

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMARKS OF KEITH W. ECKEL

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, Keith W. Eckel, president of the Pennsylvania Farmers Association, shared his thoughts on the 1990 farm bill with the Pennsylvania congressional delegation and 200 visiting members of the PFA at a breakfast meeting last week in Washington.

Mr. Eckel is a respected voice in the agricultural community, and I know my colleagues would benefit from his comments as the farm bill debate continues. He is a lifelong farmer who currently grows vegetables and grain in Lackawanna County, PA. He has been president of PFA since 1981 and is a member of the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, I submit Mr. Eckel's remarks to be inserted in the RECORD, and I commend his speech to all of my colleagues:

SPEECH BY KEITH W. ECKEL, PFA PRESIDENT

What a year we've seen for the development of peace and democracy! Certainly it has been a year of strong testimony for the free capitalistic system advocated by the United States since its founding over 200 years ago.

Our great statesman, one of our founding fathers, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free."

Eastern Europe is experiencing a rebirth . . . a rejuvenation. Its peoples have come alive with the freedom to choose democracy as a way of life. By and large it has been a peaceful revolution with the exception of a few violent eruptions such as in Rumania. The charge to democracy has been led by the people of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, East Germany, and now the Soviet Union.

This charge, this stampede toward democracy is demonstrating anew the desire to work under the guidelines of capitalism with many of the personal freedoms that we take for granted. Many anti-capitalists have become outspoken advocates of our system.

Who could have predicted this assault on socialism and the communistic way of life? If anyone had such foresight, would they have guessed that the President of the U.S.S.R. would be the person leading, or at least making it possible for this rush to freedom.

I can remember Nikita Khrushchev pounding on his U.N. desk with his shoe, and later making the ultimate threat, "We will bury you!"

West Germany might be in the process of seeing that prediction come true, because it is being buried with a flood of East German refugees seeking the rewards and opportunities of capitalism and freedom.

I recall on a visit to Germany, John Kennedy captured the essence of the American commitment to all freedom loving people as he stood at the Berlin Wall, the great bar-

rier to democracy over which people were shot trying to escape, and proclaimed, "Ich bin ein Berliner!". Who this last August could not feel the tremendous emotional relief as Berliners scaled the wall, stopped to dance on its heights, and ran to openly embrace their family members and fellow countrymen in West Germany. The ever present physical barrier to democracy and communism . . . capitalism and socialism . . . could not withstand the people's desire for freedom.

I read the other day that most of the guard dogs pulling sentry duty along the great wall were fakes. They were not trained killers, but lambs in lions' clothing. As we look at the communistic world today that's very symbolic—its perceived strength was its weakness, while its perceived weakness is its strength . . . its people seeking freedom with the right to chart their own destiny.

Yes, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free."

Freedom, our heritage, is spreading like a prairie fire, whipped by the winds of man's basic desire to be free.

Farming, agriculture in general, in the United States has been the beneficiary and the shining example of the success under our system of government. We have not just survived, but we have progressed and freed our population to pursue other professions and avocations.

Our system of freedom, capitalism and democracy works to the advantage of the individual and eventually the state.

In America we spend more on recreation than most nations have to spend on food and fiber. We worry ourselves about quality, while they worry about quantity.

We must be thankful for our freedoms and forever cautious in protecting these rights. As former President Ronald Reagan said even after his most successful negotiations in his quest for peace, "Trust, but verify".

The freedom to choose; the opportunity to succeed; the freedom to fail . . . all are precious and absolute necessities for the future of our democracy. Securing just the right combination . . . the proper mix is difficult. For example, the proposed farm legislation now before you, the Congress.

The 1985 Food Security Act becomes history this year and will be replaced by new legislation which you are developing.

The American Farm Bureau Federation and the Pennsylvania Farmers' Association have been strong supporters of the 1985 Food Security Act for very good reasons.

It has moved agriculture toward greater market orientation that allows our products to compete in domestic and international markets while maintaining a safety net for farm income.

A proper mix was achieved and resulted in reducing the burdensome surpluses of commodities that had suppressed farm prices. Farm exports increased and so did farm income.

The new farm bill will include programs for commodity price and income support,

commodity supply control, conservation provisions, trade measures, research, credit programs, food stamps and other related public policies.

Although we support the general direction set by the 1985 farm bill, some modifications need to be made. These changes that we are recommending would enhance market orientation and allow farmers to manage their operations in response to economic, environmental and technical considerations and opportunities.

We want all programs though to meet three overall objectives: (1) reaffirm our commitment to competitiveness; (2) assure the opportunity for an adequate level of farm income; and (3) maximize freedom for farmers to respond to market conditions.

Yes, the proposed farm program should not impede the economic growth of production agriculture, and needs to live within budgetary guidelines.

The farm legislation that you eventually approve will set the tone for the business of U.S. agriculture, and will establish the game rules for most of the world.

The issue at hand is extremely important. Quickly, let's examine some of the program components which need some revision.

Target prices should be frozen at 1990 levels. Additional reductions would result in eliminating the safety net level of current target prices that have been reached after five years of steady reduction.

Acreage flexibility should permit farmers to plant other program crops or approved non-program crops on permitted acreage for the crop which has a base acreage. Deficiency payments and loan eligibility will be restricted to the original program crop.

Dairy support price adjustments need to be made in the calculation of milk equivalents so that increases and decreases more accurately reflect current demand. Government purchases for federal use and programs should not be used in calculation of surplus. Stand-by supply control programs should mitigate impacts on and make restitution to all affected commodities.

Conservation reserve program land should meet conservation compliance plans at the conclusion of the contract. Farm Bureau supports the farmer having the option of returning his land to production, or bidding it back into the reserve.

Crop Insurance must not be linked to farm program participation; be available on an equitable basis for all program and non-program crops; coverage must be increased, and the program must be simplified. It seems illogical in this day and time to eliminate crop insurance as proposed by the Bush Administration. Without crop insurance, agriculture turns to the Congress for bailouts during natural disasters. Crop insurance is the business approach versus the political approach.

Research must be expanded to increase product markets, solve environmental concerns and lower production costs. We as farmers continue to seek new techniques in which to cut our dependency on farm chemicals, but cutting traditional research funds is not the way to accomplish this ultimate goal.

● 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.

We urge you to take these factors into consideration in the formation of a new farm bill, and we pledge ourselves to work diligently with you in the development of the best possible farm program.

At our national convention, we initiated a petition urging Congress to support legislation to slash the current capital gains tax.

We need to enact legislation to restore the capital gains tax exclusion to all capital assets including land, livestock and timber.

There is not any justification for a capital gains tax from an economic standpoint. One accurate description of a capital gains tax is an inflation tax. Any tax on capital gains is ultimately a tax on jobs and opportunity.

Farmers who sell their land would be among many other beneficiaries. A lower capital gains tax will increase the sale of assets and allow people to reinvest their funds in more productive alternatives.

Everybody wins with a cut in capital gains taxes because more jobs are created with increased total federal tax revenues. The cut in capital gains taxes would also foster international competitiveness, raise venture capital and help stimulate small business growth.

There should be a rate reduction of capital gains taxes for the sale of land, livestock, forestry products, nursery stock and other depreciable assets.

Some leaders claim capital gains tax cuts are a "boon for the wealthy." In 1985, almost 70 percent of the taxpayers who paid a tax on capital gains had reported earnings of less than \$50,000. Another three million that earned less than \$20,000 also reported capital gains.

Congress and the Administration have treated agriculture fairly well in recent years. You have made it possible for agriculture to look to the market place for its income. You have made it possible for agriculture to come out of a severe slump through your policy positions enacted into the Food Security Act of 1985.

We do not wish to return to heavy government involvement in the business of agriculture. In all fairness, such a move can not be justified. Hold the Food Security Act's major thrust, and fine tune it. Agriculture is on the path of economic recovery. Don't make us stumble by placing government hurdles in our way, or by failing to eliminate others like a cut in the capital gains tax.

Resist the pressure of fringe groups, reacting to emotional beliefs rather than to scientific and medical facts, who are pushing for crippling regulations that would transform the greatest and most efficient agricultural system into a centrally planned, inefficient agriculture incapable of feeding this nation, let alone the world.

In the name of misinformed sensitivity to the well-being of our environment and to the safety of our constantly growing world population, these fringe groups would stifle technological progress and prohibit the use of vital production inputs while removing all opportunities for private decision making.

Is there anyone in this room who would wish to deny one of our family members the use of insulin in their fight against the debilitating disease, diabetes, because it is a product of biotechnology just as BST is.

Is there anyone in this room who would prohibit the use of a cancer fighting chemotherapy treatment because it is a product of the chemical industry?

Is there anyone in this room who would divert research dollars dedicated to plant ge-

netic development which has produced hybrid seeds that have enabled hundreds of millions of people to escape starvation in the third world during the Green Revolution?

And who would compel America's family farmers, their productivity the envy of the world, to exchange their freedom of choice, free enterprises, for mandated, centrally planned farming operations while the rest of the world rushes to copy our system.

You, the members of Congress, must apply a cost-benefit test to all proposals being surfaced surrounding the 1990 Farm Bill. Don't be swayed by emotion! Analyze the facts. Strengthen our system! Don't cripple it!

Yes, fine tune the farm legislation to provide the proper atmosphere for us to succeed and fail, the same atmosphere the rest of the world is striving to achieve. Thank you for your efforts to improve the competitiveness of American agriculture, and for making it possible to compete on an international basis while providing the safest and highest quality food in the world.

**HAWAII STUDENT'S VIEW
ABOUT RACE RELATIONS**

HON. PATRICIA F. SAIKI

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mrs. SAIKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a "Poem About Bliss," written by a little girl from Hawaii, which encompasses the ideals of the "aloha spirit." Sabrina Hall is 9 years old and completed the following as part of a class assignment. She and her family recently moved here from Hawaii.

POEM ABOUT BLISS
(By Sabrina Hall)

I grew up in Hawaii far across the sea. Where kids of all races lived together happily. There were Japanese, Chinese and Koreans. But we all knew we were human beings.

We played games. We never called each other names. I even have two half-brothers that are "hapa." That means their mama is a different race than their papa.

Tongans and Samoans were the giants in our school. But with all of us, brotherhood was the rule. Whoever we passed along the lanai, we'd be sure to give a happy "hi".

Race was not something we thought much about. We just plain liked each other without a doubt. Everyone there liked people the same. So when it came to party, everyone came. I wish that everyone would be like this. Then the whole world will be closer to bliss.

**THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF
MARYLAND JAYCEES**

HON. C. THOMAS McMILLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to salute the Maryland Jaycees which will be celebrating its 50th anniversary this month. Since the issuance of their State charter on June 12, 1940, the Maryland Jaycees have committed themselves to improving

the quality of life in Maryland by utilizing the dedication and diverse skills of the young men and women of Maryland. Their distinguished tradition continues today through the efforts of its 5,200 members in 88 chapters throughout the State.

Community service and leadership training are two phases that Maryland has come to associate with the efforts of our Jaycees. Whether raising funds for charities, sponsoring community improvement programs, or working on individual development programs, Maryland can count on its Jaycees to be there. Their work on "just say no" drug programs, the Outstanding Senior Citizen's Award Program, the Outstanding Young Marylander's Program, and the millions of dollars they have raised over the years for muscular dystrophy and other important charities are but as brief list of their contributions to the welfare of Maryland.

We cannot begin to thank the Maryland Jaycees for their years of service to Maryland. I ask my colleagues to please join with me in saluting their lengthy achievements and accomplishments.

**IN MEMORY OF GEORGE A.
JOPLIN III**

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, proverbs tells us that the greatest evidence of a man possessing true wisdom is his quiet discipline—having and using his knowledge for the good of his community, while remaining approachable so that people may learn from his ways.

Such a man was George A. Joplin III, of Somerset, KY, who was called from this Earth Tuesday, February 14, 1990.

Jop's 31 years as managing editor, then publisher of his family's Somerset Commonwealth-Journal—formerly the Commonwealth—established his reputation as a seeker of truth, a father of his community, and a newspaperman's newspaperman. He served as president not only of the Kentucky Press Association, but also of the National Newspaper Association. He quietly and persistently built his newspaper to serve as the mirror of southern Kentucky's past, so that the community could prudently gauge its path toward the future.

Scouting was another of the passions of this quiet man. The Boy Scouts are by their very nature not an organization of superstars, but a haven for maturing young men who instinctively become part of a team. Scouting bestowed on Jop many high honors. However, none of the honors meant as much to him as knowing that in his devotion to Scouting, he nurtured young men and women in quiet and selfless discipline so that they could improve all the lives of Kentucky's sons and daughters.

Jop, ever the team player, also was a devoted Rotarian, scarcely missing a single meeting of his Somerset Club for two decades running. He savored the comradery of the Rotary Club, as well as its opportunities for

building coalitions of people to improve his community.

His wisdom and his dedication to building character in young people also led to his life-long involvement in the affairs of his alma mater, Centre College in Danville, KY.

His immense knowledge of the community and his selfless character built Jop a reputation as a sage advisor to many people, including myself. Jop's door, in the Commonwealth-Journal Building across the street from my office, was always open to me. The people who relied upon him as a confidant trusted him greatly because his words were borne of a lifetime of wisdom, knowledge, and prudence.

Jop devoted his life to what would last: his family, his church, the truth in his newspaper, the Boy Scouts, the Center College community, and of course his beloved hometown of Somerset, KY. Upon his passing, the people he touched are left with his words, his legacy of quiet wisdom, and his devotion to his community and his fellow citizens.

May your soul rest in peace, George Joplin. I know that your greatest wish would be that Kentuckians and all Americans learn from and practice the high standard you set—by patiently seeking the truth, and using that truth to establish an honorable community for the better welfare of men and women, and their sons and daughters.

THE 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF JOHNNIE AND GLADYS WELLS

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, in these times when little is permanent, I would like to ask you to join me in observing the recently observed 50th wedding anniversary of Johnnie and Gladys Wells of Houston, TX.

While I was not able to be with Mr. and Mrs. Wells at their 50th wedding anniversary reception held at the Memorial Baptist Church in Houston, I certainly would have liked to have had the opportunity to do so. I would have liked to have met these two remarkable individuals who have successfully weathered the many trials and tribulations which tear so many marriages apart.

Both Mr. and Mrs. Wells are in their early seventies. They were married on December 11, 1939, in Nacogdoches, TX, where they lived for several years. But in 1945, following World War II—in which Mr. Wells served in the U.S. Army—the couple decided to move to Houston.

Once settled in Houston, Mr. Wells operated a series of small businesses in the Aldine area. He built horse trailers, then operated an antique shop and then owned a welding business. Today, he still deals in antiques from his home. During much of this time, Mr. Wells served as a member of the Harris County Sheriff's Mounted Posse, eventually rising to the rank of first lieutenant in that voluntary law enforcement organization.

Mrs. Wells formerly worked for an attorney in Nacogdoches, but chose to become a

housewife following her marriage. The couple have one son, Johnny, Jr., who lives with them.

Mr. and Mrs. Wells serve as an example to those around them. They demonstrate that love can endure, and can bring happiness to a man and a woman for 5 years, 10 years, 15 years and even 50 years and more. Johnnie and Gladys Wells are proof of that, and all of us can learn valuable lessons from this wonderful couple.

Mr. Speaker, the verse which comes to mind when I think of Johnnie and Gladys Wells is that often-quoted, but never truer line that describes how love can endure over time: Grow old along with me/The best is yet to be./The last of life, for which the first was made.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to recognize—belatedly—the golden wedding anniversary of Johnnie and Gladys Wells of Houston, TX. I know that you join with me, and all who love them, in wishing them much happiness and good health for many, many more years to come.

TRIBUTE TO DR. FRANÇOIS-AUGUSTE DE MONTEQUIN

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and an honor to share with you the achievements and accomplishments of Dr. François-Auguste de Montequin. Dr. de Montequin is professor of Art History and chairman of the Department of Art History at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, VA. He is a true gentleman and a dedicated scholar who has contributed so much to the study of art history, architecture and colonial art in Latin America.

Dr. de Montequin was born in Santa Clara, Cuba, of French and Spanish origins. At age 12, on January 4, 1961, he left Cuba for Miami. He left his parents, siblings, and all that he knew behind, for a new life in the United States. He lived in the Kendall Refugee Camp and later was sent to an orphanage in Pennsylvania. He later returned to Florida, and was eventually moved to a home for exiled Cuban children in Albuquerque, NM. Three years after arriving in the United States, in 1964, he was finally reunited with his mother, and eventually his entire family was brought together. He became an American citizen in 1970.

Dr. de Montequin received a B.A.F.A. from the University of New Mexico, magna cum laude, specializing in history of art and architecture. During his undergraduate years he studied at the Università Italiana per Stranieri and the Accademia di Belle Arti Pietro Vanucci in Perugia, Italy. He received a doctorate degree in history and theory of architecture and art from the University of New Mexico in 1974. During his years of graduate study, Dr. de Montequin studied at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, in Madrid, Spain, with a concentration in the history and theory of architecture and art of Medieval

Spain (Muslim), Latin America, and Ancient America.

Dr. de Montequin has dedicated his life to academia. He has taught at the University of New Mexico, Hamline University in Minnesota, Skidmore College in New York, the University of Georgia in Athens (where he also served as chairman of the Art History Department), as well as his present position at the Virginia Commonwealth University. Among them are: "Forms and Expression in Pre-Columbian Art"; "Spanish Colonial Urban Planning: The Fortified Coastal City of Campeche in New Spain"; Dr. de Montequin has also written articles such as "Spanish St. Augustine During the Colonial Period: Evolution of the Oldest City in the United States," "Colonial Cities of Spain and France in the United States: Documentation and Methodology of Research," and "The Essence of Urban Existence in the World of Islam," for which he received an "Honorable Mention," the Creswell Award for Islamic Art from the American University of Cairo.

Outside of his academic work, Dr. de Montequin has organized and consulted in several art exhibitions, among them: "Art of the Eastern World" at the Skidmore College Art Gallery; "Black Kingdoms," at the Minneapolis Institute of Arts, and "The Gregorian Collection of Antique Oriental Rugs," at the Hamline University Art Galleries.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Dr. de Montequin is an example of the American dream come true. He has recently been awarded a Fullbright Scholarship to spend a year in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic. Dr. de Montequin is a true Renaissance man, and I am most proud to share his achievements with my colleagues.

CONGRESSIONAL CALL TO CONSCIENCE

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with the House an account of how one family has been split by an uncaring bureaucracy engendered by the anti-Semitism prevalent in the Soviet Union.

David Mikhalev, a Soviet mathematician, first applied for an exit visa in 1978. Not only was he refused a visa—he lost his job as well. Unable to find work in his field, Mr. Mikhalev barely kept his small family fed through a series of odd jobs.

He applied again in 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, and 1988. No go, said the Soviet authorities: He had worked for the Institute of Communications until 1975, and Mr. Mikhalev could not be allowed to leave the country as a "matter of security," they said.

The truth is, being an applied mathematician, Mr. Mikhalev never dealt with secret information during his tenure at the Institute of Communications. He never was engaged in any purely technical studies. And he has not held a job that required a security clearance since 1975. The charges that he holds secret information are a total fabrication.

If anything, Mr. Mikhalev has been denied work in his field and has faced constant harassment because he was born a Jew in a state that historically has persecuted Jews. And that same state will not allow him to leave, either.

During these years, Mr. Mikhalev, his wife and daughter lived hand-to-mouth from whatever work he could find. Held up in Moscow, Mr. Mikhalev gave his time to the struggle of other refuseniks for their rights to emigrate. He has been an active member of the Refusenik's Law Seminar and is cochairman and secretary of the Public Council of Refuseniks.

However, his daughter fell ill and was diagnosed with a rare genetic disorder that leaves the body underdeveloped. Treatment for this disease is available only in the United States, and Soviet authorities would not allow the family to emigrate despite these circumstances.

Seeing no other alternative, the couple had to obtain a divorce so the mother and daughter could seek treatment in the United States in 1988. Mr. Mikhalev has been granted U.S. refugee status, but still needs a visa.

Mr. Mikhalev's case was referred to Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev on a short list of refuseniks during the Malta summit in December. Now he has been told he needs to reapply for a visa. Some human-rights observers say that's a stalling tactic.

Mr. Speaker, the plight of Mr. Mikhalev and his family is not an isolated incident, but an unfortunate, widespread tragedy—50,000 Jews applied for exit visas from the Soviet Union in October alone, each for his or her own personal reasons, in many cases similar to the Mikhalev family's circumstances. In my own district, concerned constituents have brought to my attention the plight of individual families, such as the family of Gennadi Baburov; the family of Esther Brustein; the family of Mark Kaganov; the family of Mikhail Raikman; the family of Alexander Schlain; the family of Svetlana Sorokin; and the family of nuclear physicist Boris Vugmeister. Their names are only part of a rollcall that grows too long each day.

U.S. intercession on behalf of refuseniks has achieved positive results. We must keep the pressure on the Soviet Union to follow through on its promises to respect the basic rights of humans. Let us not forget these families, for if we forget them, the Soviet Government most certainly will, also.

**HOUSE MAJORITY LEADER
RICHARD GEPHARDT'S ADDRESS
ON U.S. FOREIGN POLICY:
"AMERICAN LEADERSHIP
IN THE NEW WORLD"**

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago, I had the great pleasure of joining our distinguished Majority Leader DICK GEPHARDT for a visit to Eastern Europe where we witnessed first hand the incredible transformation that is taking place in that region. Last week, the ma-

majority leader delivered an outstanding address here in Washington in which he discussed these historic changes and their significance for the United States. He made a series of thoughtful and perceptive criticisms and proposals regarding how our Nation should respond to these new circumstances.

This excellent address was greeted with harsh criticism by some Members, including prominent leaders of the other party. An impassioned exchange took place here on the floor of this House, and the television networks and the other news media were abuzz over the weekend with stories about the controversy.

Mr. Speaker, our majority leader's careful proposals deserve thoughtful consideration. Instead, what we have seen is a vicious personal attack on the majority leader for raising these issues. Criticizing the person who advanced an idea is not a reasonable and responsible approach to political dialogue.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the full text of the majority leader's excellent speech in the RECORD, and I urge that my colleagues in the Congress give his proposals and ideas the serious and thoughtful consideration and evaluation they deserve:

**AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN THE NEW WORLD
(Remarks by Majority Leader Richard A. Gephardt)**

AN AMERICAN VIEW OF EASTERN EUROPE

Two months ago, I led a Congressional Delegation to Eastern Europe. As I traveled through Central and Eastern Europe this winter, I felt that I was witnessing history in the making.

In Czechoslovakia, especially, I was struck by the depth of the commitment to democracy. The nation that was founded by a former resident of Pittsburgh—the nation whose flag is red, white and blue—is the nation whose "Velvet Revolution" echoes the goals and aspirations of the American Revolution. In Prague I presented the leaders of the Civic Forum with a copy of the Bill of Rights. With tears in their eyes they told me of how the ideals embodied in that Bill of Rights inspired them while they were imprisoned for advocating basic human rights.

As I talked with those young patriots in the basement of a Prague beer hall, I was flooded with emotions. Yes, pride that these courageous young men and women look to America for inspiration. But more than a little anger, too. I was angry that at the very moment when the power of ideas for which America has fought are winning the world over, America may be losing its power to help secure and consolidate that victory.

I believe that America is at risk of losing its position of leadership in the world economy. I believe that if steps are not taken to recapture our strength and reassert our leadership we endanger not only prosperity at home, but stability around the world. And I believe the current Administration lacks either the vision to know what steps we must take, or the courage to take them.

The lens of bipolar ideological struggle through which we saw the last half-century has been shattered by events. Now through the broken pieces a pattern is beginning to emerge—a vision of a world in which economic competition will take precedence over military conflict.

Our first duty is to the truth of our circumstances. We must realistically assess our present situation—by asking whether or not

the "long twilight struggle" of which John F. Kennedy spoke is truly over. Then we must candidly assess whether American foreign policy is adequately responding to the challenges and changes we face. Next we must begin to articulate what lies beyond. We must have a coordinated, coherent plan for making certain that the changes occurring are changes for the good. Finally we must be willing to take risks. We must have the vision to know what to do, and the courage to get it done.

IS THE COLD WAR OVER?

It's important to recognize that the policies we pursued to achieve our Cold War objectives—successful though they were—weren't handed down from Mt. Sinai on stone tablets, meant to be followed for the ages. Rather, they were a response to a set of events—a means to shape a safer world.

The Cold War itself was not inevitable. It evolved principally from three events or conditions:

First, the Western European democracies were no longer in a position to lead on world events. Second, Germany and Japan were in a site of ruin. And third, the Soviet Union solidified its hold on the nations its armies had swept through on the way to Berlin, with Stalin breaking his promise of free elections and refusing to allow participation in the Marshall Plan, the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund.

Today, each of those three conditions has fundamentally changed. Western Europe and Japan have strong, stable democracies and free economies; and the Soviet Union is tolerating free elections and free markets in Eastern Europe.

Let me state it plainly, once and for all: The Cold War as we have known it for four decades is over. It has ended just as the giants of a half-century ago knew it would. Surely if men of vision such as Churchill and Truman; DeGaulle and Marshall; Monnet and Spaak could somehow return today, they would be leading the fight to change the very structure they created. Because they intended them to serve a purpose, and that purpose has been served.

While retrenchment in the Soviet Union is always a possibility, the essential characteristics of the Cold War—a spiralling arms race and superpower competition for spheres of influence—have changed in fundamental ways.

Moreover, one of the main effects of the Cold War—a million troops facing off across the inner-German border—is changing as well. Even as we speak the process of German unification continues. The position of the United States on the issue of German unification is clear. It is a position I support. A unified and democratic Germany must be part of the community of free nations and allied with other democratic nations. We respect and support the right of self-determination, and believe the "two plus four" approach is well-suited to address the concerns of all of us who have been drawn into two European wars in this century. But it must be made unequivocally clear that the United States recognizes the existing border between Poland and Germany, and that the Germans do as well. The end of the Cold War cannot be a cause for resurrecting any of the conditions that led us into the last World War.

As we sail with breathtaking speed into the future, it is absolutely essential that we be guided by the constellation of democratic values, 1848 was called "the springtime of nations." I believe 1990 will be remembered

as the springtime of democracy, with freedom in full bloom. With spring elections planned in the G.D.R., Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, and in Czechoslovakia, we truly face a world that has changed.

If we have the fortitude and the determination to seize the day, we can ensure that the days of the Cold War will never return.

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP

Up until this point, however, the day has seized us, rather than the other way around. Thus far in these remarkable times, events have been happening to us, and we have been left groping for a reaction. To be sure, some of this is a function of the dizzying pace of change. But there is no escaping the conclusion that America's lack of leadership in this most crucial moment of this half-century is due in large measure to the fact that our President is not providing the direction we need.

If the nature of the challenge is indeed self-evident, why is it unseen or unfathomable to our President? Why, for example, is he asking the American people this year to give him a military budget that consumes nearly one out of every three federal dollars—to meet yesterday's challenges? Why does he want to spend \$112 million on the LANCE missile for West Germany when it can only reach East Germany? Why does he want to spend billions of dollars on armaments aimed at "communists" who don't want to be communists anymore—and yet has to be pushed into spending a tiny fraction of that to assist the anticommunist patriots that have replaced our old adversaries in Eastern Europe?

It's as though George Bush's Pentagon budget were written by someone who hadn't read a newspaper in a year. It was almost certainly written by someone who hadn't read William Webster's CIA analysis of the unlikelihood of a renewed Soviet threat—even if Mikhail Gorbachev is ousted by the hardliners. Indeed the question on the minds of people everywhere is: With peace breaking out the world over, why is our President intent on beating plowshares into swords?

I believe the answer lies in the President's lack of vision. George Bush campaigned for the Presidency without any sense of what he disdained as "the vision thing." As his campaign and the early days of the Presidency showed us, he would much prefer to occupy his time and the nation's attention with issues like Willie Horton and yet another tax cut for the privileged. It's not that issues like crime and fiscal policy are not important—of course they are. But at some point it is the job of the President to summon the nation to meet new challenges on the horizon.

Thus far the President has failed to do so. Just last week he flew to California to pledge his opposition to crime, drugs—and traffic jams. As for the President's plans for the rest of 1990, the White House says, "We're going to spend more time on politics than you ever dreamed possible."

The country cannot afford that—events will force the President to react to important international matters. In the past, he has reacted—sometimes well, sometimes not—but react is all he has done.

And so, without the vision to see where we must go, the President is reduced to making every decision on the basis of polls and politics.

When Governor Earl Long of Louisiana was asked why he didn't favor prison reform, he said, "Because there ain't no votes in prison." I believe the reason Presi-

dent Bush hasn't done more to promote democracy in Eastern Europe is because there are no votes there. Indeed, there are votes to be lost by being too closely identified with what is disparagingly and inaccurately called "foreign aid." There are votes to be lost in taking a risk for peace, in appearing insufficiently "tough" on the Russians. And there are votes to be lost in calling on the American people to make some changes to adapt to the changing world.

So what we are left with is government of the polls, by the polls and for the polls. The President, who defends foreign policy choices by pointing at his soaring popularity polls, seems to take seriously the mocking words of Mark Twain, who said: "Its name is Public Opinion. It is held in reverence. It settles everything. Some think it is the voice of God."

The President's pollster is frequently trotted before the captive White House media. He criticizes Democrats for decrying the President's lack of leadership. He cites poll data as proof that the President is doing what the American people want.

Yes, the President is doing what America says it wants in his latest poll. But is he giving the American people the information they need to make an informed decision when his pollster calls? Of course, every politician has to listen to the voice of the people—there's nothing wrong with that. But the reason the American people seem reluctant to embrace the changes in Eastern Europe; the reason they oppose increased investment in democracy in that region; the reason they aren't sure if the Cold War is over, is because their President is not leading them. He is not explaining and interpreting these startling events for them. His not helping them understand the new world we live in—its challenges, its opportunities, its dangers.

The President's lack of vision, and America's lack of leadership, have consequences that are both real and grave. The President of the United States retreats from the world by failing to lead the American people to see our self-interest in the success of democracy and free markets in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. But his timid posture may well create a self-fulfilling prophecy that at best confirms the status quo and at worst condemns the fragile new democracies to failure.

In short, the Bush foreign policy is a policy adrift; without vision, without imagination, without a guiding light save precious public opinion polls. But if he wanted to, President Bush could seize the day and marshal the American people into a mighty army marching for change.

History teaches us that it can be done.

In 1947 the American people, having fought two world wars in thirty years, were loathe to be caught up in foreign entanglements. They desperately desired to focus their pent-up energies on domestic demands.

But President Truman and the wise men who advised him realized that the changing times demanded that we change with them. And so Truman shaped the change by proposing that America commit itself to building democracy and free enterprise in Europe. The Marshall Plan was a classic case of principled pragmatism.

But it was unpopular. In fact, in the Gallup Poll of 1947, only 14% of the American people supported foreign loans and assistance. No wonder why—the American economy was only about one-fourth as large as it is today, and the Marshall Plan repre-

sented an investment that would cost \$82 billion today. One hardly needed Mr. Gallup to know such a proposal would face strong resistance.

President Truman was not in much better shape. To this day no President—not even Nixon in the depths of Watergate—has been as unpopular as Truman was as he headed into the election of 1948. Perhaps sensing the political advantage, mainstream Republicans like Robert Taft and extremist Republicans like Joseph McCarthy opposed Truman and criticized the Marshall Plan.

The record resounds with attacks like "socialistic", "dangerous", "simple minded", and "giveaway." One Republican—William Jenner of Indiana—summed up much of the opposition when he said: "It seems to be Mr. Truman's thesis that the international crisis can only be solved if we buy off the dangers of communism by giving large cash donations from the American taxpayer's pocket to already shaky European governments most of whom are, in fact, only a degree or two removed from the menace from which we are supposed to be protecting them."

But Truman did not flinch. He knew it was an investment that would reap tremendous benefits in new markets for America and more stability for the world. So he pressed on, despite the political repercussions. Ignoring the polls, Truman worked with the Republicans who controlled the Congress, especially Senator Arthur Vandenberg, and signed into law what one British newspaper called "an act without peer in history."

Harry Truman lived by Sam Houston's maxim: "Do right, risk consequences." The maxim of the Bush Administration seems to be: "Do polls, risk nothing."

There is no substitute for Presidential leadership. And given the fact that President Bush has record-high levels of popularity and more than two years to go before he faces re-election, he is in the perfect position to lead.

If he were to come to Congress the way Truman did, I can assure him we would work with him the way Vandenberg did. If he would use his bully pulpit to lead, the American people would follow. And if he would summon us all to the challenges we face, this country would rise to meet them. The American people will support democracy in Eastern Europe if our President tells us it's in our deep self-interest to do so. But we risk freedom dying on the vine if our President doesn't take the lead.

The President should carefully articulate to the American people the risks and benefits of the new world. He should remind us of how fragile young democracies are. He should distinguish today's circumstances from those of 1947—why it is we don't have to replicate the Marshall Plan—the Europeans don't need it, and we Americans cannot afford it. Of course, each nation is unique, but by and large the Eastern European countries have stronger physical foundations for their economies than the Western Europeans had in 1947—their dislocation was caused by the communist system, not by the destruction of war. However, while they have stronger economic bases than the Western Europeans had after the war, many Eastern European nations have weaker traditions of free government and free enterprise.

So the President should call on America not necessarily to spend a lot more on foreign aid—but to spend a lot smarter. For example, the new military base in Italy the

President's budget calls for will cost more this year than the total amount of savings we will receive from all the proposed base closings here in America. But do we need another military base to defend Western Europe—or can we better advance freedom and democracy in all of Europe through economic, technical, political and moral support? By the same token, do we need an increase of almost a half a billion dollars in military assistance in our foreign aid budget, and converting another \$400 million in military loans to grants, while at the same time reducing UNICEF emergency aid for children and United Nations Environmental Program assistance at a time when famine and disease and pollution are becoming more clear and present dangers than superpower conflict?

The President should lead America in reassessing and changing our priorities to meet the new challenges. Otherwise history will remember the Bush foreign policy as a latter-day Maginot Line. He should let us know that if we invest a small amount in freedom today, we can reap a tremendous benefit down the road—a benefit that can include billions of dollars in savings from defense, new markets for American products, new jobs for American workers, new freedom to address old domestic difficulties. But most of all we stand to gain peace and stability. We have an historic opportunity to lower the deadly levels of tension in the nuclear age, and pull our children farther back from the brink of Armageddon.

With the demise of the Cold War, the American people are awaiting a new vision—a new way of looking at the world and understanding these momentous events. In Eastern Europe and around the world, the challenge for the United States is to help free people consolidate their gains, and build nations that are free, prosperous and secure. Here at home the challenge is to reinvigorate the American economy and renew the American spirit. The most important tools for achieving both goals are economic rather than military.

America must once again assert itself as a leader. To do that we must change the way we think about national strength, and arm ourselves for the economic competition already underway. America must begin by helping to shape the change in Europe, or we will surely be a victim of it. To that end there is much that we can do right away.

THE AMERICAN ROLE

The Congress is taking steps to ensure that the tremendous risks taken by brave people are rewarded with the better future promised by free governments and free markets. We are making progress in granting many nations of what we used to call the "Eastern bloc" Most Favored Nation status.

Next we should expand the role American agriculture plays in encouraging change in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. I propose a Food for Freedom program that will share the strength of America's agricultural abundance with the Eastern European and Soviet people. There is no doubt that private ownership of farm land and the hard work of our family farmers are the keys to America's success in agriculture. But while Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union are moving in that direction, it is in our interests to help sustain them on that journey.

President Havel of Czechoslovakia made that very point about the Soviet Union in his recent address to Congress. If someone whose nation was invaded by Soviet troops, who was imprisoned by Soviet puppets, who was pinned under the boulder of Soviet

domination for all his adult life can call on us to assist the Soviets in moving to democracy, the least we can do is listen.

I believe that support of the process of democratization in the U.S.S.R. is in America's self-interest. We have a stake in the success of peaceful change towards a pluralist system in that nation. A stronger Soviet economy will facilitate the process of peace. How can the Soviets pull Red Army troops out of Eastern Europe if they have no jobs and no homes for them to return to in Russia?

So America must think creatively and act boldly. Rather than pouring more and more money into weapons systems, we should be investing in our own self-interest. And stability, democracy and a market economy in the Soviet Union are in America's strong self-interest.

On this point I must say that President Bush has been right—as far as he's gone. He has lent important political and moral support to the process of reform in the Soviet Union. I'd like to enlist American farmers and business people to make more substantive investments as well. Anyone who has seen the lines outside the McDonald's in Moscow knows the Soviets would appreciate American food and American goods. And American farmers and workers would appreciate the markets. We should waive trade restrictions such as Jackson-Vanik and the Stevenson Amendment, relax restrictions on high-tech exports, and encourage private investment in the Soviet Union. We provide Export-Import Bank loans and OPIC assistance to China, why not to the Soviet Union?

Another aspect of President Havel's speech that moved me was his point that rather than a hand out, the people of Eastern Europe want a hand up. The United States can offer that hand through a series of exchanges on a scale never before seen.

We need a Freedom International program for the 1990's—a modern-day Berlin Airlift bringing planeloads of people across the Atlantic in both directions: religious, educational, and political leaders from Budapest and Bratislava coming to work in churches and schools and offices in San Francisco and San Antonio. If each of America's fifty states could offer scholarships to just forty Eastern European students, we will have doubled the number of Eastern Europeans studying in the U.S.

We should support conferences on issues affecting the environment, the arts and the military. We should encourage discussion of the sources and solutions of ethnic prejudice and religious intolerance. We have so much to learn from each other. So let the exchanges begin. The Congress will soon be considering a bill which will provide \$190 million worth of technical assistance, Peace Corps programs, and exchanges to Central and Eastern Europe. In all, legislation currently before Congress will provide over a half a billion dollars in immediate investment in Eastern European democracy. And that is only the beginning.

America is well-positioned to take a leading role in providing the technical and managerial assistance the Eastern Europeans need. So much of the strength and the soul of our nation has its roots in Eastern Europe. How wonderful it would be if we could encourage experienced Americans—as part of a Free Enterprise Corps—to return to the nations from which their parents came to help a new generation have a new birth of freedom in their old countries. We in America would be benefitted by a return to those roots as well. The fight for freedom in Eastern

Europe is rekindling the revolutionary spirit of America at a time when we badly need it. We have as much to gain from this as anyone.

UNITED FOR THE CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE

But America cannot, need not and should not go it alone. History teaches us that a coordinated response from both sides of the Atlantic has been the answer to all the great challenges of this century.

For several years I have advanced the idea of forming an economic alliance as stable and as strong as the NATO military alliance. Over time, economic cooperation will be as indispensable as the military and political dialogue of the United Nations Security Council. As Trade Ministers become more vital to their nations' security than Defense Ministers, I would like to see more and more international dialogue and cooperation.

A Union of Nations for International Trade and Economic Development—[UNITED]—might be a means of giving structure to such cooperation. UNITED would bring together, on a regular basis, the leaders of the major trading democracies—the nations of the European Community, the United States, Canada, Japan and Australia. By working together, and discussing our problems and opportunities, we could bring more order and stability to issues of development, trade and competition—issues which threaten to divide us as much in the future as ideology did in the past.

UNITED would not be a new bureaucracy, but rather a new approach; an expansion and extension of what has worked so well for NATO and what is being done through G-7, the European Community, GATT, and IMF, the World Bank and others.

UNITED's mandate will be to coordinate, not to dictate. It can address so many of the topics facing leading nations today: from developing the economies of Eastern Europe to formulating new rules of international economic engagement to addressing the burden of Third World Debt.

The lessons of the past offer evidence that economic engagement can work—and that all sides can "win." The Marshall Plan's initial commitment to Europe has grown to the point where we invested some \$1.2 trillion in the 1980's alone for the common defense of the Continent. Today we are in a position to realize a dividend from 40 years of prudent investing. We must reinvest a part of that dividend. It's just good sense. A nation that spent trillions to contain Communism must be willing to spend a minuscule fraction of that to consolidate democracy. Only a prosperous and peaceful Europe will allow us to reduce our military commitments without reducing our national security.

If we hesitate now, if our resolve falters just at the moment when we are about to realize the peace and prosperity that our fathers fought for, the consequences could be disastrous. I realize the political risk such reinvestment entails. But as President Kennedy said, "there are risks and costs to a program of action. But they are far less than the long-range risks and costs of inaction."

Ultimately the attention of the world must move beyond responding to individual crises and toward building vigorous and vibrant economies in the developing countries of the world—which will be the focus of so many of the new challenges we face. Herein lies the greatest challenge and the greatest opportunity of the next century. For too long we have allowed the threat of military

confrontation between East and West to obscure the threat posed by the growing gulf between the superpowers and the super-poor.

CONCLUSION

Over time, I want to see a Europe in which America's young students have replaced our young soldiers; a Europe in which American technology has replaced American tanks; a Europe in which new American lasers replace aging American Lance missiles.

But it is a grave mistake to think that the focus of history has shifted completely away from the United States and onto Europe. The difficulties we face here—and how we rise to meet them—will determine whether a strong America leads the world in the new era of economic competition, or a diminished and exhausted America shrinks from the challenges history has laid before it.

This is our new call to arms—to rebuild American strength, to restore Eastern European democracy, to redress the problems of unbalanced trade, and to reassure the world that the Berlin Wall that divided East from West is not succeeded by a chasm of poverty separating North from South. Economic engagement and competitive coexistence will be the watchwords of the new decade and the new century that will follow it.

The stakes could not be higher. The threat could not be more real. A hundred years from now the 1990's will be remembered as the time when America reinvented itself once again, and in so doing led the world into a new era of peace and prosperity—if we have the vision to see the change in the course of history, and the courage to adjust our course to meet it.

CALIFORNIA'S FIRST AMERICANS: STILL LAST

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the history of Federal Indian policies contains many dark chapters. However, no chapter is darker than the treatment provided California Indian tribes.

The Federal Government's inexcusable treatment of California Indians is a story filled with empty promises, deceit, neglect, and on occasion, open dishonesty.

John Echohawk, the executive director of the Native American Rights Fund, has published a thoughtful article summarizing the history of Federal Indian policy in California. Mr. Echohawk's article accurately describes the Federal Government's neglect and the cumbersome process being used to stifle efforts by California Indians to obtain Government services.

I would like to urge my colleagues to take a few moments to review Mr. Echohawk's article.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

THE FIRST CALIFORNIANS ARE STILL LAST

(By John E. Echohawk)

President Bush and members of his Administration like to use the old saw: If it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it's

a duck. Their criteria for acknowledging Indian tribes, however, are significantly more demanding.

Consider the dilemma faced by 21 tribes in California. The federal government signed 18 treaties with California tribes in the 1800s, but the U.S. Senate caved in to political and economic pressure and refused to ratify them. In the fashion of the times, the Senate then concealed for 50 years the embarrassing fact that the treaties had even been made. For many more years, the federal government continued to abrogate its responsibility to protect Indian groups from the local non-Indian population. As a result, most of the California tribes were driven off their lands, relocated away from populated areas and forced into indentured service. Their culture was brutally repressed and, to escape total destruction, they took to the hills. Some were crowded onto what was left of the Spanish ranchos after statehood, and then left homeless when the lands were sold or lost in tax sales.

Now in a presidentially proclaimed kinder, gentler nation, the descendants of those Indians are asking the federal government to formally acknowledge them as tribes. Such recognition is critical to their economic and cultural survival because only recognized tribes are entitled to participate in federal housing, health and education programs, and to maintain their rightful government-to-government relationship with Washington.

These tribes are now required to prove their existence with genealogical records, historical documentation, anthropological studies, demonstration of uninterrupted political authority and minutiae of detail that are nearly impossible to come by. In an ironic twist, the tribes' documentary records depend almost exclusively on studies by non-Indians.

Contrary to popular opinion, the federal government's inexcusable treatment of Native Americans didn't end in the 1800s. In the 1950s and '60s, Congress "terminated" numerous Indian tribes by liquidating their property and administratively disfranchising them by applying new terms such as "adult Indian communities," or "descendancy groups." In California alone, three termination acts of Congress wiped away at least 37 rancherias and 61 tribes and bands. In more recent years, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has unilaterally "de-recognized" tribes that have participated in federal programs for years simply by stopping their appropriations. In fact, one BIA official testified, an Indian treaty confers recognition on a tribe only "on the day it was made." After that, recognition continues only so long as the BIA decides that the tribe is still Indian enough.

Since 1978, when the Interior Department set up an administrative procedure to "acknowledge" Indian groups, 21 California tribes and 93 others have sought to reassert their rights by petitioning the BIA for formal acknowledgment of their status as Indian tribes. To date, only 19 petitions have been acted on, and 12 of them were rejected. Tribes have spent, on average, more than \$250,000 each to meet the BIA's burdens of proof.

Inexcusable delays and unrealistic requirements have further plagued the petitioners. In California, the lone Band of Miwok Indians have been trying since 1916 to obtain federal approval. The Mono Lake and Antelope Valley Indian communities have been jumping through BIA hoops since 1976.

What's the harm in recognizing a limited number of tribes?

Unfortunately, like most problems in our society, it boils down to money. According to the federal budget office, if the BIA acknowledges more Indian tribes, there won't be enough money to go around. Besides, who wants to open the federal coffers to new claims when the deficit is so bad? This rationale neatly and unfairly pits recognized tribes against unrecognized ones. It also feeds the misguided perception that the federal government is somehow doing a favor for the poor, incapable Indians, as if this were charity and not a matter of treaties signed in good faith. Governmental debts and obligations cannot be ignored just because it suits some to do so.

Fortunately, Sen. Daniel K. Inouye (D-Hawaii) has devised a solution that can and should pass Congress. It would establish uniform criteria for federal recognition, set deadlines for consideration of petitions, provide an independent appeal procedure, and take federal recognition onto a more fair playing field.

This will not be the kinder, gentler country that President Bush envisions until the government rights this moral and legal wrong that has festered for almost two centuries.

CRS REPORT ON TRUST FUNDS AND THE FEDERAL DEFICIT

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, the Congressional Research Service completed a report, "Trust Funds and the Federal Deficit" which sheds some much needed light on both subjects. The report clearly explains budgeting and accounting features of trust funds, such as government payments and special issues securities whose impact on Federal deficits are often confused.

The report's central thesis is that trust fund surpluses do not mask the real deficit and further, that trust funds in the aggregate are in deficit themselves and, therefore increase the Federal deficit. It, therefore, can be argued that by operating deficits, trust funds have in fact, added to the debt.

In light of all the debate on trust funds, especially Social Security, I hope that every Member of Congress will review this excellent report. The summary of the report follows:

TRUST FUND PROGRAMS AND THE FEDERAL DEFICIT SUMMARY

The treatment of trust fund programs in the Federal budget is complicated and confusing. As a result, the impact of these programs on the financial condition of the Government is often misunderstood. Perhaps the biggest misconception today is that these programs are offsetting the Federal deficit by \$124 billion and thereby masking the true size of the deficit. Although attention has been drawn to the large social security surpluses, trust fund programs overall actually have been running cash deficits.

This aggregate cash deficit is not at first visible. Official budget documents show that overall income credited to Federal trust

funds in FY 1989 exceeded the spending posted against them by \$124 billion—an apparent surplus. However, what is commonly called trust fund income is not just the amounts of receipts from the public generated by these programs. Trust funds also receive credits from the Treasury, what might be called paper income. It can be misleading to treat this paper income like cash when assessing the Federal deficit, which is the gap between total cash income and total expenditures in any given year. When only receipts from the public for trust fund programs—cash income—are compared to Federal spending for them, a deficit emerges; spending exceeded receipts by \$18 billion.

Moreover, this is not an aberration. On the whole, trust fund programs ran deficits in their cash transactions with the public in 19 of the last 21 years. Even social security went through a long period when its expenditures exceeded its revenues. And even social security receives paper credits that make its current surpluses appear larger.

Because the official or traditional approach to accounting for Federal trust funds shows them to be running surpluses, the blame for the Federal deficit frequently is placed on the rest of the Government. Thus, all the Government's borrowing is usually attributed to its non-trust fund activities, and the interest expense or debt service is generally considered part of this category. However, because trust funds have regularly run operating or cash-flow deficits, they, too, can be considered responsible for the Government's need to borrow—i.e., for increasing the debt and the resulting interest expense. If interest expense were not included in the "rest of the Government" category of the budget, this category would show a surplus. The point is that no program or sector of the Government is responsible for deficits and the resulting buildup of Federal debt. The Government borrows as it needs to, for whatever obligations it has to meet.

Trust fund programs are a major part of what the Government does. In FY 1989 they generated 39 percent—some \$386 billion—of the Government's tax revenues and were responsible for 35 percent—\$403 billion—of its spending. If deficit reduction efforts are based on the erroneous assumption that trust funds overall are generating actual cash surpluses for the Government, the result may be to distort the process by which Congress determines fiscal priorities—what Congress wants to spend money on and how it will raise the resources to do so.

THE UNITED STATES AND IRAN AND RECIPROCIITY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in January, I wrote the Department of State concerning diplomatic representation and dealings between the United States and Iran who do not have diplomatic relations.

I was concerned about the lack of reciprocity in our relations. There are apparently close to 30 Iranians working in Washington at the Iranian Interests Section of the Algerian Embassy and Iran often charges Americans for visas to go to Iran. The United States does

not charge Iranians for visas and we do not have any representation in Tehran, relying on a few Swiss diplomats to carry out our business.

Attached is correspondence I had with the State Department on this issue, my letter of January 24, 1990 and the reply of the State Department of February 23, 1990. There are reasons for the lack of reciprocity but I believe that we should move to stricter reciprocity.

I would like to bring this exchange to the attention of my colleagues. The correspondence follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, DC, February 23, 1990.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of January 24, 1990 to the Secretary. I am pleased to respond, on the Secretary's behalf, to the questions you raised regarding the Iranian Interests Section of the Algerian Embassy and the issue of visa reciprocity with Iran.

With regard to the Iranian Interests Section, you are right that there is not strict equivalence in the arrangements which exist here and in Tehran. The American Interests Section of the Swiss Embassy in Iran consists of three Swiss diplomats and about 10 Iranian employees. They provide consular services to the Americans who live in Iran. By the last estimate, there were about 2,300 of them, including about 2,250 dual nationals.

In the United States, by contrast, there are approximately 500,000 Iranians, many of whom require consular services such as the issuance of new passports, registration of births, and so on. Since 1981, we have accepted an arrangement whereby these services are provided by the Iranian Interests Section of the Algerian Embassy, which is required to employ legal permanent residents of the United States or U.S. citizens only. None of the employees in the Iranian Interests Section has any diplomatic status.

On the question of visa reciprocity, the problem is that Iranian practice around the world does not appear to be uniform. The Iranian Interests Section here says that it does not charge for visas. We have canvassed our posts, however, and it appears that in some places Iranian embassies do charge fees for visas to Americans, ranging from \$10-\$15. We will take appropriate action when we are sure that this is prevailing Iranian practice.

Sincerely,

JANET G. MULLINS,

Assistant Secretary,
Legislative Affairs.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, January 24, 1990.

HON. JAMES A. BAKER III,

Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I write regarding certain aspects of United States dealings with Iran and the principal of reciprocity.

It is my understanding that there are close to 30 Iranians working in the Iranian Interests Section of the Algerian Embassy and that, on a separate issue, Iran is charging American citizens close to \$15 dollars for a visa. It is further my understanding that we are not charging Iranians for visas and that our Interests Section in the Swiss Embassy certainly does not have the personnel, American or third country national, that Iran has here.

I would like to know why there is not reciprocity, why we do not charge Iranian nationals for visas and why we allow there to be nonreciprocal representation in the two countries. The continued lack of reciprocity, in my view, sends the wrong signal to Iran.

Your consideration of this matter is appreciated and I hope this situation can be rectified.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe
and the Middle East.

H.R. 4250

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today H.R. 4250, the State and Local Multi-Objective River Corridor Assistance Act to promote the wise use of one of our Nation's most treasured resources—the 3.5 million miles of rivers and their adjacent lands.

The legislation is the result of an intensive yearlong effort to assist State and local communities develop balanced policies to preserve and enhance our country's river corridors for a multitude of uses. This effort involved extensive input from Federal agencies, public and private groups, river management experts, public officials, and private landowners.

The centerpiece of this effort was six regional workshops held early last year in Boston, Atlanta, Denver, San Francisco, Washington, and Omaha. As a result of these workshops and from hundreds of written comments received nationwide, it became clear that States and local communities want to improve the quality and uses of their river areas, but find it difficult to achieve balance between competing river uses. Communities also stressed that financial and technical assistance from the Federal Government is limited and complicated Federal regulations often-times impede State and local efforts to revitalize these areas.

Any community currently taking an action in a river corridor must deal with a bewildering multitude of Federal agencies and regulations. There is no unified approach or contact for advice and assistance, no assurance that the technical information provided is state-of-the-art data, and no defined formula which aids communities in a reasoned participatory decisionmaking process.

Rivers truly are the life blood of the Nation, providing major transportation corridors, drinking water, wetlands, waste dissemination, hydroelectric power, agricultural irrigation, timber management, recreational needs, wildlife habitat, and areas of contemplation and relaxation. The adjacent lands possess equally important qualities such as wetlands, floodplains, natural areas, urban waterfronts, historic communities, and places for fishing and hiking.

The importance and complexity of river values clearly warrants a carefully considered and well-reasoned balance among the competing users. In order to achieve balance,

future river efforts must recognize all legitimate beneficial public uses, encourage decisions which result in the maximum public benefit, and, most importantly, encourage consensus building and input from all interests and at all stages of the decisionmaking process.

Congress has passed landmark legislation over the past 20 years affecting rivers. And while the Clean Water Act, Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the Coastal Zone Management Act, to name just a few, are important, there are still many other rivers and river segments which need additional Federal assistance. These areas are subject to many competing uses, and in many instances, decisions are being made with little regard to reviewing all significant river values and uses and most importantly, without consensus from all user groups in a community.

What public laws and regulations sometimes fail to recognize is that river values and uses are quite broad. The spectrum of interest stretches from preservation of rivers in their natural state to multiple use, which historically and practically, have been the most acceptable use throughout history.

While advocating a policy which recognizes and balances conservation needs with high quality economic uses seems logical, achieving the goal is often quite difficult for communities.

The legislation I am introducing today was drafted to recognize and promote a wide variety of river uses—recreation, fishing, wildlife habitat, and economic revitalization. It also is designed to help local communities control sources of pollution, reduce flood and storm-water losses, and preserve the historical and heritage values of their rivers and waterfronts. Most importantly, the bill is intended to make Government more responsive to the State and local communities it serves through a combination of matching grants, technical assistance, and interagency cooperation.

A four-pronged legislative approach is used to achieve these objectives:

First. Matching grants and technical assistance to States, local governments, and private nonprofit groups. Eligible projects would include river restoration, greenway and heritage parks, individual river corridor projects, in urban, suburban and rural areas, and statewide river assessments.

Major criteria for eligibility area:

All significant public and private values and uses of land and water must be considered.

Decisionmaking process which reflects a high degree of consensus at all stages of decisionmaking process and includes input from local landowners.

The project shall be publicly supported and reflect significant commitment by States, local government, and private interests of the area.

Second. A multiobjective River Corridor Council would be established. Members would be the Secretary or Department heads of the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Transportation, Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, the Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Emergency Management Administra-

tion, Tennessee Valley Authority, and Army Corps of Engineers.

Major responsibilities of the Council would be:

First. Cutting Federal redtape.—Review current programs and recommend opportunities to improve their effectiveness, promote interagency coordination, and eliminate inconsistencies in Federal programs.

Second. Developing interagency training programs to provide the specialized Federal personnel to assist State and local communities find solutions to their problems. This assistance would provide a range of innovative, cost-effective options to local communities.

Third. A national clearinghouse of information on funding sources, technical assistance, model programs, and practical state-of-the-art technical data.

Fourth. Create a National River Register which would formally recognize rivers or segments exemplifying successful multiobjective approaches. Nominations would be made by the States. All recipients of the award will be eligible for matching implementation grants.

One of the most significant portions of the bill concerns the protection of private property rights. Section 205 mandates that:

Each Federal agency in the Council and all recipients of assistance under this title shall, in their planning, implementation, and management of river corridors involving private lands, give full consideration to (1) the concerns of private landowners, groups and nonprofit organizations; (2) continued private traditional and new use of river corridor lands where such uses are consistent and compatible with established goals and the wise use of significant river resource values; and (3) the creation of a project task force which includes representative private landowners to assist in decisionmaking.

I urge my colleagues to sign on as cosponsors of this local river initiative. The legislation is innovative, cost effective, and balanced. It acknowledges the need for national leadership which encourages cooperative partnerships with State and local communities.

This is a bill that recognizes that river revitalization efforts begin with local community initiatives and that the Federal Government should be a cooperative partner in those efforts.

This multiobjective approach is certainly not a new concept, but the issues, concerns, needs, and proponents for such an approach and the new innovative techniques available in the 1990's are far different than in the past.

Because of these factors and the continued reduction in Federal dollars, it is even more critical that we begin to broaden the traditional Federal role of acquisition and regulation to include the encouragement of informed, balanced State and local river corridor decisionmaking. Our goal should be developing a cooperative approach that will garner the experience and expertise of our Federal agencies and integrate this know-how with the needs and sensitivities of State and local governments and the citizenry they serve.

IN RECOGNITION OF INNOVATIVE EFFORTS IN HAWAII CHILD CARE

HON. PATRICIA F. SAIKI

OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mrs. SAIKI. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress continues its lengthy debate on child care, corporations and States are successfully attempting to resolve their own child care problems. Hawaii is a stellar example of how determination, ingenuity, and dedication can accomplish what Congress has been unable to achieve even after years of trying.

Hawaii is fortunate in that we have a well-established network for parents in search of care for their children. This network is part of a group called PATCH—or People Attentive to Children. PATCH serves hundreds of families each month and successfully places many children in quality and affordable child care. However, their success would not be so dramatic without support from the private sector.

An example of a very creative type of program are those facilities which provide care to sick children. The Queens Medical Center sick child care program reserves a number of beds for the benefit of local working parents whose children are not seriously ill, but sick enough to prevent attendance at school or child care.

Castle Medical Center offers a unique opportunity for parents with infants and toddlers, the most difficult population for which care can be found. The program is for the benefit of Castle employees and is run out of a cottage on hospital grounds, thereby making it accessible to parents during work hours.

Mauna Lani Resort in Hawaii has joined the child care effort since determining that child care is a major factor in attracting and maintaining employees. In response to the growing need for care for pre-school children, Mauna Lani will be completing an on-site center for 100 of its employees' children by September. The program is to be education-based and will be open for 16 hours a day so that all employees will be able to take advantage of its services.

Another outstanding idea was recently piloted by First Hawaiian Inc. First Hawaiian has established a program where an employee can contribute to a special pre-tax child care account to which the company will deposit up to \$200 per month. In addition, this bank holding company will reimburse employees for the cost of care at a Queens sick child care facility. With this type of system, families have the opportunity to select any type of child care they prefer.

The State of Hawaii recently implemented a revolutionary statewide afterschool program for latchkey children called A+. Thousands of children are currently enrolled and are benefiting from afterschool learning activities for only \$1 a day.

All of Hawaii's fine child care programs deserve recognition, but more importantly, they deserve assistance under a Federal child care plan as well. To quote Maui Land and Pineapple Co.'s benefits administrator, Alec McBar-net, " * * * child care should no more be considered a luxury item than should a quality public education system. * * * Rather it is a necessity in order to live and work in Hawaii."

Mr. Speaker, please bring a child care conference report to the House floor for a vote so that all American families can have access to convenient, affordable, and high-quality care.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF
THE HAMMOND HARWOOD
HOUSE

HON. C. THOMAS McMILLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a national historic landmark, the Hammond Harwood House, a museum that has preserved the heritage of 18th-century Annapolis for the past 50 years. I also wish to commend the efforts of the Hammond Harwood House Association, a volunteer group that has taken it upon themselves to purchase and restore this historical site.

In 1774, Mathias Hammond commissioned the renowned English architect William Buckland to design this home. The house remained in the family until the death of the last heir in 1924, when St. John's College became the owner. The house remained relatively empty until 1938 when the Hammond Harwood House Association was created with the goal of restoring and purchasing the historic home. In 1940, through its dedication, it raised enough funds so that it was able to purchase the Hammond Harwood House from St. John's College.

Since 1940 the Hammond Harwood House Association has been committed to restoring this Golden Age monument as closely as possible to its original 10 century atmosphere. The architecture retains its original carved woodwork, without any modern alterations, and the house also retains contents original to the era. Notably, the works of local craftsman John Shaw, and Charles Willson Peale, an 18th-century Annapolis artist, are displayed. In the drawing room, a formal colonial music program is offered which allows opportunities for the public to learn about music of the time period and local musicians to perform music of the 18th century. This exact preservation allows the community to fully experience this era.

It is with great pride that I extend my sincerest congratulations to the Hammond Harwood House Association for their 50 years of historic community service. I know that my colleagues will be pleased to join me in offering best wishes for the continued preservation and success of this prestigious landmark.

RETIREMENT OF JOHN DOUGLAS PHELPS, A TRUE PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, President Woodrow Wilson said that "there is no idea so uplifting as the idea of the service to humanity."

John Douglas Phelps, throughout his career, has put himself in the service of humanity. His mission as a public servant was to enable others to help themselves; and so upon his retirement early this summer, the work of John Phelps will continue in the lives of the many people he served.

His beginnings were modest, having grown up on a Russell County, KY, farm and begun his education at the one-room schoolhouse in the tiny farm community of Esto. In the rolling hills of southern Kentucky, John grew up learning the ability to build a team, to work for the benefit of people, whether it would be harvesting the family's crops, repairing a neighbor's barn, or participating in a church service project.

John Phelps never got rural southern Kentucky out of his blood. Fortunately, for the many people he helped in the region, southern Kentucky never loosened her grip on John Phelps. Except for his 3 years in service of his country in the military service, John Phelps has been a lifelong Kentuckian, and a southern Kentuckian for most of that.

His professional career in service to Kentuckians began in 1963, when he was employed as a social worker for the State of Kentucky. By 1967, John Phelps accepted an opportunity to further build people to help themselves, as assistant director, then director, of the West Lake Cumberland Community Action Agency. His experience with Government-related social and community programs led him to become the Federal Programs Director of the Lake Cumberland Area Development District [LCADD], a 10-county community development organization, in 1973. Nine years later, he was promoted to the LCADD's executive directorship. His work at LCADD was instrumental in the development of scores of economic development projects and the construction of facilities to help improve the lives of southern Kentuckians, and to teach them to help themselves.

But the professional career of John Phelps does not begin to describe the depth of his integrity and his dedication to strengthening his beloved southern Kentucky home. Yes, he served with distinction on several important civic and corporate boards. And through his career, he placed a high emphasis on improving his education far beyond his studies at Campbellsville, KY, College and the University of Kentucky. Moreover, his work drew honors from organizations such as the Russell County Farmers Market and the chamber of commerce.

In his service to southern Kentuckians, and in his own family, John Phelps has had an instinct for practicality, and an astute sense of the possible. His knowledge, his common

sense, and his uncanny talent for stretching people's abilities beyond their ordinary means made him a valuable adviser and dear friend to many people, especially myself.

In his retirement, I am quite sure John Phelps shall never resign his nature of helping his fellow man. I personally will miss his frequent visits to my Washington and my Somerset offices on behalf of southern Kentucky projects. Now that John Phelps is retiring, perhaps he can stop by more often, bearing wisdom and sound advice in his own warm, inimitable way.

WELCOMING THE AMERICAN FILTRATION SOCIETY NATIONAL CONVENTION TO WASHINGTON, DC

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, the American Filtration Society will hold its annual national convention here in Washington from March 18-22. I would like to take a moment to salute this organization and its members for the many important services they provide in the fields of environmental engineering, minerals and material science, oil well and reservoir technology, ceramics, pulp and paper, the food and beverage industry, clean rooms, air-conditioning, hydraulic fluids, plating, medicine and biotechnology, and the chemical industry.

The American Filtration Society unites practitioners in these and other diverse fields who are involved in fluid-solid separation. Currently, the AFS has approximately 800 individual members and more than 40 corporate members; 10 chapters, including one in my home State of Texas; and its well-respected Fluid-Particle Separation Journal.

The first chapter of the American Filtration Society was organized in Texas in 1968, when several individuals with shared interests decided to get together on a regular basis to discuss filtration issues. Since then, additional chapters have come into existence.

The society consists of individuals and corporations involved in the separation of particles from fluids. Fluids may be gases or liquids, and particles include solids, liquids within liquids, bubbles, mists, and foams. The size of these particles may be as ionic, as in reverse osmosis; macromolecular, as encountered in biotechnology; in the micron range, as typified by clays and aerosols; or larger.

The society's objectives are as diverse as its members. The society strives to:

Chart a path leading to the recognition of fluid/particle processing and separation as a recognized science and engineering;

Facilitate the transfer of technology among manufacturers and users of fluid/particle separation equipment;

Provide guidance to industry and government concerning fluid/particle separation and its significance in preserving man's quality of life through protection of the planet's environment;

Assist members to solve existing problems, exchange information with individuals having

similar interests, and to strengthen and expand their technological knowledge; and

Support organized programs of study and research at the university level in fluid/particle systems.

While few of us here in the House are likely to fully appreciate the benefits we receive on a daily basis as the result of fluid/particle separation, there is no denying that fluid/particle separation plays an integral role in a variety of industries. The scientists, engineers, and technologists who belong to the AFS are among our brightest product designers, research personnel, consultants, academicians, end users, and distributors.

The society conducts a variety of technology meetings each year, attracting participants from across the United States and from abroad as well. For example, in March 1988, an International Technology Conference was held in Ocean City, MD, and additional conferences were held last year in Pittsburgh and Houston. The annual meeting of the AFS in Washington later this month will be a major international conference.

I would like to congratulate one of my constituents—Guy E. Weismantle, president of Weismantle International of Kingwood, TX, who serves as executive secretary of the American Filtration Society.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and my colleagues will join me in welcoming the members of the American Filtration Society to their conference in Washington, and join me in saluting all that the organization—and its members—does for our country.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to recognize the American Filtration Society, its members, and its upcoming annual meeting to be held here in Washington, DC.

MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Floridians who take great pride in preserving our abundant natural resources, it is my honor to highlight an outstanding activist from Miami, FL. Marjory Stoneman Douglas has spent most of her life preserving the natural beauty of south Florida.

With a tremendous history behind her, Ms. Marjory Stoneman Douglas is celebrating her 100th birthday on April 7, 1990. As a graduate from Wellesley College in 1912, Ms. Douglas started her professional career as an educational director for department stores from Missouri to New Jersey. After her marriage, she came to Florida in 1915 and soon became the society editor of the Miami Herald. Ms. Douglas was the first woman from Miami to join the U.S. Navy in World War I. She served with the American Red Cross in Paris, France, during the war.

After returning from overseas in WWI, Marjory Stoneman Douglas initiated what turned into a brilliant writing career. She was the assistant editor to the Miami Herald and a freelance writer to many magazines including the Saturday Evening Post. She has also written

numerous articles, essays, novels, and a play entitled, "The Gallows Gate."

Writing one article about the Miami River led many publishers to request further articles on environmental issues. As a journalist she gathered facts that led her to become a key leader for the environment in south Florida. Her most famous book, "Everglades: River of Grass," helped raise our awareness of the beauty and majesty of the Everglades and Florida's wetlands. Ms. Douglas served on the original committee to establish Everglades National Park. The first session of this Congress recently enlarged Everglades National Park.

Today Marjory Stoneman Douglas is president of the Friends of the Everglades, which is an organization that protects endangered species and water quality in the Everglades. Her current project is studying and supporting the Florida Kissimmee-Okeechobee-Everglades basin.

I would like to thank Ms. Douglas. The State of Florida owes a debt of gratitude to Ms. Douglas for all her dedicated, hard work. I am delighted to wish Ms. Marjory Stoneman Douglas a very happy 100th birthday.

TRIBUTE TO INGRID SOWLE

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Ingrid Sowle, a fine medic with the Port Washington, NY, Fire Department, who was killed in the line of duty on February 19, 1990.

Ms. Sowle was hit and killed by a hit-and-run driver while she was returning to her car after assisting the rescue squad at an accident scene. She was 52 years old and had been a member of the rescue squad of the Port Washington Fire Department for the past year.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second such tragedy in a period of 15 months for the Port Washington Fire Department. In November of 1988, Lt. Robert Dayton was killed while battling a fire.

The tragic death of Ms. Sowle underscores the great sacrifices of the men and women who make up our volunteer fire departments. Each day, often without any recognition or fanfare, these people give of their time, effort, and sometimes their lives to serve their communities.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I request permission to enter in the RECORD excerpts of an article that appeared in the Port Washington News on February 22, 1990, which contained some of the many words of tribute for Ms. Sowle from her colleagues:

FIRE MEDIC KILLED BY DRUNK DRIVER

(By Christina Cronin Southard)

Ingrid Soule, 52, a fire medic with the Port Washington Fire Volunteer Fire Department, was killed in the line of duty in the early hours of Monday, Feb. 19. She was fatally struck down by a hit-and-run drunk driver on Roslyn West Shore Road near Bar Beach as she was walking back to her car after responding to a call at another accident.

Linda Popeleski, a close friend and fire medic, was with Ms. Sowle at the time of the accident. She said, "Ingrid has a heart of gold. She joined the fire medics because she wanted to give more to others. She was always making desserts for the Company. She was always there for everyone. She was sincere, kind, and loving."

Fire Chief Peter Zwerlein said, "We are very saddened. It hits home again because we just lost Bobby Dayton and some of our members are still recovering from the Avianca air crash rescue, she was a good member who was always available when needed. She was a typical volunteer firefighter. She was professional in her actions, dedicated and wanted to help the community."

Ed Oldak, president of the Port Washington Fire Medics, said, "Ingrid joined us a year ago. Her application said she wanted to serve the Port Washington community. She put in a lot of hours. She enjoyed her work and was proud of her membership in the fire medics."

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE GERACI LEAGUE OF PASSAIC COUNTY, NJ, ON ITS 60TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest pride that I rise today to salute a truly outstanding fraternal organization based in my Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey which, in 1990, is celebrating 60 years of making its community, its State, our Nation, and our world a far better place to live.

I am speaking of the Geraci Citizens League of Passaic County, NJ, which will be marking this historic milestone with its 60th Annual St. Joseph Dinner Dance on March 16, 1990, at the Princess in Lodi, NJ. I know that, as it always is, this exceptional event will be well attended, for the Geraci League has truly established a reputation that has made it a special organization while at the same time being a vital part of the community.

Mr. Speaker, as a means of conveying to you and our colleagues the rich background of the Geraci Citizens League, I would like to insert into the RECORD a copy of the official history of this distinguished organization.

THE GERACI CITIZENS LEAGUE OF PASSAIC COUNTY, NJ

The Geraci Citizens League, founded in 1930, today is one of the most unique fraternal organizations in the North Jersey area. Its membership comprises American citizens whose families emigrated from the mountain village of Geraci Siculo, hidden high in the mountains in North Central Sicily, or who were themselves emigrants.

At the turn of the century, when the tides of immigration reached American shores, many Geracese settled in the Passaic area; others traveled westward to Colorado, Texas and California. Today, there are hundreds of descendants of the original settlers living in the North Jersey area and thus, it can be said, there are more Geracese living in New Jersey than in the historic village of Geraci.

The population of the beloved village is a scant 3,000.

Although, today, Geraci sleeps gently atop an impressive rock mountain almost as high as Colorado's city of Denver, there was a time when it was historically to be reckoned with. Legend tells us that in the early days of Greek colonization, about 550 B.C., it was known as "Jerax", meaning high habitat of the eagle vulture. Its coat of arms shows the huge bird astride two scaling ladders, signifying that even that fabulous creature required the use of ladders to soar to the heights of the commune.

Through the centuries, the island of Sicily was criss-crossed by warring powers—Greeks, Carthaginians from Africa, Romans, Vandals from Central Europe, Byzantines, and the Saracens who brought with them the Muslim culture which is still in evidence in parts of the Island. Although its status has definitely changed over the centuries, Geraci was once recognized as more than a village—it had the status of a city-state or province.

Most notable of the events were those which transpired from the eleventh century. It was 1061 when Roger de Hauteville (Altavilla), one of twelve sons of Tancred of Normandy, invaded Sicily where he instituted law and learning and advanced the teachings of the Catholic Church. His son, Roger II, who reigned from 1105 to 1154, continued and expanded the enthusiastic patronage of his illustrious father. During that Norman regime, castles and fortifications, chapels and cathedrals, and institutions of learning were founded and constructed. The ruins of such a castle and its contiguous chapel are found near the church of San Giacomo at the highest point in Geraci. The chapel of St. Ann was constructed first to house the forehead relic of the Saint, which was brought to Geraci by the Ventigmiglia family and later transferred by them to a mother church in nearby Castelbuono. Castelbuono, originally Bel' Vedere, was a small community which the Ventigmiglia family set up as another homestead. Roger II was also known as the Great Count because of his sincere concern for his constituents, and the many ecclesiastical and educational improvements he brought about in the island communities.

Count Serlone of Geraci was a nephew of the Great Count and his daughter Eliusa married Roger of Barneville, related to the Altavilla family, and a crusader in the liberation of Antioch from the infidels.

The mother church of Geraci, St. Maria Maggiore, has undergone several renovations since it was first constructed about 1100 and portions of the "matrice" can still be recognized in their original form.

Members of the Geraci Citizens League have been instrumental in some of the more modern changes which have taken place in the mother church. The late Salvatore Lomauro, a well-known building contractor in the North Jersey area, and his son-in-law, Michael N. Corradino, managing owner of the Dixon Press, contributed the complete cost of renovating the front entrance of the church and still retaining the artistic appearance of the overall structure. Rudolph Intelisano, a long-established mortician, contributed the cost of two new confessionals in the church, and Mrs. Rose Giaconia contributed the cost of a new chair for the vicar. A strong sense of devotion to the ancient village still prevails among those who live in America.

Another indication of that devotion was evident when the vicar of Geraci asked fi-

nancial aid in the restoration of the chapel of St. Ann and responding to that call were a group of young men whose parents were members of the Geraci Citizens League. Their contributions successfully transformed the old abandoned chapel into a delightful setting for religious services. Doing their bit for the village of their forebears were: Michael N. Corradino, Ronald W. Giaconia (son of Rose), Stephen Leonardo, S. Terry La Corte, G. Dolph Corradino, Rudy Intelisano, Vincent Neglia, Mrs. Robert Damiano, Dominick Giordano, Frank Leonardo, Richard Alaimo and Dr. Vincent Lanteri, whose efforts have given the townspeople a boost in morale.

There is little else to be known about the mountain village with its steep cobbled streets winding precariously between ancient and modern houses. Geraci is poor in industry but rich in the culture of its chapels and churches with their magnificent statuary and paintings and religious articles and robes, some of which go back almost a millenium. There is no commerce but dozens of little shops peek-a-booming from the recesses of ancient buildings. Young people leave to seek their fortunes in the industry of northern Italy, or other countries, or even other continents. And so we find the elderly man and woman leisurely running the small shop or basking in the sun that hovers over the Piazza del Popolo, or taking care of that delightful agricultural setting, owned and run by the family, known as "la campagna".

It was perfectly natural as the nineteenth century drew to a close that young people would emigrate to that great land of opportunity across the sea. Letters from America were eagerly looked for—there was always news about how well the writers were doing, how much money could be made, how good life was! And in the early 1890's, the tide of immigration began to beat against the American shores. Many young emigrants landing in New York took up residences in the area—boarding with family or friends. Others with family ties elsewhere went westward—to Colorado, California and Texas. They mined coal, built roads and railroads, drove herds of cows across the plains, ran small general store operations with peddler-wagon delivery service—and survived.

The numbers increased many-fold after 1900 and we make note here of an interesting event. On April 4, 1903, a mutual aid society was formed, known as the "Societa di M. S. Geracese", by Rosario F. Lomauro, father of the previously mentioned Salvatore, and grandfather of Rosario F. Lomauro, attorney and a past president of the Geraci Citizens League. Those who left families in Geraci found employment and out of meager stipends put away enough to be able to send for their loved ones. In later years, those who went back to visit were to relate stories of great successes in their adopted land. Others never went back—never saw their families again and still others achieved prominence and success in business and the professions in the new land.

And so the colony of Geracese continued to grow and the Passaic area seemed to be the center of that growth. It soon became evident that a firmer link was needed to keep friends together. The answer was evident—a league—an organization representative of all those emigrants who had come from Geraci to a new future on American shores.

Bartolo Paruta, a distinguished white-haired barber, spoke to a small group of

friends and the more he talked the more convincing his point of view. Those who listened intently and agreed were merchants, builders, bakers, tradesmen, pasta manufacturers and an attorney. And so it came about—the birth of a new brotherhood in a new country with fourteen Geracese pledging themselves to assist new arrivals. The Sicilian name was "Lega di Cittadini Geracese" and its English equivalent adopted officially in later years was the "Geraci Citizens League". With Paruta were Giovanni Torregrossa, Giuseppe Filippone, Domenica Mangia, Filippo J. Silvestri, Mariano Baldanza, Francesco Lomauro, Salvatore Lomauro, Pietro Chici, Domenico Paruta, Giuseppe Castella, Giacomo Sammarco, Ignazio Cancellieri and Natale Savasta.

It became an official family, with constitution and by-laws properly drawn up in 1930—the height of the American depression. The bond that brought that first group together has endured for over six decades. The League became involved in local matters that concerned Italians generally and Geracese particularly. Its presence was felt and respected in both the Italian and the American communities. Some of its sons reached professional heights that brought respect, and recognition. The first choice to lead the organization as its first president was attorney Filippo J. Silvestri, who set a firm foundation for those who were to succeed him over the coming decades.

Two years later, in 1932, wives, daughters and sisters of the male members decided to form an auxiliary and Mrs. Rosa Baldanza was its first president. In later years, the women's auxiliary and the men's League were to merge into one.

The League organized and sponsored family picnics, Italian "Carnevale" parties, evening serenades, Mother's Day parties—and most notable of all—the continuation of the St. Joseph "devozione", the devotional supper and dance for which the League would gain an enviable reputation. The women spent countless hours preparing tomato sauce, fennel and fish; cooking, cleaning, and getting the Club's headquarters (a three story walk-up) ready for the big event. And as the years went by, the response to the St. Joseph devotion kept growing and it became necessary to find a larger dining area. The tradition is still continued after all these many years and there is no indication of any loss of interest on the part of the Geracese or their friends who look forward to attending. In 1939, a group of young people anxious to follow in the footsteps of their elders, formed the Geraci Junior League, later known as the Geraci Youth Organization. The first president of the young group was Michael N. Corradino. Following the beginning of World War II, the group disbanded as its young men and women left for military service. On May 9, 1943, the Geraci Citizens League dedicated the honor roll to the Geraci youth "in service"—109 sons and 1 daughter. Six of the sons were of the Joseph Gangi family—all in military service at the same time.

Members of the League responded generously to the War Relief Drives for Italy. And when the Italian government was faced with the threat of a communist takeover, hundreds of letters sent by League members resulted in a 30-1 victory over the communist party in Geraci, which also helped to turn the tide throughout Italy. A pet project of the League over the years was the support of the Orphanage of St. Anthony in Geraci. Clothing in abundance and thou-

sands of dollars were raised to help ease the financial problems of the home for children.

As the years have sped by, older members have passed away and new, younger Geracese, some freshly arrived from the old "paese", have stepped in to fill the gap. Today, after sixty years, the Geraci Citizens League continues as a strong and viable organization of men and women, who still feel the need for sustaining a common bond—and who find pleasure in filling that need. Their reasons are still the same as those formulated by the original fourteen founders, whose vision has stood the test of time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to present some of the rich history of a special and outstanding organization that has truly made its community, State, Nation and world a better place to live, the Geraci League of Passaic County, NJ, celebrating its 60th anniversary in 1990.

A \$150 BILLION A YEAR—WHERE TO FIND IT

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, The failure of the Bush administration to formulate a coherent policy response to the numerous changes taking place in Eastern Europe becomes more and more evident. With freedom having come to much of Eastern Europe, President Bush still has before us a budget which recommends that we spend billions of dollars to prevent Poland, Hungary, and Bulgaria from joining the Soviet Union in a land invasion of West Germany and France.

The President asks what our hurry is in cutting this obviously unnecessary spending. The answer is that we do not wish to wait to make real cuts in the deficit, nor do we wish to put off helping the elderly with medical bills or providing education benefits to children.

All of these objectives and others are hurt by the President's refusal to stop subsidizing our wealthy allies against nonexistent threats.

In the New York Times of March 8, the editors make a powerful, specific, logical case for military cuts and note that President Bush's refusal to reformulate his outdated budget is "baffling." I hope the President will heed the good sense of the New York Times and others—including his own Director of Central Intelligence, Mr. Webster—and help us reduce unnecessary military expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the thoughtful editorial from the New York Times here:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 8, 1990]

A \$150 BILLION A YEAR—WHERE TO FIND IT

It's as though America just won the lottery with Communism collapsing, the United States having defended the free world for half a century, now stands to save a fortune. Defense spending could drop by \$20 billion next year and \$150 billion a year before the decade ends.

What a precious moment; what a Heaven-sent opportunity for a political leader to capture attention and resources and do great good. President Bush, however, resists turning in his winning ticket. What will he do with this peace dividend? He says there

won't be one—and besides, it will all have to be spent reducing the deficit.

The President is surely right not to react hastily to the upheaval in global politics. Yes, the cold war is over and the Soviet Union now looks inward. But it will take time to adjust the assumptions and relationships of two generations.

The peace dividend, however, is tangible, and for the President to recoil from it is baffling. It is not bleeding heart liberals who urge Mr. Bush to be the Education President; that's his own ambition for himself. It is not elitist ecologists who label him the Environment President; that's his own title for his own aspiration.

Why, having pinned himself between a desire for progress and a pledge not to raise taxes, does he shrink from the windfall? Shouldn't he, on his own terms, embrace it? By dismissing it, the President is twice mistaken. The peace dividend is real, and realistically achievable. And the best way to spend it is to promote productivity and growth.

In his own budget, Mr. Bush would reduce the \$300 billion-plus total for defense by 2 percent a year. That would save \$140 billion over five years—and Congress is sure to cut more. If the Soviet threat keeps dwindling, it's possible to envision a \$150 billion Pentagon budget, in current dollars, by the year 2000.

Cuts that deep can only be achieved gradually, it takes time to close bases and production lines. And sensibly, reductions will start small, phasing in with evidence of reassuring change from the Soviet Union. But the sooner Mr. Bush begins to plan for cuts, the sooner savings will accrue.

THE PEACE DIVIDEND IS REAL

Close students of defense acknowledge that significant cuts can be made. William Kaufmann, who advised Republican and Democratic defense secretaries, has demonstrated in a recent study how to halve outlays in a decade. The time to begin is now, with the five-year defense budget the Pentagon will soon submit to Congress.

There are two principal tasks: Reduce conventional forces, and slow the introduction of new weapons, both conventional [see box] and nuclear.

Reduce conventional forces.—Ships, planes, tanks and troops are the place to start. They are where the money goes—four of every five defense dollars. Much of that is keyed to an improbable Soviet attack in Europe. Conventional force talks contemplate reducing U.S. troops from 305,000 to 225,000. Come 1992, that will save about \$7 billion a year. Subsequent Soviet withdrawals could trigger more troop cuts, down to, say, 75,000, saving \$12 billion more a year. And cutting six backup divisions in the U.S. would save \$14 billion a year.

Meanwhile, with a diminished Soviet threat, it's absurd to insist that third world perils require 14 Navy carrier battle groups. Reducing 14 to 12 by 1994 would save \$6 billion a year. Reducing to six by 2000 could save an additional \$22 billion a year.

It is difficult to calculate the total savings for such cuts in force size because, beyond operating costs saved, there would be untold savings in hardware and personnel.

Slow Down Nuclear Modernization.—This year's bill for missiles and bombers is \$52 billion, and present plans could make that \$87 billion by 2000. By slowing modernization, outlays could be held below \$30 billion a year. The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, expected to be signed this year will help make cuts of this magnitude safe.

With the reduction in Soviet land-based missiles, there's less need to put 50 MX missiles on rail cars, to buy more Trident submarines than Start permits. Canceling MX mobile basing would save \$4 billion between 1991 and 1995; stopping at 18 Tridents and slowing deployment of new D-5 missiles could save \$4 billion more.

The B-2 stealth bomber was designed to locate and destroy mobile missiles. Sixteen are already authorized. Deferring further procurement while continuing flight-testing would save \$23 billion between 1991 and 1995. Procurement of the advanced air-launched cruise missile can also be deferred, saving nearly \$3 billion in those years.

The Bush Administration asks \$5.4 billion for Star Wars defenses this year, and more later, even though this mammoth program still lacks clear purpose and faces formidable technical problems. Robust research could be conducted for \$3 billion a year, saving \$16 billion between 1991 and 1995. Canceling the Army's anti-satellite weapon would save an additional \$2 billion.

Apart from Pentagon spending on defense, the Department of Energy wants two new plants in which to manufacture nuclear weapons. But Start reductions will allow most nuclear material to be recovered from dismantled warheads. Canceling one of those plants would save \$3 billion between 1991 and 1995, and cutting back warhead production, billions more.

The intelligence budget is secret but is thought to have doubled in the 80's, without commensurate benefit. Spy satellites are needed to monitor arms control agreements, but keeping a dozen or so in orbit will generate more pictures than analysts can assess. Canceling one imaging radar satellite and one photo satellite a year would save \$2 billion.

There will not be easy agreement on all these cuts. But they are not reckless or speculative. A plausible plan of reductions could save \$150 billion a year by 1999. Even if some cuts aren't made, any large part of \$150 billion amounts to real money.

The next question is, what should America do with it? The President says, reduce the huge Federal deficit. So does the Senate. They're right that the deficit clouds the future and demands reduction. But the question here is what to do with the peace dividend windfall, and the best answer is, use it for positive investments in the future?

WHERE TO START

The Pentagon is building a number of new weapons useful primarily in the event of war in Europe. The weapons they would replace are already as advanced as any in the world. Here is what canceling or deferring acquisition would save in outlays, 1991 to 1995:

	<i>Billion</i>
Army light helicopter	\$2
Advanced tactical missile	1
Forward area air defenses	3
C-17 cargo plane	12
Advanced tactical fighter	8
F-16 fighter plane (new model)	10
A-12 attack plane	12
Osprey tilt-rotor aircraft	8
Advanced air-to-air missile	4
DDG-51 guided missile destroyer	8
Seawolf attack submarine	9
5-year total	77

BASE CLOSURE PROPOSAL

HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with the Members my testimony to be given on base closings:

CONGRESSMAN TALLON'S TESTIMONY ON BASE CLOSURE PROPOSAL

Madam Chair, as much as I'd like to say so, it is not a pleasure for me to be here today. But I do want to express my sincere gratitude to you and to the Subcommittee for allowing me to testify on this terrible issue of closing military bases.

We are fortunate, to be witnessing a dramatic reversal in military tension in the world—especially in Europe. America is fortunate in these events not only because democracy has finally prevailed over communism, but because all of this has happened at a point when it is critical for this nation to make a dramatic commitment to cutting spending—especially defense spending.

But I don't see the Air Force, the Department of Defense, or the President seizing this opportunity. They've just got out their machetes and they are slashing away at "tried and true" military bases with no rhyme or reason. And at the same time they've found the money to increase Star Wars by 22 percent and they want more for the B-2.

The Administration is asking for a \$301 billion for the defense budget this year when it spent only \$296 billion last year. How can the Pentagon expect local communities to cough up savings that don't show up in the big picture?

I am here to try to spare the Myrtle Beach Air Force Base in my district from the capriciousness of the perverse base closing process that is a part of this disappointing budget. We've got a great base that can do a lot more for this nation's defense and I'm angry that the Pentagon refuses to acknowledge one of their most valuable assets.

The United States military has been a part of the Myrtle Beach Community since 1940 when the Municipal Airport became part of our national defense program. During World War Two, Myrtle Beach became a critical training ground for Army fighter squadrons. In 1954, the Air Force located at Myrtle Beach to become the installation's first tenant unit.

The versatility of the base is reflected in the many missions the base has accommodated in the past. It has been the home base for B-25s, T-33s, C-45s, F-80s, SA-16s, and the F-100 Super Saber jets. Towards the end of the Vietnam War, the base became home to the A-7D Corsair II weapons system. By 1978, the 354th Tactical Fighter Wing at Myrtle Beach Air Force Base was the first combat ready A-10 wing in the Air Force and has served as back-up to NATO and a member of the Rapid Deployment Force.

The Myrtle Beach Air Force Base continues to be a viable national defense facility. It often wins major efficiency and productivity awards. For example, it is now the Air Force representative in competition for the commander-in-chief's installation excellence award. It is not unusual for the Base to receive Tactical Air Command and Air Force awards in many areas, both in combat readiness and in areas such as accounting, fi-

nance, recreation and dining rooms. The efficiency of the base is unchallenged.

Geographically, the Myrtle Beach Air Force Base is an ideal location for future military uses in the face of a changing European front. We will no doubt need a more state-side defense structure in the coming decades.

As ground to air support for missions at Fort Bragg, Fort Stewart, and Fort Benning, Myrtle Beach will continue to play a great role in our Southeastern defense.

The flight conditions are excellent due to the mild climate and the lack of civilian flight traffic over Horry County. It has all the advantages of training troops near a civilian population without being a threat. While the base is located in the heart of the city, its proximity to the ocean means that flight maneuvers can be safely carried out over water. The water would also open up the prospect for training in air-to-air refueling.

The base has a huge tract of land which is the only strip of land on our domestic bases available to train troops for a European combat scenario. Presently, this training ground is under-used but it could become invaluable when we begin troop withdrawal from Europe.

There are many other plusses of the Base to the Air Force and to the military, but the main one is the support from the Myrtle Beach community. The Air Force Base is the largest employer in Horry County and has a significant economic impact on the surrounding South Carolina counties of Georgetown, Marion, Dillon, Williamsburg, and Florence. As well, Brunswick and Columbus counties in North Carolina benefit. If we were to lose the base, it would result in a 12 percent loss in the average per capita income for Horry County.

Unlike bases in other parts of the country, we are proud to have the Air Force in the heart of our city, Myrtle Beach. Located in a resort area, it is one of the Air Force's showcase bases. The base is host to over 75,000 visitors annually. It has a hospital and commissary facilities which are the best the Air Force has to offer. If all bases afforded their personnel such an environment there would be a lot higher retention rate in our military.

The base has more than 3,400 active duty members and over 7,600 military dependents that rely on the base. In addition, we have almost 900 civilian employees on the base. In a relatively small area, these base employees and their dependents make up a very viable part of the economic activity of Horry and surrounding counties.

Unlike bases across the country, the personnel on the Air Force Base are a highly active part of our community. Many families choose to live off-base. If these employees left the area, we would have 1,500 extra housing units left empty in a housing market which already has more units than our population needs. We expect that utility rates for the community would jump anywhere between five and ten percent if the base were to close.

For all these reasons and more, it is not the time to close the Myrtle Beach Air Force Base. Still, the Pentagon has chosen to embark on a political collision course by targeting bases in an antiquated and insufficient process.

There are 32 communities nation-wide that are in for a long up-hill battle that will last at least two years because of the whimsy of this process. Our bases will be "studied" for their environmental, financial,

and economic impact for at least a year. Then the President will propose actual closure at the initiation of a future budget cycle. Then we face a heated political battle throughout Congress to determine the fate of the base.

What happens to our base and our local community in the meantime? Well, things will deteriorate. The Pentagon has already stopped construction on two projects currently under construction pending final resolution of the base closure. One is the construction of the Base Civil Engineering Administration Facility and the other project is an upgraded to the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems in various buildings on the base. In short, the Pentagon is discriminating against bases being studied for closure by making sure it doesn't spend any money for the general up-keep of the base.

The communities will also suffer if we continue on the present base closure alternative. In our case, the Air Force Base has been a great asset for the large retirement population of the area with a military retiree population of 4,110 which depend on the base for health care and commissary services. If they keep hearing that the base is on the hit-list, many of these retirees will choose to locate elsewhere. In addition, real estate prices will plummet if there is continued speculation about the closure of the base.

The process just doesn't make sense. The Air Force says that they are preparing for the elimination of the A-10 and yet I don't see them realigning or closing the other domestic and foreign bases that have the A-10 aircraft.

For the past year, I have joined with the Myrtle Beach community in working with local base officials as well as officials in the Pentagon to see that the Air Force presence remains in the Grand Strand by encouraging the Air Force to expand and diversify its role at our base.

The Pentagon now tells me that it cannot give the Myrtle Beach Air Force Base another mission because there will be fewer missions in the future. Yet they have failed to come up with a complete list of missions that will be changing or the aircraft they are going to expand, eliminate, or realign.

I think they just don't know what they have. They lack a plan. They lack a vision of what our national defense should look like in the next five to ten years. That is a dangerous oversight in light of our changing world.

In a perverse sort of reasoning, the Pentagon is bucking it off on Congress to decide what our long-term defense priorities should be. They have given us no alternative but to reject their base closing proposals wholesale.

Besides, we all know what works in shutting military installations—a commission. We closed over 80 bases as a result of the 1988 base closing commission's impartial work. Sure there were some problems, some communities fought the closure, but over-all the Commission's actions were a success in overcoming the highly politicized act of closing unnecessary military bases.

I commend Chairman Aspin for introducing new Base Closing Commission legislation because it improves on last year's effort. The Commission would make changes in both domestic and foreign installations in response to a defense strategy for the 1990's. The Commission will be given an ample period of time to decide on closures. Most importantly, the Commission would be

insulated from the highly charged political games which plagues the current process.

It is my wish to ensure that the Aspin Base Closure Commission legislation establish a moratorium on the current closure process in order that the installations now targeted for closure would be given a fair trial by a non-partisan Commission process.

My constituents want the base to stay open until it can be proven that the national defense can best be served by its closure in the perspective of a long-term defense strategy. Secretary of Defense Cheney does not expect to complete his strategy until at least nine months to a year from now. As a member of Congress with a responsibility to the pursestrings of the government, I am ready to do whatever I can to ensure that we shut our bases in a rational and cost-effective way.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SAVINGS ASSOCIATION REGULATORY RESTRUCTURING ACT OF 1990

HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Savings Association Regulatory Restructuring Act of 1990 to abolish the Office of Thrift Supervision and transfer its authorities and responsibilities to existing Federal bank regulators.

Last year, with the passage of FIRREA, Congress transformed the old thrift regulator, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, into a new agency, the Office of Thrift Supervision, under the umbrella jurisdiction of the Department of the Treasury. During consideration of FIRREA, the Senate rejected an amendment of mine which the House had accepted giving the FDIC, as the Federal regulator of State-chartered banks, primary jurisdiction over State-chartered thrifts. If it had been accepted by the Senate, this provision would have made the regulatory structure for thrifts similar to that of banks, thereby protecting the historical dual system of banking, giving more regulatory authority to the insurer—rather than charterer—and preventing expensive and redundant duplication in regulatory oversight.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that in an effort to acquiesce to the siren calls of over-stretched thrift managers who preferred to maintain a semblance of the old clubbish regulatory apparatus and the concerns of those in the political arena who wanted to protect a single regulator's job, Congress erred.

Today, less than a year after passage of FIRREA State-chartered thrifts are rushing to convert themselves into federally chartered thrifts. In my home State of Iowa, for example, there are only a handful of State-chartered institutions left, and in California, where approximately one-quarter of all thrift deposits exist, the State thrift regulator is being dismantled because so few institutions prefer to retain their State charters.

The State-chartered thrifts that do still exist in some cases have been subject to examination by three different regulators—the FDIC, the OTS, and the State regulator—and thus have to pay for extra costly examinations. At a

time when thrifts are working hard to bring their capital levels up, these extra examinations are an unwelcome expense and, as importantly, a redundant regulatory burden.

Accordingly, I am introducing legislation not only to give the FDIC supervision of State-chartered thrifts, but also to dissolve the OTS and give the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, which now regulates federally chartered banks, supervision of federally chartered thrifts. The bill also gives the Federal Reserve authority over thrift holding companies.

These changes will provide a symmetrical regulatory framework more in tune with changing market conditions and the need for effective governmental oversight. The changes, in addition, will help propel more homogeneous regulation between two industries more alike than dissimilar.

Philosophically, these changes underscore the principle of institutional accountability. In the private sector, when mistakes are made, businesses go out of existence. In the public sector, analogous discipline is lacking. In the wake of the biggest institutional failure in modern history—one that will cost every man, woman, and child in America upwards of \$1,000 each over the next 30 years—Congress moved not to dismantle, but to rename; not to take authority away from a failed regulator, but to give him more power.

The 1980's have taught us that comparability of financial regulation is an imperative social goal because deposit growth will always be impelled in institutions with the weakest regulatory oversight. A system in which the strongest are restrained and the weakest given a green light to grow is a system which puts the taxpayer most at risk.

Competition should be the hallmark of the private sector, not government agencies. When regulatory agencies develop too close ties to the institutions they regulate and a vested interest in their growth, a tendency develops to acquiesce to imprudential rules, regulations, and oversight. Hence, the appropriateness of regulatory comparability. Hence, too, the appropriateness of rewarding the regulatory institutions with firmer rules and holding accountable those responsible for forcing the taxpayer to pick up a multibillion dollar tab for a macroeconomic peacetime recessionless mistake.

The introduction of the Savings Association Regulatory Restructuring Act of 1990 is not intended to imply that the thrift industry should be abolished. While Congress in FIRREA clearly mandated the goal of making thrift and bank standards and regulation symmetrical, it wisely did not call for abolition of the industry. There still is a place in the American financial services sector for a locally oriented lending institution the primary mission of which is the making of home mortgages.

Neither does introduction of this bill reflect unhappiness with the vast majority of employees at the OTS. Line employees are not responsible for "too" political appointments at the top or the loose laws passed by legislative bodies. Consequently, this bill encourages quality employees to transfer to the appropriate Federal banking agencies.

Finally, let me underscore a point made earlier: Enactment of this bill is intended to send a signal to the American public, and to all

Government bureaucracies, that if an agency fails in its mission, it will be held accountable. That is the way it works in the private sector; it should be no different in the public.

MOSAIC—JEWISH LIFE IN FLORIDA

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the merits of a Florida project called Mosaic. The individuals involved in this project explored the role of Jews in Florida history. Of special interest to me, is the study of how Hispanic Jews worked over five decades to help create the Florida we know today.

"Mosaic—Jewish Life in Florida" is a special traveling exhibit which will be exhibited at 8 cities throughout Florida during the period of 1990 to 1992. This exhibit will include the specific processes of the American immigrant experience as illustrated by the history of one group, the Jews. The exhibit will focus on their interactions with the larger, and diverse, population of non-Jews in the formation and development of Florida. The exhibit will examine the socio-cultural pressures which flavor assimilation into the mainstram of American life.

As well, Mosaic is an official Columbus quincenary project. In 1992, Americans will celebrate the quincenary of its discovery. Americans will pay homage to the numerous groups which have forged its strength and its unique character. The organizers of the exhibit feel that we must begin to understand our multicultural roots in order to "reconnect" with our collective cultural memory.

I commend the project director, Dr. Henry Green, and the State coordinator, Marcia Zerivitz, for their colossal effort on this project. Mosaic is an exciting opportunity that contributes in making America still greater.

COSPONSORS OF THE MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1990

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that we now have 107 cosponsors of the Medicare Benefit Improvement Act of 1990. This bill would provide for new mammography, home health, hospice, and respite care benefits under Medicare at a cost of 80 cents per month in additional part B premiums in the first year.

We hope that other Members of the House will be joining us in cosponsoring this important legislation. The mammography benefit, for example, is estimated to result in the saving of some 4,000 lives per year.

The list follows:

Rep. Pete Stark (D-CA).

Rep. Bill Gradison (R-OH).

Rep. Henry Waxman (D-CA).
 Rep. Edward Madigan (R-IL).
 Rep. Bill Coyne (D-PA).
 Rep. J.J. Pickle (D-TX).
 Rep. Sander Levin (D-MI).
 Rep. Jim Moody (D-WI).
 Rep. Ben Cardin (D-MD).
 Rep. Nancy Johnson (R-CT).
 Rep. Charles Rangel (D-NY).
 Rep. Harold Ford (D-TN).
 Rep. Ed Jenkins (D-GA).
 Rep. Tom Downey (D-NY).
 Rep. Beryl Anthony (D-AR).
 Rep. Ronnie Flippo (D-AL).
 Rep. Mike Andrews (D-TX).
 Rep. Raymond McGrath (R-OH).
 Rep. James Scheuer (D-NY).
 Rep. Doug Walgren (D-PA).
 Rep. Gerry Sikorski (D-MN).
 Rep. Jim Bates (D-CA).
 Rep. Cardiss Collins (D-IL).
 Rep. Mike Synar (D-OK).
 Rep. Gary Ackerman (D-NY).
 Rep. Bill Alexander (D-AR).
 Rep. Daniel Akaka (D-HI).
 Rep. Douglas Applegate (D-OH).
 Rep. Chester Atkins (D-MA).
 Rep. Les AuCoin (D-OR).
 Rep. Sherwood Boehlert (R-NY).
 Rep. Barbara Boxer (D-CA).
 Rep. Bill Clinger (R-PA).
 Rep. Gary Condit (D-CA).
 Rep. Silvio Conte (R-MA).
 Rep. Lawrence Coughlin (R-PA).
 Rep. George Crockett (D-MI).
 Rep. Peter DeFazio (D-OR).
 Rep. Ron deLugo (D-VI).
 Rep. Butler Derrick (D-SC).
 Rep. Richard Durbin (D-IL).
 Rep. Don Edwards (D-CA).
 Rep. Lane Evans (D-IL).
 Rep. Walter Fauntroy (D-DC).
 Rep. Edward Feighan (D-OH).
 Rep. Tom Foglietta (D-PA).
 Rep. Barney Frank (D-MA).
 Rep. Sam Gejdenson (D-CT).
 Rep. Ben Gilman (R-NY).
 Rep. Bart Gordon (D-TN).
 Rep. Charles Hayes (D-IL).
 Rep. Larry Hopkins (R-KY).
 Rep. Tim Johnson (D-SD).
 Rep. Harry Johnston (D-FL).
 Rep. Walter Jones (D-NC).
 Rep. Marcy Kaptur (D-OH).
 Rep. Paul Kanjorski (D-PA).
 Rep. Bob Kastenmeier (D-WI).
 Rep. Dale Kildee (D-MI).
 Rep. Gerald Kleczka (D-WI).
 Rep. Jim Kolbe (R-AZ).
 Rep. Peter Kostmayer (D-PA).
 Rep. Martin Lancaster (D-NC).
 Rep. Tom Lantos (D-CA).
 Rep. Bill Lehman (D-FL).
 Rep. John Lewis (D-GA).
 Rep. Marilyn Lloyd (D-TN).
 Rep. Nicholas Mavroules (D-MA).
 Rep. Jim McDermott (D-WA).
 Rep. Matthew McHugh (D-NY).
 Rep. Mike McNulty (D-NY).
 Rep. George Miller (D-CA).
 Rep. John Miller (R-WA).
 Rep. John Joseph Moakley (D-MA).
 Rep. Alan Mollohan (D-WV).
 Rep. Connie Morella (R-MD).
 Rep. Richard Neal (D-MA).
 Rep. Steve Neal (D-NC).
 Rep. Mary Rose Oakar (D-OH).
 Rep. James Oberstar (D-MN).
 Rep. Wayne Owens (D-UT).
 Rep. Leon Panetta (D-CA).
 Rep. Nancy Pelosi (D-CA).
 Rep. Tim Penny (D-MN).
 Rep. Thomas Petri (D-WI).
 Rep. David Price (D-NC).

Rep. Ralph Regula (R-OH).
 Rep. John Rhodes (R-AZ).
 Rep. Bill Richardson (D-NM).
 Rep. Robert Roe (D-NJ).
 Rep. Charlie Rose (D-NC).
 Rep. Edward Roybal (D-CA).
 Rep. Patricia Saiki (R-HI).
 Rep. George Sangmeister (D-IL).
 Rep. Gus Savage (D-IL).
 Rep. Claudine Schneider (R-RI).
 Rep. Christopher Shays (R-CT).
 Rep. Louise Slaughter (D-NY).
 Rep. Christopher Smith (R-NJ).
 Rep. Robert Torricelli (D-NJ).
 Rep. Morris Udall (D-AZ).
 Rep. Jolene Unsoeld (D-WA).
 Rep. Bruce Vento (D-MN).
 Rep. Chalmers Wylie (R-OH).
 Rep. James Walsh (R-NY).
 Rep. Howard Wolpe (D-MI).
 Rep. Sidney Yates (D-IL).

SHIPPING OUT OUR SECURITY

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, every so often, a Federal agency makes a decision or contemplates an action which is so outrageous as to be totally inexplicable. Based on what I have just learned, the Maritime Administration is on the verge of making such a decision, a decision totally unsupportable from a national security, economic and employment, and maritime policy perspective.

I am referring to the conditional approval given by the Maritime Administration to a request filed on behalf of a foreign shipyard to sell one of only three U.S.-flag passenger vessels to a foreign shipping concern. This vessel, the SS *Monterey*, represents one-third of the U.S. fleet of vessels capable of providing the troopship capability and support our Nation must have at its disposal and under its direct control in time of war or emergency.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that America's maritime industry is at its lowest since the end of World War II. Many of us in Congress, in concert with the leadership of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, want to work with the Administration to fashion a maritime policy that revitalizes our Nation's fourth arm of defense. This decision by the Maritime Administration, if allowed to become final, will be a serious setback to these efforts. We simply cannot have a strong merchant marine if the Maritime Administration is allowed to routinely sell-off American ships to the highest foreign bidder.

I urge Maritime Administrator Capt. Warren Leback to reject this application and to keep the SS *Monterey* under our flag and under our control. Our security demands no less.

I would also like to take this opportunity to enter into the RECORD a letter signed by myself and 17 of my colleagues which was sent last week to Capt. Warren Leback, Maritime Administrator:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, March 6, 1990.

HON. WARREN G. LEBACK,
 Administrator, U.S. Maritime Administration,
 Washington, DC.

DEAR CAPTAIN LEBACK: As Members of Congress concerned about our nation's defense and sealift capability, we would like to strongly urge the Maritime Administration to deny any application filed under Section 9 of the Shipping Act of 1916 to sell the United States-flag vessel SS *Monterey* for operation under a foreign flag.

Captain Leback, there can be no justification, from a national defense or American maritime policy perspective, for allowing this vital sealift asset to operate under a foreign flag and to leave the control of the United States. We believe very strongly that you should end any confusion about the future of this passenger vessel by unequivocally stating that the position of the Maritime Administration is against any foreign operation of this ship in order to best protect the national security of the United States.

As you know, the SS *Monterey* is one of only three operational United States-flag passenger vessels. As such, it is one of only three vessels under the direct control of the United States capable of supporting a military contingency or emergency, through the transport of troops and supplies.

It is our understanding that there are Americans ready and financially able to purchase this ship for operation under the United States flag, employing American workers, generating revenues for U.S. taxing authorities and keeping American tourist dollars in this country. In order to obtain these benefits, the Maritime Administration must make clear that the foreign sale of this vessel would be inconsistent with the purposes of the Merchant Marine Acts of 1916 and 1936, and detrimental to our national defense. Unless such a determination is issued, foreign interests will continue to structure proposals which may serve the financial interests of some associated with the SS *Monterey* but which do not serve the best interests of the American merchant marine, our security, our economy or our nation.

Since this vessel is scheduled to be auctioned on Thursday, March 15th, we would certainly appreciate your immediate attention to this important matter. Your prompt response is critical.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Billy Tauzin, Jack Fields, Helen Delich Bentley, Herbert H. Bateman, Curt Weldon, Ron Machtley, Roy Dyson, Tom McMillen, Harley O. Staggers, Jr., Chris Smith, Carroll Hubbard, Mike Parker, Clyde C. Holloway, Elliot L. Engel, Donald M. Payne, Joe Kolter, Robert Torricelli, George Hochbrueckner.

THE INDOOR AIR QUALITY ACT
 OF 1989

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the hard work and dedication of the members of the House Committee Science, Space and

Technology Subcommittee on Natural Resources, Agriculture Research and Environment, on Thursday, March 8, 1990, the Indoor Air Quality Act of 1989, H.R. 1530, took a giant step forward. The subcommittee markup represents the first vote on indoor air quality in the House of Representatives since the bill's initial introduction in the 100th Congress. I personally want to commend Chairman JIM SCHEUER and ranking minority member, CLAUDE SCHNEIDER for their leadership on this legislation along with their commitment and sincere interest in seeing the indoor air quality issue addressed.

Much of the focus of clean air lately has been directed at cleaning up outdoor air pollution. Certainly, this is one of the most pressing environmental problems facing our Nation and world, but at the same time, I feel the right of an individual to breathe clean air does not end the moment they walk indoors. Pollutants in indoor air can be 1,000 times higher in concentration than outdoor air. At the same time, Americans spend over 90 percent of their time indoors, placing them at much higher risks for adverse health effects due to exposure of pollutants found indoors versus outdoors.

The Environmental Protection Agency admits that the indoor air quality problem is the No. 1 environmental health problem facing this country, ahead of exposure to outdoor air pollutants or hazardous wastes. Yet, the indoor air problem receives only \$2.5 million in funding and we are spending millions if not billions on the latter programs. The time for action is now in order to protect Americans by reducing this major public health threat.

We have yet to see any action in the Committee on Energy and Commerce in this legislation's 3-year history—not even a hearing. I am calling on all Members in Congress, especially the members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, to take a good hard look at this problem as this issue affects millions of Americans annually in the form of cancer, respiratory illnesses, fatigue, headaches, blurred vision, and so forth.

I applaud this good work of the Subcommittee on Natural Resources, Agriculture Research and the Environment, and urge the members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce to follow in their lead.

CHIEF AUTO PARTS IN THE VANGUARD OF RECYCLING

HON. JOHN BRYANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, Chief Auto Parts, a Dallas-based company, has initiated an innovative new program of recycling that should set an example for corporate and personal responsibility.

For too many years, too many American businesses and citizens have created ever increasing quantities of waste that have required ever more complicated and expensive disposal.

An estimated one-third of the 700 million gallons of motor oil used each year in the United States is disposed of improperly. That

means do-it-yourself oil changers and others dump 35 times more oil into our soil and streams than was spilled by the Exxon Valdez.

One expert contends that crankcase oil is the single most serious pollutant of the Trinity River that runs through the heart of Dallas.

Chief Auto Parts and its president, Mike Manor, understand that all of us and future generations will pay dearly in dollars and the quality of life for the damage we do to the environment today.

Chief Auto Parts has established a program to receive at many of its stores used motor oil, which it will then have re-refined for use again as motor oil, tar products, road material, or ship fuel.

What this company has begun to do helps our world in two important ways. It will slow this common way of polluting our environment, and it will conserve a dwindling natural resource, for which we are increasingly relying on foreign sources.

I could not agree more with a recently editorial salute in the Dallas Times Herald, which observed:

The Chief Auto Parts program is an excellent example of the kind of corporate and personal responsibility needed if real headway is ever to be accomplished in the battle for the planet. The bottom line in that battle must be a new morality for all mankind—a morality by which people are willing to take a few extra moments from their own lives in order to preserve life itself.

I hope this fine example by a good corporate neighbor takes root and inspires all of us.

I call to the attention of my colleagues a news story about the program which appeared recently in the Dallas Morning News: "Oil's Well That Ends Well."

[From the Dallas Morning News, Feb. 4, 1990]

OIL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL: AREA CHIEF STORES BEGIN PROGRAM OF RECYCLING (By Joe Simmacher)

SEAGOVILLE.—Chief Auto Parts Inc. is expanding its motor oil recycling campaign to include Dallas-Fort Worth by March 1.

The former Southland Corp. unit began testing the concept Nov. 21 in California. Now it's preparing Chief Auto Parts stores selected in Texas, Arizona and Nevada for expansion of the program.

By month's end, 18 Chief stores in Dallas and Tarrant counties, plus one store in Denison, Grayson County, will accept used oil. Eventually, about half of Chief's outlets will be in the program.

Chief Auto Parts president Michael Manor said the oil recycling program grew out of a lunch conversation with a friend last spring. "Once we found the amount of oil that was being dumped into the environment . . . we became more and more convinced it was the right thing to do," Mr. Manor said.

Molly Seay, the Sierra Club's recycling coordinator in Dallas, said the Chief move is significant if the company adopts recycling as corporate policy. While many auto-service centers and quick-change franchises accept used motor oil, inconsistency makes recycling used oil a hit-and-miss proposition at best, she said.

"One problem we're encountering is people will tell us that they are going to do it but different branches of the same company will accept things and others won't," Ms. Seay said. "And different people at the

same location will tell you different things. If they (Chief) will make it a standard public policy, then that really will be nice."

An estimated one-third of the 700 million gallons of used motor oil generated in the United States each year is improperly disposed, according to environmental groups.

About 95 percent of oil dumped or put in landfills is from do-it-yourselfers. Put another way; 35 times more oil is improperly disposed of each year than was spilled by the Exxon Valdez last March.

It costs Chief about \$400 to set up a store to receive used motor oil and \$20 per 50-gallon barrel to haul it to a recycle facility, Mr. Manor said. The used oil is re-refined and used again as motor oil, in making tar products, road materials and as fuel for ocean-going ships.

Chief officials quickly discovered that oil recycling was more complex than they originally thought. But they also decided they could not ethically turn away from the project.

"As we found more and more about the downside of what was happening to this oil, it became one of these situations we just couldn't turn our back on," Mr. Manor said.

Used motor oil is the largest source of water pollution, responsible for an estimated 40 percent of the environmental damage to harbors and waterways, according to the Department of Energy. As the oil breaks down, it kills fish and waterfowl. The used oil is contaminated with lead, heavy metals and other poisonous and carcinogenic by-products of engine combustion.

"It's really bad when people pour it down the drain, down the gutter, on the ground or whatever," Ms. Seay said. Many do-it-yourselfers put their used oil in the garbage, which is also environmentally unsound, she said.

Despite increasing efforts to recycle glass, paper and aluminum, oil recycling has dropped drastically over the past three decades.

Only 10 of the 150 used-oil plants operating 30 years ago remain open, Christopher Bryant, and analyst with a Washington law firm specializing in environmental law, said in the November issue of Resource Recycling. Oil lost to dumping is especially costly, because it takes 42 gallons of crude oil to produce 2½ quarts of lubricating oil, but only one gallon of recycled oil, he said in the recycling trade journal article.

Mr. Manor is pleased with the pilot program in California. Within 45 days, the 10 California stores collected 3,100 gallons of oil.

"The customer has really responded, which indicates there is a real need," Mr. Manor said. "Given a convenient, safe and accessible, disposal system, people will basically do the right thing."

Although some of the initial surge is due to individuals who had been holding oil with no safe or easy means of disposal, Chief estimates it is recapturing 16 percent of the oil it sells. "We're starting to get regular customers, those who come in to buy things to change their oil. We're encouraged by the amount of oil because we haven't done any big promotion."

Chief researched its program, learning the rules and regulations, then did a background check on 16 companies that could pick up the oil at Chief stores. "We didn't want to get involved with someone who had improperly disposed of oil," Mr. Manor said. "We got down to three companies that had pretty pristine records."

Chief is launching its initial recycling effort at company-owned stores to avoid possible negative reaction of landlords at leased outlets. With an operating history, Chief hopes property managers will be accommodating.

"The purpose of the test was to test our procedures, not test whether we were going to get involved," Mr. Manor said. "Once you get educated on it, you can't walk away."

The Chief program could be jeopardized by other efforts to control the hazards of used oil, Mr. Manor said. Last month, the Chief executive testified before a Senate subcommittee on transportation and hazardous materials. Adding used oil to the federal list of hazardous materials would increase the handling expense, he said.

"I am here to tell you that's the worst thing you could do, because it would vastly increase the expense of handling used oil and put recyclers in an insurance risk category that is absolutely cost-prohibitive," he testified.

Service stations already have been exempted from Superfund liability, a status Mr. Manor would like to see recycling retailers receive. "We want any retailer who recycles, and any retail property where used oil is collected to be considered a service station," he said. "Without this protection, you simply will not see retailers decide to recycle oil."

Mr. Manor also asked the subcommittee to begin a recycling credit program that would add to the economic value of used oil.

Separately, Chief introduced a line of more environmentally safe automotive products just before the oil recycling campaign.

Following 10 years as a Southland Corp. unit, Chief Auto Parts will complete its second year as an independent company in April. The auto parts business was sold as part of Southland's leveraged buyout.

Chief is the nation's third-largest auto parts retailer, with more than 500 stores in nine states. It sells 7 million gallons of motor oil each year, most of it to do-it-yourselfers.

Chief executives led a leveraged buyout of the auto-parts company with Shearson Lehman Hutton and General Electric Capital Corp. handling the debt. The company is ahead of schedule on repaying its debt, which is on a seven-year pay back.

A STRONG EXPORT-IMPORT BANK STRENGTHENS AMERICA

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, the dramatic changes taking place in Eastern Europe, Central America, and hopefully, southern Africa, and the emergence of new global markets present us with opportunities to invest in our future economic prosperity at home by promoting stability and free enterprise in countries where it has not existed for more than 40 years.

These countries need private investment, goods and services, as well as assistance in streamlining their banking and investment laws and systems.

These countries are not asking for hand-outs. They have spent 40 years with controlled economies and they are not interested in becoming indebted to us. They are looking

for trading partners, not surrogate father figures, as expressed by both Polish Solidarity leader Lech Walesa and President Havel of Czechoslovakia in recent addresses to Congress.

There are problems in these countries and many unknowns. But, in Eastern Europe alone, there are 136 million consumers who will want everything from french fries to telephones, computers to clothing. The success of the reform movements in these countries depends largely on these needs being met.

Although these events may seem far removed from the citizens of the United States, the results will reach each and every one of us. It means the opening of new markets for our goods and services.

American private enterprise can lead the way in this effort. The Commerce Department sees particular opportunities in the agriculture, health care, telecommunications, energy, tourism, and housing markets. Already, the number of United States firms requesting licensing and other information to do business in Eastern Europe has increased tenfold.

With the U.S. trade deficit still running at more than \$100 billion annually, it is important that we are able to compete successfully in emerging markets. One private study indicates that the Soviet Union alone may generate \$200 billion in trade opportunities by the year 2010.

In order for the United States to win these partnerships, rather than lose these opportunities to the Japanese and others, we have to change the way we think about foreign aid—because in the 1990's aid and trade should go hand in hand. The world has changed and we must respond to ensure our participation in the global economy.

While there is a lot of talk in Congress about competitiveness, trade deficits, and newly emerging markets, the key to making it happen is adequate and available export financing.

U.S. companies, whether large or small, are confronted with foreign competition that always seems to have a leg up on financing their ventures. One only has to compare the size of the Japanese Export-Import Bank and the United States Export-Import Bank: \$4.4 billion Japanese Ex-Im Bank, \$615 million United States Ex-Im Bank.

As a member of the Budget Committee and the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of Appropriations, I believe we can meet the new demands on foreign assistance within our limited resources and, at the same time, improve the competitive advantage for U.S. business in new emerging markets throughout the world.

There are pressures on all areas of the Federal budget, but the foreign assistance account faces some of the most formidable—with new aid packages to Panama, Nicaragua, and Eastern Europe. We all know that there is no broad based support for foreign aid and an overall increase in foreign aid will be difficult at best.

But, there is strong bipartisan support for American competitiveness and for reducing the massive trade deficit.

When we look at ways to assist Eastern Europe, our traditional form of aid will simply not be effective. I would even venture to say that in other areas of the world, such as

Africa, our traditional forms of assistance could use revision and more emphasis should be placed on private sector development.

Therefore, I believe the most appropriate vehicles for the United States to provide this assistance are the Export-Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Trade Development Program and the International Finance Corporation [IFC].

In light of these growing needs and the potential benefit to the U.S. economy from greater exports, the fiscal year 1991 budget request for the Export-Import Bank's Direct Loan Program is totally inadequate.

With the increased demands on foreign aid and the need for foreign aid that is flexible, innovative and geared to the private sector, now is the time to strengthen programs such as the Export-Import Bank, not weaken them. We must restore the Export-Import budget back to a level that meets the growing demand for its services.

American industry cannot afford to be sidelined in the international market. It took McDonald's 14 years to set up shop in Moscow, but no-one will ever be able to compete now with Bolshoi Macs.

It is alarming when the Congress hears that the American presence in Eastern Europe is something like the Stealth bomber—we believe it's there but we cannot see it—as it was described to us in a recent hearing in foreign operations.

U.S. companies can and should be a major player in our policy goals. Congress should do its part to help with the means and American business needs to show the initiative and the commitment. Working together, we can compete effectively in these emerging markets.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO GIVE PRIORITY CONSIDERATION FOR THE INCLUSION OF MORRO BAY, CA IN THE NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which amends the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to direct the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] to give priority consideration to Morro Bay, CA, for inclusion in the National Estuary Program.

The Morro Bay estuary, which is in my congressional district, contains the most significant wetland system of the central California coastline. Because of the bay's interconnected ecosystems associated with its saltwater and freshwater wetlands, Morro Bay has an unusually diverse habitat. The bay's intertidal areas support one of the largest bay wildlife habitats on the California coast and is home to many threatened or endangered species of birds and marine mammals, including the southern sea otter. These features combine to make Morro Bay an estuary of national significance.

In addition, Morro Bay is of great economic importance to the local community and the

Nation as a whole. The bay supports a thriving commercial fishing industry and many other industries which are dependent on the health of the bay, such as tourism and mariculture. As one of the few relatively intact natural estuaries along the Pacific coastline, Morro Bay attracts approximately 1.5 million visitors a year.

Despite the importance of Morro Bay to both the Nation and the local community, its well-being is threatened by a variety of pollutants and fragmented management. Serious sedimentation, as well as significant amounts of urban runoff, are threatening the survival of the estuary.

Management of the bay is currently divided among numerous governmental entities, none of which executes singular authority over the management and protection of the estuary. The variety of threats to the bay and the fragmented management have made it difficult to develop a comprehensive approach to addressing the needs of the bay.

The National Estuary Program appears to be ideally suited for solving the problems associated with the preservation of the Morro Bay estuary. The National Estuary Program would bring together those agencies responsible for management of the bay and help them develop a meaningful plan for long-term management of this important and sensitive estuary. Furthermore, the management plan developed for Morro Bay could serve as a model management plan for the other threatened small estuaries along our Nation's coastline.

Clearly, the Morro Bay estuary is worthy of inclusion in the National Estuary Program. The program offers Morro Bay a real chance to develop an approach which will ensure not only that the estuary survives, but that it flourishes. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort by supporting the adoption of this legislation.

THE SPIRIT OF DEAF CULTURE

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I wanted to address the spirit of deaf culture. It is fitting, indeed, that today, the second day of Deaf Awareness Week we pause to ponder a "silent" culture. In doing so I mean not to suggest that it is opposed to or in competition with American culture. Rather, deaf culture, as you may know or as you will see, flows from our American ingenuity and complements its heritage. Nonetheless, deaf culture, because of its rich symbolic nature, has vast lessons from which the "hearing" world can learn.

In their impressive book, "Deaf in America: Voices From a Culture," Carol Padden and Tom Humphries, themselves both deaf, speak of deaf culture in this way.

Deaf people have accumulated a set of knowledge about themselves in the face of the larger society's understanding—or misunderstanding—of them. They have found ways to define and express themselves through their rituals, tales, performances, and everyday social encounters. The rich-

ness of their sign language affords them the possibilities of insight, invention, and irony.

Indeed, it is this insight, invention and, yes, irony, that have typified my interaction and experience with the deaf and hearing impaired. I think that at times those of us who hear and converse with the audible word are prone to grow lackadaisical in our exchanges. Many words have lost their meaning, and conversation often occurs amongst distraction. It is, in the end, the necessity of being present—of being directly attentive and interested in another—that we need to learn and can learn from deaf culture.

As many of the Members of this House know, deaf culture is of a special interest to me. I have a niece who is deaf and each interaction with her is a learning experience which I have come to treasure. Furthermore, I am a trustee on Gallaudet's board of trustees with our colleague, DAVE BONIOR. That, too, has proven to be an experience rivaled by few. Finally, I have had the opportunity to employ deaf students on my staff. That has been and continues to be a source of great humility.

Each instance of exchange with deaf and hearing impaired individuals has brought a new appreciation for and understanding of both deaf culture and humanity at large.

Deaf culture is a powerful testimony to both the profound needs and the profound possibilities of human beings. The fact that the culture of deaf people has endured, despite indirect and tenuous lines of transmissions and despite generations of changing social conditions, attests to the tenacity of the basic human needs for language and symbol. (Padden and Humphries.)

It is a difficult task to stand before this House and adequately explain to my colleagues the spirit of deaf culture. It is an experience better experienced than explained and it is an experience I hope all of you will soon have.

Tomorrow, I will be introducing a resolution that would increase access for the deaf, hearing-, and speech-impaired to myself and my colleagues. Communication is the first necessity if we are to experience one another's heritage and learn from one another's experiences.

A TRIBUTE TO JACK BONO

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to a distinguished constituent of mine, Mr. Jack Bono, who is retiring after an outstanding 44-year career with Underwriters Laboratories, Inc. [UL]. For the last 12 years, Jack has been president of UL. On March 22, 1990, Jack will be honored by his friends and coworkers at a dinner commemorating his achievements.

Jack began his career with UL in 1946, following his honorable discharge from the Navy and his graduation from Northwestern University. In succeeding years, he held various engineering and management positions at UL, and in May 1978, he was named president.

Jack Bono has been an important part of the established U.S. safety system which is dedicated to protection of the public. He has contributed to the American economy through UL's standards development programs, work on national safety codes, and the development of operational practices and policies that have led to the safety certification of billions of products that are used every day by American consumers.

His work, and the work of UL, is a critical building block in the foundation upon which the U.S. safety system has been built.

Jack is also a member of the board of directors of the National Fire Protection Association [NFPA], a past president and fellow of the Society of Fire Protection Engineers and a former member of the boards of directors of the American National Standards Institute [ANSI], and the American Society of Testing and Materials [ASTM].

I extend my best wishes to Jack and his lovely wife, Bette, for a long, happy, and healthy retirement, and I commend him on his distinguished career with UL.

MAINTAIN AMERICA'S MARITIME CAPABILITY

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to see that the newly released national transportation policy recognizes the important role the U.S. maritime industry plays in our national defense planning. I agree wholeheartedly that "a viable and competitive merchant marine is essential to meeting the Nation's military sealift requirements."

The report further notes—correctly, I might add—that the present sealift capacity of the U.S. merchant marine is inadequate to support national defense needs in a national emergency. This shortfall is particularly acute in the area of troopship capability, that is, to have the passenger vessel capacity under our own flag and control to move troops anywhere in the world.

For this reason, I find it shortsighted and dangerous that the Maritime Administration is apparently succumbing to the wishes of foreign interests to sell one of our three passenger ships to a foreign buyer for operation under foreign flag.

There is no valid reason whatsoever why the Maritime Administration should choose to act as an agent of foreign shipping interests rather than as an agent of the American people. This is the worst kind of dereliction of duty. Marad should have immediately rejected the request to sell a national security asset to the highest foreign bidder. It should and must promote and preserve our maritime industry and not worry about promoting the bottom line of foreign maritime interests.

The law is clear. U.S.-flag vessels may not be sold for operation under a foreign flag if the sale is inconsistent with national maritime policy or otherwise detrimental to the best interests of the United States. The national interest must be the controlling factor when

making such a determination, not the economic gain to the vessel's owners.

Mr. Speaker, it is not too late for this situation to be corrected. Maritime Administrator Capt. Warren Leback has not given final approval to the foreign sale request. He still has the opportunity to maintain this sealift capability under the American flag; to preserve the more than 250 shipboard jobs for American workers; to ensure that American shipyard have the drydock work; to keep tourist dollars in the United States; and to generate revenues for American taxing authorities. All these benefits will be achieved at no cost to the U.S. Government. All these benefits will be lost at the expense of the U.S. Government, the maritime industry, and the American people if the *Monterey* is sold to foreign interests.

The ultimate outcome of this case will say a great deal about the future of our merchant marine. If the Maritime Administration is going to cavalierly dispose of modern, operational American ship and sabotage efforts in the private sector to increase the size of our fleet, then it will be virtually impossible to implement a meaningful national maritime policy. If the Maritime Administration no longer believes our Nation's security demands a U.S.-flag merchant marine, then our whole approach to sealift must be reexamined.

I strongly support the policy that only ships flying our flag and crewed by American citizens can be relied upon to respond to our country's needs in time of war or national emergency. By his action on the *Monterey*, Maritime Administrator Leback will clearly and loudly let us all know whether he agrees with this policy and whether he supports an American merchant marine.

I strongly urge all my colleagues to urge the Maritime Administrator to keep our Nation strong by keeping U.S. vessels afloat. I would also request that if this ship is sold to foreign interests, the leadership of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries investigate the process and the purpose which led to the administrative dismantling of our merchant marine.

GOING, GOING, GONE?

HON. HERBERT H. BATEMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, late last week, I was shocked to learn of the Maritime Administration's plans to allow the sale and transfer of the U.S.-flag passenger vessel, *SS Monterey*, to foreign citizens. This misguided decision clearly contravenes our longstanding national policy of promoting a strong merchant marine fleet capable of fulfilling our Nation's security and defense requirements.

The *SS Monterey* is one of only three oceangoing passenger vessels flying the American flag. Such vessels are a vital component of our sealift resources. The Commission on Merchant Marine and Defense concluded that our current sealift capability is inadequate for defense purposes, even if all available assets were to be used. In the area

of troop sealift, the problem is particularly acute. The Commission projected a significant shortfall in total troop lift capacity by the year 2000. Mr. Speaker, it is patently ridiculous to allow such an important sealift asset to be transferred to foreign control.

The *Monterey* is scheduled to go on the auction block on Thursday, March 15. It is my understanding that there is serious American interest in the vessel. However, the actions of the Maritime Administration have made it difficult, if not impossible, for these American interests to receive serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign transfer of the *SS Monterey* is inimical to the best interests of the United States. I urge my colleagues to join me in doing all that is possible to have the Maritime Administration rescind its approval.

STUDENTS FOR WORLD PEACE

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in order to commend the students of Ramapo Senior High School upon the occasion of their visit to the Soviet Union, April 6, through April 18, 1990.

This high school located in my own 22d Congressional District in Spring Valley, NY, has for the past 6 years traveled to the cities of Moscow, Minsk, and Leningrad. During these visits, Ramapo High School has maintained contact with two Soviet high schools and will again this year meet with their Soviet counterparts.

Mr. Speaker, at their recent meeting, President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev agreed to a renewed program of increased contacts between the citizens of both the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and further agreed and urged that educational exchanges at the earliest level be encouraged and fostered.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, we have and now continue to feel the changing climate toward global peace. The maintenance and achievement of this peace will require mutual knowledge and understanding of the history, culture, and peoples of our two nations.

Accordingly, I would like to commend the public schools of Rockland County for their active educational programs of global studies, including the history, culture, people, and language of the Soviet Union. In addition, I applaud both the students from Ramapo High School and their Soviet counterparts as they continue to serve as young ambassadors.

By their diligent commitment to a greater understanding of the people of the Soviet Union, the students of Ramapo High School have demonstrated the spirit of international brotherhood necessary for the foundation of global peace.

DESIGNATING JULY 10, 1990, AS "WYOMING CENTENNIAL DAY"

HON. CRAIG THOMAS

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of a resolution giving official Presidential, congressional, and national attention to a great event that made and continues to make a significant contribution to this Nation: The day of Wyoming's statehood.

On July 10, 1890, President Benjamin Harrison signed a proclamation admitting Wyoming as the 44th State in the Union. Now, 100 years later, with a legacy of firsts and a lasting spirit of rugged individualism, Wyoming is what America was—plus a whole lot more. And, for me, it is a particular honor to serve the people of the State in my first term in Congress during Wyoming's centennial year.

This resolution touches on some of the outstanding features in Wyoming's past and present. A proud past. A vital part of the United States. It is our future that will also be closely watched and I believe celebrated. In this next 100 years, Wyoming will use its bountiful reserves to provide energy for people throughout the country. At the same time, giving many Americans their first real experience with nature. The pristine beauty of the Tetons. The solitude of the open space in the Red Desert. The quiet way of life, the proud, pioneering way of life that is Wyoming. This centennial is an opportunity to review the past, present, and future of Wyoming. Wyoming's lasting legacy to this Nation is a spirit and determination of the true West. God bless the great State of Wyoming, the 44th State of the United States.

A TRIBUTE TO ELSIE B. HOWERTON

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues my congratulatory message to Mrs. Elsie B. Howerton, a distinguished citizen of the Eighth California Congressional District, and the wife of an equally distinguished constituent, Mr. Joseph L. Howerton.

Mrs. Howerton is a 34-year resident of the city of Berkeley. She presently serves as the elected president of the Congress of California Seniors, the elected president of North Berkeley Senior Center Advisory Council, and is a volunteer to the Lawrence Hall of Science Intergenerational Science Program wherein she participates in weekly biology workshops for fourth-grade students at Malcolm X School. Mrs. Howerton is also a member of the Commission on Aging for the city of Berkeley which she has chaired for a 5-year period, and is a participant in the Retired Senior Volunteer Program of Alameda County

[RSVP], sponsored by Peralta Community College District.

On March 14, 1990, Mrs. Howerton will be honored at an event sponsored by the Commission on the Status of Women. We wish to join our constituents in congratulating Mrs. Howerton and in commending her for her distinguished service to her city, her State, and to this Nation.

TRANSPORTATION TRUST FUNDS

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post recently ran a feature article on Secretary Skinner and the ambitious transportation policy he has developed. I commend the Secretary for taking the initiative and developing this critical plan for the future, and I hope to be of assistance in seeing the plan come to fruition. However, I am convinced that in order to meet targeted infrastructure priorities we will need to make full use of the transportation trust funds.

The article about Secretary Skinner raised the question of the trust funds: Why do we have large balances in the trust fund accounts when infrastructure needs are clearly going unmet? Federal Highway Administrator Tom Larson's response was, "It's a dicey question that we've danced around." I am encouraged by that response, after years of denying even the existence of the surplus, maybe the administration will finally admit that the enormous balances in the trust funds accounts should be spent as soon as possible in order to protect our infrastructure investment. For both safety reasons and economic reasons our infrastructure needs are now critical, and we can no longer afford to use the trust fund money to hide deficit spending in other programs.

I look forward to the upcoming Public Works and Transportation Committee action on the highway program as well as the national transportation policy, and I look forward to working with the administration to resolve the trust fund issue.

MASSMUTUAL: HELPING TO DEFINE FAMILY VALUES

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the beliefs that unifies our society is that there exists a core set of values on which the overwhelming majority of Americans agree. On this belief rests the justification for a number of the actions that are taken by government, actions which affect virtually every aspect of our lives. If asked to enumerate those values, I think most Americans would mention many which could be collectively labeled as "family values." While there may be agreement that family values exist,

however, the composition of those values has been the subject of much discussion but little attempt at quantification.

A company headquartered in my congressional district, the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., recently commissioned a study to attempt to crystallize this notion of family values. This study, the MassMutual Family Values Program, included a survey of 1,200 randomly selected Americans from across the country, and revealed that there are universally held values in America, values which transcend the boundaries of geography, demography, or politics. Chief among these values is the importance of family, as a source of pleasure, and responsibility, and a cause of concern. The preeminent status of family attaches without regard to marital status and applies primarily in emotional, rather than legal terms.

The MassMutual Family Values Program also revealed that Americans see the family as the wellspring of emotional support, and the primary teacher of the fundamental skills by which a person successfully relates to society. In this regard, the study seems to me to mark rather clearly areas in which government may be of assistance, and areas in which it may not intrude.

Mr. Speaker, I believe MassMutual should be saluted for the valuable public service it has performed in undertaking this survey of America's family values. The results should be considered by government at all levels in developing and implementing social policy. I commend the survey and its findings to the attention of my colleagues.

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO LIBERATO "CHIP" PARILLO

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great enthusiasm that I rise today to salute Mr. Liberato "Chip" Parillo. Mr. Parillo brought his long career of public service to a close this year. January 1990 marked the end of a career spanning over 50 years. I want to take this opportunity to honor Mr. Parillo's strong commitment to our Nation.

Mr. Parillo enlisted in the U.S. Army in 1936. For the next 25 years he served proudly—in World War II, Korea, Canada, China and elsewhere around the world. He has served in 11 Army camps in the United States as well. While in the Army, Mr. Parillo earned many medals and ribbons including the Combat Medical Badge for excellent performance of duty on the battlefield.

After retiring from military service, Mr. Parillo joined the U.S. Customs Service. From 1964 until this year, he served in Philadelphia as an inspector. Recently, he was honored at a retirement party by coworkers, family, and friends who saluted his five decades service in several branches of the U.S. Government.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Parillo upon his retirement from the U.S. Customs Service and salute his outstanding service to our country. I wish him good luck and continued success.

THE SALE OF SS "MONTEREY"

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely appalled to learn that the Maritime Administration is giving the go-ahead to sell to foreign buyers an American flag, Jones-Act-eligible passenger vessel. This vessel, the SS *Monterey*, is precisely the national defense and sealift asset that everyone—from the President's Commission on Merchant Marine and Defense to those within the Defense Department responsible for sealift requirements—states we must have under our flag and under our control.

Under the Shipping Act of 1916, the Maritime Administration has the responsibility to protect the national interest by ensuring that U.S.-flagships are not routinely sold to the highest foreign bidder. This law is in place to guarantee that American vessels which have recognizable military and economic value to the United States are not sold off simply in order to increase the profits of foreign shipping interests. Our national security demands that the interests of the United States take precedence over the bottom line of foreign concerns.

In this case, Mr. Speaker, the Maritime Administration is abrogating its responsibility. It is choosing to act as an agent for foreign interests looking to maximize profits at the expense of the American Merchant Marine, rather than as an agent for the American people.

In February of this year, Maritime Administrator Capt. Warren Leback told the National Defense Transportation Association that, "Defense and transportation are links in the same chain. The civilian commercial transportation industry is a major part of our national defense readiness structure." Mr. Speaker, I totally agree with Captain Leback's assessment and I urge him to reject the foreign transfer application when it reaches his desk.

TRANSFER TO FOREIGN OWNERSHIP OF THE SS "MONTEREY"

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I have been made aware recently of an action about to be taken by our own Maritime Administration which will, if it is allowed to be carried out, severely damage our maritime industry and our military readiness. What I am referring to is the pending approval for transfer to foreign ownership of the U.S.-built and -flagged passenger ship—the SS *Monterey*.

The *Monterey* is one of only three U.S.-flagged, Jones-Act passenger vessels operational today. It would serve our national interest by carrying U.S. troops in time of war—an advantage we do not have with those non-U.S.-flag vessels which sail from our ports.

Currently on the auction block, the *Monterey*, when operating, employs more than 250 American citizens operating cruises within the United States. Those citizens employed on the vessel pay taxes and the company pays taxes—all money which is returned to the United States.

Operating from a U.S. port, the *Monterey* creates additional jobs: dockworkers and marine support personnel are put to work. More jobs are available for food service companies, linen suppliers, tour companies and a host of other businesses which employ Americans and pay taxes in America. It contributes to the trickle-down effect in our society. What is good for us and our national security is also good for our economy—it keeps the money at home.

What do we gain by allowing this uniquely American vessel to be sold to foreign interests? This is a question I cannot answer. We lose—we lose tax revenues, we lose American jobs, we lose security. Who gains then? MarAd gains nothing by this sale—they have no financial stake in the vessel. The only winners in this hand are foreign interests. They will have the ship and all of the related revenues it generates.

Mr. Speaker, one the SS *Monterey* is gone, we cannot retrieve it. If we need an additional vessel for troop transport, it will be too late and we will have sold ourselves and our constituents short. I urge all of my colleagues to call Maritime Administrator Warren Leback and insist that the *Monterey* remain at home.

IN MEMORY OF STATE REPRESENTATIVE ED COOK

HON. JIM JONTZ

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Speaker, today the 106th session of the Indiana General Assembly will draw to a close and for the first time in 16 years, State Representative Ed Cook will not be present when the speaker of the house announces "The house is adjourned, sine die."

On February 15, Representative Cook suffered a severe stroke and lapsed into a coma

from which he never recovered. He passed away 5 days later.

Although Ed and I were both elected to the Indiana House of Representatives in 1974, Ed had more experience in public service having served several terms as a member of the Marshall County Council. Our districts bordered one another in north central Indiana and we joined forces many times to bring the needs of our area to the attention of the legislature.

No one knew the needs of the district he represented better than Ed. As co-owner of Cook Brothers Furniture in Plymouth, Ed brought the common sense and community values of his hometown to the general assembly. He was appreciated on both sides of the aisle for his straightforwardness and his love of a good joke.

Despite declining health in recent years, Ed never tired of representing the people who elected him. He will be missed, both in his district and in the halls of the Indiana state house.

OPERATION JUST CAUSE

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, last week, the news media reported extensively on allegations that United States military personnel in Panama had been used to smuggle drugs into the United States. It was even reported that our troops sent to Panama last December as a part of Operation Just Cause were involved, even though they were in Panama for only a few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, it appears that a handful of the thousands of troops who are permanently stationed in Panama may indeed have been corrupted by the drug lords. However, I have been assured by both the Department of Defense as well as the Drug Enforcement Agency that there is no evidence that even one military person sent to Panama with Just Cause was involved in this unfortunate incident.

It is regrettable that the media did not wait until the facts were known before erroneously

reporting that Just Cause personnel were involved.

I urge the media to make it clear to the American people that our brave troops, who fought and died to restore democracy in Panama, were unfairly maligned.

THE BENEFITS OF OLDER WORKERS

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1990

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a very special effort in my congressional district.

This week marks "National Employ the Older American Week," a chance for all employers to examine the advantages of hiring our senior citizens. The benefits of exploring this largely untapped resource are many. These workers have a lifetime of experience. They understand the needs of employers as well as those of the customer or client. I think it is valid to say that older individuals are dependable, honest, conscientious, and enthusiastic about their jobs.

There is a program in Williamsport that seeks to match older workers with local businesses. Known as STEP [Social Service Training Employment Programs], it is a comprehensive service that assists seniors in finding work. One of the incentives STEP offers is participation in the Pennsylvania Hall of Fame of Champions of Older Workers Council. Employers who have outstanding records of dealing with older workers in the labor force are nominated for the Hall of Fame. I am proud to say that STEP has nominated two such employers from Lycoming County in the 17th Congressional District: Victor's Auto Sales, and Clark's Farm Store.

I commend these employers and STEP for the compassion and understanding to appreciate the wide range of skills older workers have to offer.