a resolution entitled "National Recycling Month," which will help to send a message to cities across this Nation about the need to respond to our growing waste disposal crisis.

Brimming landfills are being closed in one city after another. More than 3,500 have been shut since 1979. Some 16,400 remain, but not for long. Nearly one-half of the Nation's major cities will run out of room for their garbage within 5 years. The landfills in Los Angeles will hit capacity by 1991; New York City has barely 12 years left.

Frustrated by the growing garbage crisis, some cities have chosen to burn their garbage in mass incinerators. This is an unfortunate choice for several reasons. First of all, you don't get rid of your trash disposal problems with mass burn. You still have to bury the ash that the burned garbage creates—some of which is toxic. Second, incineration may be a worse polluter than land disposal because it creates new chemical compounds that are released into the environment through smokestack emissions. These compounds, known as dioxins and furans, are dangerous air pollutants.

Faced with the prospect of these potentially dangerous incinerators being placed in their community, residents have organized to defeat their construction. In Los Angeles, a group of concerned citizens went against all odds in fighting a trash incinerator proposal called LANCER [Los Angeles City Energy Recovery] and won. Another group of citizens in Irwindale, CA stopped a similar proposal in their community. In the city of Philadelphia, residents effectively organized to defeat another mass burn project.

There is a safer and more efficient alternative to mass burning—recycling. Community-based trash separation and recycling requires the least amount of capital and is the most flexible of systems. Recycling not only diverts a significant portion of the waste stream from landfills—but the trash that is landfilled is basically nontoxic.

The resolution we are introducing today seeks to encourage our Nation to adopt recycling measures and to assist in developing the growth of incremental markets for materials recovered from recyclable goods. We need to expand and refine our national recycling efforts to respond to our garbage crisis—and to provide an alternative to dangerous waste disposal technologies. I would like to submit the text of the resolution for my colleagues to review and I encourage their support for this measure.

To designate June 1988 as "National Recycling Month".

## JOINT RESOLUTION

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

Whereas a solid waste disposal crisis exists in the United States;

Whereas half of the major cities in the United States will have no space available for disposal of garbage within 5 years;

Whereas mass trash incineration involves the dangers of toxic emissions and toxic landfills;

Whereas source separation, mechanical separation, and community-based recycling programs are cost-effective alternatives to mass trash incineration;

Whereas recycling diverts a significant portion of waste from landfills;

Whereas recycling converts most of the waste that eventually is placed in landfills to a nontoxic form;

Whereas the revenues from goods recovered by public sector recycling programs help to offset the costs of the programs;

Whereas shared savings, which accrue by avoiding the higher cost of landfills or incineration, make recycling an economically efficient disposal alternative to mass trash incineration even where markets for recycled materials are weak or undeveloped;

Whereas a well-developed system of recycling scrap metals, paper, and glass already exists and significantly reduces the quantity of solid waste comprised of metal, paper, and glass;

Whereas substantial increases in the amount of materials recycled will require development of markets that absorb the increase in the amount of materials recycled, known as incremental markets;

Whereas many consumer products are designed without sufficient regard for safe and efficient recycling after disposal;

Whereas the Federal Government and State and local governments should enact legislative measures that will increase the amount of solid waste that is recycled;

Whereas the Federal Government and State and local governments should encourage the growth of incremental markets for materials recovered from recyclable goods;

Whereas the Federal Government and State and local governments should promote the design of products that can be recycled safely and efficiently after use;

Whereas the Federal Government and State and local governments should establish requirements for in-home separation of waste to enable efficient recycling; and

Whereas the people of the United States should be encouraged to participate in educational and legislative endeavors that promote waste separation methods, community-based recycling programs, and expanded utilization of recovered materials: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That June 1988 is designated as "National Recycling Month", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

## STUDY FAULTS LABS' ACCURACY IN TESTING FOR AIDS INFECTION

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Subcommittee on Regulation and Business Opportunities, on which I sit, held an important hearing. A subcommittee investigation uncovered new data on the accuracy of AIDS testing done in laboratories around the country.

I'd like to share an article summarizing the subcommittee's investigation from the Washington Post.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 27, 1987]

## STUDY FAULTS LABS' ACCURACY IN TESTING FOR AIDS INFECTION

(By Susan Okie)

Laboratories testing blood for evidence of AIDS have such a high error rate that in some low-risk groups, nine out of 10 positive findings would probably be wrong, a new government analysis has found.

Such a high rate of these so-called "false positives"—in which people without the AIDS virus wrongly appear to have it—would cast grave doubts on the reliability of massive screenings.

The analysis was done by the congressional Office of Technology Assessment and presented last week at a hearing of the subcommittee on regulation and business opportunities of the House Small Business Committee. It was based on recent results of proficiency testing of approximately 700 U.S. laboratories by the College of American Pathologists (CAP).

Rep. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.), chairman of the subcommittee, said in an interview that he found the labs' error rates "mind boggling."

In addition to the false positives, the data suggest that labs may be reporting falsely negative blood test results on as many as 10 percent of individuals who are really infected with the virus.

"Both the false positives and the false negatives have frightening social implications," Wyden said. "False negatives are people who think they're well and spread the virus. False positives have the potential of just causing social chaos," because uninfected individuals might base decisions about marriage, childbearing and careers on an erroneously positive test result.

The standard blood tests currently available to detect infection with the AIDS virus are the enzyme immunoassay (EIA or ELISA) and the Western blot. The EIA, performed initially as a screening test, detects protein antibodies produced by an infected individual's immune system against particles of the virus, known as human immunodeficiency virus, or HIV.

The more accurate and expensive Western blot is done as a confirmatory test if the EIA is positive. Poor quality Western blots are the main reason for the laboratories' high false-positive and false-negative rates.

Because donated blood is discarded even if positive only on the initial EIA test, these findings do not suggest that infected blood is any more likely than previously believed—1 in 10,000—to pass through undetected.

When they are perfectly performed both the EIA and the Western blot are highly sensitive, providing positive results in infected individuals in 99.6 percent of cases. They are also highly specific, giving negative results in uninfected persons in at least 99 percent of cases. But the pathologists' proficiency testing program, in which laboratories were sent a series of "unknown" blood samples to test, showed that the error rates in laboratories around the nation are considerably higher than these ideal figures, especially for the technically more complicated Western blot.

The CAP's proficiency testing of laboratories during the period from July 1986 through June 1987 showed that the overall false-positive rate for the Western blot was 4.7 percent. The theoretical false-positive rate, if the test is properly performed, is 0.5 percent. The laboratories' overall false-negative rate was 9.3 percent, compared with a theoretical false-negative rate, if the test is properly performed, of only 0.4 percent.

Some laboratories achieve performance standards close to the ideal rates, while others have even higher error rates than the averages cited in the CAP data. But consumers having the blood tests, and doctors ordering them, often have no way of judging an individual laboratory's performance, the subcommittee was told.

In large-scale AIDS testing programs, false-positive results make up a greater proportion of all positive results when the group being tested is at low risk of infection with the virus. In contrast, false-negative results assume greater importance when a high-risk group is tested. The OTA analysis used the laboratories' performance record to predict the outcome of testing in six different populations for whom some estimate of infection with the AIDS virus was available.

For example, in a program to test 100,000 high-risk patients at a sexually transmitted disease clinic, the OTA predicted that 984 of an estimated 10,000 infected individuals would be missed because of a falsely negative blood test, while 72 uninfected people would test falsely positive.

On the other hand, if 100,000 blood donors were tested in Peoria, Ill., a group with a very low frequency of infection, 80 of the 89 positive blood tests, or 90 percent, would be false positives, the OTA analysis predicted.

Other experts testifying before the subcommittee echoed the concerns raised by the OTA report. Different laboratories use different criteria to identify a positive Western blot, and national standards have not been established for the test's performance, interpretation or quality, said James R. Carlson, director of the AIDS Virus Diagnostic Laboratory at the University of California at Davis.

Of 10 commercial laboratories sent "blind" samples by the U.S. Army to test their performance of the Western blot, 10 failed the test, some of them repeatedly, said Col. Donald S. Burke, who directs the Army's HIV screening program.

Most doctors who order AIDS blood tests assume they are accurate and know little about variations in laboratory performance, said Patricia Watson Martin, director of product development at Epitope Inc., a clinical laboratory and diagnostics firm based in Portland, Ore. "Because the opportunities for making profit from HIV antibody testing are so vast . . . we must act quickly to put controls into place to insure the quality of testing," she told the subcommittee.

Wyden said he plans to press for stronger federal oversight of the rapidly growing HIV-testing industry. "You can be pro or con testing, but as a prerequisite to a national testing policy, we're going to have to deal with this accuracy issue," he said.

### THE CONSTITUTION: A LIVING LEGACY

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, last month our Nation celebrated the bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution. All across this great land citizens gathered to recall the profound blessings which this document has bestowed upon us. Of particular importance were the activities in which the students of our Nation's schools participated to commemorate the bicentennial of the Constitution. I would like to take this opportunity to commend one student in particular for his eloquent expression of the meaning and importance of the document which binds us all together.

I speak of Michael Brough, whose essay on the Constitution won first place in the senior high division of Kleberg County, TX. We can all learn from this young man's appreciation of what makes the Constitution such a special document. In his essay, Michael explains that it is both the Constitution's basic immutable principles and its ability to adapt to change that have allowed it to endure for so long as the fundamental law of the greatest nation on earth.

Just as James Madison and his colleagues 200 years ago found it necessary to express their ideas on the Constitution in the Federalist Papers, Michael Brough has provided us with further insight into the remarkable product of the American intellect known as the U.S. Constitution. As Americans, it is vital that we understand this most important of American documents and for his efforts in this regard, I would like to commend Michael Brough on his outstanding essay and insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time.

#### THE CONSTITUTION: A LIVING LEGACY

(By Michael Brough)

For 200 years, the Constitution of the United States has served as the foundation of all facets of American government and law. It has weathered heated controversies between Americans concerning issues such as states rights, slavery, and prohibition. Through two world wars and an ensanguined civil war, it remains the strong and vital basis on which freedom rests. The Constitution's survival through affliction ranging from economic depression to social oppression is evidence of its most important characteristics—its endurance. Obviously, the founding fathers foresaw such future conflict and assigned to the Constitution three qualities to which this endurance can be attributed: a definite statement of citizen's rights, the establishment of a governmental system, and the ability to change.

In the Bill of Rights and additional amendments, certain rights and freedoms are granted to the people. These are not set into specific laws but are used as the basis for creating more explicit laws on national

and state levels. Due to the more general freedoms expressed in the great document, laws may be implemented, revoked, or changed to suit changing American society without making drastic alterations to the Constitution. However, although laws may adjust to the changing country, all must remain within the bounds of the basic tenets set forth in the Constitution, including freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, as well as the right to a fair trial. Thus, the law may be adjusted to future circumstances and values, but the freedom of Americans will remain intact.

In addition to setting forth rights, the Constitution established an ingenious system of national government. The basic pattern was for three separate but balanced federal powers. A bicameral congress, head of the legislative branch, became the law-making body for the United States; the executive branch, led by the President, was to carry out the law; and the Supreme Court and the remainder of the judicial branch were to interpret the laws. This delineation of power and responsibility created a thorough system of checks and balances when insured constitutionality and popular public consent to all laws and the administration of the law.

Finally, to insure the endurance of the Constitution, the framers of the document included provisions for change. The "elastic clause" of Article I empowers Congress to pass new laws to meet change. The Supreme Court can also modify laws by determining their constitutionality and interpreting their meaning. Thirdly, the authors introduced a slow, but not impossible, process by which the Constitution may be amended. Thus, the Constitution can adopt to changing times. With the ability to change, the provision of an organized government, and the statement of basic rights, the Constitution of the United States has served as the framework of today's American government. Throughout its two hundred year lifespan, it has remained a vital, dynamic document that truly is a living legacy.

### NATIONAL ACADEMIES OF PRACTICE

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with Representatives CLAUDE PEPPER, BOB WHITTAKER, DANIEL AKAKA, HELEN BENTLEY, HOWARD BERMAN, HANK BROWN, DICK CHENEY, ROY DYSON, MIKE ESPY, PETER DEFazio, VIC Fazio, DENNIS HASTERT, PAUL HENRY, GEORGE HOCHBRUECKNER, STENY HOYER, NORMAN LENT, MEL LEVINE, JOHN LEWIS, JIM MOODY, BRUCE MORRISON, SID MORRISON, JIM OLIN, JIM QUILLEN, PAT ROBERTS, TOMMY ROBINSON, BILL SCHUETTE, VIRGINIA SMITH, MIKE SYNAR, TED WEISS, and DAN GLICKMAN, legislation which would provide a Federal charter to the National Academies of Practice [NAP].

Established in 1981, the National Academies of Practice was created to serve as the Nation's interdisciplinary health policy forum. It consists of nine academies: Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Optometry, Osteopathic Medicine, Podiatric Medicine, Psychology, Social Work, and Veterinary Medicine. Academies

are dedicated to addressing the issue of the national health from the perspective of hands-on practitioners in an interdisciplinary fashion and without regard to the special interests of any of the nine health care delivery disciplines.

Membership in the NAP is restricted to 100 distinguished practitioners within each of the nine academies. Distinguished practitioners are elected by their peers and are individuals who have spent a significant portion of their professional careers as practitioners providing direct care to consumers.

Legislation to provide the NAP Federal charter status has already passed the U.S. Senate. I hope that you will join me in ensuring that this worthy organization receives positive consideration in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of this legislation:

H.R. 3562

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

#### SECTION 1. CHARTER.

The National Academies of Practice, a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, is recognized as such and is granted a Federal charter.

#### SEC. 2. POWERS.

The National Academies of Practice (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "corporation") shall have only those powers granted to it through its bylaws and articles of incorporation filed in the State or States in which it is incorporated and subject to the laws of such State or States.

#### SEC. 3. PURPOSES OF CORPORATION.

The purposes of the corporation shall be to honor persons who have made significant contributions to the practice of applied psychology, dentistry, medicine, nursing, optometry, osteopathy, podiatry, social work, veterinary medicine, and other health care professions and to improve the practices in these professions by disseminating information about new techniques and procedures.

#### SEC. 4. SERVICE OF PROCESS.

With respect to service of process, the corporation shall comply with the laws of the States in which it is incorporated and those States in which it carries on its activities in furtherance of its corporate purposes.

#### SEC. 5. MEMBERSHIP.

Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members of the corporation shall be as provided in the bylaws of the corporation.

#### SEC. 6. BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES.

The composition of the board of directors of the corporation and the responsibilities of such board shall be as provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

#### SEC. 7. OFFICERS OF CORPORATION.

The positions of officers of the corporation and the election of such officers shall be as is provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

#### SEC. 8. RESTRICTIONS.

(a) INCOME AND COMPENSATION.—No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or direc-



tor of the corporation or be distributed to any such individual during the life of this charter. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to the officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual and necessary expenses in amounts approved by the board of directors.

(b) **LOANS.**—The corporation shall not make any loan to any officer, director, or employee of the corporation.

(c) **POLITICAL ACTIVITY.**—The corporation and any officer and director of the corporation, acting as such officer or director, shall not contribute to, support, or otherwise participate in any political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

(d) **STOCK.**—The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock or to declare or pay any dividends.

(e) **CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL.**—The corporation shall not claim congressional approval or Federal Government authority for any of its activities.

#### SEC. 9. LIABILITY.

The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

#### SEC. 10. BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION.

The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of any proceeding of the corporation involving any of its members, the board of directors, or any committee having authority under the board of directors. The corporation shall keep, at its principal office, a record of the names and addresses of all members having the right of vote in any proceeding of the corporation. All books and records of such corporation may be inspected by any member having the right to vote in any corporation proceeding, or by any agent or attorney of such member, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time. Nothing in this section shall be construed to contravene any applicable State law.

#### SEC. 11. AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS.

The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law", approved August 30, 1964 (36 U.S.C. 1101), is amended by inserting after paragraph 70 the following:

"(71) National Academies of Practice."

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I was absent this summer for several votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Roll No. 237, adoption of conference report on H.R. 558: "Yea."

Roll No. 285, adoption of House Resolution 231: "Yea."

Roll No. 286, passage of H.R. 618: "Yea."

Roll No. 287, adoption of the rule on H.R. 3022: "No."

Roll No. 288, passage of H.R. 3022: "No."

Roll No. 289, Eckart amendments to H.R. 1414: "Yea."

Roll No. 312, adoption of the rule on House Resolution 238: "No."

Roll No. 315, adoption of House Resolution 192: "Yea."

Roll No. 316, adoption of House Resolution 260: "Yea."

Roll No. 319, passage of H.R. 1154: "No."

Roll No. 320, Lungren amendment to H.R. 442: "No."

Roll No. 321, passage of H.R. 442: "Yea."

Roll No. 322, adoption of the rule on H.R. 3030: "Yea."

### DRUG CZAR'S "GREAT ESCAPE" THWARTED IN MEXICO

#### HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently U.S. drug agents discovered an 800-foot-long tunnel that was being dug to a Mexico City jail housing drug czar Rafael Caro Quintero. Caro is a major narcotics trafficker and the prime suspect in the brutal February 1985 torture-murder of DEA Agent Enrique Camarena Salazar.

According to published reports, Mexican officials were aware of this tunnel and did nothing about it until we found out about it.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Foreign Affairs' Task Force on International Narcotics Control, I have watched the drug enforcement situation in Mexico deteriorate. Mexican cooperation in the Camarena case has been tepid at best. For 2½ years, Caro has been in jail awaiting a trial that I doubt ever will occur.

This was a major public works project of this nature—25 feet beneath the surface, 6 feet wide and 4 feet high, shored up for the entire length and taking 6 months. I sincerely doubt that it could not have been constructed in secrecy.

Everything about this episode is suspicious but all too familiar. Mexican officials either look the other way or else actively support the drug traffickers in their efforts to avoid prosecution. The upper levels talk a good fight, but their works are inadequate.

Now I know that Mexico's judicial system differs from our own. But before I leave this body, Mr. Speaker, I just once want to see Mexico try and convict a major trafficker or the people who murdered our DEA agent. I don't believe that is asking too much.

In the meantime, I congratulate our agents in the field for their fine work in ferreting out this escape tunnel.

### NATIONAL CULT AWARENESS WEEK

#### HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designating November 13-19, 1988, "National Cult Awareness Week." This will commemorate not only the 10th anniversary of Jonestown, where one of the most distinguished Members of this House, Leo J. Ryan, was murdered, but it will also serve to educate people about the dangers of destructive cults.

Destructive cults—of which Jim Jones' People's Temple is one of the most infamous—attack members' fundamental human rights and civil liberties. They use a variety of deceptive and coercive techniques to compel members to submit to the will of the cult leader. These groups deprive the cult member of his or her freedom of choice and erode self esteem which often results in severe psychological damage. Destructive cults attack the most fundamental principles enshrined in our Constitution—in the words of Thomas Jefferson, "There can be no freedom of religion unless there is freedom of mind."

You or one of your family or friends may already have been approached by cult recruiters either on the street or even in your home. You may already be aware of some of the methods used by cults to recruit members, but I would like to take this opportunity to describe some of the most harmful techniques employed by these groups.

All new recruits are isolated from society and from contact with any viewpoint that might contradict the teachings of the cult. This usually includes cutting off all contact with family and friends—telephone conversations and letters are strictly controlled. As the recruit becomes more deeply involved these relationships are replaced by absolute dependence on fellow cult members and, in many cases, arranged marriages.

Strong peer group pressure makes recruits doubt their own convictions. New members find themselves in an attractive environment where they are flattered and made to feel that they belong. At no time is the recruit ever left alone to think through and sort out these new and confusing experiences. Furthermore, work hours are long and demanding and the member never receives adequate sleep. Coupled with a low protein diet, the recruit rapidly becomes vulnerable and disoriented. Members are encouraged to share their innermost secrets which helps to break down the ego. Later the threat of making these secrets public is used to help prevent escape.

Guilt is employed constantly to force members to work harder and without relief. The member assumes monumental guilt both for his or her own sins and also for the state of all mankind. This is coupled with the use of perpetual physical and spiritual fear to maintain group loyalty. The slightest negative or questioning of the cult is soul threatening. Tragic consequences are prophesied for anyone leaving the group. The member comes to believe that only the cult is the way to righteousness.

Many of us associate chanting and singing with cults. This is a deliberate tactic to induce a quasi-hypnotic state of high susceptibility. Cult members must also conform in dress, and the values formerly held by the members are constantly denounced. Members are normally compelled to donate their earnings, savings, and possessions to the group which further reduces the chance of escape from the cult.

One new recruit to a well-known cult describes the experience during a 100-day leadership training camp:

The camp, which operated on a rigid schedule, was physically, emotionally, and

mentally overpowering. I felt that I never had enough food to eat or hours to sleep. There's something continuously going on, from early in the morning until late at night. Even in those situations where you're just moving from one location to another in the camp, there's somebody on either side of you. You become so fatigued and your emotions become so strongly accentuated that they set off to the side any kind of rational thinking process. You become an absorber of feelings and attitudes and behavior patterns rather than an alert adult responding to a community that is offering something which you can take or leave. You really become committed more by default than by choice.

Not all cults employ all of these techniques, and these methods are not necessarily inherently evil. However, when used by cults to deny individual choice, they attack our fundamental civil liberties. As we celebrate the 200th anniversary of our Constitution we must take all steps to ensure that the principles of our free and democratic society are protected. For these reasons, I urge you to join with me in supporting National Cult Awareness Week.

**PRESIDENT OF EL SALVADOR'S  
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION  
GUNNED DOWN**

**HON. ROD CHANDLER**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 28, 1987*

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was appalled to learn that Herbert Anaya, the president of El Salvador's Human Rights Commission, was gunned down in front of his home by unknown assailants. It now appears likely that this assassination was the work of death squads.

It is clear that these forces, like their Communist counterparts in the FMLN, wish to subvert the peace process and overturn the reforms of President Jose Napoleon Duarte.

Well let me make clear that this outrageous, coldblooded, and brazen murder will not be tolerated. Any attempt by the forces of the right or the left to subvert the government of President Duarte will be met in the strongest possible terms.

There is no way the FMLN guerrillas can better assure United States support for their destruction than by fighting against peace in Central America. Likewise, the right wing in El Salvador can quickly end United States support by encouraging the death squads to continue or by challenging the Duarte government's stability.

Let both sides be warned that the forces of democracy in the United States Congress stand squarely behind the forces of democracy in El Salvador and all Central America.

No retreat from these principles will be tolerated.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

**HON. JAMES McCLURE CLARKE**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 28, 1987*

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 21, 1987, I was necessarily absent for several votes. I would like to make clear my position on those measures considered by the House.

On the Courter amendment to H.R. 2939, the Independent Counsel amendments, rollcall No. 370, I would have voted "nay."

On the Shaw amendment to H.R. 2939, the Independent Counsel amendment, rollcall No. 371, I would have voted "nay."

On the Shaw amendment to H.R. 2939, the Independent Counsel amendments, rollcall No. 372, I would have voted "nay."

On final passage of H.R. 2939, the Independent Counsel amendments, rollcall No. 373, I would have voted "yea."

**H.R. 1720**

**HON. ROBIN TALLON**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 28, 1987*

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest challenges to modern society is to provide basic assistance to those in need without limiting individual opportunity or independence. Until now, we have had limited success in meeting this challenge and the result has been a growing number of welfare dependents. We are beginning to recognize that providing basic goods such as food and shelter are often an insufficient and wasteful response to human need. Just as important are the deeper more vulnerable needs of a sense of worth and dignity. Too often, our Government administers to the results of employment and poverty without addressing the causes.

I rise today in support of a measure which I believe will correct this problem by linking welfare assistance with job training—H.R. 1720, the Family Welfare Reform Act. H.R. 1720 has as its fundamental component the essential link between work and welfare payments through employment training and support. It requires that targeted groups of welfare recipients participate in a national education, training and work program. The groups targeted are recipients like teen parents who are the most likely to become dependent on welfare. In establishing this training network, H.R. 1720 gives States maximum flexibility in adapting the program to meet their individual needs.

H.R. 1720 encourages States to raise benefits by enhancing the Federal matching rate for States that increase benefits to ensure that the safety net for the poor is adequate.

It sets a policy that will keep families together. In 23 States, a father must leave home in order for the family to receive welfare assistance. Under H.R. 1720, all unemployed two parent households would be eligible for assistance through the AFDC-UP Program.

It establishes the important principle that parents must be doing everything they can to

support their children before the Government offers any assistance. For this reason, child support enforcement is a critical part of H.R. 1720. The bill calls for increased paternity determinations, penalties for noncompliance with the 1984 child support enforcement amendments, and incentives to adopt automatic wage withholding laws.

Each of these provisions is an important step in the process of permanently escaping poverty. Without a doubt there will be short-term costs in enacting these reforms. But they will be far outweighed in savings to the taxpayer as welfare recipients are transferred from the welfare rolls to the payrolls.

H.R. 1720 promises to change welfare from a maintenance system to a doorway to real opportunity. It promises this change because it refocuses welfare on fundamental concepts too long forgotten or overlooked. The first is the understanding that welfare should involve reciprocal responsibilities. For too long welfare has been based on a lose-lose proposition where little is expected and little is provided.

The second concept is the critical importance of work. Work is the way to cut welfare costs and promote self-sufficiency. It confers emotional and psychological benefits on the recipient; it is an opportunity to join the Nation's mainstream. Work is important to the development of personal dignity, self-confidence, and identity, and as favorable to family stability and a healthy home environment.

The final understanding is the need to strengthen the family. The ties between marital instability, out-of-wedlock births and poverty are undeniable. Half of the Nation's poor live in female-headed families and over one-third of those in female-headed families are poor. Three out of every four new welfare cases result from either a marital disruption or an out-of-wedlock birth to first-time mother.

By refocusing the welfare system on these concepts we can create the opportunity to bring down today's barriers to productive lives for welfare recipients and invest wisely, systematically and productively in welfare prevention.

The chance to work, learn and hope are the essential ingredients of the American dream. Denied any one of these, an individual is unlikely to ever achieve a fulfilled, productive life. And for every American who is denied his full potential we sell short America's future. The choice is clear: more work or more welfare. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 1720 and a securer future for all Americans.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

**HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, October 28, 1987*

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week the House passed legislation permanently reauthorizing the independent counsel statute.

I would like to take this opportunity to state for the RECORD my reasons for voting against final passage of the bill.

If you will recall, the House rejected the amendment offered by our colleague from

Florida [Mr. SHAW] which would have extended the list of officials covered by the statute to include Members of Congress.

Time and time again, Congress has passed legislation under which the legislative branch is exempt from the bill's requirements. I ask my colleagues to consider the fact that we have legislated against discrimination in the workplace but continue to allow ourselves to hire, fire, promote or demote our own staffers on the basis of sex, race, or religion. Just this month, the majority of my colleagues voted for H.R. 162, the High Risk Occupational Disease Notification Act. It was described as a necessary step to protect the health of American workers. If the Members of this body feel that such legislation is indeed critically important, then our own offices should not be excluded from its provisions.

This practice of exempting ourselves from legislation deemed to be worthy of enactment is unacceptable to me and that is why I voted against final passage of H.R. 2939.

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE MEMBERS OF DAAD

### HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to 47 high school students from my 13th Congressional District who have dedicated themselves to halting drug abuse right at the grassroots level.

The students, who attend Holy Cross High School and Delran High School, have so distinguished themselves that they are today receiving the "Youth Against Drugs" award bestowed by the U.S. Department of Education.

The program they are involved in is properly known as DAAD—short for "Drugs & Alcohol Abuse is Deadly." and through this unique program, these students have been able to reach down into our neighborhood grade schools where first exposure to drugs and alcohol is likely to occur.

As members of DAAD, each student must have first successfully completed 16 hours of training and counseling related to chemical substance abuse. They then team up into pairs and visit fifth grade classrooms throughout the area to speak to the younger students on many hazards of substance abuse.

The students themselves must be fully committed and dedicated to the cause and, at the onset, sign a contract stating that they, too, will remain substance free.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members of this House, and, of course, First lady Nancy Reagan, have demonstrated time and again their leadership in the war on drug and other substance abuse.

But these students are leaders in their own right, intent on assuring that the next generation of Americans do not fall victim to the drug and alcohol problems which can destroy families, disrupt communities and end lives.

I'm sure my colleagues here in the House will want to join me in saluting and congratulating these young people for their dedication to a most worth initiative.

Kevin Harrison, John Ellison, Debbie Ash, Jennifer Robinson, Michelle Miller, Mary Beth Smith, Jen Moore, Stacy Peterson, Nancy Venture, Andrea Branas.

Jennifer Goldberg, Joyce Chou, Susan Schmeidler, Sandra Prickett, Erik Wall, Raquel Sheeran, Kathy Murray, Joemille Santiago, Kristin Yaskowski, Joe Cartaino, Tricia Cosgrove, Keith Harvey, Kerri Hibbs, Heather Belonger.

Julie Finertie, Gizelle Brooks, Karyn Schmeidler, Thomas Potts, Susan Southwick, Steve Schneider, Geri Nahlen, Megan Thompson, Jeff Wilkinson, Michelle Chadwick, Danielle Derosa, Courtney Henty, Teresa Mitkus, Carol Clowry.

Frank Konicki, Tom Reinhart, Noelle Tracey, Chrissie Romanoff, Stephen Zakroff, Stacey Mullian, Carol Schnell, Kevin Knight, Cathy Younglove.

#### THE PASSING OF JACK RAY

### HON. GEORGE (BUDDY) DARDEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the passing of Jack Ray, a Georgian who made an outstanding contribution to our State in his public life, and who also was a close friend of my family for many years.

Jack Ray died in Atlanta last week at age 74. He was a native of Norwood, GA—not far from my hometown of Sparta. His long political career included service in the State House of Representatives between 1943 and 1961, and as State treasurer from 1961 until 1970.

While serving in the general assembly, he was the principal sponsor of legislation creating Georgia's basic 3-percent sales tax. That new source of revenue made possible the first major school funding program in State history.

I am pleased to say that my uncle, John Ricketson, was among Jack Ray's early sponsors when he sought election to the general assembly. Over the years, our families remained close—he and my father were good friends; his son Neal and I have been friends since we attended the University of Georgia together, and our daughters have developed a strong friendship in recent years.

Jack Ray was always the same with everyone he encountered—warm and friendly, with a wonderful sense of humor. In later years, he changed his political party affiliation, but he never let that affect his relationships with his many friends.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in extending our sympathies to Jack Ray's wife, Jane Hamilton Ray, as well as to his son Neal and his sister, Mrs. Mary Robinson. Jack Ray's record of achievement in Georgia politics and government is matched by few others in our State's history.

#### DENNIS HERRICK, AN AMERICAN WRITER

### HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to share with my colleagues an article composed by Mr. Dennis Herrick, the editor and publisher of one of the most highly respected newspapers from America's heartland, the Sun, of Mount Vernon and Lisbon, IA. Mr. Herrick has always demonstrated the type of levelheaded demeanor I believe represents the highest tradition in American editorship. Although I lost my administrative assistant, Dennis Herrick, to his dream of owning a newspaper a few years ago, I continue to consider him to be a man with tremendous intellect, intense patriotism, and high values of respect for others. The following article appeared in the Publisher's Notes section of the August 6, 1987, issue of the Sun.

We liked our heroes square-jawed, lean and handsome, and some folks really go for a uniform, too. I guess that's why a lot of people think Lt. Col. Oliver North is the latest American hero. But they don't have the same feeling about chunky Rear Admiral John Poindexter with his male pattern baldness and smelly pipe.

Poindexter should be just as popular as North. After all, North was only Poindexter's errand boy in the White House pecking order.

Frankly, I am appalled by both.

North and Poindexter are men of misguided principle, vigilantes who wrap themselves in America's flag while covertly flouting its Constitution.

Both are servicemen who forgot, if they ever understood it to begin with, that their commander in chief is the President of the United States, not the nearest be-medaled admiral or general.

Poindexter and North are two of the clearest examples we have had in a long time of why the writers of our Constitution put the military under civilian control, not under the rule of officers.

The arrogance of a rear admiral and a mere lieutenant colonel deciding what Congress and the President should know and what they should not know is staggering in its implications. They wouldn't even listen to the Secretary of Defense. Here are a couple of gung-ho boys who think they have the wisdom and power to conduct America's foreign policy.

Poindexter, as national security adviser, admits he did not tell President Reagan everything about the scheme he and North were working on. "I did not want him to be associated with the decision," Poindexter said. North claims he believed Poindexter had Reagan's explicit approval, but North lied about so many other things that his credibility is shaky at best on that claim.

Forget about whether America should or should not arm the Contras, freedom fighters, mercenaries or whatever else you want to call them, and help them overthrow a foreign government.

And forget about your feelings of trading hostages for sophisticated weapons.

And forget how we armed an avowed enemy of the United States, and may very

well get some of those missiles back in the Persian Gulf the hard way.

And forget about how the entire affair has impacted the Iran-Iraq war that we were supposed to be neutral in, destroyed what little credibility we had in the Middle East, and made President Reagan look like an ignoramus and his Cabinet meetings like a bar brawl.

The question is whether North and Poin-dexter were good soldiers or zealots dangerously out of control.

It's clear to me.

**A TRIBUTE TO BETTY  
GOLDENKRANZ**

**HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and congratulate an outstanding achievement by a resident of the 10th Congressional District and a dear friend of mine. Betty Goldenkranz has been named Reading Teacher of the Year by the New York State Reading Association.

I think my colleagues will agree that along with the criticism that our schools have taken over the past few years, great unheralded strides have been made in improving the way our children are taught. When I hear of the achievements of a person like Betty, I think you can agree we should all be very proud.

Betty Goldenkranz is in her 10th year as Reading Resource Teacher for Public School 269. Her responsibilities include teacher training and staff development, as well as diagnosis and recommendation for students needing special attention.

She has spent time as a lecturer at Brooklyn College in the department of reading and learning, as well as a consultant to St. John's University for its after school tutorial program.

Betty has a BA in sociology and elementary education from Hunter College, an MS in education and reading from Brooklyn College and has also done post-graduate work, concentrating in learning disabilities.

Along the way she managed to raise three children with her husband, Steve, and they have three lovely grandchildren.

My best wishes and heartfelt congratulations go out to Betty and her entire family on this tremendous achievement.

**"SIGNING FOR SUCCESS" GAL-  
LAUDET UNIVERSITY IS  
NUMBER ONE**

**HON. STEVE GUNDERSON**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, Biannually, U.S. News and World Report publishes and comments on a survey of college and university presidents of the best colleges and universities in the United States. With the 1987-88 academic year in full swing, the October 26, 1987, U.S. News and World Report dedicated a majority of this issue to higher educa-

tion in the United States in its special report—"America's Best Colleges."

For many of us who thumbed through this issue, probably the first thing we looked for was how our alma mater ranked nationally or regionally. Aside from our personal interest in the survey, Members of Congress should note with great interest the top ranking of an institution, right in our backyard, that receives appropriated Federal funds. Gallaudet University, located in northeast Washington, DC, received the distinction as the best liberal-arts institution in the East.

It is important to note that being included within the results of the U.S. News and World Report survey is nothing new for Gallaudet University. In 1983, Gallaudet College was ranked as the fifth best Eastern liberal arts institution. Two years later, in the 1985 survey, Gallaudet College was ranked No. 3 of Eastern smaller comprehensive institutions. A year after Gallaudet was recognized as a university under title I of the Education of the Deaf Act of 1986, it has been ranked No. 1 by its peers as the top Eastern liberal arts institution. These and other accomplishments illustrate the depth and quality of the university community at Gallaudet. Gallaudet University shows us that we do get better with age.

For over 122 years, Gallaudet University has served as the only liberal arts institution in the world dedicated to educating hearing impaired individuals. Gallaudet University stands as an international symbol of the unique aptitude, potential, and talent of hearing impaired individuals by delivering outstanding educational opportunities, leadership, and programs for the hearing impaired of all ages.

Gallaudet University has made great strides in the 1980's, and I have no doubt it will continue to grow and prosper in the years to come. Congress must continue to recognize and support the accomplishments and importance of Gallaudet University's mission in our higher education community.

As a congressional trustee for Gallaudet University, I am proud of the many achievements of this fine institution, and wish to congratulate Gallaudet University's administration, faculty, staff, and students for their dedication and service for the continuing growth of this innovative learning environment.

**A BIT OF PORTUGAL IN  
NEWARK**

**HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as a lifetime resident of Newark, I share with all my fellow Newarkers a deep sense of pride in our city. Newark is a city on the move—undergoing a renaissance and a rebirth.

It is also a city of people and neighborhoods. Throughout its long history, Newark served as the gateway for countless numbers of people seeking a better life and bringing with them their many cultures and traditions. This gives Newark a social fabric that is both diverse and unique.

One Newark neighborhood that boasts a rich urban vibrancy is the Ironbound section.

This prosperous, tightly knit community is particularly noted for the many contributions of its Portuguese-American residents and its special ethnic flavor.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to include in my remarks a recent article from the New York Times highlighting the many attractions in the Ironbound neighborhood.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 7, 1987]

**LITTLE PORTUGAL: PAGE OF HISTORY IN  
NEWARK**

(By Marian Burros)

Visitors to the Ironbound section of Newark enter a time warp. Just three blocks from Pennsylvania Station here and a five-minute drive from Newark International Airport is an ethnic neighborhood of 40 or 50 years ago, where in the late afternoon, neighbors visit with neighbors, the women on their stoops, the men in the local bars.

Portuguese music blares from loudspeakers along Ferry Street, a milelong stretch of shops and restaurants. The language in the stores is Portuguese. Travel agencies offer bargain trips to Portugal. Imported Portuguese ingredients take up at least 20 percent of the shelf space in the markets, while the 50-odd restaurants serve Portuguese dishes, with a generous helping of Spanish favorites like paella and mariscada.

This tiny section of Newark is bounded on three sides by railroad tracks and on the fourth by a railroad yard—hence the name. Some, however, prefer to call it Down Neck, from its location on a neck bordered by the Passaic River, or simply Little Portugal.

A working-class community since it was settled in the early 19th century, the Ironbound has seen a succession of immigrant groups: German, Irish, Polish, Italian. It did not become famous for eating and shopping, however, until the Portuguese began arriving in the 1960's and 70's.

Today, most estimates agree that about 50,000 to 70,000 residents of the Ironbound, or 50 to 70 percent of the population, are Portuguese; the remainder are Hispanic, Italian, black and Polish.

It is a prosperous, tightly knit community. Those who leave feel a constant pull to return. Isabel and José Fernando Costa, for example, moved back three years ago from South River, N.J. "Even when I lived in South River," Mrs. Costa said, "I still came here to shop. The butcher does something special for you, and the fish is fresh."

At lunchtime, the markets are filled with young women who work in the area and know the butchers and fishmongers by name. Maria Cordiero of Elizabeth, N.J., shops once or twice a week at Conde's Fish Market, which opened in 1929. "The things are fresher here," she said.

Many women from the Ironbound shop for groceries every day usually after work and often with children in tow. At stores like Seabra's on Ferry Street, Portuguese and American ingredients jostle for shelf space: Serra Curado, a goat cheese dipped in paprika and oil, and Kraft single slices; Portuguese corn bread, dense and crusty from its corn-and wheat-flour base, and Wonder bread; ketchup and piri-piri, the stinging hot peppers from Angola, a former Portuguese territory.

Retail bakeries supply the stores with excellent breads and many customary Portuguese sweets. There are also the distinctively perfumed and fruity Portuguese olive oils and unusual cuts of meat: salted pig's ears,

pork tongues, tails and snouts and chickens with heads and feet intact. The Lopes Meat Company is famous for its spicy sausages, such as chourico and linguica, and presunto, which resembles prosciutto. At week's end, the fish markets feature fish flown in from Portugal.

These ingredients will be turned into savory Portuguese specialties like caldeirada, a fisherman's stew that includes cod, squid and monkfish. The whole is suffused with olive oil, as are so many Portuguese dishes. Bacalhau, the beloved salt cod, is offered in a dozen variations. Sardines are grilled, then eaten head and all.

Pork is a staple and the basis of two hearty recipes: pork and clams cooked with pickled vegetables and olives and served with fried potatoes, and feijoada, a casserole of pork and beans similar to the Brazilian dish of the same name, except that the beans are white instead of black.

The neighborhood appeals not only to Portuguese-Americans, who come from as far away as Long Island, Westchester County and Pennsylvania, but to other transplanted Europeans. Michael Frede, who is German and teaches at Princeton University, comes with his wife, Gabrielle. On one visit, Mrs Frede was pushing their 13-month-old twin daughters in a stroller through Orlando, a food market on Ferry Street.

"It's like an old-type community that we don't have in Princeton," Mr. Frede said. "The things we can get here are much more European—the ham, cheese, rabbits chourico. This is like an outing for us. We have some coffee and shop."

It is the restaurants, however, that attract the largest cross section of visitors. "You can't get the food anywhere else—the taste, the quality, the way it's presented," said Michael Bertone, a lawyer who was dining at the Peninsular on Ferry Street.

"When I came to New Jersey in 1973 as Federal prosecutor, I quickly learned that Newark is known for its Portuguese food," said Peter Sarasohn, a lawyer in Roseland, N.J., who recently brought two business associates to Casa Vasca.

Casa Vasca is a Basque restaurant, but even the Portuguese say it is difficult to tell Spanish and Portuguese restaurant food apart. "After a while, they blend here," said Céu Cirne-Neves, who was born in Portugal and came to the United States when she was 14 years old. "So even though paella is not Portuguese, it's made in Portuguese restaurants."

Ms. Cirne-Neves, who is the public-relations director for St. James Hospital in the Ironbound, said the Portuguese food was authentic. But Armando Fontoura, the undersheriff of Essex County, N.J., and the president of the Portuguese-American Congress of New Jersey, disagreed. Mr. Fontoura came to the Ironbound from Portugal when he was 11. "Catering to Americans in the restaurants," he said, "has bastardized the food."

Authentic Portuguese food is less oily than Spanish food and uses spices more widely, according to Jean Anderson, the author of "The Food of Portugal" (Morrow, 1986). The distinction is probably lost in the Ironbound. "For Americans," said José Marques, the owner of El Pastor restaurant on Market Street, "we make things with less hot pepper, less fat and less salt."

Despite the American intrusions—the ketchup on the table, surf and turf on the menu—the Ironbound is essentially a European enclave in the United States, one to which its sons and daughters often return.

Mr. Fontoura, for example, said his family has made a down payment on one of the area's first condominiums. "I miss the people and the density," he said. "There is someone always available to talk with until the wee hours of the morning." And there are the Portuguese foods: "Why, you can buy everything you need right here."

**TRIBUTE TO MR. FRANK ZACCARIA, PRINCIPAL OF THE PASSAIC COUNTY TECHNICAL AND VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL**

**HON. ROBERT A. ROE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join in honoring a man of great compassion and selfless ambition. Mr. Frank Zaccaria, the newly appointed principal of the Passaic County Technical and Vocational High School, will be honored by the Federation of Italian Societies at its annual dinner dance on November 1, 1987.

Mr. Zaccaria has long recognized the value education holds for all members of society, including those with special needs and requirements. At this time I would like to quote a brief history of his distinguished career which includes a wide range of both private, civic and public duties:

**TRIBUTE TO MR. FRANK ZACCARIA, PRINCIPAL OF THE PASSAIC COUNTY TECHNICAL AND VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL**

Frank was born in Totowa on August 8, 1930, and has been a resident of West Paterson for the past eighteen years. He attended local schools and graduated from Passaic Valley High School in 1947. At the outbreak of the Korean conflict, Frank joined the U.S. Air Force, served four years, and achieved the rank of Staff Sergeant, while serving with the European Occupation Forces in Germany and Italy.

After his discharge, he returned to civilian life and married Mary Brosnan, resumed his job at Continental Can Co., and enrolled at Seton Hall University earning a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Sociology. Frank continued his education and received a Masters Degree in Education from William Paterson College.

After 22 years in a business career, which saw him rise from a factory line worker to Production Control Manager, Frank chose to pursue a long desired career in the field of Education for the Handicapped. In 1971, he joined the staff of the Passaic County Technical and Vocational High School as a teacher of the handicapped. It wasn't long after that he was appointed to the position of Coordinator of Cooperative Industrial Education, placing handicapped students in jobs. In 1985, Frank became Supervisor of Career and Vocational Education. The Board of Education appointed Mr. Zaccaria principal of that school in January 1987.

In addition to his membership in the New Jersey Principal and Supervisors Association, the Epsilon Pi Tau Professional Society of Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, the American Vocational Association, and the New Jersey Cooperative Industrial Education Coordinators Association, he was elected to "Who's Who" in American Cooperative Education in 1980.

Frank's civic activities and interests include serving as Vice President of the Board of Trustees of Tombrook College for five years, Secretary to the West Paterson Planning Board, member of the Passaic County Boy Scouts of America's Executive Board, one of the founders of the Italian American Forum, member of the West Paterson Bicentennial Committee, and membership in the West Paterson American Legion Post #238.

He has been an elected councilman of the West Paterson governing body since 1973, having held the various positions of Council President, Police Commissioner, Fire Commissioner and Finance Commissioner.

He and Mary are members of Our Lady of Pompeii Church in Paterson. Their five children, Frank X., Kathleen and her husband Richard Dellanno, Karyn, Mary, and Pamela, are the delight of their lives and a lovely tribute to their 31 years of married life.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is most apparent that Frank is a self-made man, who turned from a successful business career to rechannel his efforts into a career where his love of knowledge could be passed on to others. Education is the most precious commodity we can pass on to our children, and it is important to remember that education must be flexible to meet the needs of everyone who desires to learn. Schools such as Passaic County Vo-Tech give students an option, allowing them to learn valuable and much needed job skills for New Jersey's booming economy, while still providing a solid background in the traditional studies thus allowing them to continue their education beyond high school.

Frank Zaccaria has been intimately involved in the school both as an instructor and administrator for 15 years. He is a concerned educator, one dedicated not merely to supervising children while their parents work, but to a complete, well rounded education where the parents are involved in the process as the students. Mr. Speaker, the world today is a demanding one, but if we can find men and women like Frank Zaccaria, who care enough to prepare our youth to be active and productive in it, then I am confident we will leave our communities and our country in very capable hands.

**STOP THE EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN**

**HON. GEORGE MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a bill to ban the importation into our country of products produced by exploited children. I am very pleased that the measure has drawn the support of nearly 90 of our colleagues, as well as the endorsement of many advocacy organizations representing labor, children, and human rights. It's time to demand that the brutalization of children in the workplace stop.

Today, the Christian Science Monitor printed my opinion editorial which discusses the steps which must be taken to protect the

world's children. I urge my colleagues to read the article, and to cosponsor my legislation.

The article follows:

**STOP EXPLOITING CHILD LABORERS**  
(By George Miller)

In June 1970, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service added the whale to its list of endangered species, severely restricting the importation of whale products.

The same step was taken in 1978 to help ensure the survival of the Asian elephant. Since the enactment of the Endangered Species Act in 1966, similar protection has been granted to rhinos, leopards, wombats, and many other species.

Don't the world's children deserve the same level of protection?

According to the International Labor Organization, 88 million children between the ages of 11 and 15 are now part of the world's labor force. They, and millions more younger than 11, work in dismal and dangerous conditions, putting in endless hours and getting virtually nothing in return.

Child labor is on the rise in large part because third-world countries are racing to meet the demand for their products created by Western nations. A Thai government survey revealed that child labor in Thailand increased 30 percent between 1981 and 1983, and evidence suggests the rate has continued to climb in tandem with the Thai export industry. A 1985 United Nations study of Thai industry reports that "manufacturing industries employing a large proportion of child workers are those which expanded very rapidly in the last few years as a result of their export potential."

Child laborers all over the world leave a long trail of profits for company owners, traders, and Western department stores.

The Mocary factory in Morocco can produce a carpet for less than \$20. When it is sold to Macy's in New York for \$166, Mocary executives gain almost \$100 in profit. After marking up and selling the rug, labeled "Made in Morocco exclusively for R. H. Macy's," Macy's makes a \$282 profit. The broker who arranges these and other transactions makes millions of dollars each year in commissions. The United States imported 10,000 carpets, worth \$2.3 million, from Morocco in 1985. Western consumers create the demand for these products, but do nothing to ensure that the world's children are not sacrificed. Its time to use our economic strength to protect the children of the world rather than allow commercial demands to underwrite their enslavement.

When concerns about international exploitation of child labor are raised, we are frequently admonished that we cannot affect labor conditions abroad. We are told we cannot mandate remedies, or that foreign governments won't even respect their own fair-labor laws. Yet by prohibiting the importation of products derived from endangered species, we do attempt to influence the policies of foreign governments.

We should in effect, add "exploited children" to the list of "endangered species." This is the essence of legislation that I recently introduced in Congress: barring the importation into the US of any item produced in violation of internationally recognized child labor rights.

We are also told that unless these children are allowed to work, they will starve. Such arguments have served to justify exploitation for centuries. Like the slaveholders who justified slavery on the basis that slaves were better off on the plantation, countries that ignore child labor laws

say employers hire five-year-olds out of compassion. The truth is that these companies prefer to hire children, rather than some of the millions of unemployed adults, because they can work them long and pay them little. An Indian legal scholar estimates that if child labor was eliminated in his country, 15 million adult jobs would be created.

Stopping child labor requires a national commitment to keeping children out of the workplace. Kenya, an underdeveloped and impoverished nation, is not only more aggressive in enforcing its child labor laws, but has established Africa's first policy of universal education. In many countries, however, the government simply disregards its own child labor laws, as well as minimal international standards for child labor: enforcement of a minimum working age; prohibition of work at night or in hazardous occupations; enforced standards for minimum hours of work, health, and safety; and a ban on compulsory employment. Some governments have encouraged children to enter training programs where, in the absence of any mechanism to prevent exploitation, they are soon working 70 hours a week.

By putting economic pressure on these countries, we can force them to change their child labor practices.

As child labor stunts the mental and physical growth of children, it also stifles a nation's potential for development. Economic progress in the third world will not come by wasting away the most valuable resource for the sake of foreign exchange. Prosperity will be achieved by giving children the opportunity to grow, and allowing them to make a much greater contribution to society as adults.

**WALL STREET JOURNAL ARTICLE EMPHASIZES TRUE CORPORATE SHAREOWNER RESPONSIBILITY DURING HOSTILE TAKEOVERS**

**HON. THOMAS A. LUKEN**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years, most of us have come to recognize that this country has slipped a rung or two on the ladder of international competitiveness. Confident as we are that America can regain its competitive edge, and turn an alarming trade deficit into a once-again respectable trade surplus, we nonetheless know that the task ahead will not be easy.

Recently, John Smale, chief executive officer of Procter & Gamble, headquartered in Cincinnati, addressed the question of competitiveness at the annual meeting of Procter & Gamble shareholders. An adaptation of his remarks was published in the Wall Street Journal on Friday, October 16, 1987.

Shortly, Mr. Speaker, this body will be asked to vote on legislation amending the 20-year-old Williams Act. As it seems wholly fair to suggest that we have been prompted into action by the increasingly abusive and manipulative tactics of "corporate raiders" and inside traders, and inasmuch as much needs to be said about hostile takeovers and well-run corporations, I ask that Mr. Smale's Wall

Street Journal article be inserted into the RECORD. In doing so, I sincerely hope that his salient remarks will be widely read and pondered by my fellow Members and by concerned citizens everywhere.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 16, 1987]

**WHAT ABOUT SHAREOWNERS' RESPONSIBILITY?**

(By John G. Smale)

Widespread hostile takeover activity has made maximizing immediate shareholder value appear to be the basic purpose of a business enterprise. Some defend hostile takeovers as adherence to free enterprise—as reliance on market forces to structure and restructure our economy. But this emphasis will, if not appropriately curbed, have just the opposite effect.

From the perspective of someone whose company has been in business for 150 years, I can say that by focusing on the short term, our publicly held business enterprises will see their competitive position decay, their resiliency in difficult times undermined, and their standing in our society compromised.

There is, of course, nothing new about a corporation's fundamental responsibility to its owners. What is new is the role of what I'll call the "temporary owner," whose sole interest is that of a speculator looking for the "fast buck."

In sharp contrast to the traditional shareholder, "temporary owners" play a role that can lead to the acquisition of corporate assets through creative financing—for the purpose of reaping a quick profit. This often results in the breakup and/or the forced assumption of major debt by the corporation under attack.

**A COMPETITIVE MARKETPLACE**

This process produces in my opinion, a distortion—and a serious one—of the role of business in our society.

That role is to provide goods or services the society wants at the lowest possible cost. It does this in a competitive marketplace—a marketplace continuously evolving in terms of technology, consumer needs, competitive skill and economic circumstances. Over time, how well a company does depends importantly on how vigorously it prepares for the future. That preparation often involves decisions and investments that have short-term adverse consequences.

And that's one of the things that should concern us about hostile takeovers: Managers making expedient decisions to run up the price of their company's stock in order to try to prevent the takeover of their company.

It is difficult to generalize about hostile takeovers and forced leveraged buyouts because each situation has its own unique elements. It's clear, however, that opportunity exists for manipulation to produce profits for speculators without consideration of the real interests of the corporation's long-term investors, its employees, or the communities in which it operates.

It is also clear that hostile takeovers do not do what the speculators say they will do. Research by scholars such as Michael Porter of Harvard Business School suggests they do not usually bring better management to poorly run companies, do not create additional wealth in our economy, and do not even, over time, necessarily provide a good mechanism for shareholders to realize full value for their shares.

Historically, it was considered highly desirable to have a strong balance sheet, a balance sheet with no more than a reasonable amount of debt. This enabled the corporation to withstand economic downturns, and gave it the financial resources to make major investments, all to the advantage of shareholders. Now, some argue that corporations are "underleveraged."

But an argument can be made, as well, that it is not a healthy thing that corporate debt has grown over half a trillion dollars in the last 4 years—from 37 percent of U.S. corporate net worth in 1983 to 53 percent last year, a record debt ratio.

Until recently, putting a significant part of a company's profits into investments for future growth was considered essential—the driving force of future profit growth. Now, it is argued that companies should cut investments to provide shareholders quick returns. For example, oil companies have been attacked for using profits to search for new oil reserves. Even more ominous for the ability of American business to compete technologically is what I've heard from other chief executive officers about cutbacks in research and development resulting from takeovers or resistance to attempted takeovers.

Historically, temporary fluctuations in the market price of a company's stock did not drive decisions on how the company should be structured. Now, some argue that if the total value of all of the company's stock is less than the price that could be paid for its various parts, the corporation should be effectively liquidated.

Hard to measure, but nonetheless important, is the damage that overemphasis on short-term results can bring to the attitudes of our society toward corporations. Corporations are citizens—paper citizens to be sure—but citizens nonetheless. A corporation exhibiting little concern for the rest of society or for its own future risks the disfavor of our citizens.

A corporation's success over time is almost totally dependent on its ability to attract and retain good people as employers—good people in terms of their talents, their integrity, and their willingness to sacrifice at times for the good of the company. But for a corporation to expect this kind of commitment and dedication from its employees; it must reciprocate. It must evidence a greater breadth of purpose than short-term maximization of per-share stock price.

There can be little argument about the obligation that those who manage and govern corporations have to the shareholder. But what about the shareholder's obligation? In fact, doesn't ownership itself imply some responsibility if our economy and our society are to be healthy?

Here, an examination of the history of my company is, I think, helpful. Procter & Gamble, founded in 1837, predates over 99 percent of the business corporations in this country. It has seen public attitudes and expectations concerning corporations shift with economic and political circumstances over the years.

Our beliefs about the responsibilities of ownership are based on the attitudes of our founders and their successors—owners of a family business. Through their actions, the Procters and the Gambles demonstrated time and again three aspects of responsibility, which are still a part of this company's character.

They were generous with their time and money to help those less fortunate and to build a thriving community. They planned

the business for the long-term, and they were mindful of their employees.

The company has always been an industry leader in employee benefits and has, today, the longest running continuous profit-sharing plan in existence.

Early in the 1920's, the company implemented a plan, revolutionary for its day, of selling direct to retailers. The resistance of wholesalers to this idea, coupled with a national financial crisis and recession, resulted in a 1-year loss to the company of more than \$30 million. That was an amount about equal to what the company had earned in its previous 5 years.

You can imagine how Cooper Procter, the corporation's chief executive at the time, felt about this. He knew it would adversely affect the value of the company's stock in the short run. He wrote his niece at the time: "My own judgment and prestige will suffer \* \* \* I cannot help \* \* \* in the long run, the present plan will work for the advantage of the average stockholder who had this stock as an investment and not as speculation."

Cooper Procter was right, of course. The decision worked to the advantage of the stockholder, because the decision had fundamentally made the company more competitive.

We feel very deeply our obligation to the owners of this company, both individual owners and the institutions who own large numbers of shares. We have the fundamental obligation to enhance the value of their ownership over time.

Importantly, we feel responsibility for our own employees and retired employees who constitute by far the largest single group of shareholders. This company doesn't have a pension plan. It has profit sharing. And the vast majority of the company's profit-sharing plans are held in P&G stock. Furthermore, 16,000 of our some 44,000 U.S. employees purchase additional P&G stock each month through a payroll deduction plan.

#### GUIDING PRINCIPLES

For the most part then, the employees of this company—management and workers alike—have their financial well-being tied to P&G stock. And over time, it's worked out pretty well. In the past 35 years, for example, an investment of \$100 in P&G, with simple reinvestment of dividends, would have grown to \$6,977—an amount 75 percent higher than from a similar investment in the stocks included in the Dow Jones Industrial average for those years.

We have no crystal ball. We don't know what the future will bring. We do know, however, that the principles that have guided the conduct of this company's business in the past have served its shareholders, its employees, the communities where it operates, and consumers throughout the world—and served them well. We intend to continue operating on the basis of those principles in the future.

I believe the basic business system in this country has worked well. It has been, by and large, efficient. It has produced the world's highest standard of living for our citizens. We must be very sure that in an environment of expediency—with some willing to manipulate corporate structure for quick profits—we don't end up compromising the basic strength of this unique business system.

VIETNAM: ANOTHER BETRAYAL?

## HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of all Members an article written by Al Santoli entitled "Vietnam—Are We Setting the Stage for Another Betrayal?"

Al Santoli is a much decorated Vietnam veteran and author of many books on Vietnam. His article, written in the editorial section of the Washington Times on September 22, 1987, addresses the current negotiations between the Reagan administration and the Vietnamese Government concerning our missing servicemen in Southeast Asia. This "must-read" article grows in importance with the current negotiations taking place regarding Central America; it seems the United States has learned the wrong lessons from the Vietnam war.

[From the Washington Times, Sept. 22, 1987]

VIETNAM—ARE WE SETTING THE STAGE FOR ANOTHER BETRAYAL?

(By Al Santoli)

With all the best intentions, the Reagan administration is once again engaging in a foreign policy debacle. By encouraging "humanitarian assistance" and considering lifting certain trade restrictions to Vietnam, the stage has been set for further destabilization in the Pacific region.

This development concerns allies like Thailand, whose citizens are suffering ongoing attacks by Vietnamese and Laotian troops, who also train and supply militant Thai "Pak Mai" guerrillas. And as part of the Soviet "internationalist" alliance, Vietnam's aggressive activities extend to our own hemisphere.

In El Salvador, captured guerrilla documents and communist defectors have stated that top FMLN guerrilla commanders have been recently trained in Vietnam. And on Aug. 31, 1987, in a nationally broadcast speech before the ruling Council of Ministers in Hanoi, Vietnam's No. 2 leader Pham Hung, reaffirmed: "Vietnam will actively continue . . . to support the struggle against imperialism in El Salvador, Chile, Palestine, Lebanon . . . and the policy of national concord of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan" (the Soviet proxy regime). And in Guatemala, American M-16 rifles captured by Hanoi are being found in the hands of communist guerrillas.

Earlier this August, President Reagan sent a delegation to Hanoi led by retired Gen. John Vessey to discuss the missing-in-action (MIA) issue. This visit set the U.S. aid initiative into motion. After the Vessey delegation returned to Washington, I asked the trip's organizer and point man at the National Security Council for the MIA issue, Col. Richard Childress, if they discussed the training and supplying of Latin American guerrillas with the Vietnamese. Col. Childress emphatically said, "No," because that would have created an unharmonious atmosphere at the meetings.

After the seven years of frustration on the MIA issue, the administration had capitulated to Hanoi's intransigence, ignoring the regime's brutal behavior to its own citizens, to

its neighbors and in the international community.

The aid initiative comes at a time when Vietnam is stepping up its propaganda campaign to divide ASEAN solidarity and win votes of support on its occupation of Cambodia at the upcoming United Nations session. And rather than moving away from the Soviets, who have doubled their aid to Vietnam to \$2 billion annually, in speech after speech Vietnamese leaders proclaim that "militant solidarity and all-around cooperation with the Soviet Union is the cornerstone" of Vietnam's policy.

Presently, the Soviets are expanding military bases in Danang and Cam Ranh Bay, already their largest overseas naval and air facilities. And with the recent Indian seizure of the Sri Lankan port of Trincomalee, the Soviets have the ability to threaten or block both entrances to the Straits of Malacca, the choke point of shipping between the Indian and Pacific Oceans.

The administration's irrational actions are reminiscent of the Paris Peace Accords of 1973, which guaranteed the return of all American prisoners and remains. Col. Childress was only a junior officer at the time. His lack of sound judgment in dealing with the Vietnamese and Laotian communists is almost understandable. But Gen. Vessey played a major policy role in handing Laos to the North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao.

In 1972, as deputy chief of the Joint U.S. military Advisory Group in Thailand, Gen. Vessey was responsible for planning the defense of Laos after the cease-fire went into effect. At that time, the North Vietnamese were continuing a blitzkrieg offensive throughout Laos, especially along the Ho Chi Minh Trail, the main invasion route to South Vietnam.

The backbone of Laotian defense was 30 battalions of Thai Special Guerrilla Units trained by U.S. Special Forces. On Dec. 18, 1972, in a *top secret* cable to the Pentagon, Gen. Vessey condescendingly ignored the Vietnamese offensive and advocated disbanding the SGUs. Hence leaving Laos at the mercy of communist forces. And our loyal friends, the Hmong irregular troops, were slaughtered as they tried to disrupt the NVA onslaught toward South Vietnam on the trail. The Vessey cable to the Pentagon states: "Agreement to maintain the SGU assistance to Vietnam at this time is tantamount to supporting their occupation of Cambodia and future aggression against Thailand.

And in El Salvador, since FMLN leaders have received training in Vietnam, landmine terrorism has tragically increased, creating hundreds of civilian casualties.

The Reagan administration's policy of paying the communists for MIA remains through intermediaries goes back at least to late 1984. At that time, unknown to the public, Col. Childress spearheaded administration pressure on the Asian Development Bank to grant an \$8 million interest-free loan to Laos for a forestry project of dubious merit. An American official at the bank resisted out of concern that the project would help to support the 50,000 Vietnamese troops that control Laos. And he feared that slave labor for the project would come from former American allies who are inmates in the Laotian gulag. But after heavy administration pressure, the money was given. And another such loan for Laos is being prepared at present.

Human rights conditions in Laos and Vietnam are among the most reprehensible in the world. Last week, while Mr. Reagan met

with the pope, more than 200 Catholic priests and nuns, 3,000 Buddhist monks and nuns and 30 Protestant ministers continued to languish with thousands of other re-education camp prisoners in Vietnam's gulag.

Immediately prior to Gen. Vessey's trip, Vietnam's media heralded a mass arrest of Catholics, including an 81-year-old priest, in Thu Duc near Saigon. And while Montagnard tribespeople continued to be persecuted in Vietnam, on the Thai-Lao border desperate Hmong refugees are being murdered by Vietnamese and Lao troops.

Thailand, through threatened by U.S. trade sanctions, has stepped up its efforts to suppress drug trafficking. Meanwhile, the Laotian government has become a major grower and exporter of opium, heroin and marijuana. Much of it is exported through the Vietnamese port of Danang. Drug enforcement experts in Asia say that this year the Laotian opium crop is 100-200 tons, a 400 percent increase above last year. This dramatic rise in the Laotian drug trade was confirmed by U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Ann Wroblewski in recent testimony before the House of Representatives.

I don't believe that any servicemen who were taken prisoner or died in Indochina would agree that the reclamation of their remains is more important than protecting our children from the drug trade.

And as a veteran who fought alongside those men, I don't believe that their sacrifice should be a reason for the U.S. government to grant aid or support to Soviet proxy regimes who have broken every rule of international law and decency. Especially when they openly broadcast the large amounts of fresh food they ship to the Soviet Union while their own people are hungry.

So long as Vietnam and its surrogates remain a threat to their neighbors and our allies in other parts of the world, the U.S. government must not, as in 1973, capitulate and give license for further tyranny.

As in North Korea, where more than 8,000 American bodies remain, we must not let sentiment take precedent over strong resolve and sound judgment. This is the only hope to break the stranglehold of communist strongmen over their enslaved peoples.

The administration should learn from the lesson of Ethiopia, where massive Western aid was cynically exploited by the regime. Though some people were saved from starvation, thousands of others are being slaughtered in subsequent communist-forced relocation and collectivization campaigns. And instead of moving the Ethiopian regime away from the Soviets, who maintain a major naval base there, we've helped them consolidate their power.

When administration or congressional delegations visit Hanoi, the first place they should visit is the giant statue of Lenin erected just last year in Ba Dinh Square, the only such icon in all of Southeast Asia. There may be a more productive way to gain the release of captured American servicemen like Mike Bosiljevac, who quite possibly was transferred to Moscow because of his technical knowledge. Rather than paying ransom to proxies, it would be better to deal directly with Moscow, similar to the acquisition of Anatoly Sharansky.

The MIA issue remains highly charged, sometimes to mythic proportions, for many patriotic Americans who wish to reclaim honor lost in Vietnam. But we should remember that the brave servicemen put their lives on the line—and sometimes endured horrific torture—for the ideals of freedom and to stop communist expansion.

They are dying a second death because not only were their ideals betrayed in 1973, but even now their remains are being used to further enslave the peoples of Southeast Asia.

## MORE SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SOLUTIONS TO AIDS

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, it is always gratifying for this Member to read when responsible journalists and editorial boards endorse a public opinion approach to solving the AIDS epidemic rather than succumbing to the sophistries surrounding a civil rights approach. I commend the following editorials for your attention:

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Sept. 22, 1987]

### REAGAN RIGHT ABOUT AIDS BILL

It's understandable that Congress would consider a ban on discrimination against AIDS sufferers and making the unauthorized disclosure of their identities a federal crime. The notion that people who may soon die must also endure intimidation and censure is repugnant.

But the Reagan administration is right to criticize the proposal as premature. It would deprive public health officials of important information, subject medical workers to unnecessary exposure to AIDS and grant carriers of a fatal, contagious disease exemptions not enjoyed by carriers of any other illness. The bill should be dropped.

There is no doubt public fear of AIDS has led to episodic discrimination and abuse against some AIDS victims. The refusal of a public school in Arcadia, Fla., to admit three children with AIDS and the subsequent burning of their home were appalling actions. Yet, it would be wrong to view this as a civil rights case, requiring the same types of legislative remedies accorded minorities two decades ago.

Dr. Otis Bowen, secretary of health and human services was correct in saying that if various state health officials find they have a problem with discrimination against AIDS victims, they "should be free to act accordingly. Other states and Congress will be able to observe and learn from the results."

AIDS is not a race or religion. It is a lethal, contagious disease which has infected about 41,700 Americans and killed 24,000 so far. As Dr. Bowen notes, most states already have laws prohibiting the unauthorized disclosure of medical information and requiring certain types of tests for public health reasons.

AIDS is a rapidly growing, national health problem about which too little is known. State and local health agencies, along with private and public hospitals and physicians, are in the forefront of the battle against this epidemic.

As the disease spreads, there are bound to be errors in judgment. They will have to be corrected at whatever level of government is appropriate. But Congress should let the process unfold rather than stepping in with the wrong federal law at the wrong time.



[From the Dallas Morning News, Oct. 16, 1987]

**AIDS MUST BE TREATED AS HEALTH ISSUE**  
(By Jerry W. Chevalier)

The AIDS virus was first recognized in the United States in the late 1970s. It was first thought to occur only in homosexual men, hence the name that was first associated with it: GRID (gay-related immune deficiency). However, it is a heterosexual problem too.

This disease is associated with indiscriminate sexual activity (particularly anal intercourse) and the sharing of intravenous needles that is common among drug abusers. Acquired immune deficiency syndrome also can be transmitted by contaminated blood products and body fluids, blood transfusions, and from mother to fetus.

The projections from the U.S. Public Health Service show that the AIDS epidemic will be with us for at least another five years. It is estimated that there are 50 to 100 people infected with AIDS for every person diagnosed as having AIDS, and that by 1991, there will be 270,000 reported cases, 3,000 of which will involve infants and children. Right now, AIDS is the No. 1 killer of women ages 20-35 in New York City.

Society is searching for a way out of the terrible dilemma posed by this disease. The dilemma specifically is that policy-makers and citizens are faced with the difficult task of finding effective measures to contain a devastating epidemic that, in turn, does not violate the privacy of individuals and does not damage human lives and dignity. However, one must consider the other side of the story. There are hundreds of thousands of Americans infected and dying from this virus.

Society must keep in mind that people routinely are medically tested for a variety of diseases for obtaining insurance, marriage licenses, certain jobs, as hospital work-ups for diagnosis and for admission as immigrants to the United States. However, this has not been the case with AIDS. AIDS always has been the exception to the rule concerning fatal dangers to the public (immigrants, soldiers, and prisoners are now being tested).

Testing should be done on all individuals entering a hospital or health clinic as part of their routine workup. The act of testing all individuals would eliminate the stigma of testing "high-risk" or select groups of people. It also would decrease the cost of health care the individual, family or society has to incur by identifying what the individual has and not waiting until the person has a life-threatening opportunistic disease such as pneumocystis carini pneumonia, cryptococcal meningitis, toxoplasmosis or CMV, which is how AIDS is currently diagnosed.

The results of the HIV test should be made available to all health care workers who would have direct patient contact that would or could cause exposure to blood or body fluids. All people who have had sex with that individual should be contacted and informed that they may have been infected with the HIV just as any other sexually transmitted disease is (contact tracing). Those individuals should then be tested and educated about what their options are. In addition, the person's place of employment should be informed if that individual's job lends itself to frequent or potential contact involving blood or body fluids such as the medical, dental and nursing fields.

From the time of AIDS' discovery, the whole emphasis has been that "the needs of the one outweigh the needs of the many."

The constant flooding of information on how you cannot get AIDS and the supposed inaccurate tests are part of the problem. According to Wadley Blood Bank, the HIV test is 99.7 percent accurate. If the individual HIV test is positive, it will be repeated. If it is still positive, then a more accurate test is done, the Western Blot test, which is 100 percent accurate.

When new ways of transmission are discovered, they are downplayed by the media and public officials so as to not create panic or hysteria. For example, when some dentists and health care workers caught AIDS from their patients, it was downplayed because those people "had breaks in the skin" through which the virus entered or that the blood had prolonged contact on their skin. Breaks in the skin are not uncommon, and we do not know how long blood has to be in contact with your skin before you will be infected. Accidents happen every day; they are unavoidable and unpredictable.

Society has allowed a vocal, highly political minority to misappropriate AIDS as a moral issue, thus giving our government leaders an excuse to abdicate their responsibility. AIDS is a health issue, and should be treated as such.

There are laws before Congress now ensuring that the rights of the individual shall be inviolate, such as the law stating that insurance companies shall not discriminate against people who live in certain ZIP code districts or addresses, as they have in the past. There is also the patient confidentiality law that provides for confidentiality of the individual, but not to the extent that the confidentiality will endanger other lives.

We need laws to protect the rights of the individual against those who would take advantage, but you cannot treat a deadly problem by ignoring it.

Mandatory testing should not be done to ostracize those who carry the virus but to make them aware of precautions they need to take to protect themselves and others.

There are hundreds of thousands of people in this country carrying the virus and spreading it to others, often unknowingly. Like other dangerous and contagious diseases—which is how AIDS should be treated—we cannot control it if we do not know who is spreading it. A person who is HIV positive will not necessarily develop AIDS, but he can spread it to those who will; therefore, mandatory testing and careful dissemination of information as outlined should be instituted.

Jerry W. Chevalier is a registered nurse working at a metroplex hospital and a candidate for a master of science degree in nursing at the University of Texas at Arlington. Jane Langdon, also an R.N. and a UTA graduate student, contributed to this article.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1987]

**MAKE IT A CRIME TO SPREAD AIDS—COUNSELING ISN'T ENOUGH FOR RECKLESS OR DELIBERATE INFECTORS**

(By Douglas J. Besharov)

"I have AIDS," Kenny Grice told his friend Lorenzo Owens, three tragic words heard all too often these days. Owens was not sympathetic, though. The two men had just had sex. As Grice dressed, Owens got a knife from the kitchen and slit his lover's throat. Owens subsequently pled guilty to manslaughter.

Lost in the recent furor about AIDS testing is the question of the obligation of individuals who test positive to protect others from this life-taking disease. Until now,

most experts have assured us that the education and counseling of victims will be enough to prevent dangerous behavior. Yet there is deeply troubling evidence that a small minority of AIDS victims either are intent on infecting others—or simply do not care enough to change their sexual practices.

Although most studies document a tremendous reduction in risky sexual behavior by homosexual men, most also show that knowledge of positive test results does not affect the sexual behavior of a small core of AIDS victims—they do not reduce the number of their sex partners or the number of times that they engage in unprotected anal intercourse.

In a Johns Hopkins study of 1,000 gay men, two years after being tested for AIDS, more than 15 percent still did not want to know the result. (Initially, more than 30 percent had not wanted to know.) In a Miami study, 16 of 28 AIDS patients continued to have unprotected sex for one to three years; 13 of their steady partners later tested positive. Studies in London and Paris show similarly disturbing behavior.

None of these studies involved a random sample of AIDS victims, but their message is clear: Positive test results do not prevent a small number of infected persons from recklessly exposing others to this dread disease.

Some might say that people assume the risk of contracting AIDS when they have unprotected sex with members of high-risk groups, such as gays and drug users. But consider this: In a recent study conducted by Adelphi University researchers, 80 percent of the wives of bisexual men did not know of their husbands' homosexual activity. This is a dangerous lack of information. In a study of 45 married couples with one spouse carrying the disease and the other having no other known risk factor, 26 spouses became infected.

Moreover, there is evidence that some confirmed AIDS carriers become even more reckless toward others. "The drug addicts who test seropositively really go wild, with lots of increased drug use and sexual acting-out behavior," according to Edith Springer, a New York City health counselor. And then, of course, there was a widely reported case of Joseph Edward Markowski, charged on June 29 in Los Angeles with attempted murder for selling his AIDS-contaminated blood and with assault with the intent to commit great bodily injury for acts of prostitution.

Educating and counseling AIDS carriers should certainly be the first and most important steps in trying to prevent such dangerous behavior. But it is denying reality to suppose that they will be enough. Cases like those described above call out for criminal prosecution.

Picturing AIDS victims as emaciated and near death, many will say that criminal prosecution would be heartless—and useless. But most people who test positive are still healthy and may lead normal lives for years. For them, the prospect of criminal prosecution would not be an empty threat.

The San Antonio health department last year sent letters to 14 AIDS victims warning that further sexual activity would lead to felony charges under the state's Communicable Disease Prevention and Treatment Act. Unlike Texas, however, most states do not have laws that adequately cover the deliberate or reckless exposure of others to AIDS. Although many states have laws making the transmission of communicable

diseases a crime, most of these laws are limited to specified diseases, such as syphilis, gonorrhea and even tuberculosis, but not AIDS.

Even when state penal laws do cover all communicable diseases, including AIDS, they usually require an actual "transmission" of the disease. Rarely can this be proven in AIDS cases. Despite some early concern about a high rate of false-positive results, the test is now considered very reliable, at least in regard to high-risk groups. A more serious legal problem is that the AIDS test only determines the presence of AIDS antibodies—that is, it only shows that someone has been exposed to the virus. It does not prove that someone has AIDS or AIDS-related complex (ARC). Nor are medical experts sure how many of those who test positive can spread the disease or how many will actually come down with the disease. (Most estimates range from 20 to 50 percent, but some go as high as 100 percent; no one really knows.)

Many states are now considering legislation to fill these gaps in their penal laws. Most proposals, unfortunately, are designed to meet special problems—or the most recent news story. Thus, a California bill would make donating blood after testing positive a felony punishable by six years in jail. Nevada—which has long had legalized prostitution—has passed a law providing 20-year jail sentences for prostitutes who continue to ply their trade after learning that they test positive. Such piecemeal legislation obscures the central issue. More generalized criminal legislation is needed.

States should make it a felony to expose others deliberately or recklessly to the AIDS virus—whether or not the disease is transmitted, and whether or not the victim tests positive for AIDS antibodies. Although exposing someone to the AIDS virus does not always result in an infection, doing so is analogous to speeding on a busy street or shooting into a crowded room. Whether or not someone is hurt, the act demonstrates a criminal disregard for the safety of others. Many general disease control statutes have long been structured this way. Florida and Idaho recently made it a crime to willfully or knowingly expose anyone to the AIDS virus.

Possible transmission through sexual contact requires special legislation because of the problems of consent. Many courts hold that, by engaging in sexual conduct, a person assumes the risk of becoming infected. But this need not be. As mentioned above, many states have along had statutes that make transmitting venereal diseases a crime. And, over the years, there have been numerous convictions for the intentional transmission of a communicable disease through sexual contact.

One legislative approach to deal with the consent problem in nonmarital situations, already passed in the New Jersey Assembly, makes it a felony for those who know that they had AIDS to "commit an act of sexual penetration." But such legislation is likely to raise strong opposition. In explaining his objections to similar legislation, Thomas B. Stoddard, the New York Civil Liberties Union's legislative director, says that he fears that "the AIDS crisis will be used to recriminalize consensual sodomy statutes."

In any event, it is not necessary to go this far. Adequate protection for sexual partners can be achieved by simply making it a felony not to tell a sex partner about a positive AIDS test. Who could object to that?

We can have a compassionate response to AIDS victims without countenancing a

small minority's antisocial behavior. Criminal penalties for deliberately exposing others to the AIDS virus will not eradicate this frightening dread disease, but they will certainly be a step toward containing its spread.

## SOUND ECOLOGY IS GOOD BUSINESS

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 28, 1987

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I insert an excellent speech by Barber Conable, President of the World Bank, in today's RECORD:

### SOUND ECOLOGY IS GOOD BUSINESS

(An address by Barber B. Conable, President, the World Bank and International Finance Corp., to the World Resources Institute, May 5, 1987)

It is a honor to address members and supporters of the World Resources Institute.

The Institute is a global resource itself. Policymakers owe you a lasting debt of thanks for the research you pursue and the admirable balance with which you present it.

What I owe you on this occasion is a report on the World Bank's actions, plans and progress in matching our fight against global poverty with our commitment to environmental protection.

The two goals are not just consistent. They are interdependent. Sustained development depends on managing resources, not exhausting them.

Economic growth based on any other premise is a costly illusion. What is wasted or poisoned today leaves that much less to nourish the world tomorrow.

"Environmental neglect," as I said to the Governors of the World Bank seven months ago, "destroys assets vital not just to the quality of life but to life itself." Environmental planning, I would add tonight, can make the most of nature's resources so that human resourcefulness can make the most of the future.

I share the optimism of the recently released report of the World Commission on Environment and Development. With its members I, too, "see . . . the possibility for a new era of economic growth . . . based on policies that sustain and expand the environmental resource base."

My optimism, like theirs, is tempered by caution.

In environmental affairs, as in many others, science has outdistanced government. Yet many of the problems the world has come to recognize as urgent are still beyond man's technical, as well as political, capacities.

We know that we must stop the advance of the deserts. We do not yet know how.

We know that population control is essential to environmental protection. But, for all the progress of past decades in family health and planning, population growth in many of the poorest lands continues to outrun resources.

We know that we must save the tropical rain forests. But neither developing nations nor international institutions have adequate alternatives for hungry people in search of food, and the land to grow it on. And researchers are only beginning to discover the potential of the forests to support settled and wildlife together.

Most broadly, we know of the planet-wide threat to the basic resources of air and water on which the survival of earth depends. But common effort to save the global commons requires a degree of institutional coordination and a measure of sustained political resolve that man applies more readily in destroying than in preserving life.

In measuring the influence of the World Bank against the environmental challenge, I see how long a road there is to travel from awakened environmental consciousness to effective environmental action.

The Bank has long been at the forefront of that march. Ours was the first international lending institution to set explicit policies on limiting any harmful environmental consequences of development projects it supported. In the early 1970s, for example, a Bank-financed iron ore terminal was built on a Brazilian beach under strict safeguards against pollution and with real respect for the site's natural beauty.

Inevitably, the Bank has also stumbled. For instance, a more recent Brazilian project, known as Polonoreste, was a sobering example of an environmentally sound effort which went wrong.

The Bank misread the human, institutional and physical realities of the jungle and the frontier.

A road which benefited small farmers also became a highway for logging companies.

Protective measures to shelter fragile land and tribal people were carefully planned. They were not, however, executed with enough vigor.

In some cases, the dynamics of the frontier got out of control.

Polonoreste teaches many lessons. A basic truth is that ambitious environmental design requires realistic analysis of the enforcement mechanisms in place and in prospect.

When mistakes associated with the Polonoreste project became obvious in early 1985, the Bank interrupted payments as a way to encourage important corrective measures. We learned not that we should avoid projects with environmental implications, but rather that where institutional safeguards are weak, the Bank must be a positive force to strengthen them.

Brazil has now made progress in building safeguards for environmental protection. And the Bank is anxious to support Brazil's government in pursuing a National Environmental Program that can become a model for other nations.

For a second basic truth is that development cannot be halted, only directed. And the Bank cannot influence progress from the sidelines. It must be part of the action.

With the developing nations, we must go on learning by doing. If the World Bank has been part of the problem in the past, it can and will be a strong force in finding solutions for the future.

"Nothing so needs reforming," Mark Twain observed, "as other people's habits." The Bank will begin by reforming its own.

First, we are creating a top-level Environment Department to help set the direction of Bank policy, planning and research work. It will take the lead in developing strategies to integrate environmental considerations into our overall lending and policy activities.

At the same time, new offices in each of the four regional technical departments will take on a dual role. They will function both as environmental watchdogs over Bank-supported projects, and as scouts and advocates for promising advances in resource management. In this process, they will routinely

consult with environmental officials in developing countries, and will work to strengthen local institutions. The establishment of these offices will increase significantly the number of staff directly involved in environmental programs.

Those organizational changes do not just add layers of interference to head off errors of commission. The added staff will also help define policy and develop initiatives to promote growth and environmental protection together. They will work to ensure that environmental awareness is integral to all the Bank's activities.

Environmental action adds a new dimension to the fight against global poverty. It recognizes that sound ecology is good economics. Indeed the objectives of sustainable economic growth, poverty alleviation and environmental protection are often mutually reinforcing.

Population pressure, pushing farmers onto increasingly marginal land, is a major cause of ecological problems in many countries, particularly the poorer ones. Curbing population growth is essential for sustainable economic growth; otherwise it will not be possible to introduce policies and programs that steer farmers to the best land, that induce the production of crops which strengthen the soil and stem erosion, that bring livestock to graze where pasture is rich, and that educate city and country dwellers alike to respect and safeguard the balance of nature.

The World Bank is a force for development and will remain so. We will continue to support major investments in energy and infrastructure, in industrialization and irrigation.

Our role in such projects, however, will include greater sensitivity to their long-term environmental effects. And we will put new emphasis both on correcting economic policy incentives that promote environmental abuse, and on stimulating the small-scale activities that can combat human and environmental deprivation.

Not only will we strengthen the Bank's longstanding policy of scrutinizing development projects for their environmental impact and withholding support for those where safeguards are inadequate, but we will also institutionalize an approach to natural resource management that puts a premium on conservation.

As part of these philosophical and institutional changes, I propose to allocate new resources to a number of new environmental initiatives.

In partnership with member countries and with the rest of the development community, we will begin with an urgent, country-by-country assessment of the most severely threatened environments in developing nations.

We will promote a country-wide initiative against the advance of the desert and the destruction of forests in Africa.

We will contribute to a global program to support tropical forest conservation.

And we will participate in a cooperative effort by the nations of the Mediterranean and other international agencies to prepare a long-term campaign to protect that sea and its coasts.

As recent events have demonstrated, environmental protection is a subject which warrants increased efforts in industrialized as well as in developing countries. But progress is especially hard to achieve in the developing world.

So many other priorities demand simultaneous attention. So few skilled personnel

are available. And so much must be done to build the institutional capacity to handle complex environmental issues.

Acknowledging those realities, the World Bank also acknowledges its special responsibilities in helping developing nations shape their growth. As an advisor, a source of intellectual as well as a financial support, the Bank must be responsive and innovative. And as a lender, it must exert new and persuasive influence to integrate better management of natural resources into development planning and investment.

Fortunately, we are far from alone. The Bank can profit from and contribute to the valuable work of our member nations, the expert and dedicated efforts of non-governmental organizations and the wide, continuing experience of other international agencies such as the United Nations Environment Program.

We must start, however, with better knowledge of the problems and the opportunities we face.

To gain that understanding, the Bank will use our added staff resources in a collaborative effort to assess environmental threats in the 30 most vulnerable developing nations. That five-year process will involve not just study but education, and not just in the Bank but also with responsible developing country policymakers.

Our goal will be to develop a new appreciation of the forces at work against environmental balance. Our objective is a sort of natural resources balance sheet, a coherent planning instrument for better management.

I believe we can make ecology and economics mutually reinforcing disciplines. By looking closely at market forces and broadly at all key sectors of development activity, we can identify both the effective and perverse factors shaping and misshaping the environment.

I am not proposing make-work research. What I seek from data—much of which is already on hand—is a composite inventory of environmental assets and liabilities.

With such a planning instrument, we could move toward establishing the value of those priceless resources—topsoil and grass cover, water and drainage, human skills and traditional lifestyles—we too often treat as worthless.

Let us show in economic and environmental terms what subsidies to pesticide producers and timber cutters and livestock growers actually cost in ruining the land and driving families from it.

Let us weigh the real price of wilderness resettlement against the expense of health and family planning clinics, of agricultural extension services, new crops and new farming techniques.

Let us hold pricing policies and currency values up to the light of environmental analysis to see if and how they encourage over-exploitation of natural resources.

And let us acknowledge that, while we must exercise increasing care with large-scale development projects, small is not necessarily beautiful. It is time we recognize that individual practices driven by poverty and ignorance and unexamined economic policies have cumulative effects that are just as environmentally destructive as any badly planned wilderness road or hydroelectric project.

We must reshape not just the Bank's outlook and activities but also the customs and ingrained attitudes of hundreds of millions of individuals and of their leaders. In doing so we must remember another piece of

Mark Twain's wisdom: "Habit is habit, and not to be flung out of the window, but coaxed downstairs a step at a time."

Our environmental assessment surveys will move us one big step forward. They will assemble the knowledge we need to move further and faster toward environmental rationality in our leading programs.

In Africa, while country assessments proceed, the Bank will also lay the ground for action that crosses national boundaries and tackles regional environmental dangers.

Africa's needs are critical. Over the last 15 years, despite the best efforts of African governments and the international community, per capita income and per capita food production in most of sub-Saharan Africa have declined. At the same time and in the same areas, deserts have spread, forests have dwindled, soil has washed away.

With population projected to rise from 380 million to 690 million in the last two decades of the century, the pressures of urbanization, fuelwood consumption and slash-and-burn farming are stripping West Africa alone of 3.6 million hectares of forest a year. Continued over three years, that tempo of deforestation would denude an area the size of Greece; over ten years, the Ivory Coast.

The rate of forest loss in five West African nations is seven times the world average, and desertification in just one country—Mali—has drawn the Sahara 350 kilometers farther south in the last 20 years. The Congo River carries an average of 65 million metric tons of soil into the ocean each year.

Against these natural and man-made forces, I believe we must mount an international environmental rescue and development effort in sub-Saharan Africa. I will ask World Bank staff experts to draw up a special program of technical studies to identify and assess urgent, promising environmental protection projects, regional, not just national, in their sweep.

Environmental threats do not respect political lines of demarcation. Environmental solutions must generate political and technical responses as broad as the challenge.

Our work should point the way for action by donor and recipient nations and non-governmental organizations. The latter have a particularly important role to play, in that problems of deforestation and natural resource degradation are development problems and can best be solved with the active participation of people at the grassroots level. Our common priority should be co-ordinated intervention against the spread of deserts and for the conservation of forest resources.

We must be bold in both the scope of our enterprise and in testing untried ideas. Unless we reach beyond today's limits and doubts, we cannot truly measure our capacity for progress.

Tropical forests in Africa, Asia and Latin America also demand priority attention. Tropical deforestation is not only a major environmental problem, it is a critical development problem as well. Deforestation is leading to widespread degradation of the natural resource base, undermining the capacity of the environment to support developing country economies and populations.

The World Bank is the world's largest single source of financing for tropical forest conservation and development. Over the past decade World Bank investments and technical assistance grants in forestry have exceeded one billion dollars. We are ready to do more.

The Bank intends to more than double its annual level of funding for environmentally sound forestry projects from \$138 million this year to \$350 million in fiscal 1989. At the July meeting in Bellagio, Italy sponsored jointly by your Institute, the Rockefeller Foundation, FAO, UNDP and the Bank, we will propose specific strategies for expanding priority work in forest management and reforestation.

Our Tropical Forestry Action Plan is a direct outgrowth of the World Resources Institute's excellent 1985 report, "Tropical Forests: A Call for Action." That study called for a doubling of forestry investments over the next five years. It redefined the challenge of conservation by making it clear—in cost-benefit terms—how deforestation impoverishes both man and nature. It also recognized that simply providing more funding for forestry is not enough; increased investment in forestry must be accompanied by policy measures designed to ensure sustainability.

We are improving our understanding of the connection between the loss of tree cover in upland watersheds and flood damage downstream, between fuelwood scarcity and fertilizer shortages and between the annual destruction of 11 million hectares of tropical rain forest and the loss of plant and animal species of great, potential genetic benefit to mankind.

We are becoming increasingly able to define investment programs to correct past mistakes and prevent new ones.

We can mobilize resources for agroforestry and sustainable farming systems based on it.

We can help nations determine the wooded areas to protect and those to use more intensively.

We can help train foresters and farmers in new techniques of tree breeding, in the cultivation of medicinal plants and the conservation of wildlands.

We are, in short, better aware of the gravity of the global danger, better equipped to address it. Now we must be prepared to mobilize resources to combat deforestation on a global scale.

Lastly, in the Mediterranean region, the Bank stands ready to assist in an intensified international effort to protect the heritage of beauty and natural resources that 18 nations and some 400 million people hold in common.

The governments of the Mediterranean states have long recognized the danger of pollution to public health and to fishing and tourism industries. The World Bank, the European Investment Bank and Regional Development Fund, the United Nations Environment Program, with many other agencies, have been active in providing financial and technical help to alleviate this problem.

Now we are exploring together the possibility of designing a broad, international project to improve the Mediterranean environment and strengthen it with a long-term preservation plan. It is an ambitious political as well as technical undertaking, involving many separate governments and technical support agencies.

The World Bank is well placed to help coordinate their effort. And if, with our assistance, the peoples of the Mediterranean can make progress in managing the great resource they share, they can set an example to the whole world of cooperation in protecting the global commons.

I have given you only an introduction to the World Bank's environmental action

agenda. Events, not speeches, will test its sweep and its impact. But I cannot end these remarks without a note of combined caution and exhortation.

While there is much we can do, no one knows better than I do the actual limits of the Bank's influence on the policies and practices of the developed and developing nations. No one knows better than you do the power of informed and aroused public opinion to command and redirect the attention of decision makers.

The World Bank needs the help of environmental activists in every nation, in those where organized groups have already proven their effectiveness and in those where consciousness is only now dawning.

We need your advice, your expertise, your pressure and your imagination to make the urgent work of environmental protection a coordinated campaign for a safer, richer, healthier world.

As ours is a common cause—the battle against global poverty is also the fight for a sustainable environment—let us be allies for progress on every front. There is a long campaign ahead. We cannot accept anything less than victory.

Thank you.

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 29, 1987, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

#### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

##### OCTOBER 30

9:30 a.m.  
Armed Services  
Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on Title I provisions of S. 1085, Nuclear Protections and Safety Act of 1987, focusing on defense nuclear safety matters. SR-222

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Aviation Subcommittee  
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Military Airlift Command

to ensure the safe operation of flights carrying military personnel. SR-253

#### Joint Economic

To hold oversight hearings on long term costs of U.S. trade deficits and the U.S. foreign debt. SD-628

10:00 a.m.

#### Finance

##### Health Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the affects of the current nursing shortage on health care. SD-215

#### Foreign Relations

##### International Economic Policy, Trade, Oceans and Environment Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings with the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Narcotics and International Operations to review the Overseas Private Investment Corporation's (OPIC) lending practices and the Mideast pipeline proposal. SD-419

10:30 a.m.

#### Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

##### Agricultural Credit Subcommittee

Business meeting, to resume mark up of S. 1665, Farm Credit Act of 1987. SR-332

#### NOVEMBER 2

10:00 a.m.

#### Special on Aging

To hold hearings on the proposed Medicare Part B premium increase. SD-628

#### NOVEMBER 3

9:30 a.m.

#### Armed Services

##### Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on conventional arms control in Europe. SR-222

#### Energy and Natural Resources

Closed briefing on the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement and its potential effects on energy and natural resources industries. SD-366

10:00 a.m.

#### Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending nominations. SD-226

2:00 p.m.

#### Energy and Natural Resources

##### Public Lands, National Parks and Forests Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 708, to require annual appropriations of funds to support timber management and resource conservation on the Tongass National Forest, Alaska. SD-366

#### NOVEMBER 4

9:30 a.m.

#### Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business. SD-366

10:00 a.m.

#### Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold joint hearings with the Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Technology and the Law on the use

and regulation of biotechnology in agriculture.

SR-332

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To resume hearings on safety and re-regulation of the airline industry.

SR-253

Environment and Public Works  
Water Resources, Transportation, and Infrastructure Subcommittee  
To resume hearings to review infrastructure issues.

SD-406

NOVEMBER 5

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

Joint Economic

To hold hearings to evaluate the prospects for U.S. exports and imports.

SD-628

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To hold hearings to review recent developments in the securities markets.

SD-538

2:00 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Public Lands, National Parks and Forests Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 708, to require annual appropriations of funds to support timber management and resource conservation on the Tongass National Forest, Alaska.

SD-366

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of Title IV, Part C of the Omnibus Drug Act (P.L. 99-570), and to hold hearings on S. 1684, to settle Seminole Indian land claims in Florida.

SR-485

3:15 p.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee  
To hold oversight hearings on the ability of consumers to plan their financial affairs.

SD-538

NOVEMBER 6

9:30 a.m.

Finance  
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 639 and S. 1099, bills to empower states to require out-of-state vendors to collect state sales and use taxes.

SD-215

NOVEMBER 9

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings on the greenhouse effect and global climate change.

SD-366

NOVEMBER 10

9:00 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs  
To hold oversight hearings on implementation of the Indian Child Welfare Act (P.L. 95-608).

SR-485

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
To continue hearings on the greenhouse effect and global climate change.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry  
To resume joint hearings with the Committee on Judiciary's Subcommittee on Technology and the Law on the use and regulation of biotechnology in agriculture.

SR-332

10:30 a.m.

Judiciary  
Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 698, Syndicated Television Music Copyright Reform Act of 1987.

SD-226

NOVEMBER 12

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Communication Subcommittee  
To hold oversight hearings on the public broadcast system.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations  
To hold hearings to reexamine the War Powers Resolution with a view to possibly revising the law.

SD-419

1:00 p.m.

Select on Indian Affairs  
To hold hearings on S. 1722, to establish the National Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation within the Smithsonian Institution, and to establish a memorial to the American Indian, and S. 1723, to establish certain regional exhibition facilities as part of the National Museum of the American Indian.

SR-301

NOVEMBER 13

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Surface Transportation Subcommittee  
To hold hearings to review the activities of transportation property brokers.

SR-253

NOVEMBER 16

2:00 p.m.

Select on Indian Affairs  
To resume hearings on S. 1722, to establish the National Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation within the Smithsonian Institution, and to establish a memorial to the American Indian, and S. 1723, to establish certain regional exhibition facilities as part of the National Museum of the American Indian.

SR-301

NOVEMBER 17

9:00 a.m.

Rules and Administration  
Business meeting, to consider pending legislative and administrative business.

SR-301

NOVEMBER 18

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To resume hearings on safety and re-regulation of the airline industry.

SR-253

NOVEMBER 19

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SR-253

2:00 p.m.

Select on Indian Affairs  
To hold oversight hearings to review Federal agency actions related to the implementation of the Department of the Interior's Garrison Unit Joint Tribal Advisory Committee final report recommendations, and on proposed legislation to implement the report recommendations.

SR-485

DECEMBER 2

9:00 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs  
To hold hearings on S. Con. Res. 76, to acknowledge the contribution of the Iroquois Confederacy of Nations to the development of the United States Constitution and to reaffirm the continuing government-to-government relationship between Indian tribes and the United States established in the Constitution.

SR-485

DECEMBER 3

9:00 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs  
To hold hearings on S. 1236, authorizing funds for certain programs of the Navajo-Hopi Relocation program.

SR-485

CANCELLATIONS

OCTOBER 29

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources  
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

NOVEMBER 5

NOVEMBER 10

NOVEMBER 12

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Aviation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on activities  
of the Federal Aviation Administra-  
tion, Department of Transportation.

SR-253

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Aviation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1600, to create  
an independent Federal Aviation Ad-  
ministration.

SR-253

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Aviation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1600, to create  
an independent Federal Aviation Ad-  
ministration.

SR-253

3:00 p.m.

Conferees

On the education provisions of H.R. 3,  
Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness  
Act of 1987.

SD-430