

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL  
IMPROVEMENT

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise with the hope of beginning the process toward creating a truly safe and efficient air traffic control [ATC] system. Each day, travelers must face an air traffic control system paralyzed by increased volume, frequent delays and diminished safety.

Within the constraints of Government bureaucracy, the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] cannot respond in a timely fashion to the growing needs of the air traffic control system. Federal personnel and procurement regulations pose major road blocks to efficient management and safety. Air traffic control facilities remain understaffed and the civil service system provides no incentives for new controllers. Just as discouraging, few facilities have needed modern radar technology.

Today, I have introduced legislation incorporating several excellent ideas for improvement. The following legislation would divest ATC facilities, personnel, and equipment to a nonprofit, user-owned corporation. The corporation's stockholders would be limited to airlines, private pilots, business aircraft owners, airline pilots, air traffic controllers, and Federal Government users. At the same time, the FAA would retain its existing safety functions.

I believe this revolutionary new concept warrants extensive hearings and review. This much needed legislation can serve as a guidepost as we struggle to restore safety, efficiency, and traveler confidence. In the coming months, I urge my colleagues to carefully consider the merits of this landmark legislation:

H.R. 4693

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

## SECTION. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Air Traffic Control Service Improvement Act of 1988".

TITLE I—AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL  
CORPORATION

## SEC. 101. ESTABLISHMENT OF CORPORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established a nonprofit corporation, to be known as the Airways Corporation, which—

(1) shall operate the air traffic control system of the United States after the completion of transfers of air traffic control facilities and equipment under section 201;

(2) except as provided in subsection (b), shall not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government;

(3) shall have its principal office in the District of Columbia and is deemed to be a resident thereof; and

(4) to the extent consistent with this Act, shall be subject to the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (D.C. Code, § 29-301 et seq.).

(b) WAR OR NATIONAL EMERGENCY.—

(1) TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS.—In the event of a declared war or national emergency, the President may by Executive order transfer any functions, personnel, property, records, funds, and other matters relating to the Corporation to the Department of Defense.

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF PLANS.—The Board, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall develop plans for the effective discharge of the functions of the Corporation in the event of a declared war or national emergency.

## SEC. 102. INCORPORATION.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF INCORPORATORS.—The President shall appoint 5 incorporators, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve as the initial board of directors of the Corporation until the first annual meeting of stockholders, or until a board of directors is elected in accordance with section 104, whichever is later.

(b) FUNCTIONS OF INCORPORATORS.—The incorporators appointed under this section shall—

(1) subject to approval by the President, draft and file articles of incorporation for the Corporation, draft the initial bylaws of the Corporation, and take any other actions necessary to the establishment and initial operation of the corporation;

(2) arrange for an initial stock offering in accordance with section 103; and

(3) establish initial criteria for determining who is a private pilot and what is a business aircraft for purposes of section 102(a) (2) and (3).

(c) ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION.—The articles of incorporation filed by the incorporators in accordance with subsection (b)—

(1) shall provide for cumulative voting under section 27(d) of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (D.C. Code, § 29-327(d));

(2) may be amended, altered, changed, or repealed by a vote of not less than 66 percent of the outstanding shares of the voting capital stock of the Corporation.

## SEC. 103. ISSUANCE OF STOCK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may issue and have outstanding, in such numbers and amounts as it shall determine, shares of capital stock of a total par value of \$100,000,000 consisting of 6 classes as follows:

(1) A class of shares to be known as Class A, consisting of not more than 40 percent of all shares of common stock issued by the Corporation, which may only be purchased by persons who are air carriers.

(2) A class of shares to be known as Class B, consisting of not more than 20 percent of all shares of common stock issued by the Corporation, which may only be purchased by persons who are private pilots.

(3) A class of shares to be known as Class C, consisting of not more than 10 percent of all shares of common stock issued by the Corporation, which may only be purchased

by persons who are not air carriers who own one or more business aircraft.

(4) A class of shares to be known as Class D, consisting of not more than 7½ percent of all shares of common stock issued by the Corporation, which may only be purchased by persons who are employed by an air carrier as pilots.

(5) A class of shares to be known as Class E, consisting of not more than 7½ percent of all shares of common stock issued by the Corporation, which may only be purchased by persons who are air traffic controllers.

(6) A class of shares to be known as Class F, consisting of 7½ percent of all shares of common stock issued by the Corporation, which shall be owned by the Secretary of Transportation on behalf of the United States.

(7) A class of shares to be known as Class G, consisting of 7½ percent of all shares of common stock issued by the Corporation, which shall be owned by the Secretary of Defense on behalf of the United States.

(b) PRICE OF FIRST ISSUE.—The shares of common stock first issued by the Corporation shall be sold at a price equal to not more than \$100 for each share.

(c) VOTING RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each share of common stock in the Corporation—

(A) shall be vested with all voting rights; and

(B) shall be entitled to one vote.

(2) ASSIGNMENT.—A person owning one or more shares of Class B, C, E, D, E, of F stock may assign the right to vote all or part of their shares to any person eligible to own shares of that class of stock.

(d) INSPECTION AND COPYING RIGHTS.—The right of a holder of stock issued by the Corporation to inspect and copy records of the Corporation shall not be subject to the requirements of section 45(b) of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (D.C. Code, § 29-345(b)) relating to the percentage of stock which a stockholder must hold to have such rights.

## SEC. 104. DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS.

(a) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—

(1) ELECTION.—The Corporation shall have a board of directors consisting of 15 individuals who are citizens of the United States, selected annually as follows:

(A) 6 members elected by shareholders owning one or more shares of Class A stock.

(B) 3 members elected by shareholders owning one or more shares of Class B stock.

(C) 2 members elected by shareholders owning one or more shares of Class C stock.

(D) 1 member elected by shareholders owning one or more shares of Class D stock.

(E) 1 member elected by shareholders owning one or more shares of Class E stock.

(F) 1 member appointed by the Secretary of Transportation.

(G) 1 member appointed by the Secretary of Defense.

(2) CHAIRMAN.—The Board shall elect one of its members annually to serve as Chairman of the Board.

(3) COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES.—Members of the Board may receive compensation

● 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.

in accordance with rules established by the Board.

(b) **PRESIDENT OF CORPORATION AND APPOINTMENT OF OTHER OFFICERS.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT.**—The Corporation shall have a president and such other officers as may be appointed by the Board from among persons who are citizens of the United States. Persons appointed under this paragraph shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

(2) **COMPENSATION.**—Individuals appointed under paragraph (1) shall be compensated at rates fixed by the Board.

(3) **RESTRICTION ON RECEIPT OF OTHER SALARY.**—A officer of the Corporation shall not receive any salary from any source other than the Corporation during the period of the officer's employment by the Corporation.

(c) **PRIVATE PILOT AND BUSINESS AIRCRAFT CRITERIA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Board may revise the criteria established by the incorporators under section 102(b)(3) for determining who is a private pilot and what is a business aircraft.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—The right of a person to own, and receive dividends and exercise voting rights with respect to, shares of stock of the Corporation referred to in sections 103(a) (2) and (3) shall not be affected by actions of the Board under this subsection.

**SEC. 105. POWERS OF CORPORATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Corporation may—

(1) plan, initiate, construct, own, manage, and operate, by itself or in cooperation with other entities, an air traffic control system;

(2) furnish, for hire, air traffic control services to air transportation common carriers, and other operators of civil aircraft;

(3) establish reasonable nondiscriminatory fees for the provision of air traffic control services;

(4) enter into contracts under which other entities may operate individual air traffic control facilities on behalf of the Corporation;

(5) acquire, by construction, purchase, or gift, physical facilities, equipment, and devices necessary to the operations of the Corporation, including air traffic control and associated equipment and facilities;

(6) issue voting securities in accordance with section 103;

(7) issue nonvoting securities, bonds, debentures, and other certificates of indebtedness as may be appropriate; and

(8) conduct or contract for the conduct of research and development related to the operations of the Corporation, and establish technical specifications of all elements of the air traffic control system.

(b) **USUAL POWERS OF STOCK CORPORATION.**—To conduct activities authorized by subsection (a), the Corporation shall have the usual powers conferred upon a stock corporation by the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (D.C. Code, § 29-301 et seq.).

(c) **REVIEW OF FEES.**—The Secretary of Transportation shall issue regulations not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act for the review and appeal of fees established by the Corporation under subsection (a)(3).

**SEC. 106. FOREIGN BUSINESS NEGOTIATIONS OF CORPORATION.**

(a) **NEGOTIATIONS OF CORPORATION.**—Whenever the Corporation enters into negotiations with any foreign entity with respect to facilities, operations, and services authorized by this Act to be conducted by the Corporation—

(1) the Corporation shall notify the Secretary of State regarding the initiation, conduct, and foreign policy implications of such negotiations; and

(2) the Secretary of State shall advise the Corporation of relevant foreign policy considerations and, upon request of the Corporation, shall render such assistance as may be appropriate.

(b) **NEGOTIATIONS OF SECRETARY OF STATE.**—The Secretary of State shall consult with the Corporation with respect to all negotiations conducted by the Secretary regarding matters which relate to air traffic control.

**SEC. 107. SANCTIONS.**

(a) **PETITION FOR RELIEF.**—Except as otherwise prohibited by law—

(1) if the Corporation engages in any activity, or takes any action in furtherance of any policy, which is inconsistent with the policy and purposes of this Act; or

(2) if any other person—

(A) violates any provision of this Act;

(B) obstructs or interferes with any activity authorized by this Act;

(C) refuses, fails, or neglects to discharge any duty or responsibility under this Act; or

(D) threatens any such violation, obstruction, interference, refusal, failure, or neglect;

the district court of the United States for any district in which such Corporation or other person resides or may be found shall have jurisdiction, upon petition of the Attorney General of the United States, to grant such equitable relief as may be necessary or appropriate to prevent or terminate such activity.

(b) **PUNISHMENT, LIABILITY, OR SANCTION UNDER OTHER PROVISIONS.**—Nothing contained in this section shall be considered to relieve any person of any liability, punishment, or sanction under any other law.

**SEC. 108. REPORT.**

(a) **CORPORATION.**—The Corporation shall transmit to the President and the Congress, annually and at such other times as it considers appropriate, a comprehensive and detailed report of its operations, activities, and accomplishments under this Act.

(b) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The Administrator shall transmit to the Congress, annually and at such other times as the Administrator considers appropriate, an evaluation of the capital structure of the Corporation so as to assure the Congress that such structure is consistent with the most efficient and economical operation of the Corporation.

## TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

**SEC. 201. TRANSFER OF FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT TO CORPORATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date the Senate approves the appointments of the President under section 102(a), the Secretary of Transportation shall take such steps as may be necessary—

(1) to transfer to the Corporation all right, title, and interest of the United States in, and all control of the United States over, all facilities and equipment under the jurisdiction of the Administration on the date of the enactment of this Act, which are part of the air traffic control system including the air route traffic centers, terminal radar control centers, VHF omnidirectional radio stations, long-range and terminal radar systems, flight service stations, and related facilities and equipment; and

(2) to transfer all right of the United States in airport control towers, landing aids, and landing slots to owners of the air-

port where such towers and aids are located and to which such landing slots relate.

(b) **COMPENSATION.**—In consideration for property transferred by the United States pursuant to subsection (a) the Corporation shall pay into the General Fund of the Treasury \$100,000,000, and shall relinquish all rights of the Corporation to amounts in the Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

**SEC. 202. AIRPORT FEES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other law, on and after the date of the transfers carried out by the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 201(a), an airport may establish and charge fees for use of airport facilities by, and provision of services to, air carriers and air transportation passengers, including—

(1) fees which air carriers must pay for landing aircraft at or taking aircraft off from such facilities; and

(2) fees which passengers must pay for departing from such facilities.

(b) **CRITERIA.**—Fees established under subsection (a)—

(1) shall be in an amount equal to the cost to the airport of providing the particular use or service for which the fee is charged, plus a reasonable profit; and

(2) may vary according to time of day and demand for the facility or service.

**SEC. 203. AIRPORT ACCESS.**

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—An owner, operator, or other person in charge of a public-use airport shall not deny access to and use of the facilities of such airport by any person operating an aircraft which is in compliance with all laws relating to aviation safety if the person offers to pay all fees which are usually charged for such use.

(b) **PENALTY.**—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be subject to a civil penalty under section 901(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. App. 1471(a)).

**SEC. 303. LIABILITY OF CORPORATION.**

Notwithstanding any other law, the Corporation is immune from all tort liability which is not based on a fault.

**SEC. 303. DEFINITIONS.**

As used in this Act—

(1) the terms "airport" and "public-use airport", respectively, have the meaning given such terms by section 503 of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2201 et seq.);

(2) the terms "air carrier", "aircraft", "air transportation", "civil aircraft", "citizen of the United States", "person", and "United States", respectively, have the meaning given such terms by section 101 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. App. 1301 et seq.);

(3) the term "Board" means the board of directors of the Corporation elected under section 104;

(4) the term "Corporation" means the corporation established by section 101 of this Act;

(5) the term "Administration" means the Federal Aviation Administration; and

(6) the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

**SEC. 305. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**

The Secretary of Transportation shall submit to the Congress not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act such conforming amendments as the Secretary of Transportation determines are necessary to fully implement this Act.

IN HONOR OF THE REVEREND  
FRANCIS N. MANIOLA

**HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize a man who has made a distinct and important contribution to the Chicago community on the occasion of two very special events. In 1988 the Reverend Francis Maniola will celebrate the 50th anniversary of his ordination and his 75th birthday.

The Reverend Maniola attended Quigley Seminary South and St. Mary of the Lake Seminary. On April 23, 1938, the Reverend Maniola was ordained into the church and began his service to the church and community. In the 50 years since that time, he has served many parishes including St. Agatha, Christ the King, Presentation B.V.M., Queen of Angels, and our Lady of Mount Carmel. His major appointments have, however, been a professorship at Quigley Seminary South and his present service to the parish of St. Symphorosa in Chicago where he has served since 1967.

The dedication, commitment, and strength of spirit which the Reverend Maniola has exhibited is especially precious and commendable in our material world of today and has been an essential contribution to the Chicago community. I am sure that my colleagues join me in sending the Reverend Maniola our best wishes and congratulations upon the occasion of these two significant milestones in his life; the 50th anniversary of his ordination and his 75th birthday.

NATIONAL MARITIME WEEK,  
MAY 22-28, 1988

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, May 22 was National Maritime Day. As we look at the condition of the American merchant marine, I am reminded of a characterization that was first used in the 1960's—benign neglect. This country has always been able to depend on our merchant marine to further American interests in the event of war or national emergency. The problem existing today is a shrinking pool of American seamen and a shortage of military useful U.S.-flag vessels. The Commission on Merchant Marine and Defense—Bennett Commission—has documented the conclusion that the deterioration of our merchant marine poses a clear and present danger to the economic well-being of the United States as well as our national security.

Those of us who fight to strengthen the merchant marine wait in vain for the President to follow up on the Bennett Commission's recommendation that he state a national maritime policy. This administration sabotaged Congress' attempt to create 500 jobs for American seamen on the 11 reflagged Kuwaiti vessels. The Department of Defense argued

that, somehow, having foreign citizens on the Kuwaiti tankers furthers our national security. That argument is perplexing at best, and those of us who know this industry were incredulous when we heard it. That argument also ignores the drastic shortage of jobs for American seamen and the impressive role the merchant marine has played in helping to defend our Nation since colonial times.

Turning to international trade, the maritime community worked together and had a decisive victory in the deletion of the transportation annex from the United States-Canada Free Trade Agreement. That annex would have damaged a cornerstone of maritime law, the Jones Act—one of the few remaining aids to our declining maritime industry.

In the face of overwhelming support for the trade bill, the President vetoed legislation that the maritime industry as well as other American businesses need desperately. A veto will not change the fact that free trade does not exist in the world. While every other maritime nation subsidizes the building, repair and, in many cases, the operation of its vessels, this administration opposes giving American shipbuilders, ship repairers, and U.S.-flag operators the help they need to compete in the highly competitive international market.

Many speeches will be made across the land this week on the importance of the merchant marine. A wise man once observed that those who do not learn from the mistakes of the past are bound to repeat them. My hope during this National Maritime Week is that we recognize the critical role the American merchant marine has played in keeping the United States strong and free. Once we recognize the importance of this contribution, we must pay the price to ensure that the merchant marine continues to be the linchpin in our economic and military strength.

Someone, someday is going to have to accept the fact that we are going to have to spend money to strengthen our shipyard mobilization base and keep U.S. merchant mariners and ships at sea. The problem will not go away. Let's hope that we have the courage to do what must be done.

LOS LUCEROS NATIONAL  
MONUMENT

**HON. BILL RICHARDSON**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to introduce a bill designating the Los Luceros hacienda in New Mexico as a national monument. A national monument at Los Luceros will commemorate the great heritage of the Spanish explorers who led the European colonization of our Southwest more than four centuries ago. The Spanish conquistadores, led by Juan de Oñate, came out of Mexico to found the farthest outpost of the Spanish empire—what we now call New Mexico. In return for leading the colonization effort, Oñate was named New Mexico's first Governor. On January 7, 1598, his caravan of 130 traveled north, but instead of following the rivers, the caravan went straight across the

desert to intercept the Rio Grande where it swung to the east. Oñate had unknowingly finished blazing the Camino Real, the road that would one day carry the commerce of the United States and Mexico.

On July 11, 1598, the Oñate expedition reached the end of their journey near the confluence of the Rio Chama and the Rio Grande. At this spot near the present city of Espanola and the San Juan Pueblo, Oñate established the first Spanish headquarters in New Mexico. This settlement was called San Gabriel de Yunque-Ouinge. It was the first Spanish-built capitol of New Mexico. The capitol was moved to Santa Fe in 1609.

Near the sight of San Gabriel, a captain in Oñate's army, Pedro Lucero de Godoy, began construction of the buildings now known as Los Luceros. This property was developed to include a main house and several other buildings which have great historical significance as some of the earliest relics of the region's Spanish colonial heritage. These buildings served several functions during the next three centuries, notably as a military post and the seat of local justice.

In light of its historical significance as the place where the first Europeans established permanent communities 22 years before the Pilgrims arrived at Plymouth Rock, Los Luceros should be recognized and preserved through designation as a national monument. From these first settlements, the influence of the Spaniards would endure through three successive governments. Combined with the rich cultural traditions of the Pueblo Indians, who had first occupied a pueblo at the site in the early 1300's, the Spanish contributed significantly to the New Mexico culture we have today.

Mr. Speaker, my bill establishes the Los Luceros National Monument to be managed by the National Park Service. In managing and interpreting the national monument the Park Service will highlight the historical and cultural significance of Los Luceros, the significance of the Oñate-led colonization to U.S. history, and the role of the Pueblo Indian during this period.

The bill also directs the National Park Service to establish the Juan de Oñate Interpretive Center at the Los Luceros National Monument. This center will serve as a focus for interpreting the historic events and cultural resources relating to the monument and the history of Spanish colonization of the interior of the United States.

Finally, the bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility study of designating the San Gabriel historic landmark as a national historic site, and thus a part of the National Park System. The Park Service will work closely with the San Juan Pueblo in conducting this study.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in this long overdue recognition of the significant contributions of this colonization period by supporting this important legislation.

THE ERITREAN CONFLICT IN  
ETHIOPIA

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday's Wall Street Journal featured an excellent op-ed on the Eritrean conflict in Ethiopia. The author, a Canadian journalist who recently spent 5 weeks in Sudan and Eritrea, confirms many of the inhumane policies of Colonel Mengistu that we have discussed in this body. I found particularly interesting his interview with Sadiq El-Mahdi, the prime minister of neighboring Sudan. He said this: "In 1984, we all suffered famine, but last year with the same conditions as Ethiopia, we in the Sudan not only fed ourselves but even exported food. Ethiopia's policies are often responsible for its famine."

Having made his observations first hand, the author comes to one, bottom-line conclusion: "There seems only one realistic solution to Ethiopia's problems, be they economic, social, political, or military: a coup to replace the paranoid, homicidal Mengistu regime."

I urge my colleagues to take note of this penetrating analysis of the Ethiopian situation.

The article follows:

[From The Wall Street Journal, May 24, 1988]

ERITREAN WINS PUT MENGISTU ON DEFENSIVE  
(By Peter Wirthington)

One of the world's longest-running wars is in Eritrea—the northern province of Ethiopia that is in its 27th year of fighting for self-determination.

I recently returned from five weeks in Sudan and Eritrea, looking into the plight of refugees and checking resistance groups opposed to the Marxist regime of Ethiopia's Lt. Col. Mengistu Haile Mariam. I was in Eritrea in mid-March when the Eritrea People's Liberation Front (EPLF) scored a spectacular military victory that eliminated three Ethiopian divisions and a brigade.

Although every EPLF victory weakens the Mengistu regime, it also increases the suffering of the Ethiopian people. More troops are being moved into the north, food is scarcer for civilians in the Ethiopian-controlled areas as aid is restricted and foreign-aid workers are expelled, renewed napalm bombing has been reported in Tigre, and Lt. Col. Mengistu has appealed to Ethiopian patriotism to rally and resist an "Arab-sponsored invasion from the North." Reports are that every Ethiopian is now required to "volunteer" a month's pay or pension to the war effort.

DEATH AND SURRENDER

The EPLF attack took place on the Nakfa front. One ambush wiped out the 29th Mechanized Brigade. A half mile of road was a tangled mass of tanks, armored carriers, trucks, guns and corpses. A second ambush at Kilhamet, on the mountain road between Afabet and Keren, was another killing ground. In this part of the world enemy dead are left to hyenas, vultures, crows, the sun.

In all, some 20,000 Ethiopian troops were killed or captured in the 48-hour battle. Most simply surrendered.

The advance was so swift that at Ethiopian corps headquarters in Afabet, the Eritreans captured three Soviet military "advis-

ers"—two colonels and a lieutenant—and killed a fourth. Capturing senior Soviet advisers is something that Jonas Savimbi hasn't accomplished in Angola.

If it weren't in such a strategic location, Eritrea probably would have had its independence long ago. But it occupies more than 600 miles of Red Sea coast from Sudan to Djibouti. Were it to be an independent state. It would cut off Ethiopia's access to the sea—something the West couldn't contemplate in the years after World War II when it and the United Nations were deciding the future of Italy's former colonies.

Libya received independence in 1952; Somalia got independence in 1960 after the U.N. put it in trusteeship to Italy for 10 years. But, under pressure from Western powers, the U.N. ruled in 1952 that Eritrea be federated with Ethiopia, a country to which it had few ties in language and culture. It was supposed to have autonomy; Ethiopia would be responsible for defense, foreign affairs, trade and currency.

Ethiopia abrogated the U.N. terms in 1961-62. It made Amharic the official language and banned Tigrinya (the predominant language of Eritrea), Arabic and Ge'ez. It dismantled Eritrean industries, banned unions, and in 1962 annexed Eritrea—without holding a referendum, as the Eritrean constitution required. And the war began.

After Haile Selassie was deposed as emperor in 1974 and the U.S. decided not to support "revolutionary" Ethiopia with arms and weapons, Lt. Col. Mengistu turned to the U.S.S.R., saving Ethiopia from defeat by the Kremlin's other client state, Somalia, which had invaded the disputed Ogaden desert.

After that, Lt. Col. Mengistu decided to eliminate the irritation that was Eritrean independence. He failed, the Eritreans bounced back, and now it is Lt. Col. Mengistu who is threatened by Eritrea, as well as by other resistance movements throughout Ethiopia.

Ironically, Lt. Col. Mengistu's determination to unite Ethiopia by eliminating all opposition has divided the country as never before. Ethiopia's costly, losing war in Eritrea has spurred on Tigrean resistance, as well as encouraged rebel movements in Wollo Province and such groups as the Oromo Liberation Front and the Ethiopian People's Democratic Alliance.

Lt. Col. Mengistu's policy of forcibly resettling people mainly from the dissident territories of Wollo and Tigre to quieter areas both creates resistance and contributes to famine. Farmers are conscripted into the army, property and food are confiscated for taxes, and a bad agricultural and economic situation is made worse.

In an interview last month, Sadiq El-Mahdi, prime minister of Sudan, estimated that two-thirds of some 700,000 Ethiopian refugees in his country were escaping the Mengistu policies rather than drought and famine.

"In 1984 we all suffered famine," he said, "but last year with the same weather conditions as Ethiopia, we in the Sudan not only fed ourselves but even exported food. Ethiopia's policies are often responsible for its famine."

Until recently Ethiopia had insisted none of its troops were EPLF prisoners. Even before its recent military victory, however, the EPLF claimed to hold more than 10,000. Eager to see some, I was taken to a valley a few miles from the now-fluid front, where I saw 7,000 or 8,000 prisoners—all without shoes (to prevent escape); most seemingly relieved that for them the war was over.

All the officers I spoke to said they would be shot if they returned home. Maj. Shameless Debebe said he was trained in the U.S.S.R., had been a soldier for 14 years, and was political commissar of the 19th Infantry Division. He said he had no intention of going home. Maj. Geiu Asrat Menda, commander of the 29th Mechanized Brigade, recalled a commanding officer who had failed in attack being paraded before division officers and shot. Lt. Tamiral Ohnrko said officers were expected to commit suicide rather than be captured.

Prisoners acknowledged that Ethiopian army morale was low, and that the Eritreans were motivated and good fighters.

All said it should be the Eritreans' decision whether to remain with Ethiopia.

Every prisoner I questioned said the alliance with the Soviet Union wasn't popular in Ethiopia. "The Russians in Ethiopia make the Americans look good—just as Mengistu makes Haile Selassie seem better," said one officer.

For their part, the Eritreans are increasingly concerned about how to feed and care for the prisoners, whose total is now close to 25,000.

Eritrea says it subscribes to the Geneva Convention and treats prisoners humanely. I saw no evidence of maltreatment. On the contrary. I saw many groups of Ethiopians who are no longer prisoners but have the status of free men.

In Eritrea I found high moral and unusual confidence. I had been told that the EPLF was Marxist, but though there is a central committee, Poliburo and general secretary. I found no cult of personality, no dogma, and no slogans. Homage was paid to concepts of self-reliance, individuality, personal initiative and democracy. Before the Ethiopian revolution, the U.S.S.R. supported Eritrean independence. Now the Eritreans see the Soviet Union as an imperialist power whose methods are more oppressive than anything they'd experienced in the past.

There probably is greater sexual equality in Eritrea than in just about any other place in the world. Women serve in the front ranks of the army, and every woman fighter I talked to made a point of saying she will never go back to a subservient role. The men I talked to agree, saying the future is one of equality.

When one thinks of Ethiopia and its civil war, one thinks of famine and refugees. But on the Eritrean side of the war zone one doesn't encounter much hunger. There are few international aid workers here, so Ethiopia's expulsion of foreigners in the areas it controls doesn't mean much as far as the Eritreans are concerned.

The Eritrean Relief Association has the job of feeding, educating and looking after the civilian population. It has a fleet of more than 200 trucks that nightly transport food and supplies on a 12-hour drive from Sudan into Eritrea, where they are redistributed to outlying areas. Tigre has a supply system similar to Eritrea's though not as sophisticated nor as efficient.

I didn't see one starving person in the regions I visited. On the contrary, I saw camels loaded with flour and food heading behind enemy lines to feed people.

The Eritrean Relief Association says it originally budgeted \$95 million this year to provide medicine, food, transport and services for 850,000 people. While Lt. Col. Mengistu's expulsion of aid workers and apparent moves toward confiscating Red Cross supplies don't affect people in the Eritrean war zone, Eritrean victories have left the

relief association with a million people to feed and double the territory to cover. No Western government provides aid to the Eritrean Relief Association, though nongovernmental agencies and private relief groups provide funds. The association claims 95% of all donations go directly to the needy.

Many Eritreans have never known peace. The war, in fact, is older than many of the fighters. Few are willing to discuss the possibility of someday being part of a united Ethiopia. The bug of independence or self-determination has bitten too deeply.

#### REALISTIC SOLUTION

It's too early to say how the Eritrean breakthrough on the Nakfa front will affect the war, but it has led Lt. Col. Mengistu to come to terms with Somalia so he can transfer more troops north, and to negotiate with Sudan's prime minister to try to curtail international aid to the Eritreans.

In the meantime, it is the civilian population in the Ethiopian-controlled zones that suffers most and endures the most hunger. There seems only one realistic solution to Ethiopia's problems, be they economic, social, political, or military: a coup to replace the paranoid, homicidal Mengistu regime.

Until that happens, there is faint hope for Eritrea, and less for Ethiopia.

### INSTRAW: THE UNITED NATIONS AGENCY FOR TRAINING AND EDUCATION ON THIRD WORLD WOMEN

#### HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues' attention to a speech delivered last week in Washington by Ms. Dunja Pastizzi-Ferencic, the director of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women [Instraw].

Instraw is the United Nations agency which is responsible for providing the other branches of the United Nations with assistance in training, research, and information relating to Third World women. These are essential services for the United Nations and for other bilateral and multilateral aid agencies. For example, Instraw's research on the roles of women in developing countries has assisted the United Nations and the U.S. Agency for International Development [AID] in the design of its projects and programs.

This little-known but critical branch of the United Nations receives no funding from the U.S. Government. While AID officials often comment on the unavailability of data on Third World women, they have not advocated additional funding for the organization that collects such data. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 4049, which, among other things, would authorize a modest U.S. contribution to Instraw. U.S. assistance for Instraw would be well spent and would provide the donor community with information and training resources that are badly needed.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following excerpt from Ms. Pastizzi-Ferencic's speech at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY Ms. DUNJA PASTIZZI-FERENCIC, DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING INSTITUTE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN

Since its inception, Instraw has been at the frontline to improve methodological approaches to the assessment and recognition of women's contribution to development. We need reliable statistics, indicators and data, if we want to bring women into mainstream development. What do we know about women? We have recently celebrated the birth of the five billionth inhabitant of our planet; we know more than half of them are women. Where do they stand and what are they doing?

According to labour statistics women account for less than 35% of the total labour force. According to an ILO/Instraw projection, in the year 2000 there will be almost 900 million women workers. The following questions immediately arose: do so few women work? What definition of labour force are we using? What kinds of jobs do women hold and what rewards do they get from their labour? Judging from available data, women presently constitute one quarter of the industrial labour-force and almost one fifth of the labour force in agriculture and services. We are aware that statistical and other surveys provide only a partial view of the vital participation of women in development. The existing data centers mostly on women's reproductive role and educational status. According to statistics, a great number of women are not working. Women are statistically invisible and therefore, forgotten producers and providers of services. Their work falls within the so-called informal sector of economic activities, unrecorded in official statistics and macro-economic aggregates such as the gross national product. It would take me too long to elaborate on all Instraw efforts and results on statistics on women. An example to the point is the Institute's collaboration with the United Nations Statistical Office, aimed at providing a methodological approach for the quantification of women's work in the informal sectors of the economy. Our aim is to reflect women's contribution in the system of national accounts (SNA) and in major international standard classification systems. We have prepared and presented a strong and thoroughly researched case for taking women's role into account in SNA, ISCO and ISIC, which are all due for revision. Reports based on national experiences contained proposals for revision and suggestions for further work. The advocacy voice of Instraw has been heard at all international fora where the issue was discussed, including the UN Statistical Commission and the Conference on Labour Statisticians. If Instraw had not taken these issues into account, we would have to wait for the next revision, probably till the end of this century.

The same approach of co-operation and mainstreaming with other UN bodies was applied in other Instraw programmes, related to issues of policy design such as women in the world economy, South-South co-operation, choice of technology, drinking water and sanitation and new and renewable sources of energy.

Another highlight of Instraw activities refers to our search for innovative and participatory training methodologies. The guiding principles of Instraw training strategy are: (1) operation through networks of international, regional, national and local institutions, (2) training of trainers so as to obtain a multiplier effect, (3) training in-

situ, primarily in developing countries to stimulate grass-root participation and (4) influencing training activities within and outside the UN system through its role as catalyst for developmental change.

In view of the general scarcity of adequate training material on women and development, Instraw has concentrated its efforts on innovative training modules with an accent on simultaneous awareness raising and information delivery using new communication tools. The training material produced enhances participatory training and is adjustable to various target audiences and different training needs.

Instraw policy is also oriented toward the strengthening of co-operation with international, regional and national training institutes. As a first step in this direction, Instraw has established co-operation with the UN training institutes and institutes with global and regional scope of action, such as CIRDP, ESAMI and ICPE.

We need to explore further new types of training technology, curricula and training material. We need to foster changes in women's own views as to the value and significance of their potentials. We need to respond to the ever-growing demands of grass-root trainers, facilitators and extension workers. To answer these needs, Instraw will continue to adapt and refine its training strategies by continuous monitoring and evaluation in order to contribute meaningfully to the investment in human resources and women's advancement.

Collecting and providing access to information on women and development constitutes a vital element of Instraw programmes, which requires a modern and efficient communication infrastructure. The new communication technologies could immensely contribute to training with a more effective delivery of distance training, particularly for the population in rural areas. The main problem at the present stage is how to create comprehensible, useful and relevant software or, in other words, relevant information and training messages, which would primarily serve the needs of women in developing countries.

Operating from an island state, it was vital for Instraw to secure direct communication links with other United Nations information data bases and establish an electronic mail system to intensify interaction. The Institute has identified other possible programmes and projects related to the use of communication technology for women and development purposes, with an emphasis on data bases, training and software production. Such possibilities will be further considered and developed by an expert group meeting which will be convened later this year in Rome.

The importance of innovative research is crucial at this stage; the potential of innovative training is enormous; the range of possible applications of communication technologies is striking. If all of this is technically feasible, how shall we use it for development purposes, for bridging the gap between developed and developing countries, between men and women? Women give life and bring to maturity every new generation; they work tirelessly for the benefit of human beings; their vital force is being felt everywhere and yet, there is not enough willingness and there are not enough resources to assist unanimously adopted strategies leading them to a better future.

As a voice from the South, let me finish with a touch of optimism that you will keep supporting Instraw, a small dynamic unit

trying to contribute to the advancement of women and their societies to an acceptable level by the year 2000. It is the responsibility we all share and to make it a reality we should pledge our energies and commitment; to this end, we should mobilize all available resources.

### TRIBUTE TO ED CRITCHLOW

#### HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a special tribute to Mr. Critchlow, a journalist in my congressional district who recently passed away. In many ways, Mr. Ed Critchlow was a pioneer in the newspaper business in west Tennessee. He assumed ownership of the Union City Daily Messenger in 1940. He also owned several weekly newspapers in adjacent counties.

Throughout his career and his life, he remained committed to high ideals and standards. He demanded that the news be covered fairly and objectively. That did not mean that he did not have strong views on issues important to his community and his country. He did and he used the editorial pages fearlessly in his pursuit of honesty and high standards.

Mr. Critchlow was the quintessential newspaperman. He was thorough. He doggedly pursued news stories. He was fair. He was objective. Most importantly, he viewed his role as a newspaper owner, reporter, and editor as a sacred trust and never wavered from that belief. He was truly the kind of newspaperman that today's journalism students can look to as a standard of professionalism.

Finally, Ed Critchlow was a good man who cared about his family and his community. He remained deeply interested in the challenges confronting his city and worked diligently to contribute to their resolution.

Ed Critchlow was a close personal friend and one that all of us who knew him will miss very much.

In sharing this man's life with my colleagues, I would like to insert in the RECORD an eloquent article written by David Bartholomew, currently city editor of the Daily Messenger.

[From the Union City Daily Messenger, May 16, 1988]

PUBLISHER AS TEACHER

(By David Bartholomew)

The public lost a champion of its good, the community lost an ardent booster and those of us who worked for him lost a friend as well as an employer with the death Saturday of Ed Critchlow.

Today's journalism schools with their emphases on combination journalism-business degrees or media law don't produce many such editors and publishers in his vein. He was one of the breed who truly saw his community newspaper as a community trust and whose version of journalistic activism was doing what he felt was in the best interest of Union City and Obion County.

He was a man who believed in giving young people a chance. I know. He gave me mine, even as I called him Mr. Critchfield the day I walked in off the street and told him I was a writer. I'm not sure he believed

me but he was willing to spend some time and money to find out. That was 20 years ago.

Mr. Critchlow left most of the nuts-and-bolts teaching to Bill King but it was from him that I drew my inspiration. He was a newspaperman's newspaperman, determined to get it first and get it right. He told me over and over again that the only way I would ever succeed in this business was if I was enthusiastic and excited. He instilled that excitement in me to the point my heart still skips a beat every time I hear a siren.

His most oft repeated advice to me was. "To be a good newspaperman, you've got to cover the waterfront."

Though nearing 70 when he hired me, he still worked the Associated Press wire stories, wrote headlines and dummed out the front page every day. And he left no doubt that he was the editor.

One day when felt I had moved from questioning to learn to questioning his judgment, he grabbed one of his ever-present suspenders, leaned back, and roared, "By gosh, I don't have to have a reason; I own this newspaper." Assured I was properly chastised, he then took the time to explain why he had handled the story as he had.

I felt he had finally accepted me the day I got the coveted invitation to join him, Bill and ad manager Arthur Melton for coffee. I don't think an invitation to meet the president would have thrilled me any more than for Mr. Critchlow to invite me to go along. "Bill you ready, Arthur, you ready? Preacher." as he called me in reference to my part-time ministry role, "you ready?" was a real morale builder.

When we moved to the present plant, we had our own coffee room—and somehow it was never the same. But I would have traded a raise in salary for those invitations if he had asked me to.

I used to think he was excited as I was when I came up with what I thought was a big story. But he was a good enough newsman that he always punched the proper holes in it to make sure I had it solid and that I had it right.

He carried me to play my first round of golf, laughing his warm and hearty laugh at my feeble efforts. He fussed at me more than once for my mistakes. He was a friend when I needed advice. He helped me make more than a few major decisions in my life.

Though he retired fairly early in my career with the Messenger, his health failing soon after, I won't forget him giving me that much-needed chance. And as long as I get to stay in this business, I won't forget to cover the waterfront.

### IN HONOR OF THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. SYMPHOROSA PARISH

#### HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize the parish of St. Symphorosa as it celebrates its 60th anniversary and jubilee.

On June 2, 1927, Cardinal Mundelein appointed the Reverend J. Leo Sharp to serve the Chicago district of Clearing and organize the parish of St. Symphorosa and Her Seven Sons. The parish officially began its service

with a mass on June 18, 1927, at 6147 Mason Avenue in Chicago which was attended by 90 adults and children.

Since those humble beginnings long ago, St. Symphorosa has continued to grow and faithfully serve its parishioners and the Chicago community at large. St. Symphorosa has, as a religious institution, also been an important stabilizing force as the community dealt with the many changes which have occurred in our world over the past 60 years.

I am sure my colleagues join me in congratulating the members of St. Symphorosa Parish on this historic occasion, thanking them for their essential contributions to the community, and wishing them all the best in the future.

### TRIBUTE TO NEW YORK CITY'S DEPARTMENT FOR THE AGING: 20 YEARS OF SERVICE TO MILLIONS OF NEW YORK'S ELDERLY

#### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 1988, the New York City Department for the Aging, located in the heart of New York City, proudly celebrated with proper fanfare a historic occasion in its history—its 20th anniversary. I am pleased and privileged to share this event and this occasion with you, and I know you will join me in wishing them hearty congratulations.

As an original member of the House Select Committee on Aging, but also as the U.S. Representative serving the 19th Congressional District of New York, I am especially proud of the work done by the department. I have had hundreds of occasions to work with the department throughout the course of my career in Congress, which also spans 20 years; and I have seen it become a successful and precious operation that benefits New York's 1.3 million elderly people. Under the leadership of its past Commissioner Alice Brophy, Deputy Commissioner Roberta Spohn and its current Commissioner Janet Sainer, the New York City Department for the Aging has emerged a national leader in the field of aging, and in the area of innovative and effective aging projects geared to benefit the elderly.

Commissioner Sainer has been the impetus behind the department's success stories for the past 10 years that she served as its commissioner. She has brought much positive change to the department through hands-on experience and due to her 33 years devoted to the field of aging. Commissioner Sainer is a well-known and highly respected authority around the Nation in issues affecting the elderly; she has appeared on numerous occasions before the House Select Committee on Aging as a key witness, and I am honored to have her not only as a colleague in the world of aging, but also as a close friend. She is an elegant, energetic, and self-driven individual for whom I have the utmost respect and admiration.

I would like to share with you some of the history of the department, because I think it is essential to this historic occasion. Twenty years ago, the city of New York established a mayor's office for the aging with a small demonstration project grant from the Federal Administration on Aging. Its first undertaking was a research study of inner-city elderly which sought to determine who the urban elderly were, where they lived, what their needs were, and what factors were key to contributing to the quality of their lives. This served the agency as a base from which to construct future programs and services for elderly New Yorkers. Since those days, the New York City Department for the Aging has been a central data source on the aging, providing documentation for planning and advocacy efforts on behalf of the elderly. Title IV of the Older Americans Act did much to enable the department to carry out the early tradition of providing research and analysis to help shape policy beneficial to elderly constituents.

With the creation of title IIIB and IIIC of the Older Americans Act in the early 1970's, the department for the aging was able to develop a major congregate meals program in underserved and unserved areas of the city, launch for the first time home-delivered meals for elderly shut-ins, and in general expand its supportive service activities citywide. Particular emphasis was placed on expanding information and referral capabilities, outreach and advocacy for the elderly as well as legal services, homecare and transportation.

In 1975, the mayor's office for the aging was officially designated a department of New York City government and thus was renamed the New York City Department for the Aging by Mayor Abraham Beame. It had 2 years earlier, been designated the Area Agency on Aging for older New Yorkers. Today the department is one of the largest of the Nation's network of 667 area agencies on aging.

Over the years, funding through the Older Americans Act has helped to broaden the national aging network and to expand services for older Americans. The New York City Department for the Aging built upon this important initial Federal support, receiving as the years went on, additional resources from New York State, the city and the private sector to help address the growing needs of an ever changing aging population.

I am happy to report that as the New York City Department for the Aging celebrates this historic anniversary, it can proudly report that it continues to fund a wide reaching nutrition program, conducts a major employment program for low income elderly, administers the Foster Grandparent Program and has initiated a number of programs especially designed to fill crucial service gaps for the elderly.

In fact, the department has seen the value and benefit of combining funds from multiple sources, but also of forging new public private and voluntary sector partnerships to meet growing demands. Department programs which have a base in such mergings are City Meals on Wheels, a nutrition program which provide hundreds of thousands of additional meals to the homebound elderly, picking up where the Government funds for five meals a week leave off; Health Promotion Services, which originated in response to nationwide

evidence that many chronic conditions found in later years are related to poor nutrition, smoking, lack of regular exercise and non-compliance with medical regimens; the Partnership for ElderCare, a program for working caregivers of older relatives; a Hispanic Enhancement Program, which reaches out to the city's Spanish speaking elderly; the Intergenerational Work Study Program designed as a dropout prevention program for teenagers that combines training and work experience with the elderly, and of course, the New York City Alzheimer's Resource Center, which is near and dear to my heart. The center, which was established in 1984, serves over 70,000 New Yorkers who are victims of the debilitating Alzheimer's disease as well as offers of support services to the family members of these victims. The center is an active and extremely successful operation which, under the excellent leadership of its executive director, Dr. Randi Goldstein, is the first municipally funded agency of its kind in the Nation. The resource center was the first center to introduce free legal and financial planning for long-term incapacity, and shows promise of having an extremely bright future.

The New York City Department for the Aging should take great pride and pleasure in its outstanding record of service to New York's seniors. The ceremony which was held on April 28 at New York's City Hall brought together many who have worked with and for the department and whose very lives revolve around its success. There were so many who were recognized as the department's anniversary publication, a 50-page book describing the history and services of the department was presented and as proclamations in honor of the occasion were unfurled and read. In attendance were Mayor Ed Koch, and former Mayor Abraham Beame, New York State Office for the Aging Director, Dr. Eugene Callender, who has provided much support and cooperation to the department, the Honorable David Dinkins, borough president of Manhattan, and Harrison J. Goldin, the comptroller of New York City. In addition, the 200-plus audience was entertained by the sounds of the Bethune Big Band, made up entirely of musically talented seniors and the Tapping Seniors of Central Harlem, a most unique group of senior tapdancers.

Last but certainly not least, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize some of the people who have been instrumental in the department's 20 years of success. In addition to the previously mentioned Commissioner Sainer and Deputy Commissioner Roberta Spohn; Dr. Betty Bernstein, legislative analyst; Mary Mayer, director of research and planning; Valerie Levy, director of minority affairs; Eitima Maharaj, director of the Half-Fare Program; Lynn Harris, special secretary to the commissioner; Elba Carmone, director of information and referral; Helene Wolff, director of public affairs; Leane Cheek, associate director of public affairs; the numerous directors of the senior centers throughout the New York City metropolitan area and the senior citizens themselves, who make up 18.7 percent of the great city of New York's total population, and who are among some of most active and socially aware citizens in the United States.

As the New York City Department for the Aging launches its 21 year, I wish them continued success and prosperity, and I salute them for their commitment toward enhancing the quality of life for the elderly of New York now and the years to come. As we celebrate May as "Older Americans Month," we also celebrate "New York City Department for the Aging—20 years of Service."

## NEW MEXICO HERITAGE PRESERVATION AWARDS

### HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fine and important work being conducted by the New Mexico Office of Cultural Affairs and several outstanding New Mexicans to preserve the historic and cultural heritage of the Southwest. On May 6, 1988, I had the honor of attending the banquet for the New Mexico Heritage Preservation Awards in Santa Fe, NM. All New Mexicans are fully aware and proud of the Spanish, Indian and Anglo cultures which give New Mexico a unique heritage. I want to congratulate the award winners listed below, as well as the Cultural Properties Review Committee and the Office of Cultural Affairs, for their efforts to preserve our great heritage for present and future generations.

#### NEW MEXICO HERITAGE PRESERVATION AWARDS

To Ira Clark, of La Mesilla, for his extensive research on water use, development, conservation and exploitation, culminating in his book "Water in New Mexico." This book discusses the importance of water resources to the development of the New Mexico, as we now know it.

To Goody Taylor, owner, and Stevens, Mallory, Pearl and Campbell, Architects, for the sensitive renovation of the Hotel St. Francis, Santa Fe.

To Dr. John P. Wilson, Las Cruces, for his historical research on Lincoln County, resulting in his book, "Merchants, Guns and Money—The Story of Lincoln County and Its Wars."

To Dr. Marjorie Lambert of Santa Fe, for more than 50 years of commitment to the archaeology and ethnohistory of New Mexico.

To Timothy Maxwell and Linda Tigges of Santa Fe, for efforts in establishing Santa Fe's Archaeological Preservation Ordinance. This is the first effort by a local government in New Mexico to establish an ordinance to protect local archaeological resources.

To the New Mexico Community Foundation for their efforts to preserve the historic churches throughout New Mexico.

To the Rail Planning Projects Bureau, New Mexico State Highway and Transportation Department for their efforts to preserve historic railroad stations in Las Vegas, Raton and Gallup.

To the Friends of the Albuquerque Petroglyphs [FOTAP], for efforts to preserve and expand public knowledge and appreciation of the petroglyphs of Albuquerque's West Mesa.

To Tommy Bolack, of the B Square Ranch, Bloomfield, for efforts to preserve the significant archaeological resources on the B Square Ranch.

To the City of Albuquerque Advance Planning Division, the Open Space Division and The West Mesa Escarpment Open Space Task Force Committee, in recognition of the preparation of the West Mesa Escarpment Plan and revisions to the Albuquerque Comprehensive Plan, dealing with the preservation of cultural resources.

To Peggy Stokes, formerly of Roswell, and member of the Chaves County Historical Society, in recognition of her efforts to foster appreciation of the historical resources of Chaves County.

To the Albuquerque Tribune, in recognition of their extensive coverage and support of cultural resource issues in the Albuquerque area and throughout New Mexico.

#### CULTURAL PROPERTIES REVIEW COMMITTEE

Chairman—Patrick H. Beckett, Archaeologist, Publisher, Researcher Las Cruces.

Vice-Chairman—Dr. Joseph Sanchez, Historian, Albuquerque.

Edith Cherry, Architect, University Professor, Albuquerque.

Ed Mazria, Architect, Santa Fe.

Dr. Phillip Shelley, Anthropologist, Portales.

Dr. Rina Swentzell, Architectural Historian, Santa Fe.

Robert Torrez, State Historian, Santa Fe.

#### OFFICE OF CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Helmuth J. Naumer—Cultural Affairs Officer.

Thomas W. Merlan—State Historic Preservation Officer.

Dr. Lynne Sebastian—Deputy Director, Historic Preservation Division.

### PIONEER PRESS-DISPATCH PROVIDES SOUND ADVICE ON ARCTIC REFUGE

#### HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, Congress is currently debating the recommendations of the Reagan administration to open to oil and gas leasing the environmentally and ecologically priceless coastal plain portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska.

Many of us who participated in the debates prior to enactment in 1980 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act continue to believe that the House was right when it twice voted to designate that area as wilderness, so that oil and gas leasing would be precluded. In support of that, I have joined Chairman UDALL of the Interior Committee as a cosponsor of H.R. 39, which would provide such a designation for the coastal plain.

On May 22, the Pioneer Press-Dispatch newspaper in St. Paul, MN, provided sound advice concerning this matter. In reviewing the arguments advanced in support of leasing, the editorial says that while initially they appeared persuasive, they "melt under closer scrutiny." The editorial concludes that, "Rather than pin its energy future on Arctic permafrost and caribou, America should begin to develop the inexhaustible supplies of renewable energy it will need in the soon-to-be-here next century.

Congress should reject the oil industry's request to drill in the wildlife refuge's coastal plain region."

Mr. Speaker, I agree, and for the benefit of our colleagues, I am attaching the full text of the editorial referred to.

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press-Dispatch, May 22, 1988]

#### DRILLING IN ALASKA: U.S. SHOULD DEVELOP OTHER ENERGY SOURCES

In 1980, Congress defined the borders and set the rules for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, a 19-million-acre parcel of rugged land lying along the northeastern coast of Alaska. Since then, the oil industry has been working hard to convince Washington to permit drilling in the refuge's 1.5-million-acre coastal plain region.

Initially, the industry's arguments appeared persuasive: The site is promising, domestic oil production is needed to help reduce reliance on imported oil and ANWR's fields can be tapped without harming the fragile arctic environment.

However, the industry's claims melt under closer scrutiny.

Chances of finding any oil are less than one in five. And if significant fields are discovered, they would furnish less than 2 percent of U.S. oil consumption over the life of the fields. The nation could do better by simply reducing auto gas consumption by an average of two miles a gallon.

Earlier this month, the industry's environmental claims received a severe blow when the New York Times published the results of a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service study on the environmental damage caused by development around Prudhoe Bay, located just west of the refuge, and the Trans-Alaska Pipeline.

According to the report, environmental damage has been significantly greater than envisioned before the project began 16 years ago. The report found that:

About 11,000 acres of vegetation used by wildlife—roughly double the prediction—have been destroyed.

Most bird species have declined in population.

While the number of caribou in the Central Arctic herd has increased, the number of bears, wolves and other predators has declined. In addition, new roads and increased air traffic have opened the area to more hunting pressure, which has reduced the number of other large mammals.

Sedimentation, erosion and oil spills have damaged both the quality and quantity of North Slope freshwater supplies more frequently and more severely than expected. And while the impact statement made no mention of fresh water uses, the industry now consumes more than 200 million gallons of fresh water a year.

Expansion of oil production into the Arctic Ocean has damaged marine water quality. Moreover, the decline in fish populations has been far greater than expected.

"Intensive" pesticide spraying has created unforeseen pollution problems.

Crude oil has driven the world's economies for nearly a century. But supplies are running out. The long-term solution is not to risk everything in a frantic race to find the last drops of recoverable crude. Rather than pin its energy future on arctic permafrost and caribou, America should begin to develop the inexhaustible supplies of renewable energy it will need in the soon-to-be-here next century. Congress should reject the oil industry's request to drill in the wildlife refuge's coastal plain region.

### HOUSING POLICY IN THE NINETIES

#### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for Wednesday, May 25, 1988, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### HOUSING POLICY IN THE NINETIES

Housing has been an American success story. Decent housing is now available to the vast majority of our citizens. Since 1940 the share of housing rated by the Census Bureau as inadequate has dropped from 40% to 50%. In 1940 half of the nation's housing units had no plumbing or heating, while today nearly all of our housing meets these minimum standards. We now have more than 100 million homes in America, and our housing stock is estimated to be worth \$5 trillion. The impact of housing and its related industries on the entire economy cannot be overestimated.

Yet the vital signs for housing today indicate disturbing trends. Owning a home has always been an integral part of the American dream. But the housing dream is fading for millions of Americans. The percentage of Americans who own homes has been declining since 1980 after 35 years of steady increases. In many parts of the country, homes are becoming less and less affordable because prices have risen faster than incomes. By one estimate, less than 1/3 of all potential homebuyers today are able to afford a median-priced home. The sharpest drop in homeownership has been in the Midwest.

The nation is also not providing well for lower-income families. Only one-quarter of the very poor are being assisted by existing housing programs, such as Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) subsidies. Rental housing that is safe, decent, and affordable is becoming ever more scarce. The homeless are becoming more visible as their numbers increase. Virtually no one who has carefully examined the housing situation in America today believes that the needs of the nation's poor, and increasingly of the middle class, are being met.

The Reagan Administration's housing policy has generally been to cut funding for all housing programs, increasing assistance in the form of rent vouchers while decreasing funds for construction and renovation subsidies. Federal housing programs have suffered a disproportionate amount of domestic spending cuts during the 1980's. Funding for HUD programs dropped by 75% over the past decade, to \$7.5 billion last year.

The federal government also provides some \$55 billion annually in tax breaks for housing, to ease the cost of homeownership on individuals as well as to encourage rental housing. The mortgage interest deduction alone now costs the treasury \$31 billion a year in income taxes foregone. Some changes were made in the 1986 Tax Reform Act to scale back real estate tax incentives, primarily for investors, in exchange for lowering overall tax rates.

More attention has been paid recently to the housing needs of low-income Americans. Last year the Congress passed its first major

housing bill since 1979. It doubles the number of needy families receiving HUD subsidies, and steps up efforts to renovate deteriorating public housing. The Congress also provided \$280 million in emergency housing assistance to the homeless. These are modest efforts compared to the nation's needs, but they do signify that housing is starting to receive greater attention.

My view is that the nation must renew its commitment to decent and affordable housing of all kinds. We must make housing a higher priority on the national agenda. Given the magnitude of the problem, it is clear that the solution will require great flexibility and broad participation. The effort cannot rest solely on federal spending but will require the participation of state and local governments, non-profit and for-profit sectors, and religious and community organizations. Subsidies from the federal government are needed, but a realistic eye has to be kept on the federal deficit. Non-profit organizations are skillful at rehabilitating housing, but on a fairly modest scale. Developers make good use of local tax incentives and innovative zoning laws, but it is difficult for them to assist the very poor and the homeless.

A partnership must be formed involving Washington, state and local governments, developers, financial institutions, and community groups. The federal government should provide assistance in the form of seed money which other partners can leverage to produce far more housing than Washington alone can afford. A national housing task force recently recommended a \$5 billion program of federal funds and matching state money to upgrade and expand low-income housing.

I am encouraged by the many innovative programs developed by states and localities faced with sharp cuts in federal housing assistance. They have learned how to cut construction and labor costs, and to finance projects through public-private partnerships. From 1980-1987, state governments created 112 housing programs, compared with 44 state-run efforts established in all prior years. These programs are providing an important new source of low-income housing.

Other proposals are aimed at making homeownership more accessible. They include authorizing federal agencies such as FHA and VA to insure larger mortgages and more adjustable-rate mortgages and to allow smaller down payments. We should continue to experiment with the sale of public housing to tenants. The federal government could also support community development banks providing below-rate, private financing for moderate-income buyers. Another suggestion is to permit individuals to use their tax-exempt IRA or 401(k) savings to buy homes.

The overall success of federal housing policy over the last half century are evident. Yet it is also clear that many needs are not being met. Cuts over the past decade have severely limited housing opportunities for many Americans, but they have also forced us to reevaluate and improve existing programs, and to develop better and more broadly based programs for the nineties. Housing in America is not just a shelter, an asset, or where we happened to live; it represents who we are and what our values are. Decent housing for all Americans is an important social policy goal that we should all care about.

## THE WAY TO MARS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to my colleagues' attention a special full-page advertisement by the Planetary Society in today's Washington Post, titled "The Way to Mars." With this advertisement, the Planetary Society sends a bold message to President Reagan as he leaves for the summit talks in Moscow. The United States and the Soviet Union can work together on space missions, and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has recently proposed cooperation in the unmanned exploration of Mars. This joint activity can be a powerful symbol of our Nations' willingness to suspend differences in the pursuit of a common goal.

The Planetary Society makes the convincing argument for joint exploration of the Red Planet beginning with unmanned projects and ultimately leading to joint manned missions. I sincerely believe that much of the credit for a possible cooperative agreement on Mars missions at the summit must go to the Planetary Society's president, Dr. Carl Sagan. He has been a leading and outspoken advocate of such cooperation for several years. The Planetary Society's Mars declaration initiative has served both to educate the public and to generate broad-based support for joint United States and Soviet missions to Mars. This initiative is truly an act of peace.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would request that the text of the "The Way to Mars" advertisement from today's Washington Post be inserted in the RECORD.

[Advertisement from The Washington Post, May 26, 1988]

### THE WAY TO MARS

We have before us a historic opportunity to fulfill an ancient dream, to help preserve this world and to venture forth to another.

The Planetary Society is the largest space-interest group in the world. For the last four years it has advocated Mars as the principal long-term goal for the U.S. and Soviet space programs—robotic exploratory missions and long-duration human space flight, leading to the epochal first landing of humans on another planet. Since then the moribund U.S.-Soviet Space Cooperation Agreement has been renewed; U.S. scientists will work on the forthcoming Soviet Phobos mission, and Soviet scientists will work on the U.S. Mars Observer mission, and three bills are now before the U.S. Congress setting the goal of human exploration of Mars and encouraging US-USSR cooperation toward that goal.

General Secretary Gorbachev has just explicitly called for a joint U.S.-Soviet unmanned mission of discovery to Mars—important for its scientific harvest; for its potential to bring the two nations together in a great common enterprise; and, along with other robotic missions as a necessary precursor for joint human voyages to Mars early in the 21st century. Mars has now entered the realm of discourse between heads of government.

The Mars Goal has captured the imagination of a strikingly diverse group of American leaders who have signed The Planetary

Society's Mars Declaration (below). It includes liberals and conservatives, Democrats and Republicans; Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine general and flag officers, and leaders of peace groups; astronauts and religious leaders; labor and industry executives; politicians and poets; Nobel Laureates and sports figures; ambassadors, university presidents, and former presidential science advisors; former cabinet and sub-cabinet members; and every former Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration since its founding, except the present incumbent.

### THE MARS DECLARATION

Mars is the world next door, the nearest planet on which human explorers could safely land. Although it is sometimes as warm as a New England October, Mars is a chilly place, so cold that some of its thin carbon dioxide atmosphere freezes out at the winter pole. There are pink skies, fields of boulders, sand dunes, vast extinct volcanoes that dwarf anything on Earth, a great canyon that would cross most of the United States, sandstorms that sometimes reach half the speed of sound, strange bright and dark markings on the surface, hundreds of ancient river valleys, mountains shaped like pyramids and many other mysteries.

Mars is a storehouse of scientific information—important in its own right but also for the light it may cast on the origins of life and on safeguarding the environment of the Earth. If Mars once had abundant liquid water, what happened to it? How did a once Earthlike world become so parched, frigid and comparatively airless? Is there something important on Mars that we need to know about our own fragile world?

The prospect of human exploration of Mars is ecumenical—remarkable for the diversity of supporting opinion it embraces. It is being advocated on many grounds:

As a potential scientific bonanza—for example on climatic change, on the search for present or past life, on the understanding of enigmatic Martian landforms, and on the application of new knowledge to understanding of our own planet.

As a means, through robotic precursor and support missions to Mars, of reviving a stagnant U.S. planetary program.

As providing a coherent focus and sense of purpose to a dispirited NASA for many future research and development activities on an appropriate timescale and with affordable costs.

As giving a crisp and unambiguous purpose to the U.S. space station—needed for in-orbit assembly of the interplanetary transfer vehicle or vehicles, and for study of long-duration life support for space travelers.

As the next great human adventure, able to excite and inspire people of all ages the world over.

As an aperture to enhanced national prestige and technological development.

As a realistic and possibly unique opportunity for the United States and the Soviet Union to work together in the spotlight of world public opinion, and with other nations, on behalf of the human species.

As a model and stimulant for mutually advantageous U.S./Soviet cooperation here on Earth.

As a means for economic reconversion of the aerospace industry if and when massive reductions in strategic weapons—long promised by the United States and the Soviet Union—are implemented.

As a worthy application of the traditional military virtues of organization and valor to great expeditions of discovery.

As a step towards the long-term objective of establishing humanity as a multi-planet species.

Or simply as the obvious response to a deeply felt perception of the future calling.

Advances in technology now make feasible a systematic process of exploration and discovery on the planet Mars—beginning with robot roving vehicles and sample return missions and culminating in the first foothold of human beings on another planet. The cost would be no greater than that of a single major strategic weapons system, and if shared among two or more nations, the cost to each nation would be still less. No major additional technological advances would be required, and the step from today to the first landing of humans on Mars appears to be technologically easier than the step from President John F. Kennedy's announcement of the *Apollo* program on May 25, 1961 to the first landing of humans on the Moon on July 20, 1969.

We represent a wide diversity of backgrounds in the fields of sciences, technology, religion, the arts, politics and government. Few of us adhere to every one of the arguments listed above, but we share a common vision of Mars as a historic, constructive objective for the technological ambitions of the human species over the next few decades.

We endorse the goal of human exploration of Mars and urge that initial steps toward its implementation be taken throughout the world.

*(Partial list of signatories)\**

Carl Sagan, Director, Laboratory for Planetary Studies, Cornell University.

Bruce Murray, Former Director, NASA/Caltech, Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

Thomas O. Paine, Chairman, The President's National Commission on Space, Former Administrator, NASA.

Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldren, Michael Collins, Apollo II Crew First Manned Lunar Landing.

Diane Ackerman, Poet and Author.  
Bill G. Aldridge, Executive Director, National Science Teachers Assn.

Joseph P. Allen, Shuttle Astronaut.

Luis W Alvarez, Nobel Laureate, Physics.

Jack Anderson, Syndicated Columnist.

Christian Anfinsen, Nobel Laureate, Chemistry.

Harry Ashmore, Pulitzer Prize, Journalism.

Isaac Asimov, Author.

Morton Bahr, President, Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

David Baltimore, Nobel Laureate, Medicine.

Lawrence Barker, Jr., President, LSB Leakey Foundation.

Alan Bean, Apollo and Skylab Astronaut.

Steven C. Beering, President, Purdue University.

James Beggs, Former Administrator, NASA.

Lucy Wilson Benson, Former National President, League of Women Voters, Former Undersecretary of State.

Richard Berendzen, President, American University.

Hans A. Bethe, Nobel Laureate, Physics.

Baruch Blumberg, Nobel Laureate, Medicine.

Daniel J. Boorstin, Librarian of Congress Emeritus.

Norman Borlaug, Nobel Laureate, Peace.

\* Affiliations for identification purposes only.

Frank Borman, Apollo Astronaut, Vice Chairman and Director, Texas Air Corporation.

Richard L. Bowen, President, Idaho State University.

Ernest L. Boyer, President, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Ray Bradbury, Author.

Tom Bradley, Mayor, City of Los Angeles.

George E. Brown, Member of Congress, California.

John Lott Brown, President, Univ. of South Florida.

E. Margaret Burbidge, Director, Center for Astrophysics and Space Sciences, University of California, San Diego; Former President, American Assn. for the Advancement of Science.

Anthony J. Calio, Former Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Admin.

Melvin Calvin, Nobel Laureate, Chemistry.

A.G.W. Cameron, Professor of Astronomy, Harvard University; Former Chairman, Space Science Board, National Academy of Sciences.

Scott Carpenter, Mercury Astronaut.

Johnny Carson, Talk Show Host, NBC.

Jimmy Carter, Former President of the United States.

Raul H. Castro, Former Governor of Arizona; Former U.S. Ambassador.

Franklin Ramon Chang-Diaz, Shuttle Astronaut.

Warren Christopher, Former Deputy Secretary of State.

Henry G. Cisneros, Mayor, San Antonio, Texas.

John F. Clark, Vice President for Public Policy, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics.

Arthur C. Clarke, Author.

Stephen F. Cohen, Professor of Politics, Princeton University.

William E. Colby, Former Director, Central Intelligence Agency.

Paul Coleman, President, Universities Space Research Association.

Charles Conrad, Jr., Apollo and Skylab Astronaut.

Gordon Cooper, Mercury and Gemini Astronaut.

Robert S. Cooper, Former Director, Advanced Research Projects Agency, Department of Defense.

Norman Cousins, Author.

Walter Cronkite, CBS News Special Correspondent.

Gerard Debreu, Nobel Laureate, Economics.

Federick B. Dent, Former Secretary of Commerce, Former U.S. Special Trade Representative.

John Denver, Composer.

John DiBiaggio, President, Michigan State Univ.

Hugh Downs, Host ABC News 20/20; Chairman, National Space Society.

Frank Drake, Dean, College of Natural Sciences, Univ. of California, Santa Cruz.

Sidney D. Drell, Former President, American Physical Society.

Richard Dreyfuss, Actor.

Robert F. Drinan, S.J., Former President, Americans for Democratic Action.

Ann Druyan, Writer, Producer.

Joseph Duffey, Chancellor, University of Massachusetts; Former Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities.

Charles M. Duke, Jr., Brig. Gen., USAF, Ret.; Apollo Astronaut.

Bonnie J. Dunbar, Shuttle Astronaut.

Freeman J. Dyson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton.

Sylvia A. Earle, Research Biologist.

Donn F. Eisele, Apollo Astronaut; Vice President, Prudential Bache Securities.

Susan Eisenhower, President, The Eisenhower World Affairs Institute.

Farouk El-Baz, Director, Center for Remote Sensing, Boston University.

Ronald Evans, Apollo Astronaut.

John Fabian, Former Director of Space Programs, HQ USAF; Shuttle Astronaut.

Maxime A. Faget, President, Space Industries, Inc.

Richard P. Feynman, Nobel Laureate, Physics.

George Field, Professor of Astronomy, Harvard University.

Daniel J. Fink, Former Chairman, Space Applications Board, National Academy of Engineering.

Val L. Fitch, Nobel Laureate, Physics; Pres., American Physical Society.

William H. Fitch, Lt. Gen., US Marine Corps, Ret.

William A. Fowler, Nobel Laureate, Physics.

John Hope Franklin, James B. Duke, Prof. of History, Duke University.

Herbert Friedman, U.S. Naval Research Laboratory, Emeritus.

Louis Friedman, Executive Director, The Planetary Society.

Robert A. Frosch, Former Administrator, NASA; Vice President for Research, General Motors Corporation.

Don Fuqua, President, Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc.

John Gardner, Founder, Common Cause.

Jake Garn, U.S. Senator, Utah.

Noel Gayler, Admiral, U.S. Navy, Ret.; Former Director, National Security Agency.

Murray Gell-Mann, Nobel Laureate, Physics.

Alan Geyer, Professor of Political Ethics, Wesley Theological Seminary.

Robert R. Gilruth, Former Director, NASA Project Mercury.

Donald A. Glaser, Nobel Laureate, Medicine.

T. Keith Glennan, Former NASA Administrator.

Joseph Goldstein, Nobel Laureate, Medicine.

Andrew J. Goodpaster, General, U.S. Army, Ret.; Former Commander, NATO.

Richard F. Gordon, Jr., Gemini and Apollo Astronaut.

Stephen Jay Gould, Professor of Geology, Harvard University.

Jerome Grossman, President, Council for a Livable World.

Norman Hackerman, President Emeritus, Rice Univ.; Former Chairman, National Science Board.

Fred N. Haise, Apollo and Shuttle Astronaut; President, Grumman Space Station Division.

Evelyn E. Handler, President, Brandeis University.

Herbert A. Hauptman, Nobel Laureate, Chemistry.

James Head, Prof. of Geology, Brown University.

Jim Henson, Creator of the Muppets.

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, President Emeritus, University of Notre Dame.

Howard H. Hiatt, Former Dean, School of Public Health, Harvard University.

Earl D. Hilburn, Former President, Western Union.

Carl N. Hodges, Director, Environmental Research Laboratory, Univ. of Arizona.

Roald Hoffman, Nobel Laureate, Chemistry.

James Holderman, President, Univ. of South Carolina.

Robert W. Holley, Nobel Laureate, Medicine.

Shirley M. Hufstедler, Attorney, Former Federal Judge, and Former Secretary of Education.

Donald Hunten, Professor of Planetary Sciences, University of Arizona.

James B. Irwin, Apollo Astronaut.

Edward H. Jennings, President, The Ohio State Univ.

George W. Johnson, President, George Mason University.

John A. Johnson, Former Chairman and C.E.O., Communications Satellite Corp. (COMSAT).

James Earl Jones, Actor.

Quincy Jones, Composer.

Henry W. Kendall, Professor of Physics, M.I.T.; Chairman, Union of Concerned Scientists.

Donald Kennedy, President, Stanford University.

Joseph P. Kerwin, Skylab Astronaut.

Vera Kistiakowsky, Prof. of Physics, M.I.T.

James R. Killian, Jr., Former Science Adviser to President Eisenhower; Former President and Chairman, M.I.T.

Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, Former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

Ray Kline, President, National Academy of Public Administration.

Foy D. Kohler, Former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union.

Louis L'Amour, Author.

Gene LaRocque, Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy, Ret.; Chairman, Center for Defense Information.

Donald N. Langenberg, Chancellor, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Ursula K. LeGuin, Author.

Byron Lichtenberg, Shuttle Astronaut; President, Payload Systems Inc.

Peter Likins, President, Lehigh University.

John M. Logsdon, Director, Space Policy Institute, George Washington University.

Jon Lomberg, Artist.

Jack Lousma, Skylab and Shuttle Astronaut.

James A. Lovell, Gemini and Apollo Astronaut.

Bernard Lown, President, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (Nobel Peace Prize).

George Lucas, Chairman, Lucasfilm Ltd.; Executive Producer, Star Wars trilogy.

Richard W. Lyman, President, The Rockefeller Foundation.

Barry Mano, President, National Assn. of Sports Officials.

Hans Mark, Chancellor, University of Texas System; Former Secretary of the Air Force.

Spark M. Matsunaga, U.S. Senator, Hawaii.

Thomas Mattingly, Apollo & Shuttle Astronaut; Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy.

William J. McCune, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Polaroid Corporation.

James A. McDivitt, Brig. General, USAF, Ret.; Apollo Astronaut.

John L. McCluskey, Chairman, U.S. Commission/International Space Year; Former Secretary of the Air Force.

Bruce Merrifield, Nobel Laureate, Chemistry.

James Michener, Author.

G. William Miller, Former Chairman, Federal Reserve Board.

Marvin Minsky, Professor of Science, M.I.T.; Founder, Artificial Intelligence Laboratory, M.I.T.

Edgar D. Mitchell, Apollo Astronaut.

David Morrison, Chairman, Solar System Exploration Committee; NASA Advisory Council.

Bradford Morse, Former Administrator, United Nations Development Program.

Gerald J. Mossinghoff, President, Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

George E. Mueller, Former NASA Associate Administrator, Manned Space Flight.

Daniel Nathans, Nobel Laureate, Medicine.

John E. Naugle, Former NASA Associate Administrator for Space Science.

Paul Newman, Actor and Director.

Edmund F. O'Connor, Lt. Gen, USAF, Ret.

Eleanor Holmes Norton, Former Chair, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunities Commission; Professor of Law, Georgetown Univ.

Severo Ochoa, Nobel Laureate, Medicine.

Glenn Olds, President, Fetzer Foundation.

Paul Olum, President, University of Oregon.

Tobias Owen, Professor of Astronomy, State University of New York.

Joseph V. Paterno, Head Football Coach, Pennsylvania State University.

Linus Pauling, Nobel Laureate, Chemistry; Nobel Laureate, Peace.

Rev. Norman Vincent Peale, Author.

Gregory Peck, Actor.

Chase N. Peterson, President, University of Utah.

Esther Peterson, Consumer Advocate.

Russell W. Peterson, Former Chairman, U.S. Council on Environmental Quality.

Rocco A. Petrone, President, Space Transportation Systems Division, Rockwell International, Inc.

William Pickering, Former Director, NASA/Caltech Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

Sidney Poitier, Actor, Director.

Rev. Avery D. Post, President, United Church of Christ.

Bruce R. Poulton, Chancellor, North Carolina, State University.

Simon Ramo, Director Emeritus, TRW Inc.

Eberhardt Rechtin, President and C.E.O., The Aerospace Corporation.

Eberhard F.M. Rees, Former Director, Marshall Space Flight Center, NASA.

Roger Revelle, Former President, American Assoc. for the Advancement of Science.

Frank H.T. Rhodes, President, Cornell University, Chairman, American Council on Education.

Elliot Richardson, Former U.S. Attorney General; Chairman, United Nations Association of the U.S.

S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary Emeritus, Smithsonian Institution.

Charles Robb, Former Governor, Virginia.

Walter Orr Roberts, Director Emeritus, National Center for Atmospheric Research.

Gene Roddenberry, Executive Producer, Star Trek.

Herbert J. Rowe, Senior Vice President, Electronic Industries Assn.

Vera C. Rubin, Astronomer, Carnegie Institution of Washington.

Richard G. Rutan, President, Voyager Aircraft, Inc.

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler, President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Harrison H. Schmitt, Former U.S. Senator, New Mexico; Apollo Astronaut.

Bernard A. Schriever, General, USAF, Ret.

Russell L. Schweickart, Apollo Astronaut.

V. June Scobee, Chairman, Challenger Center for Space Science Education.

Glenn T. Seaborg, Nobel Laureate, Chemistry; Former Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Donna E. Shalala, Chancellor, Univ. of Wisconsin.

Albert Shanker, President, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO.

Roger L. Shinn, Professor Emeritus of Social Ethics, Union Theological Seminary.

Rev. Robert H. Shuller, Crystal Cathedral Congregation.

William E. Simon, Former Secretary of the Treasury.

Donald K. (Deke) Slayton, Apollo Astronaut (Apollo-Soyuz Mission).

Jane G. Smith, President, Samantha Smith Foundation.

Richard G. Smith, Former Director, Kennedy Space Center, NASA.

Roberta Snow, Founding President, Educators for Social Responsibility.

Steven Spielberg, Director and Producer.

Robert L. Staehle, President, World Space Foundation.

Thomas P. Stafford, Lt. Gen. USAF, Ret.; Apollo Astronaut (Apollo-Soyuz Mission).

Glen H. Stassen, Professor of Christian Ethics, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

H. Guyford Stever, Foreign Secretary, National Academy of Engineering; Former Presidential Science Advisor.

Robert L. Stewart, Brig. Gen., Deputy Commander, U.S. Army Strategic Defense Command.

Lewis Thomas, President Emeritus, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center.

Clyde W. Tombaugh, Discoverer of Pluto.

Lily Tomlin, Actress.

Malcolm Toon, Former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union.

Virginia Trimble, Professor of Physics, University of California, Irvine.

Ted Turner, President and C.E.O., Turner Broadcasting System.

Frank E. Vandiver, President, Texas A&M University.

Charles A. Walker, Chancellor, Univ. of Arkansas.

Paul C. Warnke, Former Chief U.S. Arms Control Negotiator.

James E. Webb, Former Administrator, NASA.

Victor F. Weisskopf, Institute Professor, M.I.T.; Former President, American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Robert R. Wilson, Former Director, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory; Former President, American Physical Society.

William W. Wimpfinger, International President, International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO.

Leonard Woodcock, Former Pres., United Auto Workers; Former U.S. Ambassador to China.

Sidney Wolfe, Director, Kitt Peak National Observatory.

John F. Yardley, President, McDonnell Douglas Astronautics Company.

Charles E. (Chuck) Yeager, Brig. Gen., USAF, Ret.

Jeana Yeager, Voyager Pilot.

Herbert F. York, Former Director, Livermore National Laboratory.

Dreams are maps. It is time to set sail for the 21st century.

Under the leadership of Carl Sagan and Bruce Murray, The Planetary Society—a nonprofit, tax-exempt membership organization—is dedicated to planetary exploration and the search for extraterrestrial life. It has been instrumental in promoting international exploration of the planets as an es-

sential step in maintaining peace and in promoting human understanding. We believe that high technology can be used with foresight and wisdom.

To add your signature to the Mars Declaration, or to join The Planetary Society, contact: The Planetary Society.

**"YOUNG PEOPLE TOGETHER"  
AN INTERNATIONAL YOUTH  
CAMP IN MIDWESTERN IRELAND  
PLANNED FOR MID-JULY**

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, I wish to share with you some information I recently received which may be of interest to you.

The Centre for International Cooperation located in Shannon, Ireland, has contacted me to announce that it is hosting an International Youth Camp "Young People Together" planned from July 17-29, 1988 as the inaugural event of an extensive program of youth exchanges and meetings.

The Centre for International Cooperation which is a grouping of public and private enterprise, has as its goal to promote effective and enduring cooperation among nations thereby assisting in eliminating the basis for potential conflict. By developing carefully managed programs, it aims to forge international links in a variety of specific areas—in education, commerce, trade, industry, communications, tourism, science, and culture. The centre hosts international conferences on many aspects of cooperation at its location at Shannon International Airport.

This concept was adopted in August 1986 by a consortium consisting of Aer Lingus [Irish Airlines], Aer Rianta [Irish Airports], Guinness Peat Aviation, the Irish Peace Institute, Peat Marwick/Stokes Kennedy Crowley, and the Shannon Development Co. These organizations believe that prosperity and peace can be built through managed cooperation in socioeconomic and cultural fields.

The centre is linked with and supported by the companies within the consortium, and by the National Institute for Higher Education in Limerick, which houses the largest college of engineering in Ireland, as well as colleges of science, business, and humanities.

Working within the framework of the centre's activities, the youth program has established the following goals: To facilitate and assist the work of youth organizations working for international understanding; to develop a program of positive interaction among young people from various nations. Activities will be focused on cooperation in a variety of areas including sports, the arts, academic and/or professional interests; and to ensure the continuation of practical cooperative activity among the young people involved in its projects.

The idea of the International Youth Camp originated in discussions between Irish, Soviet, and American delegates at the Conference on International Tourism in May 1987. Work on

the development of the concept has been continuous since that time.

I wish to commend the Centre for International Cooperation from this outstanding initiative. Just as it is the goal of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs to find a peaceful solution to the problems that plague Ireland and Northern Ireland, the aims of the centre are admirable as it seeks to counter the atmosphere of mistrust and hostility that exists between the people of the Republic of Ireland and the North of Ireland.

I wish to thank U.S. Program Representative Linda Eastman for taking the time to share this exciting program with us, and to wish her much continued success and good luck.

**TRIBUTE TO MARY ANN  
CAMPANA**

**HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to pay tribute to Mary Ann Campana, an outstanding citizen from my 17th Congressional District of Ohio.

Ms. Campana has made numerous contributions to the field of aviation and the cause of women. At the age of 18, she became the first woman in Ohio to receive her pilot's license. On June 4, 1933, at only 19 years of age, Mary Ann Campana established the world light airplane endurance record of 12 hours, 27 minutes, exceeding the old mark by more than 1 hour.

Ms. Campana immigrated to the United States from Italy with her parents when she was 8 years old. She was educated in the Youngstown school system, where she attended Oak Street and Lincoln Elementary Schools and East High School. She went on to attend Youngstown College.

Saturday, June 4, 1988, will mark the 55th anniversary of Mary Ann Campana's historic flight. She will be feted by several local and State organizations on this day, and I find it only fitting that we in the House do the same.

To this day Mary Ann Campana still resides in Ohio and continues to serve as an inspiration to many. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pride to pay tribute to such a fine lady and a true pioneer.

**INTRODUCING A BILL TO REAUTHORIZE THE OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS**

**HON. GERRY SIKORSKI**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce, along with my colleague, Congressman FRANK McCLOSKEY, a bill to reauthorize the Office of Government Ethics for an additional 6 years. OGE was established by title IV of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 and reauthorized for 5 years in 1983. Its

current authorization expires on September 30, 1988, the end of this fiscal year.

The Office of Government Ethics has the extremely important task of providing "overall direction of executive branch policies related to preventing conflicts of interest on the part of officers and employees of any executive agency." The Office has responsibility for matters involving public and confidential financial disclosure requirements for executive branch personnel; "revolving door" or post-employment conflicts of interest; other criminal conflict of interest restrictions; and standards of conduct for executive branch employees. In fact, under the Ethics in Government Act, the Director of the Office of Government Ethics is charged with 15 separate and significant responsibilities.

While OGE is a major policymaker and serves as the overseer and watchdog of the entire executive branch "ethics system," each executive branch agency head has first line responsibility for the administration of all so-called ethics in government programs within his or her agency.

To assist them in this task, agency heads appoint designated agency ethics officials [DAEO's]. Each DAEO is responsible for the day-to-day management and coordination of his or her respective agency's ethics program and acts on behalf of the agency head. A DAEO's duties include administering the public financial disclosure requirements of title II of the Ethics Act, initiating and maintaining ethics education and training programs, monitoring administrative actions and sanctions, and serving as a liaison with OGE with regard to all aspects of the agency ethics program. Each DAEO must ensure that the agency establish and maintain an effective ethics program, consisting of the numerous elements set forth in the Ethics in Government Act regulations.

Over the past 3 years, the two Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittees I have chaired have devoted a substantial amount of time to examining the workings of this executive branch ethics system. We have held a series of hearings looking at agency ethics programs, allegations of ethical misconduct by several executive branch employees, and the role, organization, operation and performance of OGE.

Subcommittee examination of particular cases and of the executive branch ethics system as a whole show that it is not functioning as it should. In August 1987, for example, the subcommittee conducted an inquiry into the filing and review of Attorney General Edwin Meese's financial disclosure forms. We learned that OGE's review had noted the "limited blind partnership" listed by the Attorney General, but completely failed to identify it as an irregular and improper arrangement. This case raised serious doubts about its adequacy of OGE review of other financial disclosure forms.

Through two other hearings, other problems were raised regarding the conflicts of interest that arise when government officials negotiate for employment with the private sector. In October 1987, the subcommittee considered the case of Mr. Robert Watkins, a high-level Commerce Department official who solicited em-

ployment from foreign auto manufacturers immediately after negotiating for the United States in trade talks with some of the same automakers. This case was especially disturbing in light of its similarity to that of Mary Ann Gilleece, examined by the Investigations Subcommittee in 1985. The Gilleece case involved a Defense Department Assistant Secretary who solicited employment from major defense contractors she was simultaneously regulating. Both the Watkins and the Gilleece affairs brought to light inadequacies in the ethics education and counseling available to executive branch employees. Unfortunately, however, it appears that pointing out the problem is not always the first step toward a remedy—the Watkins situation arose a full 2 years after we first examined the Gilleece case.

These subcommittee examinations and our September 1986 oversight hearing on the Office of Government Ethics itself have raised troublesome issues about the executive branch ethics system. We have found that OGE has not kept nor required agencies to keep even rudimentary management data necessary for adequate monitoring, management and oversight of the executive branch ethics programs.

OGE has made little use of the authority granted to it in 1983 to issue its own regulations.

OGE has frequently failed to monitor and follow-up on cases in which the Department of Justice declines criminal prosecution, though a standards of conduct violation may exist.

Furthermore, OGE has chosen not to use its authority to order corrective action by individuals and agencies.

The legislation I am introducing today is a step toward remedying this situation. Beyond merely reauthorizing the Office of Government Ethics, it carefully responds to the shortcomings in the current system. Rather than making sweeping, dramatic changes which will be ultimately unworkable and unacceptably expensive, this legislation addresses the problem areas within the context of the current ethics system. It leaves untouched that which has proven useful and changes only that which clearly needs to be changed. I will briefly describe some of the proposed changes contained in this bill.

Most importantly, the bill establishes, as of October 1, 1989, the Office of Government Ethics as an independent agency and makes the Director removable by the President only for "good cause." Taking the Office out from within the Office of Personnel Management and making it an independent entity will enable the OGE Director to more effectively carry out his often difficult and politically sensitive responsibilities. The good cause removal standard is necessary to ensure that the OGE Director is able to exercise independent judgment.

In addition, the legislation gives the Director the authority to appoint officers and employees and to contract with the General Services Administration or with other Federal agencies for administrative support services. As an independent establishment, the OGE will need these capabilities.

In an attempt to increase OGE's accountability to Congress and the people of the

United States, the legislation requires OGE to submit annual reports to Congress describing the actions taken by the Director in fulfillment of his or her statutory duties. OGE will also be required to promulgate regulations requiring each executive agency to submit an annual report to OGE describing and evaluating the various elements comprising the agency's ethics program. Such annual reports will ensure that OGE has available the basic management data it needs to develop truly effective leadership and perform effective oversight of agency ethics programs. These reports will also make agencies more accountable to OGE in the area of ethics.

The bill requires the Director of OGE to ensure that executive agencies establish proper, written procedures for the collection, filing, review, and public availability of financial disclosure statements. Our oversight of agency ethics programs has shown that agency evaluation of financial disclosure forms ranges from detailed conflicts analysis by attorneys using Standard and Poors, to haphazard review by unpaid summer interns. Requiring agencies to develop written procedures will provide continuity and help eliminate inconsistent and inadequate review of disclosure forms.

Next, the legislation requires the OGE Director to prescribe regulations requiring each agency to notify the Director when a violation or possible violation of law, rule, or regulation relating to conflict of interest, financial disclosure, or the standards of conduct is referred by the agency to the Attorney General or the President. This provision will ensure effective oversight and adequate administrative follow-up by OGE of cases in which criminal or civil prosecution is declined. Such notifications by agencies are not to be required if they are otherwise prohibited by law.

This bill also permits the Director of the Office of Government Ethics to request assistance from agency inspectors general in conducting any investigation relating to matters within the jurisdiction of the OGE Director. This provision merely extends the scope of the Director's current authority to request such assistance in cases involving financial disclosure.

Another important provision of the legislation gives the Director the authority to make findings and clarifies the current statutory language which gives the Director the responsibility for "ordering corrective action on the part of agencies and employees which the Director deems necessary." There has been widespread confusion concerning the exact meaning and scope of this authority. The legislation I am introducing makes explicit our intent that the Director of the Office of Government Ethics be permitted to order employees to take specific action to correct a violation of ethics laws or regulations. If the Director finds that the employee has not complied with the order and taken appropriate corrective action within a reasonable period of time, the Director will be required to notify the appropriate agency head or the President.

Last, but certainly not least, this legislation reauthorizes the Office of Government Ethics for 6 years, removing it from the current reauthorization cycle under which reauthorization coincides with presidential transition years.

This change, requested by OGE, will enable the Office to operate more efficiently and effectively in both of these important time periods. The legislation authorizes \$2,000,000 for OGE for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989 and such sums as may be necessary for the 5 years thereafter.

I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

## ONE THOUSAND YEARS OF ORTHODOX CHRISTIANITY IN RUSSIA

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, this September millions of Orthodox Christians throughout the world will gather to celebrate the 1,000th anniversary of the conversion of Russia to Orthodox Christianity. This occurrence led directly to the unification of the Russian people, an event with profound consequences in modern history.

Orthodox Christianity has been the inspiration for many. In the Soviet Union, the Russian Orthodox Church has been the locus for organized protest movements, and continues to function as a potent force for social progress. Throughout the world, Christianity has been a rallying call to arms and a claxon for peace. It has the power to make people sacrifice their lives in its name. Religion in general, and Orthodox Christianity in particular, has proven to be an impressive force in its own right.

Russian Orthodoxy has continued to serve as a small light of religious freedom in the sea of oppression that characterizes the Soviet Union. On Christmas Eve, the Soviet Government plays the most modern and exciting Western films in an attempt to lure churchgoers from mass. A recent survey of the theaters during Christmas Eve demonstrated, however, that the overwhelming majority of people who attended the movies were either Jewish, Muslim, or atheist. Despite the advent of glasnost, Orthodox Christianity continues to battle for survival in the Soviet Union.

Our hearts go out to these people, yet another symbol in the ongoing struggle for religious freedom. We commend the Russian Orthodox Church on reaching its millenium, and accomplishment that has seemed increasingly difficult as the 20th century has progressed. Its perseverance and longevity are inspirations to all of us who would give up when faced with overwhelming odds.

## THE ROTARY CLUB OF PATERSON: 75-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to salute an outstanding service organization in my Eighth Congressional

District of New Jersey which, for three-quarters of a century, has not only assisted individuals in need, but a wide range of other organizations whose common goal it is to serve the community, State, and Nation. I speak of the Rotary Club of Paterson No. 70 which this year is celebrating the 75th anniversary of its founding.

The Rotary Club of Paterson will commemorate its many notable years of service and unity with a gala evening of entertainment on Saturday, June 4, at The Park Ridge Marriott Hotel in New Jersey. I am certain that this affair, under the direction of Rotarian PDG Art Scialla, chairman of the 75th anniversary celebration, will be a terrific success.

Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to list all of the vital community endeavors that this fine organization has been involved in for the past 75 years. I would like to note, however, that this list includes giving aid to persons in need of hospital care, providing recreation facilities and groups for local youth, and working to ensure the health of newborns in the States and abroad. The Rotary Club of Paterson is one of thousands of Rotary Clubs around the world, including Australia and the United Kingdom. Most certainly, organizations such as this one are highly valued and greatly appreciated by many communities.

The Rotary Club of Paterson was organized in 1913 and was issued its charter on June 2 of the same year. Today, the esteemed leaders of the club must be filled with pride as they look back not only on the years of private successes within their ever expanding membership, but on the decades of widespread community causes they have championed.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a few of these outstanding gentlemen for the record. They include John B. Tiger, president, William B. Van Benthuysen, president-elect, Gordon R. Geiger, vice president, James H. Jesraly, secretary, Thomas V. Barone, treasurer, and John Manopoli, assistant treasurer. I will also mention the excellent board of directors: Robert Dalzell, Jamie Dykes, James Evans, Ron Farrington, Steve Fava, Brian Fischer, Peter Garafano, William Hannah, Nathaniel Liberman, Albert Manzo, David Meyer, Herbert H. Neelman, Howard Rosen, George Stickney.

Mr. Speaker, as this historic anniversary approaches, for the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to cite the history of the Rotary Club of Paterson No. 70 by quoting from their official literature:

**A BRIEF HISTORY—PATERSON ROTARY CLUB  
No. 70**

Less than eight years after Paul Harris and his small group of business friends began holding their regular luncheon meeting in Chicago, another group of community leaders held their first Rotary meeting on February 25, 1913 at Crawford's Restaurant in Paterson, New Jersey. Paul Harris' new idea for a professional men's service club was spreading rapidly in different parts of the country. In 1908, a club was formed in San Francisco; two years later it spread across the Canadian border to Winnipeg, Manitoba and then, a year after that, overseas to Dublin, Ireland. By the time that the Paterson Club was formed, there already were sixty nine other clubs. By 1988 there were over twenty three thousand

clubs with over a million members located in almost every country of the free world.

From its very beginnings, Paterson was a most unique city. Created out of the raw wilderness, it was an organized, planned development by a group of investors headed by the first Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, Alexander Hamilton. The group purchased much of the strategic land along the Passaic River for the establishment of mill sites in the name of the Society for the Establishment of Useful Manufactures—known as the SUM. They named their new city after William Paterson who was the first post-revolutionary governor of the state of New Jersey and one of the framers of the Constitution of the United States. Major Pierre L'Enfant, who planned the City of Washington, was engaged to lay out plans of Paterson. Unfortunately, the investors thought it too elaborate and settled for a more modest design.

Shortly after the forming of Paterson's Rotary Club, it began its long time assistance of the YMCA. In 1918, there was the purchase of a quantity of double deck sleeping cots and bedding for use at a summer camp at Greenwood Lake. The support for the needs of the YMCA continues to this day. In the mid-1940's the club gave major financial help for the construction of a large social hall at the YMCA's new summer camp at Silver Lake in Sussex County.

Another major interest has been in a regular support of the Paterson Memorial Day Nursery, which was one of the first centers in the United States created to help in the day care for the children of working mothers. Contributions have been regularly donated to help in the support of work being done by the Boys' Club, the Boy Scouts and, especially, the Salvation Army. Paterson has sponsored an "Interest" Club at Eastside High School, a service club for young people of secondary school age. They practice one of the tenets of International Rotary, "Service Above Self". With over 30 members they have undertaken projects such as visits to hospitalized children and encouragement of scholarship and higher education goals among Paterson High School students.

In an effort to develop programs in which young people can actively participate, the club has sponsored midget baseball teams and boxing club activities. In addition to financial assistance, many members of Club No. 70, have worked with the various groups and taken part in their activities on a regular basis.

Assistance to the local hospitals has been of special concern to the Paterson Rotary Club. Many of its members have been and are now serving on various hospital advisory boards. In the mid-1980's, the club furnished the Downtown Clinic of St. Joseph's Hospital with a fully equipped passenger van unit to transport patients who could not afford bus or taxi fare.

In recent years, the Paterson Club has been taking part in the Rotary Youth Exchange Program, wherein high school students are sent to study in foreign countries and students from those countries are brought to the U.S. for a year of study. Club No. 70, in cooperation with other clubs in District 749, has been active in the Gift of Life program in which Rotarian, Dr. Joseph Amato of Children's Hospital of New Jersey has saved the lives of many children from third world countries due to his great skills at open heart surgery. In 1988, the major drive of Rotary International has been the Polio Plus Program to immunize all of the

children of the world by 1990 against polio and five other vaccine preventable childhood diseases—measles, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus and tuberculosis. Rotary shares this commitment with the World Health Organization and UNICEF. Of the quota assigned by Rotary International to Club No. 70, Paterson has committed to just over 500% of its assigned goal.

Locally, Paterson Rotary has contributed funds and helped support the following organizations this year: Memorial Day Nursery; Board of Education, School No. 6; Lou Costello Sportsman Club; Don Bosco Technical High School; Jr. State Football Colts; Paterson Rotary Baseball Team; St. Joseph's Hospital & Medical Center; Paterson YMCA; Inner City Ensemble; Paterson Midget Basketball League; Paterson Boys' Club; Boy Scouts of America, Passaic Valley Council; Silk City Boxing Club; Eastside High School Interact Club.

Over the past 75 years, local, national and international figures have addressed the Paterson Rotary Club. In 1913, during the club's first year, there were raves about the presentation of Dr. Frederick A. Cook, the noted Arctic Explorer. Senator Bill Bradley, Governor Tom Kean, Mayor Frank Graves, Rabbi Martin Freedman, have been recent speakers.

Due to the immense size of the Rotary movement world wide with its thousands of clubs, a visit from a senior officer of Rotary International to a local club is a rare happening. Paterson has been most fortunate in this department. For its 75th Anniversary Celebration on June 4, 1988, the club is to be honored to have as its guest the President Elect of Rotary International for 1988-89, who will be the Keynote Speaker. He is Royce Abbey, from Greenvale, Australia.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to present this history of a service organization whose widespread efforts have greatly enriched the community, State, Nation, and beyond. We in Paterson are proud to host Rotary Club No. 70 with its dynamic history and members who have always put "Service Above Self." As the Rotary Club of Paterson celebrates its 75th anniversary, I know that you and all of our colleagues here in Congress will want to join me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations for their many accomplishments and worthy activities on behalf of the entire world community.

**SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY  
OF BLESSED VIRGIN MARY  
PARISH**

**HON. CURT WELDON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to extend my sincere congratulations to Msgr. Francis Schmidt and the members of the Blessed Virgin Mary Parish of Darby, PA, on the occasion of their 75th anniversary.

For 75 years now, the Blessed Virgin Mary Parish has been spreading the word of Christ and providing spiritual guidance to its parishioners and the residents of Darby Borough and Delaware County. The charitable works and excellent record of community service by

its members simply proves the overwhelming success of their efforts.

It is with great pride that I offer my most sincere congratulations to all of the priests and parishioners of Darby Borough's Blessed Virgin Mary Parish. I am sure that they will continue to guide, assist, and service the residents of our region for another 75 years, and beyond.

**RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT:  
IS MORE SPENDING THE  
ANSWER?**

**HON. JACK F. KEMP**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, all of us want to increase the competitiveness of American enterprise, though we may disagree on the best means to achieve this. There seems to be a fairly wide agreement on the idea that one important way to become more competitive is to spend more on research and development.

While I agree that we want to encourage research and development, there is good reason to doubt that throwing more money at the problem, by itself, will be any more effective in this area than it has been in other areas.

David Soergel is an expert in research and development and Federal procurement policies, whose work I have followed for many years. In recent testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, he explained why proper incentives—putting individual entrepreneurs on the same footing with large corporations—are essential if devoting more resources to R&D is really to result in innovation and improved competitiveness.

Some will find Mr. Soergel's comments and conclusions controversial, but everyone involved in the subject will find his ideas stimulating. I commend this important testimony to my colleagues.

The article follows:

COMMENTS BY D.G. SOERGEL

Thank you for the invitation to comment on the SASC Subcommittee's Issues List, regarding DoD acquisition policy and management.

The List is indeed most comprehensive, covering as it does both internal DoD issues and issues involving the complex spectrum of Defense Industry-DoD relations pre, during, and post contracting.

Some of the 36 issues, in my view, could be aggregated and addressed in the context of the larger issue of the effectiveness of competition between independent weapon designers and producers. For example, Issue 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 relate innovation incentives for new designs to independent R&D. Would more innovative designs be motivated as a consequence of increased IR&D reimbursement? On the face of it, it would seem that the answer would be "yes." The more the better seems to rule here.

But we ought to probe deeper. By far the bulk of defense contract IR&D/B&P overhead reimbursements goes to about 100 of DoD's largest contractors (\$3.4 billion in 1985 by DCAA audit), with smaller DoD contractors reimbursed proportionately less IR&D/B&P. These funds are both paid and

subsidized by taxpayers (tax deductible by Section 174 of the tax code) and in fact put a double whammy on newcomers into DoD's R&D's markets. Also, the funds are pre-negotiated into the overhead of the contractor's defense contracts. They are non-competitively awarded to current contractors (not to newcomers) for proposing new weapons business.

Because IR&D/B&P funds are equivalent to Applied Research funds—both start selected ideas toward final development—and because DoD sets-aside only 15% of the large firms' IR&D for competitive procurement, DoD's 100 largest firms are a "leg-up" on all other competitive bidders for new system R&D awards. They don't have to compete for their earliest "seed capital" because IR&D/B&P is pre-negotiated into the overhead of their existing contracts.

This negotiation, rather than competition, acts as an effective shield against newcomers into major system R&D markets, and IR&D/B&P becomes more a competition inhibitor than enhancer. DoD's tens of thousands of smaller contractors, and especially newcomers who are not yet federal contractors, cannot afford equivalent independent R&D and proposal expenditures in order to stay competitive and subsequently compete against the largest contractors for system prototypes or full-scale developments.

The rationale for negotiation rather than competition seems to be that the firms best qualified to innovate new systems for the future are the ones that had innovated new systems in the past—for some, in the dimming past. This is a false premise for fashioning weapon acquisition policy, as proven time and again by many empirical research studies which located actual sources for well-known innovations.

For example, Issue Alert #8, "Innovation in Small Firms," SBA, July 1982, concluded that the early 20th century notion—market power and innovation are more likely to occur together—cannot be supported by research. Major innovations, those having had the greatest impact on society and the economy, were most often found in industries of medium concentration (shipments by the four largest firms were 21 to 40 percent of the total). Many have come from newcomers to an established industry; Chester Carlson, the inventor of "Xerox" for example, who revolutionized the office equipment industry.

The defense industry, on the other hand, is a highly concentrated industry. Two firms ship 100% of DoD's total fighter aircraft market; one firm, 100% of Army's tank market; two (shortly one) firms, 100% of the USAF's bomber market, and so on.

Indeed, the supply-side of DoD's marketplace is trending towards unchallengeable monopolies for weapon-types, reinforcing defense industry economic concentrations and decreasing competitiveness within the defense industry as a whole.

So, as we continue to analyze the six IR&D/B&P issues within the context of design competitions, we begin to sense that we are heading in the wrong direction. Competition should be applied to independent design teams during the earliest design phases, where small Applied Research dollars leverage high production dollars. Competition should not be delayed until prototype competitions, final development competitions, or production leader-follower competitions when production prices and qualities have already been locked-in by the much earlier Applied Research expenditures. Designers, after all, are the ones who

decide the prices and qualities of materials, components, and subsystems for integration into new systems. And, by those decisions which are made during the earliest design phases, designers do in fact lock-in the majority of a new system's downstream production price and quality.

Obviously, less competition during design means less motivation to use adequate but least cost parts in new system designs, such as non-developmental items that had been developed by someone else. Engineers are in the business of new designs. And the more new design required in a new system, the higher the fee for the company.

A related comment. The Issues List did not address the impact on industrial competitiveness caused by R&D activities performed in-house by DoD's 111 laboratories, which employ 30,000 scientists and engineers, and within Federally-Funded R&D Centers (FFRDCs) that support DoD on a sole-source contract basis.

These private labs (FFRDCs) and public labs (DoD) are tax exempt, non-producing R&D performers. They non-competitively spend the bulk of DoD's non-IR&D/B&P Applied Research funds (\$1.4 billion, 1985) for their own in-house R&D work, which mainly consists of research on new materials, components, and subsystems for yet unspecified new systems. They start parts of new systems, but don't finish them through production. Therefore, while they are given decision authority for elements of new systems, they are at the same time shielded against responsibility for system outcomes. Since system designers are required to use the products for their work, most new system designs are very similar and exhibit little innovative span and choice for operators.

When this \$1.4 billion (1985) non-competitive Applied Research is connected to the \$3.4 billion (1985) of prenegotiated (not completed) IR&D/B&P, we can accurately conclude that the "military-industrial complex" is alive and well.

Indeed, as President Eisenhower warned, by DoD's noncompetitive tax expenditure as outlined above, the complex has put itself into an ideal position for discouraging anyone—individuals, emerging enterprises, Small (Technical) Businesses, commercial firms—who would be so brash as to try to break into the weapon systems market which is now controlled by an oligopoly of large defense contractors.

In summary, it is my belief that many of the 36 Issues could be aggregated under a still larger issue, that of competition between independent weapon designers at the earliest phases of weapon design. It is there relatively small dollars that lock-in major contributions to a weapons production cost and quality. They should be spent within a competitive environment. The long-sought effective and affordable weapon system acquisition policy will come from the institution of new policies which require head-to-head competitions between independent system designers at the least-cost-to-enter Applied Research phase of weapon's innovation.

This earliest use of design competition, with the highest leverage to drive ultimate production prices down and qualities up, should open the door to qualified newcomers by giving them the same independent technical and proposal cost benefits, as currently enjoyed only by established contractors through large scale IR&D/B&P cost reimbursements. Also, these earliest competitions should be designed to centralize to the

competitive system designers the authorities, accountabilities, and responsibilities for the development of new materials and components tailored to the needs of their competing dissimilar systems. This amounts to an effective hedging strategy against uncertain technologies and projected geopolitical events and combat scenarios and, in the long run, will cause a much needed widening of DoD's surge mobilization base for conventional weapons.

The above limited (and incomplete) analysis illustrates the power of synthesizing several issues to a higher order. It keeps one focused on "the forest by not getting lost in the trees," which, because of four decades of "word smithing" and tinkering is quite easy to do. Perhaps the 36 Issues of the staff paper (the "trees") could be boiled down by aggregating to 3 or 4 principal issues (the "forest").

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

#### ABOUT THE AUTHOR

David Griffith Soergel is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin (BSEE) and Washington University, St. Louis (MS, Applied Mechanics). He was awarded all undergraduate and graduate academic honors.

He has been employed by major defense contractors in various high level line and staff positions, and by the congressional 1972 Procurement Commission.

Mr. Soergel has produced twenty-one public policy research reports sponsored by twelve federal agencies, testified before congressional committees as an expert in federal policies for procurement and R&D, and has been published extensively with most entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

He currently is Executive Director, the Vebel Society, Inc., a nonprofit public interest corporation chartered to inform and educate the general public about tax-financed policies that promote venture inequality before the law throughout the national economy.

#### MEMORIAL DAY 1988

### HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, once again, we mark another Memorial Day, a day established to honor our Nation's fallen warriors. While all Americans can happily rejoice in the fact that our country is not at war, we must also remember that a number of Americans have died this year in defense of the unique and precious freedom and liberty enjoyed by the American people.

Even as we speak, thousands of young Americans are patrolling the skies, crossing the waves, or standing guard in far-flung spots across the globe. Their service and their sacrifice are on behalf of every American.

We live during troubled and violent times in an often troubled and violent world. History all too frequently has demonstrated the truth in the maxim that if we want peace, we must be prepared for war.

Our Armed Forces, and the men and women who proudly and bravely wear and have worn the uniform of all the branches and components of the U.S. Army, the U.S. Navy, the U.S. Marine Corps, and the U.S. Air Force,

serve in the cause of peace by being prepared at a moment's notice to defend the United States. On occasion, it is not enough to be strong; deterrence alone has not sufficed.

The truth is the American people have been slow to anger. Once provoked, however, the American soldier, sailor, marine, and airman has always fought courageously and tenaciously. Frequently though, the United States has not been prepared for war. The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, the single greatest military disaster in American history, is cited—quite justifiably—as the most graphic illustration of a sleeping giant, of a United States, unprepared to do anything but re-fight its last war. This lack of preparation, of planning, and of national will has had tragic consequences.

All Americans should be proud that we are a nation of democratic and humane principles and values. Americans tend to prefer peace to war and negotiations to aggression as the way to resolve international disputes. I hope that this will always be the case. At the same time, in a violent and dangerous world, a world filled with powerful regimes fundamentally opposed to individual freedom and liberty, a world replete with smaller states, groups, and people with a strong and decided predilection toward irrational and cowardly acts of terrorism, barbarism, and outrage, the United States needs a strong, effective, and flexible military.

Throughout our history, thousands of Americans have died while wearing their country's uniform in combat ranging from the opening skirmishes of the American Revolution at Lexington and Concord to the most recent armed clashes in the Persian Gulf. Millions of men and women have answered their country's call to arms; thousands did not survive to enjoy the liberty and opportunity so many of their countrymen take for granted.

Mr. Speaker, as the final sad, poignant notes of the lone trumpet echo through the hills and valleys of Arlington National Cemetery, I hope that all Americans will reflect on the values and principles of our great country and people. As we mark this Memorial Day, all Americans should take a moment for reflection, a moment to remember and honor those who have served and died in the cause of peace and freedom.

#### ST GERMAIN-LAFALCE INTRODUCE BILL EXTENDING FSLIC MORATORIUM

### HON. JOHN J. LAFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join my colleague, Chairman ST GERMAIN, in introducing legislation that will extend for 1 year the moratorium on thrifts leaving the FSLIC which was imposed under the Competitive Equality Banking Act of 1987. It is my hope that this proposal can be incorporated into the banking bill that the Banking Committee will soon be considering.

When Congress imposed a 1-year moratorium on the departure of thrifts from the FSLIC,

it was with the hope and expectation that, in a year's time, the recapitalization plan also approved under CEBA would have put the insurance fund on a sound footing, and there would be no inducement for healthy S&L's to leave the system.

Unfortunately, we have not made the progress we had hoped. I fault the Bank Board for not acknowledging that fact. Representations that all is well as we are piling up debt for future reckoning serve no one's interest.

I note that the Bank Board has endorsed the proposed extension. I would hope that reflects a realization of the seriousness of the problems which remain and how much work needs to be done. But, I must emphasize that extension of the moratorium is no solution; it provides only a window of opportunity for us to work together to find one.

The Board must not use the extension as an excuse to pursue business as usual. I urge the Board to move quickly on its riskbased assessment proposal so as to reduce burdens on our healthier institutions. Proposals for thrift charter enhancement, at least on a case-by-case basis, must also be given serious consideration to provide some inducement for our strongest thrifts to remain in the system. And it is time to take a serious look at proposals to merge FSLIC and FDIC.

Frankly, we must now once again buy time while we reach for a long-term solution. I do not like that. But I am increasingly dubious that we have any real choice.

While I am certainly willing to give the \$10.8 billion recapitalization plan approved last year a chance, I am increasingly skeptical. Recent events are not encouraging. The market seems wary of the FICO bonds. Little progress is being made in closing insolvent S&L's. Losses continue to accumulate in hundreds of insolvent thrifts across the country, pushing up estimates of the ultimate cost of restructuring the industry.

At this precarious point, a flight of healthy institutions from the FSLIC would be devastating. Yet they have less and less reason to stay.

Congress must devise a permanent, workable solution to the serious problems facing our thrift industry, not rely on stopgap measures that will drive healthy institutions away. But, as we work together to seek such a solution, we must maintain a minimum level of stability in the system. The St Germain-LaFalce bill is intended to provide the window of opportunity we need.

Congress must use that opportunity to develop a comprehensive reform program. With each day that passes, the problems mount and opportunities to avert a serious crisis grow more elusive. For that reason, the bill will extend the moratorium for only a year. By then, I believe we must have a comprehensive program in place.

#### PROSPECTS FOR A FLIGHT FROM THE FSLIC SYSTEM

The moratorium is now scheduled to expire on August 10 of this year. At that point, healthy S&L's that qualify will be able to leave FSLIC and transfer to FDIC insurance. Given the continuing pressures within the system, the risk that a large number of healthy thrifts will do so is very real.

William Isaac, former Chairman of the FDIC, has estimated that a third of the Nation's savings and loan associations could qualify to transfer. He has also emphasized that, if the special assessment is not phased out, the cost of staying in the FSLIC could be three times the penalties imposed on those institutions that decide to leave.

Officials of many healthy S&L's have warned that they will indeed seek to leave the system, particularly if their obligation rises above current levels or if the special assessment continues. Given recent events, circumstances are ripe for flight.

There is growing evidence and increasing concern that the \$10.8 billion recapitalization provided for last year will prove inadequate to the task. Each day the perceived gap in needed funds appears to grow. Some estimates of funds needed to handle failing S&L's now range upward of \$50 billion.

On April 1, the Bank Board announced that it would not begin the phase-out of the special assessment on FSLIC members. The CEBA legislation has called for a 5-year phase-out of the special premium assessment. However, it also gave the Board discretion not to implement the requirement if it believed that severe pressures on FSLIC exist.

Many in the industry have accused the Board of breaking faith. I believe that is too strong. Congress provided an escape valve for a reason, however much we hoped it would not need to be used. The Board's acknowledgement of how serious the problems are cannot be taken lightly.

But, the resulting pressures are pushing our healthier thrifts to flee the FSLIC. If we permit that to happen before a viable solution is in place, we may completely lose the opportunity to put the industry as a whole back on firm ground.

While I, therefore, support an extension of the moratorium, I believe that the concerns of our healthier thrifts must be addressed. The special assessments put debilitating burdens on these institutions, prompting the talk of departure. The extra pressure is particularly damaging to institutions that are weak, but are still viable. A program that sacrifices the healthier thrifts to the failing ones is no program at all.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF A RISK-BASED ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

I am only too aware that it is impossible to turn the industry around by holding healthy institutions hostage and depleting their resources. If we are to extend the moratorium, I believe that action must be coupled with responsible efforts to alleviate undue burdens on both healthy thrifts, and those that are somewhat weak, but are nonetheless well-managed and still basically sound. It is the latter institutions that warrant particular concern and attention.

The Board's proposed adoption of a risk-based assessment is, I believe, a serious effort to do that. I support that effort and I urge the Board to move quickly to put a program in place that will allow our healthier institutions to stabilize and grow. The Board must not use the extension of the moratorium to delay action on this important initiative.

However, I do have some serious reservations about elements of the proposal. The

Board would choose to measure risk by capital levels. Clearly, capital levels create the necessary buffer for the insurance fund. But other factors, such as quality of assets and management capability must be taken into account. A thrift with a 4-percent capital level and a very conservative portfolio should not necessarily be judged to be in a far riskier position than a thrift with 6-percent capital and a high percentage of high-risk investments.

It is also imperative, in my view, that any risk-based system hold out significant relief for those institutions in the middle. These are institutions that may not be completely healthy but can be turned around and become strong members of the industry, making a positive contribution to the financial health of FSLIC. One option the Board is considering would cut the assessment for this group by 50 percent. An even greater inducement should be considered, even if that might mean maintaining some drastically reduced assessment on the healthiest institutions.

#### THRIFT CHARTER ENHANCEMENT

Thrift charter enhancement also holds out a real prospect of drawing new capital into the system. We must weigh such proposals carefully. There are two competing policy objectives. While we want to increase the attractiveness of troubled thrifts, we do not want to reward those institutions that have performed poorly with new grants of authority. We must strike the proper balance.

In my view, we could do that by providing for case-by-case reviews by the regulators. Authorities could be expanded in those specific situations where the regulators have determined that the thrift is adequately managed and the acquirer is contributing the necessary capital.

#### CONCLUSION

I believe it is time that we consider some long-term, comprehensive solutions to the serious problems that remain. Some proposals are already under discussion, such as the recommendation to merge the FDIC and FSLIC funds advanced by my colleague Mr. KLECZKA and the thrift charter enhancement proposal advocated by my colleague Mr. BARNARD.

But, realistically, these may well be matters for the next Congress to consider. August is very nearly upon us. While we work toward a more permanent solution, we must temporarily insulate the thrift industry and its insurance fund from any further blows.

### THE DILEMMA OF A GOLDEN AGE

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, enterprising American scientists are making dramatic progress in areas such as high-temperature superconductivity, biotechnology, photonics, ceramics and manufacturing sciences, to name a few. Advances in these fields will revolutionize our way of life and make us more competitive in global markets.

Naturally, scientists are excited by these breakthroughs. So until now they've been con-

tent to fight vigorously for Federal funding for all science projects. Since I am the only doctoral-level scientist in the Congress, I might be expected to do the same. But to stay within the budget, we've got to set some priorities for science funding. The bottom line is that we can't support crucial training and research and still fund all the megaprojects on the drawing board—the Superconducting Super Collider, the mapping of the human genome, the space station, the revitalization of the space shuttle program, and others.

We spend over \$62 billion annually on science, and we need to spend that money wisely. We're not doing that now: we're using raw politics to make our choices, while our competitors outpace us by focusing on global competitiveness. Some science funding decisions should be decided by the political process. But there's room for another process as well.

Finally, Members of Congress and others are calling for some priority setting. Until recently, the science and technology community was not involved in this debate. Now, however, voices in the scientific community are calling for involvement in the decisionmaking process and unity behind some greater priority setting.

Dr. Frank Press, the President of the National Academy of Sciences, recently spoke to the NAS members and admonished them to stop "carping and sniping" and unite behind their views of America's priorities. Dr. Press proposes a "cross-cutting review" of the budget proposal, a coordinated process under the President's science adviser, and—most importantly—a system for ranking science projects. The highest priority projects would be those necessary to respond to national crises (such as AIDS), those following up on major scientific breakthroughs (such as superconductivity) and those necessary to train the next generation of scientists.

The second priority would go to megaprojects such as the Superconducting Super Collider or the mapping of the human genome. These projects could be funded at maintenance levels until new funding became available. Finally, projects such as the space station and (in his view) the Department of Defense research and development budget, where the political decisions are the crucial ones, would get a third priority.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Press' suggestions are a positive step in the right direction. I urge all Members of Congress to become more concerned with setting priorities for funding American science. I am including the full text of Dr. Press' remarks, entitled "The Dilemma of the Golden Age," in the RECORD. I hope that his remarks prove useful to all Members.

#### THE DILEMMA OF THE GOLDEN AGE

(By Frank Press, President, National Academy of Sciences)

In recent years, I have used this occasion to discuss the Academy—its projects, its influence, and its relations with the government and our society. Today, however, I want to talk with you about the state of science and the scientific community in America. These are confused and troubling times for us. Limits on resources have made visible serious differences within our community, differences that may weaken the na-

tion's scientific enterprise if they are not resolved without acrimony.

We face the dilemma of living in both the best and worst of times. In all fields of science, the journals and professional meetings are filled with exciting and challenging reports of new discoveries, new ideas, new applications. At the same time, President Reagan's proposed budget for 1989 is the strongest budget in support of science and technology in recent history. Yet, that budget is in difficulty with an essentially pro-science congress, and it has divided the scientific community. The United States supports more scientific research than Western Europe and Japan combined, and our system of universities, and national, and industrial laboratories is the envy of the world. Why then is our community in an unprecedented state of stress and internal disension? That is the issue I want to confront. That is the dilemma that we as an Academy must confront.

*The Dilemma of the Golden Age.*—We all believe that scientific exploration has intrinsic cultural and intellectual values of the deepest kind, and deserves widespread support on these grounds. However, we also know that the large resources allocated by governments to scientific research find their justification on more pragmatic grounds so well symbolized in the inscription in the dome of the Great Hall: "To science, pilot of industry, conqueror of disease, multiplier of the harvest. . . ." Indeed, throughout history the patrons of science have understood the potential of new scientific knowledge as an instrument of public welfare, of power, of national security, and of national economic strength.

Science has been faithful to that compact—that the American people for their support of science could in time expect a better life and a stronger nation. And we continue to honor that compact, so much so that this can indeed be called the "Golden Age of Science"—a time of unprecedented progress in scientific discovery and its applications.

A confluence of circumstances accounts for the golden age: the large number of scientists at work all over the world; the high level of financial support by governments and industries; the availability support by governments and industries; the availability of small and large instruments of extraordinary sensitivity that make possible experiments of a precision and scale previously unachievable; new mathematical and theoretical tools; and easy access to computers and electronic information transfer, facilitating the rapid acquisition and analysis of large amounts of data.

These tools and support drive an ever-changing science. New scientific fields are being created as traditional fields merge or are redefined. We've seen that with molecular biology, materials science, photochemistry, and microelectronics. We see that with emergent disciplines—in the mathematics of chaos, in optoelectronics, in the exploitation of quantum effects by surface scientists.

Whatever their professional origins, physicists, chemists, biologists, and engineers, and their ideas come together to pursue the new ideas. Boundaries between basic and applied research are eroding and in many fields the time between a discovery and its commercialization is now measured in years, rather than decades. It is a sign of our times and of the state of science that industrial scientists have won Nobel Prizes in physics two years in a row, and university professors have become successful entrepreneurs.

The changing nature of science leads to experimentation with new institutions for conducting scientific and engineering research, such as interdisciplinary science centers and technology centers involving academic and industrial participants on university campuses. Shared facilities housing large and expensive equipment are becoming more common, attracting researchers from across the nation.

The dilemma lies in that very exuberance—in that golden age of discovery and advance. Our scientists are submitting in record numbers proposals of the highest quality, with enormous intellectual and material potential. We have also laid on the budget table very large and very expensive new ventures—in multiple fields from high-energy physics to molecular biology, whose time in the progress of science has arrived. The proposals—small and large—are superb in quality, but unprecedented in overall cost. And the reality is that these proposals come at a time of record budget deficits.

There is the heart of the dilemma. It is not the lack of political support for science. Political decision makers in the executive branch and Congress no longer need convincing that leadership of American science and technology is vital to our nation's future. The real political issue is what does science most urgently need to retain its strength and its excellence.

The issues are funding levels and priorities. Our political leadership has no way of gauging the amount of resources necessary to maintain the strength of American science and technology. What it does see is that the inevitable competition for funds leads to conflicting advice from within the scientific community. It learns of caustic debates among scientists in our journals and in the press. And it sees issues at times frame simplistically, as in the arguments of "big science," as embodied in the superconducting supercollider and the genome sequencing project, and "small science" as represented by scientists working alone or in small teams. Arguments over funding priorities spill over into intellectual attacks on the worthiness of one field of research by practitioners of another. We see confrontation and competition bordering on the unseemly between basic and applied work, between traditional and new fields, between modes of doing research, from the single investigator to centers. At a time when we should revel in dazzling progress in almost every field of science, this sniping and carping among scientists is disturbing and destructive.

The seemingly intractable problem of setting priorities in the allocation of R&D funds has dominated the discussions at our Academy's regional meetings and it consumes my correspondence and conversations with members. We scientists, who recommend the rationality and orderly process of our profession to government policy makers, are fast losing our credibility for being balanced, fair, and analytical. Our internal disension and the mixed, conflicting, and self-serving advice emanating from our community are threatening our ability to inform wise policy making. I can think of no more important set of issues to address to the annual meeting this year.

*The Reagan budget proposal.*—The concerns over the future of American science are joined in the preparation and approval of the federal budget. The issues of allocating resources and setting priorities cannot be understood without an appreciation of the federal budget process. So, let us look at

the Reagan budget proposed for FY 1989. The President is to be commended for the statement of support for science implicit in his substantial budget initiatives for civil science and technology. He proposes a 29 percent increase over 1988 for budget function 250 which includes the National Science Foundation, NASA's Space Research and Technology programs, and the Department of Energy's general science program. He requests a 5.1 percent increase for the National Institutes of Health. The budget also signals approval and initial funding for the SSC, the genome sequencing project, and the space station. Whether or not one agrees with the specific details, the proposals carry the positive message that support of science and technology is essential to this nation's future.

The President's budget adheres to the bipartisan budget summit agreement reached after last year's stock market collapse. That agreement limits increases in total non-defense discretionary spending to \$3.1 billion. That is a 2 percent increase, a virtually static budget. The President's budget hits this limit by allocating almost all of the allowable increase to science, space, and technology, rather than to social programs, such as housing and community development.

But that decision tests political reality. It leaves Congress in the unenviable position of deciding between a budget that enhances America's long-term competitiveness and one more responsive to near-term humanitarian needs and other domestic projects.

Most impartial observers agree that the political process will result in a redirection of the President's budget, with a transfer of some funds to social programs. Several House and Senate committees have already announced such a step.

I believe that it is feckless and destructive for the scientific community to argue "for science at the expense of the homeless", as one congressman put it. It is also unrealistic to argue for generous funding of both science and social programs until the deficit is brought under control. Nevertheless, I believe that we have to make positive and responsible proposals that will strengthen American science and technology. Those proposals include suggesting criteria for setting priorities. I will address such criteria, as I will the system of developing science budgets. Here too, I will offer proposals that, I believe, are not politically stillborn, and that build on the goodwill of public officials towards science.

*Criteria for Priorities.*—Our colleagues are divided on the issue of establishing priorities across fields. At regional meetings of the Academy we are told by some participants that no one in the scientific community is wise enough to set priorities among fields. Many urge us not to enter what they feel can only be a quagmire. Some believe that we should support all of the science initiatives on the table, that to propose a list of priorities will only serve to divide our community and to insure a reduced budget. Some argue that large science initiatives have historically been accomplished by increases in the entire science budget—small and large. Some propose that tradeoffs with other national needs, such as social programs and national security, should not enter into our considerations and our strategy. And, finally, there are protagonists for specific projects or categories—the SSC, space station, genome sequencing, superconductivity, small science projects, etc.—who argue for their priority at the expense of others.

I say that we have to do better and I would like to propose criteria for the allocation of resources that are appropriate for the unprecedented federal deficit, and the state of science and technology. They are politically realistic and responsive to congressional requests for advice. My soundings of the scientific community lead me to believe that they are the least divisive. They are based on two premises. One is that we must seek to maintain American leadership in science and technology. The other is that we will steadily overcome the current national budget deficit crisis, as demanded by all thoughtful leaders in national government, industry, finance, education, and state government.

**Category 1.**—To be funded now with highest priority—at a time of budgetary constraint when all agency budgets will be limited. I include in that:

1. Preserving the human resource base and the pipeline<sup>1</sup> for science and technology. This means absolute priority for training and research grants reaching the largest number of scientists, engineers, clinical researchers. This encompasses the funding of research universities and national laboratories in categories reaching the largest number of investigators and graduate students. Examples include NIH, NSF, DOE allocations that reach individuals and small groups, fellowships and assistantships, NASA space science grants, DOE basic energy sciences, mission agency research.

2. National crises, e.g., R&D for AIDS, renewing the nation's space launch capacity.

3. Extraordinary scientific breakthroughs, e.g., high temperature superconductivity.

**Category 2.**—Large projects, with important national or scientific goals, to be authorized now. If full funding must be delayed beyond the present because of the budget deficit crisis, let it be so. However, sufficient funding should be made available to maintain the project until such time as large-scale commitments can be made. Examples:

1. SSC.

2. Mapping and sequencing the human genome.

**Political category.**—Prerogatives of the political system. Priority has traditionally been decided on the basis of value judgments by elected officials in the executive branch and Congress. Examples include:

1. The DOD R&D budget and national security.

2. The Space Station.

3. Regional economic development, and employment.

4. Projects that enhance the U.S. image like manned space flight, or projects with significant contributions by foreign governments.

5. Initiatives to enhance U.S. "competitiveness" e.g., education, training, civil sector R&D.

It may be wise for huge multibillion-dollar projects like the space station to be left for major funding decisions by the next President, who will be in office in a scant eight months, and will have the responsibility for seeing them done.

The rationale for these categories is, I believe, straightforward. Above all, the science base must be maintained and even strengthened. And that means support for our ablest men and women with the best ideas. We

<sup>1</sup> It is especially important to attract more Americans now that a substantial fraction of our graduate students in science and engineering are no longer American.

must confront national crises such as AIDS and our sudden incapacity in space. And we must not be left behind when a major breakthrough occurs, such as with superconductivity.

Finally, although we may have to slow them down temporarily, we cannot shy away from major scientific opportunities simply because they cost a lot.

Basic to these criteria for establishing priorities is my belief that a great nation like the United States can and should undertake all of these initiatives—and can do so in the near term. I also believe, with others, that the next administration, with bipartisan support, must recommend a mix of budgetary cuts, reallocations, and revenue increases over a period of a few years. Those actions hopefully will remove the deficit crisis as a factor limiting the resources that can be committed to education, science and technology. The argument in favor of such support is irresistible—the creation of wealth required to increase living standards and attend to other national needs can only flow from increased productivity, of the kind generated by new knowledge and a well-trained workforce. And if the trends initiated by President Reagan in the relationship between the superpowers continue, future Presidents may even be able to justify substantial reallocation of resources from the military to the civil sector.

**Government Organization for Science and Technology Budgeting.**—Part of the difficulty with the budget and appropriation process can be attributed to the disarray of the federal government's system for developing the science and technology budget. It is astounding but true that nowhere in the federal budget-making process is there an evaluation of the complete federal budget for science and technology and its overall rationale in terms of national goals. Funds are requested by some fifteen federal departments and agencies without coordination. Requests appear in the budget process as fourteen separate budget functions, spread over at least six divisions of the Office of Management and Budget, and requiring approval by nine appropriations committees in Congress, with input from a number of budget and authorization committees.

I do not argue for a centralized Department of Science and Technology. That would be a disaster. Nor do I propose a politically unachievable change in the complex structure of congressional budget, authorization, and appropriation committees. However, I believe that with the growth and impact of R&D expenditures that now amount to \$62 billion, there is now a need to assure a cross-cutting review of the budget proposal, in both the executive branch and the Congress. At present the process examines how each agency's science and technology budget meets the agency's mission. It is now necessary to review how the aggregate science and technology budget serves such national goals as competitiveness, health, security, and world position. It is also important to understand the impact of the overall budget on training and on equipment and facility needs.

It is feasible to do so within the existing governmental structure. I agree with those who propose that in the future the President's science advisor, working with the OMB director, should be given the coordinating role within the executive branch, and should assume the responsibility for providing the rationale for a coherent and adequate federal science and technology budget. This function would have to be car-

ried out, as so many have said, as an instrument of presidential policy, as a resource to OMB, and not as special pleading for scientists.

It is preferable—in fact, it may be the only way to make the system work—for a President to direct his science advisor to assume this function as a part of the organization of the White House staff, rather than seeking to mandate this function by statute of Congress. To be effective in such a role, a science advisor must have authority and standing; elsewhere I have proposed that the science advisor be named a member of the Cabinet without portfolio or a full Assistant to the President to carry out these and other duties of like importance.

In recent weeks some members of the Congress, struggling with the President's budget, have proposed that the two budget committees in Congress provide an overview for the science and technology budget. By statute, the budget committees play a critical role in the budget process. They issue a joint resolution that specifies budget totals as well as allocations to each budget function. However, ultimate decisions are made by appropriations committees and disagreements typically occur. Nevertheless, the influence of the budget committees is undeniable. It is a reasonable extension of their mandate for the budget committees to provide Congress with a cross-cutting evaluation of the entire science and technology budget, with recommendations for allocations and priorities. It will be necessary, and is natural, for Congress to seek outside advice if it takes on this task; and it has been proposed by some that the National Academies, as congressionally chartered advisers, respond if called upon.

In a recent report the Congressional Research Service stated that "Without . . . advice [from the Academies or the Office of Technology Assessment] the Congress will have little choice but to make . . . decisions without formal guidance on priorities from experts in the scientific community, and the scientific community will have no choice but to accept the results."

That is the problem. And that is the challenge.

I believe that we cannot refuse such a call. In doing so, however, we must take care not to subsume a governmental role. However, we can analyze and comment on the impact of the overall budget for science and technology. And we must also be willing, for the first time, to propose priorities across scientific fields, if the times call for it. We can do so in a manner that is knowledgeable, responsible, and useful.

We should accept this new challenge in this, our 125th year of public service.

#### THE PASSING OF A PATRIOT

### HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, George Edward Durell was a deeply principled man who believed in honest money based upon constitutionally derived authority. He was the motivating force behind the Coalition for Monetary Education, with which I have had the privilege of associating myself, as have several of my colleagues in the House.

George Edward Durell of Berryville, VA, died on April 1, 1988, at the age of 93. Born on December 11, 1894, in Harriman, TN, to George B. and Genevive Hill Durell, Mr. Durell was the retired chairman of the board of the Union Fork and Hoe Co. of Columbus, OH.

Mr. Durell was a patriotic American who contributed significantly to business and community service. A graduate of Princeton University, class of 1917, he served as a captain in the cavalry in World War I, as a member of the board of trustees of the Ohio Manufacturing Association for over 40 years, and as a trustee of the Ohio Forestry Association. For 17 years he was a member of the appeals board of the Ohio Selective Service System. He also served two terms as chairman of the Franklin County (Ohio) Republican Party Finance Committee, and one as a member of the Ohio delegation to the Republican National Convention.

An avid horseman, Mr. Durell was a member of the American Foxhound Association, a co-founder and past master of the Rocky Fork-Headley Hunt Club of Columbus, OH, and a member of the Blue Ridge Hunt of Clarke County, VA. He was also a member of the Early American Industries Association, the Columbus Club, and the Princeton Club of New York.

In 1953, Mr. Durell retired to Berryville, VA, where he began actively investigating the subject of the monetary system of the United States, particularly the history of the country's gold reserves. A tireless worker who consulted widely with Members of Congress, executive officials, other researchers, and a wide variety of individuals and organizations concerned with monetary and banking reform, Mr. Durell developed a considerable fund of knowledge on the history of the gold reserves, and supported the publication of several books on that subject, on the Federal Reserve System, and on monetary policy. Much of this work was done by or through the George Edward Durell Foundation, a nonprofit organization dedicated to public education on sound money.

In addition to the Durell Foundation, Mr. Durell also helped to establish the Coalition for Monetary Education and the National Alliance for Constitutional Money, nonprofit organizations concerned with educating the public and mobilizing legislative opinion in favor of sound money and honest banking. With the formation of these organizations, together with the Durell Foundation, Mr. Durell contributed significantly to broadening the public debate on monetary and banking issues central to the future economic, social, and political health of this country. He has thus left the country an invaluable legacy, for which all Americans should be thankful, today and in the years to come.

Constitutionalists and sound money advocates join his family and friends in mourning his passing.

**SUBMISSION OF STATEMENT OF  
HON. JAMES H. BURNLEY, SEC-  
RETARY OF TRANSPORTATION  
ON PASSAGE OF THE RAIL  
SAFETY IMPROVEMENT ACT  
OF 1988**

**HON. BOB WHITTAKER**

OF KANSAS

**HON. NORMAN F. LENT**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. WHITTAKER. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, 1988, the House of Representatives approved the Rail Safety Improvement Act of 1988, the first comprehensive railroad safety legislation enacted in many years. This bipartisan bill includes a variety of needed improvements in railroad safety, from both the technical and the human factor perspectives. Upon the approval of the Rail Safety Improvement Act, the Secretary of Transportation, the Honorable James H. Burnley IV, issued an official statement commending the House for its timely action in improving the margin of safety on the Nation's railroads. We are honored by this praise from the Secretary, and we hereby submit his statement for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JIM BURNLEY ON THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES' PASSAGE OF 1988 RAIL SAFETY ACT, MARCH 23, 1988

Today's vote by the House of Representatives to pass the Rail Safety Act of 1988 as reported by the conference signals a significant advance in our efforts to improve rail safety in this country. It explicitly provides the Federal Railroad Administration with the same direct authority to enforce safety requirements for railroad employees as the Federal Aviation Administration has for airline employees. The present ability of the FRA to regulate rail companies in areas such as tracks, equipment and signals has resulted in substantial improvement in accident rates. The new legislation clarifies the Department's ability to enforce safety laws and regulations involving human as well as mechanical error—including the disengaging of safety devices, as occurred in the tragic January 1987 Amtrak crash.

Congress is to be congratulated. This legislation, together, with our proposed drug testing rule for railroad employees, will help assure the American public that rail travel in the United States is as safe as possible.

In addition to strengthening FRA's authority over individual employees, the bill will help the Department enforce the law more effectively by increasing the maximum penalty for violations from the current \$2,500 to \$10,000. Also, our new access to the National Driver's Register will permit us to better evaluate the qualifications of locomotive engineers and other rail personnel by identifying those who have drunk driving convictions.

Today's Congressional action is the culmination of more than a year of hard work on the part of Congress, the Department and many citizens who use the railroads, to give us the authority we need to guarantee maximum levels of safety on the rails.

**THE ANIMAL DRUG AMEND-  
MENTS AND PATENT TERM  
RESTORATION ACT**

**HON. THOMAS J. TAUKE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the Animal Drug Amendments and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1988. Modeled after the 1984 Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act for human drugs, the legislation I have introduced is designed to promote generic competition while retaining incentives for the development of new animal drugs. The legislation embodies the compromise reached at the end of the last Congress among generic and pioneer drug manufacturers and a number of organizations representing livestock producers.

This legislation establishes an abbreviated new drug application process for generic versions of post-1962 drugs and extends patent life for new animal drugs to reflect the time needed to receive Federal marketing approval.

The Animal Drug Amendments and Patent Term Restoration Act tracks existing Food and Drug Administration policies and procedures for the approval of generic versions of animal drugs approved before 1962. Recognizing, however, that animal drugs are often used in combination and in different species, the act provides the FDA with the flexibility needed to make case-by-case scientific judgments on the data needed to support abbreviated applications. Under this legislation, the generic animal drug must be bioequivalent to the pioneer animal drug. Drugs used in food animals must satisfy requirements for human food safety, and testing in one or more species may be required.

Recognizing the need to show that animal drugs are safe and effective in animals and in human food, the act permits a new animal drug manufacturer to waive the 5 year exclusivity entitlement when the drug is first approved for use in non-food-producing animals and apply this period when the drug is approved for a food-producing animal.

The act provides transition protection for animal drugs developed in reliance on the current approval process. First, the act provides protection from generic competition for any animal drug approved between January 1, 1988, and the enactment date of the legislation for up to 3 years after the drug's patent expires or for up to 10 years from the animal drug's approval date, whichever occurs earlier. Second, this legislation creates a private right of action for companies entitled to exclusive marketing so the use of unapproved animal drugs may be restrained and the black market in unapproved drugs combatted more effectively.

Finding the delicate balance between promoting generic competition, on the one hand, and ensuring that pioneer drug firms continue to have incentives to develop new drugs, on the other, is most difficult. The Animal Drug Amendments and Patent Term Restoration Act I am introducing today comes close, I be-

lieve, and merits your support. I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and work with me for its enactment.

Thank you for your attention to my comments.

If I may be permitted, I would like to submit the following letter for the RECORD:

MAY 24, 1988.

HON. THOMAS J. TAUKE,  
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TAUKE: As representatives of the livestock and poultry industries, the below listed organizations support the concept of revising the premarket approval of veterinary drugs by authorizing an abbreviated application procedure for generics. This concept will allow the use of generic drugs by this nation's producers. We, therefore, support the Animal Drug Amendments and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1988 which you will soon introduce. This compromise package was developed late in the 99th Congress.

Generic drugs are desirable to the producers of animals and animal food products. The appearance of generics in the marketplace will lower the cost of the product due to increased competition. This, in turn, lowers the cost of production and results in increased profits for livestock and poultry producers. The producer, in this case, is the ultimate consumer of the product and will benefit from the decreased cost of animal drugs.

It is important to realize, however, that producers depend upon pioneer companies to develop new and improved animal drug products. The veterinary drug division of major pharmaceutical companies is small in relation to their other division. The reason is that it represents a smaller market and less profits. Because of this, the development of new animal drugs is currently somewhat stagnant. Therefore, we must not place an overburden on pioneer companies by legislative actions that discourage research and development of new animal drug products. The incentive for new product development is the basis for the needed patent term restoration and exclusive marketing provisions in the compromise package.

There is also a provision in the compromise package entitled "Veterinary Prescription Drugs" which amends Section 503 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FDCA). This section of the bill provides statutory recognition of the veterinary prescription drug categories in the FDCA which exist today through the Food and Drug Administration's regulations.

The appearance of generic drugs will economically benefit livestock and poultry producers, and the compromise package assures that pioneer companies will be anxious to continue to invest in animal and drug research. In sum, the compromise package represents the most beneficial and economical situation for the consumer—livestock and poultry producers, and the producer—generic and brand name companies.

Once again, on behalf of the membership of the organizations below, we support the compromise legislation you are introducing. We hope that the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, the House Committee on Energy and Commerce and ultimately, the full House will pass this version of the generic animal drug legislation in the 100th Congress.

Sincerely,

Alabama Farmers Federation, American Farm Bureau Federation, American

Veterinary Medical Association, Coalition For a Just Animal Drug Law, Generic Pharmaceutical Industry Association, National Grange, National Turkey Federation, United Egg Producers.

## ASBESTOS EXPOSURE

HON. GERRY SIKORSKI

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, my colleague JIM FLORIO has been at the forefront of our efforts in Congress to reduce the threat of asbestos exposure in our communities. He has recently written an article commenting on the Environmental Protection Agency's March 1988 Report, required under the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Abatement Act of 1986, on asbestos in public and commercial buildings. The EPA report recommended against taking any action to abate exposure to asbestos in those buildings. I believe Congressman FLORIO's remarks are worth reading by anyone who shares our concern about the threat of asbestos exposure to public health.

JAMES FLORIO TAKES ISSUE WITH THE EPA

(By U.S. Rep. James Florio)

For those of us who have spent the past few years keeping tabs on the federal Environmental Protection Agency, the recent report on asbestos in non-school buildings was not a shock. It was "merely" a disappointment.

In effect, what EPA was telling us in its rehash of old data and its refusal to assign the issue anything resembling a priority, was that thousands more people will die over the next decades from asbestos exposure that could have been avoided. EPA's only response to such high-risk figures as the fact that 500,000 buildings contain damaged asbestos materials was to say the issue needs more study, and that the cost to building owners of removing asbestos will be high.

What was missing from EPA's assessment is a fair balance of the costs of asbestos exposure. Yes, it is more costly to remove asbestos than to do nothing. But the real question is the cost in human lives if we don't act. Everything in the EPA report pointed to aggressive federal action—everything, that is except the recommendations.

When I sponsored the Asbestos Hazards Emergency Response Act (AHERA) in 1986, my intention, as was the case with the other backers of the measure, was to get rid of the asbestos danger in schools. None of us ever imagined that such a well-meaning and necessary program would then be used by EPA as a smoke screen to prevent action in other equally important areas. But that is what happened. In the public buildings report, which was required under AHERA, the EPA said we should wait and see how the asbestos-in-schools program proceeds before jumping into anything else.

That might make some sense, were it not for the fact that by spring of this year it had become clear that the schools program was going along far too slowly and that EPA deserved a lion's share of the blame. In February, I wrote to EPA administrator Lee Thomas because complaints from around the country were piling up.

In one case, officials from a school district contacted EPA to obtain a list of certified asbestos-removal contractors and they were told to consult the Yellow Pages. In addition to lacking information on accredited inspectors and training opportunities, EPA was acting at a glacial pace regarding establishment of EPA-approved training schools offering asbestos inspector and management courses.

We found, for example, that there was only one school offering the inspector and management course for the states of New Jersey and New York. It is held only once a month, for five days, and limited to 40 students. At that rate, it is hard to conceive of there ever being enough qualified people to remove asbestos safely.

It is clear to me that we cannot let EPA set its own timetable. We need legislation, styled after AHERA, that deals with the problem of asbestos in government buildings, whether state, federal or local. That is a logical next step, to be taken as soon as the school cleanups are completed. Rather than spreading EPA and the asbestos-removal industry too thin, this legislation could act as an incentive to spur both into action. Let's face it, the more certainty there is about asbestos cleanup, the more likely it is that competent people will want to enter the field. And the more important it will be for EPA to treat the problem seriously.

I would like to make it clear that I envision a strong role by the private sector in our effort to rid the nation of the danger of asbestos. And I do not mean for that role to be adversarial. We can, we must, work together. Asbestos removal contractors, building owners, past manufacturers of asbestos—all should have input in developing a program that recognizes everyone's needs and makes sure that costs are borne fairly. Our goals isn't bashing an industry or the government. It is solving a problem.

Having said that, I do believe we have to do more to prod the federal government on environmental issues, and not just asbestos. If anything, the past few years of frustration have made those of us who care about the environment aware of the fact that passing laws just is not enough.

Perhaps we were wrong when we thought back in the late 1970s that the battle to balance economic impacts with environmental protection had ended. We thought it was all over and that the good guys had won. Congress followed through with sweeping measures covering hazardous wastes, clean water, clean air, asbestos and other problems. But we awoke to find many of these policies have been twisted and distorted in their implementation.

Perhaps we were naive or overly optimistic, but we thought that if congress created programs to clean toxic waste sites or control air pollutants, the work would get done. Unfortunately, we left the job in the hands of regulators who either lacked adequate funding or were ideologically opposed—or, sadly, both.

The time has come to look at new ways of getting the job done. In the past couple of years we have responded by adding to legislation mechanisms that make it so that enforcement does not rely on EPA. In the Superfund renewal, we put in a "community right-to-know" provision that forces firms to report directly to their surrounding residents as to what dangerous materials are being processed. In the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act we creatively wrote the law so that safe, appropriate methods of

disposing of toxic wastes will be in the economic best interests of those doing the disposing.

We must continue to pursue such solutions, even though they are more complex, or we risk a nation crippled by environmental gridlock. Nor can we simply wait for a new administration to come to Washington, one with a more enlightened view of what it takes to ensure a safe, healthy environment. The massive federal budget deficit will see to it that even the best-intentioned top-level people at EPA will not have at their disposal the resources that were available a decade ago and are still required today.

Knowing that we can neither count on the money or the good faith of those whose job it is to carry out the will of Congress, those of us who care about the environment will just have to be a little wiser, a little more imaginative than we had to be before. Anyone who does not realize that this is what the American people want probably does not belong in office.

**DR. ARTHUR LOCKHART, LOCAL HERO**

**HON. CARDISS COLLINS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, this year, Dr. Arthur Lockhart, pastor of the Healing Temple of God in Christ in Chicago, will celebrate his 50th birthday. During the past 22 years, Dr. Lockhart has been a driving force in the improvement of his community.

Dr. Lockhart's accomplishments have been numerous and impressive. As pastor, he has provided counseling and guidance to the church's membership and the community at large. He has initiated programs to provide safe and affordable housing for the residents of the westside of Chicago, and has sponsored the renovation of properties on the depressed 4900 West Chicago Avenue block.

Dr. Lockhart is an inspiration to children in the neighborhood. He has been called "Santa Claus" by the community because of the thousands of toys, food baskets, and clothing he distributed throughout the area. He has personally hired youngsters from the area to work at the church's summer day camp to help develop their sense of responsibility and character. Many of these young people have completed high school and been able to attend college through Dr. Lockhart's monetary contributions.

The Illinois State Legislature declared October 4, 1987, and the first Sunday of every following year to be "Arthur Lockhart Day." This great humanitarian deserves recognition as a role model whose work has brought a better life to the members of his community. The performance of his selfless exploits is a testament to the fact that personal contentment can best be achieved by making others happy. Dr. Lockhart is an American of whom we are proud.

## COMMEMORATION OF THE MILLENNIUM OF THE CHRISTIANIZATION OF KIEVAN-RUS'

**HON. ROBERT A. ROE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, the year 1988 marks an anniversary which most assuredly has a greater significance than any other for Ukrainian people. I am speaking of the celebration of the millennium of the Christianization of Kievan-Rus', the commemoration of 1,000 years since Volodymyr, Prince of Rus-Ukraine, declared to the Orthodox faith the official faith of his beloved nation and her people.

This historic anniversary of the baptism that took place in the waters of the Dnieper River in 988 will be commemorated by Ukrainian Orthodox faithful everywhere they are free to worship. In my Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey the millennium anniversary will be observed on Sunday, June 5, at the Ukrainian Orthodox Holy Ascension Church in Clifton, NJ, with the greeting of His Beatitude, Metropolitan Mstyslav Skrypnyk, Primate of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the United States of America and Diaspora.

Mr. Speaker, such observances, while celebrating an historic event, also serve to remind us how fortunate we are in our great Nation to be able to worship freely, and how, in many nations, such as the Soviet Union, freedom loving people are oppressed and persecuted for their religious beliefs. Here in this great body, we have gone on record as expressing the sense of Congress that in celebration of the millennium the Soviet Union should proclaim a general amnesty for imprisoned Christians and allow Christians to practice their faith within their churches and homes.

This important measure, House Concurrent Resolution 223, passed the House on May 18 by a vote of 394 to 0. Mr. Speaker, because of the great significance of this measure and this anniversary, I would like to insert the text of House Concurrent Resolution 223:

H. CON. RES. 223

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in 1988 in celebration of the millennium of the Christianization of Kievan-Rus' the Soviet Union should proclaim a general amnesty for imprisoned Christians and allow Christians to practice their faith within their churches and homes.

Whereas the Grand Prince of Kiev established Christianity as the official religion of Kievan-Rus' in 988 A.D. and invited priests of the Byzantine Church to instruct his people in the teaching of Christianity;

Whereas Christian churches have been instrumental in sustaining the faith of the believers and in developing the religious culture of the region for the past one thousand years;

Whereas the Christianization of Kievan-Rus' has made outstanding contributions to world literature, music, folk art, customs and places of worship;

Whereas, although the Constitution of the Soviet Union guarantees religious freedom, Soviet leaders, over the past 70 years, have sought to dissolve many forms of religious witness in the Soviet Union and replace them with Marxist atheism;

Whereas the Soviet Union is signatory to the Helsinki Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Madrid Concluding Document and has an obligation to comply with the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

Whereas the Soviet Union is committed under Principal VII of the Helsinki Final Act to "respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.";

Whereas in the Soviet Union it is illegal to formally teach religion to persons under 18 years of age;

Whereas openly distributing Bibles or other religious materials has been restricted in the Soviet Union and in some cases has been the basis for imprisonment and harassment;

Whereas thousands of churches have been closed and confiscated in the Soviet Union during the last seven decades, and the Soviets have severely restricted the number of theological seminaries; and

Whereas there are at present nearly 200 Christians who are known to be serving prison sentences, are in exile, or are confined in psychiatric institutions in the Soviet Union because of their religious beliefs, including Balys Gajauskas, Viktoras Petkus, Pastor Ivan Antonov, Pastor Nikolai Boiko, Semyon Skalich, Lev Lukyanenko, Father Vladimir Rusak, and Victor Walter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that it is the sense of Congress that in 1988 in celebration of the millennium of the Christianization of Kievan-Rus'—

(1) the Soviet Union should comply with its obligations under the Helsinki Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Madrid Concluding Document, and the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and allow Christians to practice their faith without interference, persecution, or harassment;

(2) the Soviet Union should grant a general amnesty for all Christians who have been imprisoned because of their religious beliefs;

(3) the Soviet Union should allow religious believers of all ages to worship and practice their faith without restrictions in their homes and churches;

(4) the Soviet Union should permit unlimited publication, distribution, and importation of Bibles and other religious materials in all languages; and

(5) the Soviet Union should allow churches that are closed or used for secular purposes to reopen, allow new churches to be built when needed, and allow theological seminaries to open or expand in order to insure an adequate supply of priests and pastors for the parish churches.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the provisions of this resolution are vital to the religious freedom of people everywhere, because if any group of people are denied their religious freedom, then none of us are truly free. In this regard, I wholeheartedly concur with my colleagues, Congressman CHRISTOPHER SMITH of New Jersey and FRANK WOLF of Virginia, who recently wrote to Feodor M. Burlatskij, Chairman of the Public Commission for Human Rights in the Soviet Union, calling for the following reforms:

The release of all prisoners of conscience who have been convicted because of their religious activities and beliefs.

The end of harassment of religious activists who have been released from confinement.

The institutions of legal and constitutional changes that guarantee religious liberty.

The legalization of religious groups that currently are forbidden to practice their faith openly, such as the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox Churches.

Abolishing the requirement that all religious groups must officially register with the state and have all their activities approved by government authorities.

Allowing religious instruction for both adults and children.

Lifting restrictions on the importation and the free dissemination of religious literature and objects.

Ending government restrictions on the education of clergy.

Allowing religious groups to engage in private charitable activities.

Mr. Speaker, as those of the Ukrainian Orthodox Faith in my Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey, and throughout the world celebrate the millennium of this profound and historic event, I ask you and our colleagues to join me in calling for full amnesty and religious freedom, not only in the Soviet Union, but wherever religious oppression exists.

IN SEARCH OF INNOVATION IN THE CITIES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a very thought-provoking article written by my good friend, Mr. Otto Silha. Mr. Silha is chairman of the Innovative City Project and Multihousing World Conference. He has taken an energetic leadership role on the issue of the future of our cities and has been deeply involved in some very exciting urban innovation projects.

One of his most recent articles, which appeared in the May 3 edition of the Christian Science Monitor, follows:

Not long ago Eliot Janeway, the political economist, told his clients, "Forget your hopes for housing. Overnight drops in mortgage rates won't hook new buyers. . . Housing starts can't recover with homes for sale, a drag on all local real estate markets."

Whether you agree with Mr. Janeway or not—and you probably don't—and whether he's right or not, perhaps one reason that housing in the United States has been, is, and may continue to be flat is failure of our private and public leadership to provide potential buyers with innovative, exciting places to live.

One element of drama and excitement for some people—not all, mind you, but some—is provided by greater density in their living, working, and playing. Meanwhile, opponents of that possibility, taking advantage of the vagaries of environmental reviews and impact statements, have given higher-density housing a bad name.

On Manhattan's East Side, preservationists are attacking density in a city whose

crowds and skyscrapers are world famous. Fortunately, the city planning commission is resisting the proposal to halt an increase in apartment towers.

Incidentally, the average density on New York's Park Avenue is 300 households per acre. By comparison, Bertrand Goldberg's Marina City in Chicago has 600 households per acre, still, I believe, the highest density in the Western world.

It is true that more innovative planners, and certainly futurists, have sought to advance the density principle beyond what Manhattan has produced by accident as a result of land costs, and beyond even what Bertrand Goldberg produced in Chicago by design.

The architect-philosopher Paolo Soleri of Arizona best represents futurists with a dream of the ultimate urban density. He calls his urban design discipline "arcology," a combination of architecture and ecology.

One of Mr. Soleri's arcologies, called "A 3-D Jersey," was commissioned by the State of New Jersey, Rutgers University, and the Ford Motor Company. The proposed structure would be three times as high as the Empire State Building, and a mile and a half wide, where a million people could live and work in hive-like urban colonies.

An approach to futuristic urban change more practical than Soleri's emerged in the mid-1960s in the form of the Minnesota Experimental City Project. A distinguished group of experts, under the auspices of the University of Minnesota, began work to test the basic notion of a new kind of city, and to identify the ways in which such a project could be usefully developed.

The 1965-73 project was founded on recognition that urban innovation was approached in piecemeal fashion at best and had been the subject of surprisingly little research and development. In no other part of our society had so much public and private investment been made based on such limited information.

Some of the experiments planned for the Minnesota Experimental City included:

An automated transit system, using personal vehicles, all designed by Ford engineers and displayed in model form at Transpo 74.

All public buildings designed for educational use.

Land bond financing that would provide funds to build the city's infrastructure with a majority of the land value increase resulting from the public decision to build the city. In this plan, residents would pay for services and receive dividends rather than a tax bill.

And a large-scale enclosure (100 acres-plus) supported by housing structures with Goldberg density.

The project was stalemated by the 1973 energy crisis, world economic turmoil, and the years of public and private indecision that have followed. And that is typical of what has happened in our country since we landed on the moon in 1969.

It was no wonder that when the Japanese, early in this decade, began to plan their Technopolis concept—to build a network of more than 20 high-tech cities throughout their country—the only places they visited in the US were Disney World and Silicon Valley.

Where are our new cities? Almost every other major country in the world (and some minor ones) have made significant progress in the design and building of innovative urban centers. A dozen of Japan's Technopolis cities are under construction, and you

can bet that their housing designs, spurred by their frugal use of land, will forge new frontiers in housing density.

It is patently true that the failure of US new town projects contributed to the nation's housing crisis.

Cities are the lifeblood of any nation's vitality and the engines of economic growth. They are the centers of work, community, and prosperity.

At a time when the National Commission on Space is recommending that we spend \$700 billion on a space colony and a mission to Mars, we must also direct major attention to earthly problems. It is time to marshal private and public leadership to develop new projects, new towns, to test and demonstrate new systems and services, to provide models and show results.

City building and the rebuilding of our present cities will be the major industry in our nation in the year 2000. The combination of the need to innovate and our crumbling infrastructure—roads, sewers, bridges—dictates that fact of life.

The private sector must take the lead, with significant, energetic support and encouragement from public leadership. Housing in innovative settings can be an important initiative. We have high business density in office buildings; we have high people density in shopping centers. We should consider higher density in creative housing.

HONOR THE OLDEST PATRIOTIC FRATERNITIES

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an organization entering its second century of service to the citizens of our Nation. The Improved Order of Red Men and the Degree of Pocahontas are the oldest patriotic fraternities in the Nation. Their motto of "Friendship, Freedom, and Charity" embodies our most cherished American traditions.

Dedicated to the love of patriotism, the order has strived to make our Nation a better place in which to live. They have worked tirelessly to preserve the ideals and principles for which our forefathers fought so valiantly some 200 years ago.

The Improved Order of Red Men and its sister fraternity, the Degree of Pocahontas, have been instilling in our citizens an ideal which we so desperately need in today's age of public cynicism; a deep love and pride in one's country. On behalf of myself and this historic 100th Congress, let me say that we are truly indebted to this fine organization for their many years of dedicated service to our Nation.

SOVIET POLITICAL PRISONER RELEASES

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I am pleased to

share with my colleagues the news that, within the last few days, several prominent Soviet dissidents have been freed from incarceration and permitted to go home.

Hanna Mykailenko, who had been forcibly confined in psychiatric hospitals since 1980, when she was arrested for defending Ukrainian cultural and linguistic rights, was released on May 20 and permitted to go to her home in Odessa. A special Serbsky Institute commission had recently examined her case and "found her to be sane."

In addition, we have also learned of the early release of Ukrainian political prisoner, Petro Ruban, who had been sentenced in 1985 to 13 years labor camp and internal exile for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda."

Finally, the Commission also received word that Ukrainian Helsinki monitor Vitaliy Kalynychenko was released before the end of his term from perm camp No. 35 and is at home in Ukraine, although he is reported to be in very ill health.

Mr. Speaker, while we welcome the news of the release of these three individuals, on whose behalf the Helsinki Commission and many of my colleagues have repeatedly spoken out over the years, we cannot forget other prisoners of conscience who continue to languish in Soviet psychiatric hospitals and labor camps, including 11 imprisoned Helsinki monitors.

In this regard, the 18 congressional members of the Helsinki Commission recently sent a letter to President Reagan calling the President's attention to the 350 remaining known political prisoners. In this letter, the members of the Commission state the belief that the release of these individuals is essential to the improvement of relations between our countries. We hope that these releases signal the beginning of a concerted effort by the Soviet Government to release all of the remaining prisoners of conscience. This, Mr. Speaker, would send a strong signal that the Soviets are intent on taking seriously their commitments under the Helsinki final act and other international agreements.

#### TRIBUTE TO CHARLES E. WOLF

### HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in order to pay tribute to Charles E. Wolfe, an outstanding citizen of my 17th Congressional District of Ohio. Mr. Wolfe was recently named "Driver of the Year" for 1987 by the Western Reserve Transit Authority [WRTA].

Mr. Wolfe has been an employee of WRTA for 10 years. He represented WRTA at the American Public Transportation Association's 1986 bus rodeo in Detroit and finished 12th overall in the 35-foot bus category. His performance is a reflection of the many letters he has received on his polite, courteous, and professional approach to his position as a bus-driver.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pride to represent such a fine and caring gentleman.

#### REMEMBERING PAMELA MENTZER

### HON. HELEN DELICH BENTLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, many times in our lives we tend not to think too much about the people who hold the often thankless jobs classified under the heading of civil service. When we do, we usually think of the policemen and firemen who make the papers when they save a life or lose their own in the line of duty. However, there is another breed of civil servant—one whose efforts are taken for granted much more than any other.

I am speaking of the paramedics. They too work long hours and often have to work on holidays. These souls must also undergo special training and meet certain standards before they are certified to do their jobs. Several months ago the people in my great State of Maryland got a rude awakening in terms of recognizing the sacrifices made by these people when Pamela Lynn Mentzer, a 22-year-old paramedic, was killed in an auto accident. She was driving home after have completed a grueling 14 hour shift; she was later described by one of her superiors as literally "falling asleep on her feet" due to her exhaustion. It's a shame that it took this incident to make people aware as to how hard these life savers work and the amount of time and energy demanded by their job. However, as Memorial Day approaches, I feel it's only right that people remember Pamela Mentzer, an individual whose devotion to her work as well as her intense desire to save lives wore her out to the point that it cost her her life. While she did not die fighting a fire or by a gunshot wound, I feel that Pamela should be recognized with the same respect afforded all civil servants who have made the supreme sacrifice. For these reasons I shall tell her story here.

Pamela Mentzer—called "Aunt Bea" by all her coworkers—was the daughter of a Baltimore County fire captain. She initially went to nursing school, yet decided later to pursue a career as a paramedic. She initially tried to become a paramedic in Baltimore County, yet was rejected in part because she was somewhat overweight. She then lost 27 pounds in 2 weeks and obtained a job with the Baltimore City Fire Department. This girl, Mr. Speaker, obviously was no quitter.

She worked at one of the busiest medic units in the city; in addition, she was only one of three women assigned to that particular station. However, she approached her duties with a sincere devotion and concern for the well-being of others. The hours were hectic and sometimes the work was gruesome—but she loved it. The one thing about the job she couldn't handle easily was death. During her last tiring shift she was unable to save one man from dying of a heart attack. "She wanted to save people," her mother, Beverly Phillips, explained. "She couldn't stand it when people died."

The man's death and the long hours took its toll on Pamela both physically and emotionally. She climbed wearily behind the wheel

of her automobile at nearly 6 o'clock in the morning last December 27 and started on her way home. It's been speculated that she fell asleep at the wheel, for her car sped through a red light and struck a passenger bus. Pamela was killed instantly.

I find little difficulty in saying that Pamela Mentzer was a hero. She worked night after night treating the injured and saving the lives of others. Yet even her intense devotion and love of what she was doing could not make up for the toll that the hours put on her. There are thousands of paramedics in our country, and I am sure that they work with the same intensity as did Pamela. I pray that changes can be made so that such a tragedy can never be repeated.

I know that Pamela's family still feels the intense pain of her loss; in addition, I know my words will do little to alleviate the grief which still lingers in their hearts. In any event, they may take some solace in the fact that Pamela—as will all the civil servants who make the supreme sacrifice—will live in our hearts as long as she is remembered.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that she will never be forgotten.

#### NATIONAL EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS RECOGNITION MONTH

### HON. LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced legislation to declare September "National Employee Assistance Programs Recognition Month." We in Congress should recognize the valuable services that employee assistance programs [EAP's] provide, and help draw the attention of the Nation to their existence and to the benefits they offer. I am hoping this resolution will accomplish these goals, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this measure and support its passage.

As the resolution, which I have had reprinted below, states, EAP's are programs in the workplace formally designed to identify employees with personal problems as early as possible, accurately assess the nature and severity of their problems, refer them to appropriate care in the community, follow up to ensure they get the help they need, and monitor the results of this process.

The problems addressed by EAP's are myriad. The EAP "movement" began as a workplace response to employee alcoholism. Today, alcoholism is recognized as being only one of many problems that employees may encounter during their working lives. Employee assistance programs have taken a broad approach to helping troubled employees. They have proven to be a valuable resource for individuals who are in need of guidance but who don't know where to turn.

Mr. Speaker, EAP's have enabled countless numbers of our Nation's work force to get through difficult times. When workers are confronted with problems associated with aging parents, personal substance abuse, financial

difficulties, or delinquent children, a workplace EAP counselor can offer the direction and guidance that is needed. By referring these individuals to appropriate agencies, EAP's relieve anguish and preserve the health and productivity of these employees. There can be no question that Employee Assistance Programs are beneficial to all involved.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this measure.

H.J. RES. 574

Whereas an employee assistance program (EAP) is a program in a workplace formally designed to identify employees with personal problems as early as possible, accurately assess the nature and severity of their problems, refer them to appropriate care in the community, follow up to ensure they get the help they need, and monitor the results of this process;

Whereas employee assistance programs promote individual employee health, well-being, and productivity by reducing the impact of chemical dependency and other personal problems;

Whereas employee assistance programs enable both labor and management to identify troubled employees with personal problems, motivate them to seek help, and assist them in returning to an acceptable level of performance; and

Whereas there is a need to further educate employees, employers, and the public as to the important benefits of participating in employee assistance programs: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That September, 1988 is designated as "National Employee Assistance Programs Recognition Month" and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.*

**A TRIBUTE TO CHANCELLOR  
WILLIAM A. JENKINS**

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding and respected educator, Dr. William A. Jenkins. He will be retiring as Chancellor from the University of Michigan-Dearborn in June. Over his 8 years tenure at the university, Chancellor Jenkins has made significant contributions to the quality of education in the University of Michigan-Dearborn community.

Chancellor Jenkins has provided effective and progressive leadership through the implementation of many innovative programs and policies on the Dearborn campus. He initiated the Incentive Scholarship Program, which is operated by the University of Michigan-Dearborn in conjunction with the Detroit Public Schools, to provide equal opportunities for all university applicants. The program has since been adopted by 12 of 15 institutions of higher learning in the State. Chancellor Jenkins also improved upon the existing Evening Degree Program whereby working students are afforded the opportunity to obtain a

degree from among 11 different fields of study through evening classes. Senior citizens are offered an array of educational opportunities through the Retired Person Scholarship Program. Chancellor Jenkins has also sought the computerization of the Dearborn campus to cut administrative costs and, more importantly, to help students save valuable time and gain access to the latest technologies.

Chancellor Jenkins has also markedly improved the morale and the diversity of the university by involving more students, alumni, businesses and industries in the academic and physical growth of the campus. Student clubs and organizations on campus have nearly doubled since 1980. Enrollment at the University of Michigan-Dearborn has increased by 16 percent from 1980 to 1988. Alumni involvement is also on the rise with the establishment of a director of alumni relations by Chancellor Jenkins. As a result, annual giving to the university from alumni, businesses and industry has increased dramatically in 1986-87, especially in relation to business and industry subsidies for research. In addition, both business and industry have turned to the institution for problem solving advice and personnel recruitment.

I congratulate Chancellor Jenkins for his stellar achievements in improving and progressing the quality of education in the Dearborn community and the State at large. On his retirement, I regret we are losing a fine educator and a good friend, nevertheless, I wish him good luck in the days ahead.

**STRENGTHENING THE  
CARIBBEAN BASIN INITIATIVE**

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the testimony submitted by Edward A. Laing, the Ambassador to Belize, before the Subcommittee on Trade. Ambassador Laing's remarks are submitted in conjunction with the April hearings on H.R. 3101, the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act.

I would like to commend Ambassador Laing for his understanding of the area and its importance, and for the logic and foresight of his solutions. He recognizes, as do the cosponsors of H.R. 3101, that the Caribbean Basin, in order to be a productive and enriching environment both for its inhabitants and its trading partners, needs a renewed commitment of U.S. economic assistance. Increased assistance is crucial so that countries of the Caribbean Basin can diversify their economies, aid their "infant" industries, and train their populations. I hope that my fellow members of Congress will share Ambassador Laing's sense of urgency and work to enhance the economic and political climate of such a high-need region.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY EDWARD A. LAING,  
AMBASSADOR TO BELIZE

I appreciate this opportunity of addressing this distinguished Subcommittee, of the Committee of Ways and Means, on H.R. 3101. The Subcommittee and the larger

group of sponsors of this Bill must be warmly congratulated for this initiative, which would expand the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act of 1983. Above all, permit me to thank you, the Administration and the Congressional Friends of the Caribbean for regarding the health of the fledgling Caribbean economies as a paramount policy concern of the United States.

The people of our region cannot continue to be mainly primary producers if we are to avoid expanding the international dole, massive migration to the North and social unrest, which respects no boundaries. That the Bill's sponsors recognize this is evident from their efforts therein to: create opportunities for economic diversification, preserve the principles of specialization and comparative advantage, and provide facilities for value-addition, particularly in the more disadvantaged countries.

**ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION**

The Bill's provisions promoting economic diversification include those on the "special category articles" in section 213 of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (sec. 4), the removal of quotas for products wholly made from U.S. materials (sec. 7(a)), the increase in the duty-free allowance for returning residents (sec. 7(b)), cumulation in countervailing duty and antidumping law cases (sec. 8) and ethyl alcohol (sec. 9). However, recognizing the acute needs of the Caribbean and the immense difficulties with diversification in our essentially monoproducer economies, I would exhort the Subcommittee to craft provisions which are as flexible and workable as possible. For instance, it would be desirable to simplify section 4, which, as presently written, would be difficult to operate.

**SPECIALIZATION AND COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE**

It is not proposed that economic diversification be forced on Caribbean economies at the expense of the basic tenets of the fundamental free trade principles of specialization and comparative advantage. They should all operate together. This is illustrated by tourism. Lacking few mineral resources, skilled work forces or capital, the Caribbean's main assets are its scenic and other natural resources, historical riches and the charm of its human resources. It therefore provides attractive tourism destinations, especially such countries, as Belize, with scores of such hidden treasures as Maya historical sites, the longest coral reef in the Americas and animal preserves.

The Bill seems to acknowledge the importance of tourism with its provision for increased duty-free allowances to returning American tourists. This will contribute to the growth of that industry, thus both fostering economic diversification and underpinning specialization and comparative advantage.

However, we must remember that Caribbean tourism is highly complementary with tourism in the southern United States. We all share in the benefits of increased tourism. I therefore strongly urge that the duty-free allowance be significantly increased. Furthermore, the new Act should (1) clearly express a United States policy to expand Caribbean tourism, which is symbiotic to American tourism, and (2) encourage legislative and executive action by the end of this legislative session tangibly to foster the expansion of such tourism.

At the same time, try as we can to diversify away from sugar, comparative advantage makes it clear that several of the larger territories are most experienced and efficient

at producing sugar. The proposal to restore our sugar quota to 1983 levels is therefore one which is dictated by all the circumstances.

**VALUE-ADDED IN THE DISADVANTAGED COUNTRIES**  
*Disadvantages of Belize and certain eastern Caribbean states*

Section 3 of the Bill wisely recognizes that all of the CBI countries, while poor, are not equally disadvantaged. In particular, Belize and certain Eastern Caribbean States have very limited resource bases. There are lower levels of development than in most other CBI countries; e.g., in Belize, there is a much smaller absolute and relative number of first class hotel rooms than elsewhere in the region.

Infrastructures are weak. For instance, in Belize the important southern highway to our deepest port and fertile banana-producing area is unpaved. The same is the case with the roads in our scenic Mountain Pine Ridge resort area. There are no bridges over the streams leading to our north-east forest preserves. In Belize and most, perhaps all, of the countries, transmission lines shed loads and electric generation is inadequate. Transportation facilities, especially for international shipping, are limited and expensive.

Our per capita incomes are uniformly low though, deceptively, just high enough to disqualify our countries from International Development Association (IDA) assistance. Yet some of the poorer countries with lower per capita incomes have what Belize and these Eastern Caribbean countries do not: manufacturing bases. By comparison, the only "manufacturing" in Belize are small import-substitution plants, for bathroom tissues and matches, and, for the export market, garment-stitching plants employing fewer than 800 persons.

These countries all have small, poorly-trained populations and Belize, a relatively large country, over twice the size of Jamaica, has the added disadvantage of one of the lowest population densities in the world. Belize also has the highest ratio, 1:6, of first generation immigrants (mostly unskilled refugees) in the Hemisphere. I need not belabour to this distinguished Subcommittee the strain these factors impose on the economic and social resources of, and the threat they pose to, our stable democracy.

*Justification for differential measures*

Such gross disadvantages justify the special measures of the type which have been proposed in section 3 of the Bill for certain Eastern Caribbean countries, and recommended before this Subcommittee, by all the CBI beneficiaries, for Belize. Such measures are consistent with established United States and global policies favouring differential treatment of the lesser-developed and otherwise disadvantaged countries, as exemplified, e.g., by the International Development Association, "soft windows" at international lending agencies, the spirit of Part IV of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), paragraph 6(iv)(a) of the GATT Ministerial Declaration of November, 1982, and the regime for island and land-locked developing countries within the United Nations system, notably the Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

The need for differential measures (and special assistance) has also been recognized in Chapter VII of the Annex to the Treaty establishing the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), to which Belize, and the preponderant majority of the Eastern Caribbe-

an countries presently listed in section 3 of the Bill, belong or have the liberty of belonging, by virtue of Article 2 of the Treaty. Approximately, Article 3 of the CARICOM Treaty designates Belize and those countries as "Less Developed Countries" (LDCs).

Differential measures for the CARICOM LDCs are especially justified by the fact that these countries are much more newly-independent than the other CBI countries. Each of them attained independence since 1973, the year the CARICOM Treaty was signed. In Belize's case, independence was attained as recently as September, 1981, making Belize one of the two newest independent countries in the area. As newly-independent states, the CARICOM LDCs have not had equality of time and of opportunity for economic development, unlike many of the world's countries which have been independent for over one century. Section 3 seeks to give these countries a chance to catch-up, to attempt to grow-up industrially, to gain a headstart.

It should be noted that the average GNP of the countries is \$136 million and that their trade with this country constitutes less than 1 percent of U.S. imports. Section 3 will therefore be in no way harmful to the U.S. economy.

*Value-added in infant industries*

Section 3 will provide these lesser-developed countries the opportunity of establishing, for the very first time, in cases like Belize and Dominica, new industries which will enhance local value-added in the territories, provide training for work-forces, furnish employment for large urban populations and allow the countries to attempt to take-off. Above all, "infant" industries will be established, in these infant countries, consistently with the special provisions of Article XVIII of the GATT, which recognize that certain economies "are in the early stages of development," i.e. the countries are newly independent and, as the Ad Note to GATT Article XVIII provides, in some of them there is excessive reliance on primary production, as in Belize and Dominica.

*Identifying the countries*

The most correct and appropriate method of designating the beneficiaries of section 3 should be "CARICOM LDCs." This would have the advantages, over the present "Eastern Caribbean" terminology, of:

Consistency with the established treaty framework of the regional integration system;

Predictability and objectivity of the underlying economic criteria, by which the countries can, if necessary, be automatically declassified and graduated from the benefits of section 3, if they later become "More Developed Countries," a category prescribed by the CARICOM Treaty;

Fairness; and

Geographic and political neutrality.

If it is still desired to include other countries which are not CARICOM LDCs, such countries can be mentioned by name.

If such an approach is not followed and the Eastern Caribbean terminology is retained, it is suggested that section 3 should be reworded "Belize and the Eastern Caribbean."

*Substantial transformation*

It has been seen that the class of beneficiaries of section 3 is extremely small. Since the class is defined either in terms of a limited treaty and, by implication, by reference to the countries' recent independence, it is not possible that the class can be enlarged,

with the potential for injury to U.S. interests.

Since for neither this reason nor any other, can there be injury to the United States, and since the substantive benefits are extremely limited, no harm can be done by affording the special rule of origin without the requirement of "substantial transformation" of general U.S. trade law. Certainly, any fear of the countries being used for "pass through" operations is unjustified. Therefore, it is recommended that, to satisfy section 3's special rule of origin, the product should be required to belong to a tariff classification different from that of its components. A partial, though rather complex, model can be found in the recent U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement.

**CONCLUSION**

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee on Trade: I believe that what the original Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act and this new Bill seek to do are to avoid expansion of the international dole by encouraging and, where possible, assisting in the creation of the infrastructures necessary for multi-sectoral economies and by stabilizing and improving the framework for trade. We truly appreciate this exercise in the Hemispheric solidarity and hope that it will be massively expanded.

**REPORT OF THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS TASK FORCE ON THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE**

**HON. VIC FAZIO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and Mr. Bennett of Florida, I would like to present to the Members of the House the report of the Democratic Caucus Task Force on the Strategic Defense Initiative. I urge my colleagues to carefully review this concise, balanced and consensus set to recommendations regarding the future of SDI.

The text of the Report follows:

**STRATEGIC DEFENSE—STRATEGIC CHOICES**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TASK FORCE ON THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE**

These recommendations are the result of extensive research and consultations conducted by the Task Force on the Strategic Defense Initiative, chaired by Representatives CHARLES E. BENNETT (D-FL) and VIC FAZIO (D-CA), and appointed by the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives for this purpose.

From January to May 1988, the members and staff of the task force held 25 meetings with many of the Nation's most knowledgeable experts on strategic defense. The task force members have all had oversight responsibility for SDI while serving on the Committees on Armed Services, Appropriations, Budget, Foreign Affairs, Government Operations, Intelligence, and Science, Space, and Technology.

The members of the task force are:

Chairman.—CHARLES E. BENNETT and VIC FAZIO.

Members.—LES AU COIN; HOWARD BERMAN; GEORGE BROWN; BILL CHAPPELL, JR.; RONALD DELLUMS; NORMAN DICKS; THOMAS DOWNEY; RONNIE FLIPPO; GEORGE HOCHBRUECKNER;

EDWARD MARKEY; NICHOLAS MAVROULES; FRANK McCLOSKEY; DAVE McCURDY; JIM OLIN; MARTIN O'LAY SABO; and JOHN SPRATT.  
 Ex Officio Members.—LES ASPIN; JACK BROOKS; TONY COELHO; DANTE FASCELL; RICHARD GEPHARDT; MARY ROSE OAKAR; and THOMAS FOLEY.

Many members of the Caucus helped by sharing with the task force their assessment of the SDI Program. The task force also sought out the views of experts both inside and outside the administration with experience in the field and with a broad range of views. Those experts who met with the task force include the following: Lt. Gen. James A. Abrahamson, Dr. Harold Brown, Dr. Robert Cooper, Lt. Gen. Glenn Kent (ret.), Dr. George Miller, Hon. Robert McNamara, Lt. Gen. Brent Scowcroft (ret.), Ambassador Paul Warnke, and from the Office of Technology Assessment, Dr. Anthony Faiberg, Dr. Thomas Karas, and Dr. Peter Sharfman.

The task force also utilized the expertise of the members' personal and committee staff and of the professional of the Library of Congress, the General Accounting Office, the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Technology Assessment.

#### INTRODUCTION

Two technological events at the end of World War II—ballistic missiles and nuclear weapons—have left humanity ever since the awful possibility of extinction. Over the years since the V-2 and the atomic bomb, there have been two concepts for preserving civilization: active defense and deterrence. Active defense relies on intercepting weapons already launched. Deterrence relies on the threat of devastating retaliation to discourage an enemy from daring ever to launch its weapons.

Active defenses clearly have appeal. But as appealing as active defense may seem, the economic and technical challenges posed by the combination of weapons of unimaginable destruction in missiles of unimaginable speed have frustrated every attempt so far to build workable defenses. Thus we have been forced to rely on deterrence.

However, neither the United States nor the Soviet Union has ever abandoned research on active defenses. Strategic defense research, funded at just under \$1 billion, was underway when President Reagan made his speech on March 23, 1983, inaugurating the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). The effect of SDI has been to raise funding, as well as expectations, considerably. But, after spending \$13 billion over the last 5 years, SDI is a long way from fulfilling the President's expectations. Indeed, there is good reason to question whether present efforts will be any more successful than earlier attempts.

Our primary objective must always be to minimize the likelihood of thermonuclear war. So long as we rely on deterrence, our strategic forces must be able to survive Soviet attack and strike back. At least in theory, active defenses might help, but not if we would have to rob our conventional forces to pay for them. The costs for a ballistic missile defense would be measured in the hundreds of billions of dollars, even without the logically essential addition of a massive new air defense system to defend against Soviet bombers and cruise missiles. In this era of tight budgets, the only realistic source of funds for SDI is where most of the defense dollar now goes: conventional forces. Yet that could easily lead to someday finding ourselves in a conventional war

with forces so weakened by budgetary diversions to SDI that our only alternative to capitulation would be precisely what we were trying to avoid in the first place—nuclear war.

#### WHAT WE ARE FOR

We believe that strategic defense research must continue at a reasonable and stable pace. We must make sure that we understand the technology as least as well as the Soviets do, lest we be caught by a Soviet technological breakthrough. We should also continue to explore potential ballistic missile defenses that would be compatible with the traditional interpretation of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

We also believe that arms control offers the possibility of increasing crisis stability, which is the key objective. While we favor equitable general reductions in nuclear weapons on both sides, a more important goal in our negotiations is eliminating destabilizing weapons—those that by virtue of being both powerful and vulnerable, could tempt a ghastly preemptive strike in desperation by the other side in time of deep crisis.

In addition, we must pursue on our own various programs not dependent on the success of our arms control negotiations. These include a vigorous program in devices to ensure that our missiles could penetrate any potential Soviet ABM defense, and strategic force modernizations aimed at making our offensive weapons more stabilizing and secure.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Research on strategic defense technologies is an appropriate part of this nation's defense program. For almost thirty years and at the cost of some \$100 billion, the search has continued for ways to counter nuclear weapons. Research should continue, both to keep ahead of similar Soviet efforts and to probe as yet unforeseen defensive technologies.

2. Research should concentrate on new technologies that might have long-term potential of defending our country against Soviet nuclear weapons designed in response to defensive deployments. Such research must address nuclear threats other than ballistic missiles. Because we are confident of our ability to overcome traditional ABM technologies, basic research into potentially more effective directed energy technologies is a prudent hedge against the risk of a Soviet breakthrough.

3. Research should also explore near-term options, aimed at: guarding against a Soviet breakout of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty by developing decoys and other devices to continue to ensure that United States nuclear missiles can overwhelm and penetrate existing or potential Soviet defensive systems; exploring the cost, technical feasibility, and strategic advisability of ABM Treaty-compliant defenses against the threat of accidental and unauthorized missile attacks, concurrently with a rigorous examination of other options to address that threat; improving surveillance capabilities by developing advanced sensors for early attack warning and for verification of compliance with treaties; and, exploring methods for enhancing crisis stability and the survivability of our nuclear forces through mobility. Strategic mobility would probably be a significantly less costly method of enhancing deterrence than deployment of a Phase I strategic defense.

4. Funding for this research must be based on a realistic assessment of priorities within

the defense budget and must not undercut more pressing defense needs, particularly in areas of conventional force improvements. All our defenses are a deterrent against war; funds spent on strategic defense that is only marginally effective, the nation could be made weaker, not stronger.

5. The research program we recommend (as outlined above) is at odds with phase I of the Strategic Defense System (SDS), as now formulated—a system which emphasizes space interceptors and near-term deployment and which would violate the ABM Treaty. Early deployment of SDS would freeze design of the system prematurely, and divert funds from long-term research into near-term systems with fractional effectiveness at best.

6. U.S. policy should support mutual adherence to the traditional interpretation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty because it serves our national security interest. The ABM-Ballistic Missile Treaty made possible the Strategic Arms Limitations Treaties (SALT I and II). There is no technical breakthrough in ABM defenses that justifies abrogating the Treaty, providing the Soviets comply with it.

7. The U.S.-Soviet arms control talks underway in Geneva should continue with a focus on resolving current differences over strategic defenses. A resolution of such differences is crucial if the two sides are to reach agreement on deep reductions in offensive forces and further limits on nuclear testing. In this regard, the United States and the Soviet Union should examine ways to limit the escalation of the arms race into space, including mutual and verifiable limitations on specific space tests. This could involve a review of the ABM Treaty to clarify its terms.

## NEWARK CELEBRATES CUBAN INDEPENDENCE WEEK

### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last week the city of Newark celebrated Cuban Independence Week. This special occasion marks the anniversary of Cuba's independence from Spain on May 20, 1902. It is a time to remember the past and the continuing struggle for freedom in Cuba. It is also an opportunity for all Newarkers to express their appreciation to the Cuban people of Newark for their many important contributions to our city. Cuban-Americans have added to the rich diversity of culture that characterizes Newark today and their dedication and hard work have benefited the entire community.

This weeklong celebration began with a special ceremony at city hall where City Council President Henry Martinez and Deputy Mayor Sylvia Guarino read proclamations praising the Cuban people of the city of Newark \* \* \* for their high spiritual and cultural values.

In addition, outstanding citizenship awards were given to several Cuban-American Newarkers. Among those honored were: Lazaro Alvarez, Sr., owner of Newark Business Machines on Ferry Street, as outstanding businessman; Ricardo Pastrana, president

of the United Cuban Organizations of Newark as outstanding civil leader; Carlos Bidot, editor and publisher of La Tribuna, as outstanding journalist; Cheln Garcia Alonso, as outstanding musician and composer; Migdalia Gonzalez, former president of United Cuban Organizations of Newark, as outstanding woman; and Vicente Lopez, grandmaster of the Caballeros de la Luz organization, as outstanding community leader.

Other activities marking Cuban Independence Week included a wreath laying ceremony at the statue of José Martí, a fighter for Cuban independence, in Cabrini Park and special events at Casa Cuba highlighting Cuban culture.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my warmest congratulations to all of those who were honored this year and I want to join in expressing both appreciation and gratitude to all Cuban-American Newarkers for enriching our city.

### WASATCH NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

#### HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Wasatch-Cache and Uintah National Forests are two of Utah's greatest natural treasures. This narrow strip of forest lands in the Wasatch Mountains provides an imposing natural skyline for Utah's major cities—Salt Lake City, Ogden, and Provo. Besides furnishing critical watershed, it is a unique area that offers a full range of recreational opportunities, from downhill skiing with comfortable resorts and hotels, to primitive wilderness areas for hiking, camping, and fishing, to picnic areas and campgrounds which provide the residents of my district a quick opportunity to get away from the city and spend an hour or a day outdoors. We are truly fortunate to have such a tremendous resource in our backyard.

This proximity to Utah's major population centers has presented certain challenges, however. The most obvious is the extremely heavy use experienced on these two forests. The Wasatch-Cache and the Uintah National Forests serve 8.6 million recreational visitors per year. By comparison, Yellowstone National Park, a much larger area, serves 2.4 million visitors per year. These Utah National Forests also experience year-round use, with all of its attendant pressures, rather than seasonal, summertime use.

This intensive recreational use requires intensive and careful management and maintenance in order to avoid the gradual derogation of our mountains. Unfortunately, the resources needed by the Forest Service to manage this area have been unavailable. A GAO report conducted in 1986 indicated that only \$1.5 million had been spent that year on maintenance at the Wasatch-Cache National Forest, and that there were over \$10 million in maintenance needs that were going unmet. This translates into a deterioration of many of the facilities in these forests, as campgrounds, picnic areas, and trails fall into disrepair. Perhaps even more significantly, it means that

the Forest Service is unable to manage and protect the resource, and that many areas are being overused because we are unable to disperse the recreational users throughout the area.

In order to address this problem, I am introducing today a bill to establish a Forest Service National Recreation Area along the Wasatch front. This legislation will accomplish two important things: first, it will recognize this area as a recreational resource of national significance which deserves greater protection and support; second, it will provide for the management as one integral unit of those areas of the Wasatch-Cache and Uintah National Forests that receive heavy recreational use. This new recreational area will continue to be managed by the Forest Service.

Mr. Speaker, as the population of Utah's Wasatch front continues to grow, our people are going to need more and better recreational facilities. The Wasatch-Cache and Uintah National Forests provide a unique and popular natural recreational resource. My legislation will assure that it is a resource that is available for many years into the future.

### MEMORIAL DAY TRIBUTE

#### HON. CARL C. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor all of the brave men and women who have died in the service of their country throughout the years, and to express my deep thanks to all of the veterans in the United States who have given of themselves to keep this land strong and free.

Memorial Day, or Decoration Day, has traditionally been a day that we honor our war dead by decorating their graves with flags and flowers. Memorial Day celebrations started in 1866, just after the Civil War, when memorial associations were formed, mostly of women, to care for the graves of Union and Confederate soldiers. In Waterloo, NY, and Carbondale, IL the dead were honored with parades, business closings, and solemn speeches. Then on May 5, 1868, General Logan, the first Commander-in-Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, issued the general order for nationwide observance of Decoration Day on May 30.

Since that time we have honored these special people in many ways. But it is because of them that we enjoy the freedom that we do today. The veterans of this country have given of themselves to keep America and her citizens safe. We have all, at one time or another, been touched by war. And many of us have lost someone close to us due to war. The price of freedom is very high. But if we want to keep our freedoms we must be willing to pay that price, no matter how high.

Just since the turn of the century, we have been called to stand strong for our country five times. Many across this Nation can remember each of those conflicts as if they were yesterday. Those memories pull at their heartstrings with thoughts of lost fathers, sons, brothers, and friends. So now it is only right that we honor, not only the soldiers who

died, but those who have survived those conflicts that have kept us free. We will never be able to repay them for their sacrifice and courage. We can only promise to them to keep the fire of freedom burning, and to protect this country with our lives as they have done. The veterans of the United States have given us so much to be thankful for that they deserve all of our praise on this very special day.

### A TRIBUTE TO ANNE DIAMENT: ALAMEDA, CA, CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

#### HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I share with my colleagues the contributions of a truly outstanding public servant, Anne Diament. Anne's longtime commitment to serving the Alameda community has led the South Shore Center and Alameda newspapers to name her "Citizen of the Year." She will be honored with a dinner on June 1, 1988.

There is no one more deserving of this great honor than Anne Diament. Anne has been a vital part of her community for over 35 years. In 1952, when Anne arrived in Alameda from New Jersey, she began volunteering in organizations which directly involved her children, including the PTA, Alameda Girl Scout Council, and Alameda Boy Scout Council. Today, she continues to be a leading member of her community.

As a member of the city council, housing commission, and Alameda Welfare Council, Anne has provided Alameda County with outstanding leadership. As mayor, she was a strong advocate for the city's underprivileged, calling for continued support for social service programs to serve the homeless and hungry. She also worked hard to preserve the city's historical neighborhoods, and to foster good relations between the city and schools.

In her selfless service to others, Anne continues to nurture a sense of community spirit. Not only has she been an active member of the local Red Cross for over two decades, but she has been involved with the League of Women Voters, Meals on Wheels, and numerous other service clubs. She currently serves on the steering committee for the city's strategic plan, and is helping to organize the government watchdog group, Concerned Citizens for Good Government.

Anne is a woman who deserves our respect and admiration. She is an example to us all. And so, it is with great pride and gratitude that I join the members of the Alameda community in honoring and thanking Anne Diament for her dedicated efforts. I wish her much good fortune in her future endeavors.

**THE CENTENNIAL OF A GREAT  
BREWERY**

**HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 26, 1988*

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an important anniversary occurring this year in central New York. The F.X. Matt Brewing Co., in my hometown of Utica, NY, produces some of the finest beer in the Nation. This family business is celebrating its centennial during 1988 and I want to extend my warmest congratulations to all of the people at Matt's as they continue an old honorable tradition.

The F.X. Matt Brewing Co. has been in operation for almost a century. Currently the Nation's 12th largest brewery, a few of the company's labels are: Saranac 1888 All Malt Lager, Matt's Premium, Season's Best Holiday Amber Beer, Utica Club, and Utica Cream Ale. The company also serves as a contract brewer and produces New Amsterdam Amber, Portland Lager, Dock Street Amber Beer, and a nonalcoholic brew, Birell.

Known as the West End Brewing Co., upon its founding in 1888, the name was changed in 1980 to the F.X. Matt Brewing Co., in tribute to its founder. F.X. Matt I—grandfather of the current president—was born in the Black Forest region of Germany, and learned the art of brewing at the famed Duke of Baden Brewery in Rothaus, Germany.

Emigrating to America in 1878, Matt began work in Bierbauer's Columbia Brewery, then one of nine breweries located in Utica. After several years in Central New York, where he learned the management, marketing, and shipping aspects of the brewing industry, he became the manager of the brewery in Utica. In 1888 he reorganized that brewery to form the West End Brewing Co.

The company employed 12 people in 1888, but grew under the guidance of Matt. During the Prohibition years, 1919 to 1933, the brewery survived by making near beer—without alcohol—and soft drinks. My colleagues will appreciate that the founder made several trips to Washington, DC, during Prohibition, in an attempt to learn when the law might be repealed. On March 22, 1933, his persistence paid off, as his brewery was the first in the Nation to obtain a permit to sell—just 1½ hours after repeal was signed by President Roosevelt.

After Prohibition, F.X. was joined by his two sons, Frank and Walter. In 1951, F.X. turned over his role as president to his son Walter. The second Matt embarked on a construction program spanning over a quarter of a century and \$18 million of modernization and expansions.

The current president, F.X. Matt II, who succeeded his father Walter in 1980, has continued the modernization tradition of his predecessors. In addition to state-of-the-art brewing technology, the company has also opened a Victorian reception area and tour center, and the Brewery Shop, which sells fun, quality gift and specialty items. The modern era also brought some memorable advertising campaigns, the most famous of which was two

talking beer steins, Shultz and Dooley, who spoke and sang the virtues of Utica Club.

From its beginning in 1888, the F.X. Matt Brewing Co., has come a long way. At the turn of the century, more than 1,200 breweries were in operation in the United States. Today, 1 of about 40 breweries nationwide, the company employs about 200 people. Anyone who appreciates a delicious, cold, foamy brew or who knows what this kind of ambitious family business means, to a community, can raise a mug in toast to the centennial of a fine old company.

**THE DEATH OF MAYOR ART  
PETERS**

**HON. DOUG BEREUTER**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 26, 1988*

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Fremont, NE, in my congressional district, have lost a very popular mayor and a beloved community leader with the sudden death of Art Peters. His loss is felt greatly by his family and the people in the Fremont community where he was elected four times as mayor of this progressive city of 24,000 citizens.

Peters was elected to the Fremont City Council in 1970 and then was elected mayor in 1972. He was reelected in 1976 but stepped down a year later in order to have time to care for his ailing wife, Emma, who died in 1977. Peters was elected as mayor again in 1980 and reelected for the fourth time in 1984.

Peters' accomplishments during his prominent tenure as mayor will prove very beneficial for the Fremont community for many years to come. He has provided leadership in capital improvement projects totaling more than \$61 million. Those projects included high-rise housing for the elderly, Keene Memorial Library, and the Stanton and Gifford Towers. Other projects under his direction were a \$27 million powerplant addition and the \$12 million purchase of a gas utility company for the city. These are just a few examples of his many valuable contributions to the Fremont community.

Mayor Peters was 77 years old when he died in his sleep on May 19, 1988. He has earned the highest respect of the residents of Fremont, and he will certainly be missed by his constituents, by those many Nebraskans who knew him and by this Member. His leadership, service, and dedication as both an elected public official and a citizen will always be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our condolences to the family of Art Peters, his many friends, and to the residents of Fremont, NE.

**THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF  
ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY**

**HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 26, 1988*

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 28, 1988, Americans of Armenian descent throughout the United States and their compatriots all over the world will pause to celebrate the 70th anniversary of Armenian independence.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to mark this important milestone in Armenian history, and I want to point out that the Armenian Church has been instrumental in holding the Armenian people together and in preserving their national identity despite centuries of invasion by more powerful neighboring countries.

After 600 years of foreign domination, the courageous Armenians, although small in number and limited in resources, threw off the yolk of their oppressors and declared their independence on May 28, 1918, but this precious freedom was destined to be short lived, for the newborn Armenian Republic was brutally partitioned less than two years later by Russia and Turkey.

Today, historic Armenian lands are in the hands of Turkey and the Soviet Union, and the independence of Armenia remains an unresolved question.

The Armenians have struggled unceasingly and died willingly to preserve their Christianity and to keep alive a free and independent Armenia. Their struggle shall continue until the territorial integrity of Armenia is restored and Armenia achieves its ultimate destiny as a free nation in the consortium of independent world governments.

Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate an anniversary of freedom; in the tomorrows yet to come, hopefully we shall celebrate a rebirth of freedom in Armenia. I join with Armenian Americans in my own 11th Congressional District, as well as across the Nation, in observing this important anniversary, and I share the hope of Armenian Americans that one day Yerevan will once again reign as a capital of an independent Armenia.

**INTRODUCTION OF FOREST  
WILDFIRE EMERGENCY PAY  
EQUITY ACT OF 1988**

**HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 26, 1988*

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, in the 1987 fire season, Federal firefighters from 43 States battled more than 2.3 million acres of burning forests throughout the United States.

The majority of fires started with a split second strike of lightning, and it took a battle force of thousands of dedicated men and women, working endlessly to bring the fires under control. For the forests, the property, and the lives they saved, our debt of gratitude can never be repaid.

But for some we owe more than gratitude. Over 2,000 of these men and women were not paid for a portion of the long overtime hours they spent in the heat, smoke, and dust. During the fiscal year 1988 continuing resolution, Federal firefighters were compensated for their long hours. However, it is time the compensation was made permanent.

By law, Federal employees at the GS-7 level and above cannot earn more than \$2,682.40 for a 2-week period, no matter how many hours they work.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the "Forest Wildfire Emergency Pay Equity Act of 1988" to correct this glaring inequity that prevents some of our firefighters from being paid for their long hours and emergency work.

This bill makes possible fair treatment for all the brave men and women who protect America's wildlands by fighting forest fires. It recognizes that fire fighting is not a 9 to 5 job and it assures that firefighters will be compensated for their long hours of hard and hazardous work.

I urge my colleagues to join me in rectifying this unjust situation and showing our support for our Federal firefighters.

#### ABE MILLER DAY IN FOREST HILLS

#### HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor W. Abraham "Abe" Miller for his selfless commitment to the Forest Hills, NY, Little League. Abe Miller is one of the founders of the Forest Hills Little League, and under his 30 years of leadership, thousands of youngsters have learned and loved the game of baseball. I am proud to be a part of Abe Miller day on May 30, when the Forest Hills Little League honors him for his outstanding work.

Abe Miller has been at the forefront of community efforts to provide local youth with challenging extracurricular activities. Throughout his years of service to the Forest Hills area, he has demonstrated particular concern for the needs of all people, especially the young.

When organized youth baseball for the Forest Hills community was just a dream, Abe Miller took the initiative and obtained the land for the playing fields. He continues to handle general administrative duties for the league.

Mr. Speaker, Abe Miller has been a responsive and successful advocate for the youth of the Forest Hills community. He never hesitates to express his concern and hope for young men and women. He represents the finest in human values and ideals, and is a vigorous opponent of inequity and injustice.

Thanks to his tireless work with the Forest Hills Board of Education, the youngsters of Forest Hills have a gymnasium that gives them many hours of pleasure. He has encouraged local merchants to sponsor youth athletic teams, and he has served as treasurer of the Forest Hills Youth Activities Association for the past 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Abe Miller for his outstanding

community service, and wishing him great success in the future.

#### A TRIBUTE TO HAMPTON HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

#### HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a special group of high school students from my 18th Congressional District. These students from Hampton High School recently competed in the Pennsylvania State Mock Congressional Hearing Competition sponsored by the National Bicentennial Competition on the Constitution and Bill of Rights. Because the team performed in a superb fashion, Hampton High School placed second overall in the State competition.

I would like to acknowledge the members of the Hampton team who accepted the challenge to study and defend the Constitution as a living document: Tracy A'Hearn, Joe Barriella, Karla Berg, Becky Boyd, Mike Breneman, Vince Brown, Cheryl Capezzuti, Linda Claus, Joe Dalu, Leslie Dunstan, Ed Grazier, Dan Frenia, Katie Heggstad, Jem Houck, Kathy Houggy, Chris Hwostow, Billie Joe Kessler, Renee Leszczynski, Megan McLaughlin, Laurel Penny, Kirsten Rafferty, Scott Salisbury, Lydia Wirtz, Liz Yates, Mike Yukevich, Robin Fako, and Martin Gorski.

These outstanding students were fortunate to have Mrs. Sally Durrant as their adviser and teacher. Mrs. Durrant was the initiating force in bringing the National Bicentennial Competition curriculum to the Hampton students. In addition, her sixth period political science class placed second in the Hampton competition. She is to be commended for fostering in this next generation of American citizens an understanding of the background, creation, and subsequent history of the unique system of government brought into being by our Constitution.

Other involved individuals deserve recognition for their part in the students' success. Mrs. Durrant's assistants who helped coach the students for the State level competition are: Mr. Ron Poister, Mr. Art Chero, Mr. Dave Dunton, Mr. Paul Hoffman, and Mr. Bill Shoemaker. Also, Mr. Paul Kraus from the Hampton Rotary secured the funds that allowed the students to travel to the State Competition in Carlisle, PA.

The National Bicentennial Competition provides an excellent opportunity for students to understand in depth the principles and ideals that underlie and give meaning to the writing, ratification, and implementation of the basic documents of American democracy—the American Constitution and Bill of Rights. I am very proud of the Hampton High School students and faculty for grasping the importance of this challenge to Americans to gain a deep appreciation of the significance of our Constitution, its place in our history and in our lives today.

#### ORVILLE REDENBACHER HONORED

#### HON. JIM JONTZ

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Speaker, popcorn king Orville Redenbacher has made many Americans happy with his famous gourmet popping corn.

Mr. Redenbacher, who grew up on a farm and has worked in agriculture all his life, was recently recognized for his 40 years of work in corn research with an honorary doctorate from Purdue University.

On May 15, 1988, Mr. Redenbacher received the honorary degree of doctor of agriculture from Purdue University at their commencement exercises in West Lafayette, IN. Mr. Redenbacher, who has just turned 81 years old and is still popping, graduated from Purdue in 1928.

I know Mr. Redenbacher's popcorn well. He grows 95 percent of it in the Hoosier State, and shells it all in my own hometown of Brookston. His popcorn is packaged in Valparaiso, also in Indiana's Fifth Congressional District.

Mr. Redenbacher worked in Indiana as a county extension agent and then as a farm manager before beginning his pop to the top in 1952, when he founded the Chester, Inc., popcorn company in Valparaiso.

Orville Redenbacher's trademarks have always been the quality of his kernels, and his personal touch in marketing his popcorn. In fact, he has always marketed his popcorn personally, first by traveling coast to coast with his tasty product, and then by appearing on TV commercials in his trademark bowtie.

In my office in Washington, we pop Orville's gourmet popping corn for visitors and constituents every day. I invite you, Mr. Speaker, and all of my colleagues to stop by my office to sample one of my State's tastiest products.

Orville Redenbacher can be proud of the honorary degree from his alma mater, and of the pleasure his gourmet popping corn has brought to so many Americans.

#### THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

#### HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to mark the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the establishment of the independent state of Israel.

There are longstanding cultural, religious, strategic and economic ties between the United States and Israel. And, over the past 40 years our two countries have utilized these shared traditions toward the common goal of advancing democracy and peace in the world. Like all good friends, we have had our differences—but none has come close to destroying our crucial and strategically important alliance.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Israeli people and their leaders during this month of their 40th anniversary and wish them peace and prosperity in the days ahead.

**SUPPORT FOR H.R. 2737, THE CONTINENTAL DRILLING AND EXPLORATION ACT**

**HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER**

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Miss SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 2737, the Continental Drilling and Exploration Act, into the House because it offers an important opportunity to advance our ability to understand the characteristics and dynamics of the Earth's crust. Research in this area is managed currently by a nonprofit corporation, DOSECC, which is composed of 41 member universities including Brown University.

Funding for continental drilling and exploration comes from the National Science Foundation with additional support from the U.S. Geological Survey and the Department of Energy. The efforts of these agencies could be improved through closer coordination and the formation of a long-term exploration plan. H.R. 2737 would provide this coordination by ensuring that these Federal agencies work together through an interagency group. These agencies are also required to produce a report that describes long-term policy objectives, a schedule of scientific and engineering events, funding needs, and program benefits.

Greater knowledge of the continental crust will provide many useful benefits to humanity. One benefit will be an improvement in our ability to predict earthquakes and volcanoes. One such project is already underway at Cajon Pass on the San Andreas Fault in California. Ultimately, the project plan calls for a 16,000-foot hole to be drilled into the Earth's surface, giving researchers an unusual opportunity to peer deeply beneath the Earth's surface. Although earthquakes are often considered to be a west coast phenomenon, when they occur in the East they can be extremely severe.

Another area of contribution from this research will be the development of geothermal and other energy sources and the discovery of valuable mineral deposits. The United States is largely dependent upon foreign countries for many of its strategic minerals and continues to import 6 million barrels of oil a day 15 years after the first OPEC-induced energy crisis. Recent events in the Persian Gulf remind us that we remain insecure as long as we remain energy-dependent.

Finally, this research will help us evaluate the safety of storing hazardous or radioactive wastes underground. The underground storage of wastes is a practice that has been used without a complete understanding of the degree of porosity and stability that underground depositories in fact possess. Minimizing the generation of wastes should always be the first order of business, but when there is no alternative to disposal, only procedures should be used that have been demonstrated to be safe.

I would like to thank my colleagues who have contributed to the passage of this piece of legislation, especially the leadership of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and the Interior Committee. Their efforts have ensured smooth and timely progress for this legislation. I would also like to thank the administration for its assistance and support.

In conclusion, I would say that H.R. 2737 will be good both for science and the Nation. I therefore urge my colleagues to give it their support.

**ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF LIGHT**

**HON. DENNIS E. ECKART**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the city of Painesville, OH on the 100th anniversary of the Painesville Municipal Electric System. First established in 1888, the Painesville Municipal Electric System is the tenth oldest in the country and the oldest of the 13 municipally-owned electric systems in Ohio.

While the Painesville Electric System started providing only street lighting for Painesville when the plant first opened on June 15, 1888, the demand for electric power grew quickly. Soon all of Painesville used the electricity that the system generated. Today, the system is expanding more than ever before to serve not only Painesville, but also North Perry Village, Painesville, Concord, and Perry townships.

In an age where it is not uncommon to hear of the problems of providing power and light to communities, it is good to hear of such an unqualified success story. Painesville city officials, stockholders, and the people who have kept the electric plant running smoothly over the past 100 years deserve special thanks for their hard work. I salute the city of Painesville and the Painesville Electric System.

**DR. WALTER E. MASSEY FETED AT SCIENCE SKILLS CENTER AWARDS NIGHT**

**HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw the attention of my colleagues to the many accomplishments of Dr. Walter E. Massey. Dr. Massey is being honored at the Brooklyn Academy of Music, in Brooklyn, NY, at the Annual Awards Ceremony of the Science Skills Center.

Walter E. Massey earned his bachelor of science in physics and mathematics in 1958 from Morehouse College, Atlanta, GA. He received an MS and Ph.D. in physics in 1966 from Washington University, St. Louis, MO.

After a period as a postdoctoral research associate at Washington University, Dr. Massey joined Argonne National Laboratory in 1966 as a postdoctoral fellow and became a staff physicist in 1968. Later that year he accepted an assistant professorship of physics

at the University of Illinois. He became an associate professor at Brown University in 1970, and was promoted to professor of physics and also named dean of the college in 1975. During his tenure at Brown, he received a number of awards, including the Distinguished Service Citation of the American Association of Physics Teachers in 1975, and was named by "Change" magazine as one of the 100 most important educators in America. In July 1979 he became director of Argonne National Laboratory, as well as professor of physics at the University of Chicago. In addition to being director of Argonne, in the fall of 1982 he became vice president for Research of the University of Chicago.

In May 1984, Dr. Massey relinquished the position of laboratory director at Argonne and became vice president of the University of Chicago for Research and for Argonne National Laboratory. In this position he is responsible for formulating, articulating, and implementing the research policies of the university, including relations with industry and Federal agencies. The president, provost, and vice president for research constitute the Academic Affairs Committee of the University. He also has responsibility for the University's management of Argonne National Laboratory. The university operates Argonne National Laboratory under a contract with the U.S. Department of Energy. Argonne is a multi-disciplinary energy research laboratory with a staff of approximately 3,800, with sites in Illinois and Idaho.

Dr. Massey's research has been in the many body theories of quantum liquids and solids. He has lectured and written on the physics of quantum liquids and solids, the teaching of science and mathematics, and the role of science and technology in a democratic society.

During his career, Dr. Massey has been a member of the Physics Advisory Committee of the National Science Foundation, the National Academy of Sciences Advisory Committee on Eastern Europe, and the U.S.S.R., the Council of the American Physical Society, the National Science Board, and the board of directors of the American Association for the Advancement of Science [AAAS].

For the academic year 1974-75, he was an American Council on Education Fellow in Academic Administration at the University of California-Santa Cruz; and in 1979 he conducted seminars on "Science as a Liberal Art" for college faculty under the auspices of the Lilly Foundation. While at Brown, Dr. Massey was the originator and director ICTOS [inner city teachers of science], a program to educate science teachers for urban schools.

Currently Dr. Massey is a member of the board of trustees of Brown University, the board of trustees of the Rand Corp., the Physics Department Visiting Committee on MIT, and the Physics Department Visiting Committee of Harvard University. He is also president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science [AAAS], the first black person to hold that post, and is currently co-chairman of the AAAS Steering Committee for the Project to Strengthen the Scientific and Engineering Infrastructure in Sub-Saharan Africa.

In 1982, Dr. Massey chaired the Mayor's—Chicago—Task Force of High Technology Development, and he is the founding chairman of the Chicago High Tech Association. He is a member of the Governor's—Illinois—Commission on Science and Technology, a trustee of the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy—high school—and a member of the board of directors of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. He is chairman of the board of the Argonne National Laboratory/University of Chicago Development Corporation [ARCH], an independent corporation whose purpose is to facilitate the commercialization of the results of research at Argonne and the university, and a member of the board of directors of the Amoco Corp., the Continental Materials Corp., the First National Bank of Chicago, Motorola, Inc., and the Tribune Co.

Dr. Massey is active in cultural and civil affairs: a past director of the United Way of Chicago and a trustee of the Museum of Science and Industry and the Chicago Symphony Orchestra. He holds honorary degrees, doctor of science, from Lake Forest College, Morehouse College, Atlanta University, Rutgers University, Williams College, Elmhurst College, Marquette University, and Boston College.

Dr. Massey was born and attended high school in Hattiesburg, MS. He is married to the former Shirley Anne Streeter, and has two sons, Keith and Eric.

Dr. Massey, through the accomplishments of his life's work, indeed serves as a role model and inspiration, not only to young black children, but to all children who desire to pursue scientific studies. I extend my very best wishes to Dr. Massey for continued success in the years to come.

#### ST. ANTHONY HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL TEAM HONORED

#### HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, a dinner in honor of the St. Anthony High School basketball team known as "The Friars" will be held on May 31, 1988 at 7:00 p.m. at the Plank-Board Inn, Kennedy Boulevard and South Street, Jersey City.

According to Thomas Hart, Jersey City councilman, the St. Anthony High School basketball team, is from a small school in downtown Jersey City, which annually brings great honor and prestige to themselves, their families, their friends, and to the city of Jersey City. This year, they outdid themselves, extending their stature to the national level. They began in December and January by winning the Iolani All America Prep Classic, a most prestigious national basketball tournament held in Honolulu, HI.

In winning the championship of this tourney, they defeated the top teams of the Nation and, as another result, they were rated the No. 1 team in America. As a result of their 29-1 overall season record against top competition, they were ranked the No. 2 team in America at the end of the season. When we realize the number of teams which compete

across this Nation, that ranking takes on very poignant significance.

The St. Anthony High School basketball team won the Hudson County Interscholastic Athletic Association Championship—second straight—and won the New Jersey State Interscholastic Athletic Association Championship—Parochial B—for the sixth consecutive year, matching the State record for consecutive championships set by St. Peter's Prep.

The proud staff consists of Bob Hurley, head coach; John Duffy, assistant coach; Paul Steffens, assistant coach; Gary Pitchford, frosh coach; Sister Mary Felicia, principal; Sister Mary Alan, athletic director; Mary Calabrese, assistant athletic director; and Frank Kochanski, assistant athletic director.

The team members are: Syd Raeford, Monty Davis, Rusty Terry, Bobby Hurley, Jr., Jerry Walker, Robert Gleason, Darren Savino, Mark Harris, Terry Dehere, George Dunbar, Chris Jordan, Sean Rooney, Danny Hurley, and Anthony Banks, manager.

This is proof positive that small things can be big. Here we have a valued group of youngsters working under a dedicated coach and devoted and competent nuns and teachers at St. Anthony's High School, winning State championships for basketball when they do not even have a gymnasium of their own.

I am sure that my colleagues in the House of Representatives would like to join me in this tribute to the St. Anthony's basketball team, the "The Friars," and their coaches and teachers for their outstanding school and team spirit.

#### IN SUPPORT OF THE FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL H.R. 4637

#### HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I joined the majority of my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 4637, the Foreign Appropriations bill. I did so after great consideration. It was difficult for me to vote for foreign aid because of the cutbacks in programs that help our inner cities.

Nonetheless, I am aware of the importance of our foreign assistance programs in effectively addressing our foreign policy and security interests. The programs also allow us to maintain our leadership role in assisting in the process of Third World development.

But as chairman of the House Banking Subcommittee on International Finance, Trade and Monetary Policy, I would like to draw your attention to the provisions relating to the U.S. Export-Import Bank. Our country is beginning to realize the importance of exporting to the well being of our economy. More and more businesses, small and large, are learning to take advantage of the lower value of the dollar and the increasing opportunities to sell abroad. But a major obstacle many exporters face is the lack of export financing. More and more commercial banks are withdrawing from trade financing for a variety of reasons, including their experience with the LDC debt crisis.

Consequently, the need for the programs of Eximbank has grown. Given our Nation's huge trade deficit and the increasing opportunities to export overseas, it is our job to make sure that Eximbank has enough resources to provide for that increased demand for export financing.

Of course, we are all aware that our resources are limited because of our Nation's unsustainable budget deficit. Given the budget constraints, Congressmen WHITTEN and OBEY have done a fine job in accomplishing the challenging task of making sure that our resources are allocated properly. I appreciate their support of the Eximbank's programs.

I particularly appreciate the gentlemen's efforts to appropriate for the tied aid fund, also known as the war chest. I have included a 1-year extension for the war chest in the trade bill which was vetoed on Tuesday by the President, but which was successfully overridden by this body on the same day. This extension is critically important in assisting U.S. exporters to combat predatory financing by our foreign trade competitors.

I certainly hope that the provisions of H.R. 4637 remain intact as the Senate body considers the bill.

#### LET'S REVITALIZE THE FEDERAL OCEANOGRAPHIC FLEET

#### HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 4704, the NOAA Fleet Modernization Act of 1988. This bill authorizes the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] to develop and implement a fleet modernization and expansion plan over a 10-year period beginning in fiscal year 1990. Unless NOAA begins a modernization and expansion plan for the fleet, we will be unable to carry out important national ocean research objectives.

The NOAA fleet represents about one-third of the total Federal oceanographic fleet. As such, the fleet is vital to carrying out fisheries, oceanographic, mapping, surveying, and meteorological programs. A recently completed contractor study entitled "Assessment and Plan To Extend the Service Life of Vessels of the NOAA Fleet" has identified specific fleet shortcomings and recommended that NOAA expeditiously undertake a modernization plan which includes both vessel upgrades and needed ship replacements. Similarly, an about-to-be-released report of the National Academy of Sciences Marine Board concerning the choice between leasing and buying new ships recognizes that NOAA's unmet needs for vessel time will continue to increase into the next decade.

By the end of this decade the average age for a vessel in the NOAA fleet will be 25 years. This is the average industry accepted service life for most vessels. Without a modernization plan, obsolescence of the entire fleet in the 1990's will be inevitable. Inadequate fleet capabilities could lead to essential oceanographic programs being imperiled.

The modernization plan recommended by the private contractor study will not only extend the life of NOAA's ships, but it will ultimately reduce Government costs by obviating the need for a total fleet replacement program.

New NOAA responsibilities for surveying and mapping the exclusive economic zone of the United States as well as offshore territories and possessions also require an expansion of the NOAA fleet. Furthermore, recent scientific focus on global climate issues requires NOAA to undertake additional research on atmospheric and oceanic processes. These responsibilities justify expanding the size of the fleet from 23 to a total of 30 ships.

As chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I am committed to supporting and enhancing the capabilities of the NOAA fleet in accordance with present and future needs. Longstanding national research and management objectives can best be secured by NOAA's maintaining adequate vessel capabilities.

I am also concerned about the deteriorating state of our Nation's shipbuilding capability. The last commercial oceangoing vessel was delivered last year, and there are no new orders on the books. American shipyards are now totally dependent on Navy work, although the Navy's budget is facing a drastic pruning this year. The President's Commission on Merchant Marine and Defense called attention to this perilous situation in its second report and recommended that the United States "implement a national program for merchant ship construction in United States shipyards."

While certainly not a cure-all, I believe that this measure is an important step forward for our shipyards. It will provide them with desperately needed business through this lean time and will also send an important message that the Federal Government will strive to find a solution to the nagging decline of this vital industry. Moreover, the skills and technology necessary to construct a commercial vessel are different from those needed to build a military vessel. Once they are lost, they are not easily retrieved, and this bill will help retain them.

More specifically, my bill authorizes the Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere, the Administrator of NOAA, to develop and implement a 10-year fleet modernization and expansion plan. This plan will generally include: the replacement of four obsolete vessels; the upgrading and modernization of 19 vessels, including two which are at present deactivated; the acquisition of seven new vessels; and the acquisition of new scientific equipment for the entire fleet. The new vessels are likely to include a deep water oceanographic and atmospheric research vessel, a bathymetric survey vessel, a large fisheries research vessel, a coastal fisheries research vessel, and three coastal shipping hazards survey vessels. The bill also directs NOAA to upgrade eight, replace one, and acquire two vessels in the first 3 years of authorization.

NOAA also will require the addition of 301 personnel positions, including 49 commissioned officers, to develop specifications for, acquire, operate, and maintain the vessels called for in the plan. My bill gives NOAA the authority to obtain needed personnel as well

as the authority to acquire modern scientific instrumentation for the fleet.

All modernization, upgrading, and construction of vessels must take place in private shipyards in the United States. Furthermore, 50 percent of the cost of all machinery and equipment must be purchased in the United States, except for scientific equipment that reasonably cannot be acquired in the United States. NOAA is granted needed authority to enter into multiyear contracts or charter agreements for the construction, lease, or acquisition of the vessels called for in the plan. Finally, the bill authorizes a total appropriation of \$613 million over 10 years, from fiscal year 1990 to fiscal year 1999.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to restore and expand our oceanographic research capabilities.

## FUNDING THE SSC

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, one of the key topics of debate to be brought to the floor in this Congress and the next is the funding for the Energy Department's superconducting super collider or SSC.

DOE started out last year with an invitation to all the States to enter a competition to be the site for the SSC, which will be the world's largest scientific project when it is built.

With an estimated cost of \$4.4 billion, 4,500 construction jobs over a period of about 7 years, and 2,500 permanent jobs, the SSC competition drew 25 States at the proposal filing deadline last September.

A few months later this list was cut to eight, which included Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, New York, Tennessee, and Texas. New York later withdrew its proposal.

It's important to note that this paring of the competitors from 25 to 7 was done after an evaluation by a distinguished independent group of experts under the auspices of the National Academies of Science and Engineering.

As one of the seven finalists, or best qualified States as DOE calls them, Arizona obviously has a strong interest in having DOE select our site near Phoenix as the place to build the SSC.

We want this project very much. We want the status as the site of the world's largest scientific project. We want the construction jobs and the permanent jobs.

But I think it is important as we consider this major expenditure for basic research in high energy physics, that we set the record straight on some of the myths that have emerged as the competition gets more intense.

For example, myth No. 1: All of the \$4.4 billion will be spent in the State where the SSC is built.

That is not true and I want to clarify it first and foremost for my colleagues who's votes will determine the future of the SSC.

I think the best estimate of what will be spent in the host State of the \$4.4 billion is \$1 billion or less than 25 percent of the total cost.

Right now, I understand that General Dynamics is one of the leading companies with the capability to build the SSC's magnets, which would be a major part of its total cost. If General Dynamics did get the contract, the work apparently would be done at their facilities in San Diego, CA.

We only have to look right here in the District of Columbia and its metro subway system for an analogy. The subway tunnel and system are here in the Washington area. But the contractors have included Bechtel from San Francisco; Morrison Knudsen from Boise, ID; the subway cars which were built in California and Italy; steel from Bethlehem Steel in Pennsylvania; CRT's and television cameras from IBM and so on.

Or, we can compare the SSC with the Space Program where launches are made in Florida and California but the hardware and expertise come from many, many other States.

Myth No. 2: Only the host State universities will be involved in the research.

The truth is that all U.S. universities involved in high energy research will benefit. In fact, scientists will come from around the world to do research at the SSC.

While California was still in the competition, few would acknowledge that the California Institute of Technology was in fact closer to the proposed Arizona sites than it was to California's proposed sites in the northern part of the State.

Now that California is no longer a contender, I want everyone to know that Cal Tech is close to us and would be very much involved in research at an SSC located in Arizona.

We're close to the physicists at Los Alamos in New Mexico, the University of Utah, and other universities that will be involved with the SSC.

Myth No. 3: Only the State where the SSC is built would benefit from high tech industrial growth.

The truth is that we can trace more than 40 percent of our GNP to being the result of basic research conducted in this country.

I don't believe that Governor Celeste of Ohio rushed to endorse Illinois and Michigan and Governor Bellmon of Oklahoma immediately endorsed Texas, when the list was reduced from 25 to 7 States, just to give the impression they were friendly neighbors.

These neighboring Governors know that their States stand to benefit very substantially from a major project such as this in a nearby State.

In that regard, I want to acknowledge with gratitude the endorsement of the Nevada Commission on Economic Development in support of Arizona's effort to be the site for the SSC.

The Commission, which spearheaded Nevada's own SSC bid, knows that the growing high tech industry in that State will benefit greatly if the SSC comes to Arizona.

Believe me, Arizona knows what it is like to be bypassed in competition for major Federal and private industry projects. Certainly we

have not had our share of all the billions of dollars of Federal expenditures that have gone to such national projects as the Space Program and the SDI.

Nevertheless, the Arizona delegation and especially my former distinguished colleague of the other body, Senator Barry Goldwater, have been great supporters of these efforts because they believed they were needed for our country regardless of what might be spent in our own State.

It is my hope that as we consider the SSC project here, that the delegations from all States will give it their support.

#### A LIGONIER VALLEY TREASURE

### HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today in tribute to one of the finest and most compassionate women in Pennsylvania—Dr. Mary Kinney—a true treasure of the Ligonier Valley, located in my congressional district.

Dr. Kinney has admirably served her community both as physician and public servant. She has worked as a general practitioner in Ligonier for 50 years, as well as having dedicated 29 years, to the Ligonier Valley School Board.

For a half century, she has won the admiration and respect of the Ligonier community for her combination of compassion and professionalism in the treatment of her many hundreds of patients. She has, moreover, demonstrated and exemplary effort toward the welfare and enlightenment of Ligonier's youth.

Today, I also commend the Ligonier Valley Chamber of Commerce for acknowledging Dr. Kinney's innumerable contributions to the community.

Born in Philadelphia, Dr. Kinney was graduated as valedictorian from North Philadelphia High School, studied pre-med at Chestnut Hill College, and was graduated cum laude with B.S. and M.D. degrees from Loyola University in Chicago, which she attended on scholarship.

While at Loyola, Dr. Kinney met Harold J. Kinney, whom she married in 1936. Their marriage produced five children: James, Thomas, Mary, Jane, and John. Dr. Harold Kinney passed away in 1969.

Following her internship at Pittsburgh's Columbia Hospital, Dr. Kinney moved to Ligonier in 1938 to begin her practice.

In 1959, Dr. Kinney was appointed to the school board to fill the unexpired term of Richard J. Flickinger, was subsequently elected by a large majority in the next election, and has continued to serve ever since.

I trust that Dr. Kinney's dedication and professionalism will serve as an example to all of us. It is my pleasure to honor her today before the entire U.S. House of Representatives.

#### H.R. 4637 FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS BILL

### HON. JIM MOODY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that yesterday the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4637, the Foreign Aid Appropriations bill by an overwhelming margin. For the first time since 1981, we have been able to pass this as a freestanding bill and not as part of a larger continuing resolution. I applaud the Appropriations Committee for its work.

This bill rightly places a priority on hunger programs. It continues our support to programs fighting disease among the world's children.

I commend the bill's support for famine and disaster relief. While providing immediate relief, this bill also provides important long-term development assistance to aid the poorest nations of the world in the sub-Saharan Africa.

H.R. 4637 includes funds to promote economic development around the world. These funds promote stability and help to build future markets for American goods and services.

This bill renews our commitment to our closest allies around the world. It provides critical assistance to Israel and underscores the Camp David accords as the foundation for peace in the region. H.R. 4637 also provides important assistance to the Philippines and the government of President Corazon Aquino as it moves toward a fuller and richer democracy.

I'm pleased that the measure continues U.S. support for family planning programs. It earmarks 10 percent of child survival funds for family planning and calls on AID to expand family planning programs in Africa.

The funds appropriated in this bill will comprise only 1.4 percent of the total U.S. budget. In this way, the bill strikes a critical balance between meeting our responsibilities abroad and responding to our fiscal restraints at home. It has my strong support.

#### COLLEAGUES: SUPPORT LEGISLATION TO HELP FARMERS

### HON. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage our colleagues to join me in the fight to end injustices in trade and tax laws that prevent farmers from doing what they know best—producing our Nation's most precious commodities.

Farmers have been hit hard by the new tax laws. The damage has been caused because bill writers in Congress simply did not understand or care about farmers. Since returning to Congress, I have set to work to try to repair damage caused by the new tax laws by co-sponsoring several bills to return things the way they were.

One important new bill, H.R. 3844, exempts farmers who purchase fuel for off-road use from fuel road taxes. My belief is that when congressional liberals passed this new tax law, they really hoped farmers would forget to collect their refunds or just give up fighting the red tape. That leaves the liberals more money to spend on their wasteful giveaway programs.

We must work to repair other problems the Tax Reform Act of 1986 have caused. New laws apply uniform capitalization rules to farmers when the preproductive period of a farm product is more than 2 years. A farmer must now maintain records on all the costs attributable to each animal and cannot deduct those costs until the animal goes into production. This new law is causing the American farmer another bureaucratic nightmare. Bureaucrats in the IRS must learn that running a farm is not the same as running a factory.

Another new law I am fighting forces farmers to obtain a commercial drivers license to operate farm equipment. It is ridiculous to expect farmers, who only drive their equipment seasonally in rural areas, to comply with the same license standards as truck drivers who haul hazardous waste. H.R. 4011 will exempt farmers from this unnecessary regulation.

Finally, I am supporting a trade complaint filed with the United States Trade Representative over Japan's illegal quotas on citrus and beef. This action under section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 alleges that Japan's quotas on citrus and beef are a violation of the rules, principles, and spirit of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]. This action requests the President and the Trade Representative to take all appropriate action to open Japan's markets for American citrus and beef. I am confident that these actions will give Ambassador Yeutter all the support he needs to open these markets for our beef farmers.

I will continue to push for reforms in tax legislation and to fight against trade injustices which hurt farmers and farm families. I will not support any measure which allows the Federal Government to take additional dollars from the pockets of Ohio's farmers.

#### THE DIAMOND JUBILEE OF THE CITY OF BEACON

### HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to salute the diamond jubilee celebrations of the city of Beacon in Dutchess County in my home district of New York.

The jubilee celebrates the 75th anniversary of the city's incorporation, which took place on May 15, 1913, with the merger of the villages of Matteawan and Fishkill Landing.

This May 15, the city celebrated the anniversary with a pancake breakfast and an afternoon ceremony at city hall. These celebrations will reach a crescendo during jubilee week, June 3 to June 11. A jubilee ball, in which period costumes will be encouraged, will be held on June 4 at the Elks Club. Selec-

tions will be made for a "Belle of the Ball," "Best Bonnet" for the best lady's hat or costume, and "Best Brush" for the best beard from the members of "Brothers of the Brush," who all sport beards. Earlier in the day, a "Little Miss Beacon" and a "Young Master Beacon" will be selected in a baby beauty pageant.

Other activities for the week will include sports events, concerts and a flea market. The celebrations will culminate June 11 with a parade and fireworks.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the people of Beacon and wish them the best in their jubilee celebration.

**A TRIBUTE TO FATHER JOHN A. RICHARDSON**

**HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on June 24 at the Grassy Hill Country Club in West Haven, CT, the Reverend John A. Richardson, O.F.M., one of the most personable and humane residents of Connecticut's Third District will be honored. Effective June 30, Father John will retire as the chief of chaplain services at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in West Haven. He will be missed.

Father John was born in 1928 in Elmira, NY. He attended schools there and graduated from St. Bonaventure University. After his ordination in 1960, he spent eight years as a missionary in Brazil. He also served at St. Anthony's Shrine in Boston before coming to West Haven.

Over his 20 years of work at the hospital, Father John has counseled those who were injured during the Second World War and the conflicts in Korea and Vietnam. Over the years, he was also successful in drawing outside service organizations into the life of the hospital. He was particularly instrumental in the decision of the local council of the Knights of Columbus to donate a new chapel to the facility in 1969.

While those around Father John well knew the extent of his contributions to the hospital and its patients, his talents were perhaps never so well displayed to the rest of the community as on the day in 1980 that he talked an extremely depressed patient back inside from a window ledge seven stories above the ground. Father John received a commendation that year for this remarkable display of dedication and skill.

The VA Hospital has by no means been Father John's only commitment in the community. He has also served as chaplain for the West Haven Police, the Connecticut State Police, and the Rotary Club. He has been particularly active in the Father Curtain Council of the Knights of Columbus.

At the beginning of July, Father John will move to the Franciscan Order Friary in New York City, where he will continue to serve the order. I hope that his happiness there is commensurate with the joy he has brought not only to the patients at West Haven, but to the community as a whole.

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

**MARIETTA DEFEATS CHERAW IN CHINABERRY CUP**

**HON. GEORGE (BUDDY) DARDEN**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, most of our Nation's sportwriters neglected to report the recent results of one of the most prestigious tournaments in amateur tennis—the Chinaberry Cup.

Begun 11 years ago at elegant Litchfield Racket Club, near Myrtle Beach, SC, the Annual Chinaberry Cup Tennis Tournament has become a benchmark of amateur tennis competition between selected teams from Marietta, GA, and Cheraw, SC. Traditionally the Cheraw team is much younger and athletically skilled, but the Marietta team is better coached, more strongly motivated, and in better physical condition.

Last April, the Marietta team proved once more its tennis superiority. In decisively defeating the Cheraw team, the Mariettans were models of good sportsmanship. Led by Jon Burke, who played spectacularly in the final match, the Marietta team also consisted of Dr. Clem Doxey, Ron Francis, A.D. Little, Paul "Matty" McCabe, Wallace Montgomery, Jr., Dr. Dan Norris, Terry Segars, D.R. Shamblin, Mike Wilson, and Bill Rohner, substitute.

The losers from Cheraw are as follows: Glen "Bud" Anderson, coach, Mallory Evans, Frank Andrews, Jackie Furr, Fred Craft, Jimmy Spruill, Esq., M.B. Godbold, C.L.U., Dr. B.E. Coggeshall, Jr., Dr. Walter Crosby, Jimmy Quick, and Rich Baker, substitute.

I extend congratulations to the winners from Marietta and condolences to the losers from Cheraw.

**IN HONOR OF MAYOR WILLIAM H. WESTBROOKS**

**HON. BART GORDON**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to say a few words in praise of one of the best-liked citizens of my hometown of Murfreesboro, TN.

Mayor William Hollis Westbrook was born in a farming community called Link, just south of Murfreesboro. Link may not be big enough to make it on all the maps, but it turned out a future big man on March 11, 1988.

The mayor likes to relate his first trip to a city. He ordered a few items off a restaurant menu even though he did not understand what they were. His meal turned out a little on the starchy side. Without realizing it, he had ordered a wide variety of potatoes.

Mayor Westbrook has been a pillar of Rutherford County for 85 years now. He has served his community honorably both as a public official and as a businessman.

Mayor Westbrook represented Murfreesboro in the Tennessee Legislature from 1958 to 1964.

He served on the Murfreesboro City Council for 2 years and as mayor for 18, from 1964 until he retired in 1982. In addition, he was chairman of the Rutherford County Board of Education for many years.

His grocery store was an institution on the town square. He also ran a tobacco shop, B&W Cigar and Tobacco.

He served on numerous city commissions and boards, and he received uncountable awards for his public service.

Mayor Westbrook likes to say that he attended college at Link University. This is a branch of the school of hard knocks.

Mayor Westbrook has always been noted for his love of history and his desire to preserve the traditions and memories of the past.

A dream of his was realized in 1976, when Murfreesboro opened a historical replica of a Tennessee pioneer village called Cannonsburgh. If you are ever in Murfreesboro, try to stop by and see it, and be sure to look up Cannonsburgh's Honorary Mayor Hollis Westbrook.

Mayor Westbrook has done many things for his community, his State, and his country. He has brightened many moments and many meetings with his wit and his storytelling. For Murfreesboro, TN, and the United States, let us show our appreciation.

**HONORING FATHER GENNARO SIMONETTI ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS ORDINATION**

**HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Father Gennaro Simonetti, pastor emeritus of Our Lady of Miracles Parish in the Canarsie section of my congressional district.

Father Simonetti first came to Our Lady of Miracles in 1958. He was at the helm of the parish during construction of the new parish center and school, as well as the renovation of the sanctuary.

But more importantly Father Simonetti helped the parish establish its roots throughout the Canarsie community during his tenure. Even after his retirement in 1983, Father Simonetti has remained active at the parish as pastor emeritus.

The parishioners will be celebrating with Father Simonetti at a special Mass on June 12. I would like to extend a hearty congratulations to Father Simonetti upon reaching this milestone and thank him and all of the parishioners of Our Lady of Miracles for all the work they have done for the community.

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO ANNA McGRATH LAVALLEY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1988

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an incredible woman, Mrs. Anna McGrath LaValley. Anna will be 100 years old on July 18, 1988. I am pleased to have the opportunity to honor her on this auspicious occasion.

Anna Winkel McGrath LaValley was born on July 18, 1888, in Burlington, VT. On October 24, 1911, she married Edward McGrath and proceeded to have six children: Catherine, Margaret, Leo, Dorothy, Edward, Jr., and Patrick. Through these children, she is responsible for 13 grandchildren, 29 great-grandchildren and 8 great-great-grandchildren.

Besides caring for her progeny, she was involved in her church, Saint Mary's Cathedral, and her community of Burlington, VT. She still resides in Burlington during the summer, but spends her winters in California with her children. After the death of her first husband, she married Judge Louis LaValley in 1961.

Anna McGrath LaValley is a true example of youth. At 100 years old, this lively woman is still dancing, playing cards, and enjoying a glass of wine every so often. Anna has seen two world wars, a depression, and several small wars, and yet she continues to be upbeat about life, her country, and herself. Anna, though further along in years than most Americans, has never grown old. My wife, Lee, joins me in extending our warmest congratulations on this special occasion. We wish Anna, and all of her many children, all the best in the years to come.

A MESSAGE TO PATRICK LEON McGRATH  
BY GLENN M. ANDERSON  
Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an incredible woman, Mrs. Anna McGrath LaValley. Anna will be 100 years old on July 18, 1988. I am pleased to have the opportunity to honor her on this auspicious occasion.

Anna Winkel McGrath LaValley was born on July 18, 1888, in Burlington, VT. On October 24, 1911, she married Edward McGrath and proceeded to have six children: Catherine, Margaret, Leo, Dorothy, Edward, Jr., and Patrick. Through these children, she is responsible for 13 grandchildren, 29 great-grandchildren and 8 great-great-grandchildren.

Anna McGrath LaValley is a true example of youth. At 100 years old, this lively woman is still dancing, playing cards, and enjoying a glass of wine every so often. Anna has seen two world wars, a depression, and several small wars, and yet she continues to be upbeat about life, her country, and herself. Anna, though further along in years than most Americans, has never grown old. My wife, Lee, joins me in extending our warmest congratulations on this special occasion. We wish Anna, and all of her many children, all the best in the years to come.