

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMARKS OF GOV. ROBERT P. CASEY

HON. JAMES M. TALENT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, on March 11, 1993, I was in St. Louis, MO, where the Honorable Robert P. Casey, the Democratic Governor of Pennsylvania, delivered a thoughtful speech to the Conference on Abortion and Public Policy. Governor Casey has been a leading voice on this important issue, and I think his thoughts on abortion deserve to be heard. For this reason, I would like to submit a copy of his speech for the RECORD.

REMARKS BY GOV. ROBERT P. CASEY

All of us are joined in our conviction that abortion is a bad thing. And although many of us are Catholics, we are also joined in the conviction that abortion is not simply a Catholic concern. It's a catholic concern with the small "c"—the concern of anyone who rejects the idea of human life as a disposable commodity. The concern of anyone with eyes to see, a mind to reason, and a heart to feel.

It is not an arrogant boast, but a demographic fact, that most Americans share this conviction. Anytime the question is put squarely to them, "Do you oppose abortion on demand?" more than two out of three Americans answer yes. Asked if they favor restrictions on abortion such as we have enacted in Pennsylvania, again a majority of 70 to 80 percent say yes. Perhaps the most telling survey of all found that 78 percent of the people would outlaw 93 percent of all abortions—all but the familiar hard cases. Even in the last election, in which all sides sought to shelve the issue of abortion, exit polls revealed its central importance in the minds of most voters.

To those who favor liberal abortion policies, this persistent opposition is a mystery, a disturbing sign of something backward and intolerant in our society. Sometimes the abortion lobby pretty much concedes that Americans by and large favor restrictions on abortion—as when Pennsylvania's abortion laws were upheld by the Supreme Court. Such setbacks to their cause leave abortion advocates bewildered and alarmed, convinced that Americans still need to be "educated on the issue."

Other times—like right now—their tactic is to obscure public opinion by marginalizing the pro-life side, dismissing critics of their cause as a handful of fanatics resisting the tide of opinion. A quarter of a million people may gather to protest abortion on the Washington Mall, and if the media notice them at all, they're treated almost in a tone of pity, like some narrow fringe estranged from modern realities. As I discovered, even the governor of a major state, who holds pro-life views, can be denied a hearing at his party's convention without the national media pro-

testing it. The success of this tactic is truly a public relations triumph, only possible in an environment which constantly marginalizes and suppresses the pro-life message. And despite 20 years of brainwashing, the American people have not been fooled. If the majority of Americans support abortion, why have three of the last four presidential elections been won resoundingly by pro-life candidates? If my position is irrelevant, then so, I'm afraid, are the views of some 80 to 85 percent of the people of Pennsylvania and the United States.

As I read the polls showing our continuing unease with abortion, nothing makes me more proud to call myself an American. Among the "herd of independent minds" who make up our opinion leaders, abortion may be taken as a mark of progress. But most Americans have not followed. In the abortion lobby's strange sense of the word, America has never been a "progressive" nation. For we know—and this used to be the credo of my party—that progress can never come by exploiting or sacrificing any one class of people. Progress is a hollow word unless everyone is counted in and no one written off, especially the most weak and vulnerable among us.

You cannot stifle this debate with a piece of paper. No edict, no federal mandate can put to rest the grave doubts of the American people. Legal abortion will never rest easy on this nation's conscience. It will continue to haunt the consciences of men and women everywhere. The plain facts of biology, the profound appeals of the heart, are far too unsettling to ever fade away.

The abortion issue has intersected with my public life from the very beginning. It started in 1966, seven years before *Roe v. Wade*.

The occasion was the Pennsylvania Democratic gubernatorial primary. New York had just passed a very liberal abortion law, and the question was, Would I sign such a law in Pennsylvania if it were to pass? My opponent's answer was that this was an issue only women fully understood; that he would appoint a women's commission to study the issue, if elected; and that he would sign such a law, if enacted, in Pennsylvania. My response was simple and unequivocal: If the law were to pass, I would veto it.

I lost that primary by a narrow margin. I am fairly certain that my abortion position hurt me, because in a Democratic primary, where turnout is relatively low, liberal voters turn out in disproportionately large numbers and thus exercise a disproportionate influence on the outcome.

The point I want to make about my decisional process in 1966 is this: I took the position against a liberal abortion law instinctively. I did not consider it to be a position dictated by my Catholic faith. As a matter of fact, the Catholic Church made it clear that it took no position in the primary. And many Catholics worked openly and actively for my opponent.

For me, the imperative of protecting unborn human life has always been a self-evident proposition. I cannot recall the subject of abortion ever being mentioned, much less

discussed in depth, in school or at home. My position was simply a part of me from the very beginning.

When I was elected Governor in 1986, both my Democratic primary opponent and general election Republican opponent were pro-choice. The general election was a photo finish. When my opponent and I debated on statewide television shortly before the election, the inevitable question was asked: "If the Supreme court overruled *Roe v. Wade*, and the Pennsylvania Legislature passed a law banning all abortions except to save the life of the mother, would you sign it?" My opponent said that, while there were "too many" abortions in our country, and we should work to reduce that number, he would veto the law banning abortion. My answer was: "Yes, I would sign such a law."

My campaign people thought that my answer, with no qualifiers—no ifs, no ands, and no buts—had lost the election. I won by about 75,000 votes.

When I ran for reelection in 1990, my Republican opponent was stridently pro-choice. The abortion issue was the motivating factor behind her candidacy. She was banking on the conventional wisdom of that period—the post-*Webster* period—when the pro-choice groups tried to convince the country that women, shocked by the *Webster* decision, would rise up and drive all pro-life candidates from public life. And their message was as cruel as it was direct. The leader of the National Organization for Women in Pittsburgh said that I was sick, and would probably be dead before the election. (I had had open-heart surgery in 1987.) My opponent called me "a rednecked Irishman." The National Abortion Rights Action League released a poll purporting to show the election a dead heat when people were informed of my position on abortion. Pro-choice groups sent several dozen of their supporters to the Governor's Residence where they chanted, "Get your rosaries off my ovaries," as the television cameras whirred. And my opponent, who spent two million dollars, ran a television commercial purporting to depict a rape, to dramatize my position of refusing to recognize an exception for rape, in which it was difficult to distinguish me from the rapist.

I won by over one million votes, the largest winning margin in Pennsylvania gubernatorial political history. I am convinced the abortion issue was a key factor in that victory.

But, in between the 1986 and 1990 campaigns, I came face to face for the first time with a conflict between my personal and public position on abortion, and what I regarded as the duty imposed by my oath of office to "support, obey and defend" the Constitution of the United States. As a lawyer, I was trained to believe that the Constitution means what the United States Supreme Court says it means. The consequence of that line of reasoning was that I could not sign a law which was, on its face, in direct conflict with what the Supreme Court had decided, even when I personally did not agree with the Court's ruling.

● 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.

That issue was squarely presented when our legislature, in December 1987, and before the *Webster* ruling, passed an abortion control law which required the woman to notify the father of the child. This meant the biological father, whether or not he was the spouse of the woman. The Supreme Court had already struck down as unconstitutional even a spousal notification requirement, where the biological father was the woman's husband, and the two were living together in a normal domestic relationship.

I vetoed the law, pointing to my constitutional duty, under my oath, and the futility—from the standpoint of protecting unborn human life—of passing laws which had no chance of ever taking effect to help the unborn.

This is what I said in my veto message:

"Let me restate in summary the distinction between personal belief and constitutional duty as it applies to this legislation. I believe abortion to be the ultimate violence. I believe strongly that *Roe v. Wade* was incorrectly decided as a matter of law and represents a national public policy both divisive and destructive. It has unleashed a tidal wave that has swept away the lives of millions of defenseless, innocent unborn children. In according the woman's right of privacy in the abortion decision both exclusivity and finality, the Supreme Court has not only disregarded the right of the unborn child to life itself, but has deprived parents, spouses, and the state of the right to participate in a decision in which they all have a vital interest. This interest ought to be protected, rather than denied, by the law. This policy has had, and will continue to have, a profoundly destructive effect upon the fabric of American life. But these personal beliefs must yield to the duty, imposed by my oath of office, to follow the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States. . . .

"Most importantly, I emphasize again that we must—and we will—enact a strong and sustainable Abortion Control Act that forms a humane and constitutional foundation for our efforts to ensure that no child is denied his or her chance to walk in the sun and make the most out of life. I will sign this bill when it reaches the end of the legislative process and attains those standards."

Following the veto, my staff and I worked closely with pro-life groups and legislative leaders to draft the Abortion Control Act of 1989 within the framework of the Supreme Court cases, including the *Webster* decision. The law requires parental consent for minors, informed consent and a 24-hour waiting period. These limitations were upheld in *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey*. A spousal notification requirement in the law was struck down.

Thus, while concluding that my oath of office precluded me from signing an unconstitutional law, I also recognized a right, if not a duty, to work to change the law within the democratic process. First, by enacting a law that was designed to limit and reduce abortions within the constitutional authority of the states. Second, to speak out in favor of the protection of human life so as to influence others, including federal and state policymakers, so that they too would adopt this view.

I have described how I understood my position in 1987. But now, six years later, I feel compelled to inquire further: What exactly is the relationship between the rulings of the United States Supreme Court and the Constitution I am bound to uphold?

As everyone knows, the Court can be—and has been—seriously wrong. The Court erred in the case of *Dred Scott*. And I believe that the Court erred in the case of *Roe v. Wade*.

In this context, in this place, one cannot help but recall Abraham Lincoln's attitude toward the Supreme Court's *Dred Scott* decision, which he and so many others believed to be disastrously wrong.

Lincoln viewed the *Dred Scott* decision as, "not having yet quite established a settled doctrine for the country." A year after the decision, he said, "If I were in Congress, and a vote should come up on a question whether slavery should be prohibited in a new territory, in spite of the *Dred Scott* decision, I would vote that it should." Several years later, Congress did precisely that. In open defiance of *Dred Scott*, Congress outlawed slavery in the territories.

In his first inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln, in referring to the *Dred Scott* case, expressed the view that other officers of the government could not be obligated to accept any new laws created by the Court unless they, too, were persuaded by the force of the Court's reasoning. Any other position would mean, in his view, that "the policies of the government upon vital questions, affecting the whole people, [could] be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made, in ordinary litigation between parties, in personal actions." If that were to occur, said Lincoln, "the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned the government into the hands of that eminent tribunal."

After much thought and reflection since 1987, I must confess that I am more and more persuaded that Lincoln's view should be the standard for pro-life elected officials in 1993 and beyond.

The question I want to address tonight, then, is this: What are the responsibilities of a pro-life politician?

For no matter what the majority sentiments may be, the drift of law favors abortion. Our courts, which do not operate on majority rule, say abortion is legal, an implied constitutional right to privacy found nowhere in the text of the Constitution. For a politician like myself, opposition to abortion may thus become opposition to the existing laws one is sworn to uphold.

What then do conscience and duty require?

I believe the first step is to understand that such dilemmas are not new to our day. Any man who has ever tried to use political power for the common good has felt an awful sense of powerlessness. There are always limits on what we can do, always obstacles, always frustrations and bitter disappointments. This was the drama a future president once studied in *Profiles in Courage*, a book that now seems quaint in its simple moral idealism. The founders of our country understood the limits of political power when they swore allegiance to something higher, their "sacred honor." Lincoln felt this tension when he sought to uphold the equality of men. His real greatness was in seeing that political reform alone wasn't enough; not only the slave had to be freed, but the slave owner from the bonds of his own moral blindness. Likewise, Thomas More expressed the dilemma when, faced with the raw power of the state, he declared, "I die the king's good servant but God's first." Far from being a new problem, this tension goes all the way back to the Pharisees and their challenge to declare for or against Caesar.

Just as the problem is an old one, so are the alternatives. One of these alternatives is accommodation with power, a pragmatic acceptance of "the facts." In the abortion question, this position is summed up in familiar disavowal, "I'm personally opposed, but . . ."

The hard facts—so runs this view—are against us. However we might oppose it, abortion is a sad feature of modern life. Tolerance is the price we pay for living in a free, pluralistic society. For the Catholic politician to "impose" his moral views would be an act of theocratic arrogance, violating our democratic trust. The proper and prudent course is therefore to bring change by "persuasion, not coercion." Absent a "consensus," it is not the place of any politician to change our laws permitting abortion.

I want to be careful here not to caricature this position. Some very honorable people hold it, and it is not my purpose to challenge their motives. Yet, as some politicians advance this view it does seem an evasion, a finesse rather than an honest argument. But that, so far as I am concerned, is the secret of their own individual hearts. Here I mean only to challenge the argument on its own intellectual grounds, with the presumption of good faith extended all around.

We can dispense easily with the charge of theocratic arrogance. That would certainly apply if we were trying to impose some uniquely Catholic stricture like church attendance or fast days on the general population. But the stricture to refrain from killing is not uniquely Catholic. And that, as a purely empirical assertion, is how nearly all people of all faiths at all times have regarded abortion—as killing. Just listen, for example, to Frank Sussman, the lawyer who represented Missouri abortion clinics in *Webster*.

"Neither side in this debate"—he said—"would ever disagree on the physiological facts. Both sides would agree as to when a heartbeat can first be detected. Both sides would agree as to when brain waves can first be detected. But when you try to place the emotional labels on what you call that collection of physiological facts, that is where people part company."

Or listen to former New York Mayor Ed Koch, a fellow Democrat: "I support *Roe v. Wade* wholeheartedly," he wrote in a column. "And I do it even while acknowledging to myself that at some point, perhaps even after the first trimester, abortion becomes infanticide . . ."

Or, for that matter, just listen to President Clinton speaking last month in Chillicothe, Ohio: "Very few Americans believe that all abortions all the time are all right. Almost all Americans believe that abortions should be illegal when the children can live without the mother's assistance, when the children can live outside the mother's womb."

By referring to the unborn as "children," the President was not making a theological claim; he was just putting all the physiological facts together. The same is true when we say abortion "kills." We don't say it in meanness. It's a unique kind of killing, for the motive may not be homicidal; it may be done in ignorance of what actually is occurring. We reserve a special compassion for women who find themselves contemplating abortion. But as an objective fact, that is what abortion is, and so mankind has always regarded it. Science, history, philosophy, religion, and common intuition all speak with one voice in asserting the humanity of the unborn. Only our current laws say otherwise.

So much for theocratic arrogance. That is the more obvious fallacy underlying the "personally opposed, but . . ." line of reasoning.

But I believe it arises from a deeper intellectual confusion. It confuses prudence with pragmatism, and mistakes power for authority.

Prudence we all know to be a virtue. Classical thinkers rated it the supreme political virtue. Roughly defined, it's the ability to distinguish the desirable from the possible. It's a sense of the good, joined with a practical knowledge of the means by which to accomplish the good. A world in which every unborn child survives to take his first breath is desirable. But we know that such a world has never been. And prudence cautions us never to expect such a world. Abortion is but one of many evils that, to one extent or another, is to be found at all times and places. Men can make good laws, but laws cannot make men good.

But the point is that after facing up to such facts, the basic facts of our human condition, prudence does not fall silent. It is not an attitude of noble resignation; it is an active virtue. The voice that says, "Ah, well, there is no consensus. We must take the world as it is. There is nothing further to be done"—that is not the voice of prudence. It is the voice of expediency.

Prudence compromises—it doesn't capitulate. It's tolerant, but not timid.

Prudence asks: "If there is no consensus, how do we form one? What means of reform are available to us? How, lawfully, can we change the law?"

And here is where the difference between power and authority comes in. In the best of worlds, the law commands both. The law confers power or rightful authority, and invests authority with power. The integrity of our laws rests on a continuity, a corpus juris reflecting the accumulated experience of our civilization. Laws are the conventional application of permanent principles. And if democratic government depends on any one central idea, it's that raw power alone, laws that flout those permanent principles, cannot command our respect. Our obedience, yes. Our allegiance, no.

Alexander Hamilton put it this way: "The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for among old parchments or musty records. They are written, as with a sunbeam, in the whole volume of human nature, by the hand of Divinity, itself; and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power." Even the more secular-minded Thomas Jefferson agreed: The "only firm basis" of freedom, he wrote, is "a conviction in the minds of people that their liberties are the gift of God."

American history has had its dark moments, but only twice has this principle been radically betrayed. Only twice has mortal power, using the instrument of the law itself, sought to exclude an entire class of people from their most sacred human rights.

This place in which we meet today marks the first time.

One hundred and thirty-six years ago, a human being was declared a piece of property, literally led off in chains as people of good conscience sat paralyzed by a ruling of the court.

The other time was January 21, 1973. An entire class of human beings was excluded from the protection of the state, their fate declared a "private" matter. That "sunbeam" Hamilton envisioned, the Creator's

signature on each new life, was deflected by human hands. No one has ever described what happened more concisely than Justice Byron White in his dissent. It was an act of "raw judicial power"—power stripped of all moral and constitutional authority.

Roe v. Wade was not, then, one more natural adaptation in our constitutional evolution. It was not like *Brown v. Board of Education*, a refinement extending law and liberty to an excluded class. Just the opposite: It was an abrupt mutation, a defiance of all precedent, a disjuncture of law and authority. Where we used to think of law as above politics, in *Roe* law and politics became indistinguishable. How strange it is to hear abortion now defended in the name of "consensus." *Roe* itself, the product of a contrived and fraudulent test case, was a judicial decree overruling a consensus expressed in the laws of most states. It arose not from the wisdom of the ages or from the voice of the people, but from the ideology of the day and the will of a determined minority. It compels us to ignore the consensus of mankind about the treatment of the unborn. It commands us to disregard the clearest of Commandments. After twenty long years, the people of the United States have refused to heed that command.

Roe v. Wade is a law we must observe but never honor. In Hamilton's phrase, it's a piece of "parchment," a musty record bearing raw coercive power and devoid of moral authority. It has done its harm and will do much more. But those who say we must learn to live with it still don't get it. Ultimately, *Roe* cannot survive alongside our enduring, unshakable sense of justice. It is no more permanent than any other act of human arrogance. It is no more unchangeable than the laws which sent Dred Scott back to his master.

This has been the generation of what Malcolm Muggeridge called "the humane holocaust." The loss can never be recovered. Indeed, it can't even be calculated. Not even the familiar statistic—1.6 million a year—begins to express the enormity of it. One person's life touches so many others. How can you measure the void left when so many people aren't even permitted to live among us?

The best we can do is change what can be changed, and, most importantly, stay the course.

And there is no need to wait for some political consensus to form. That consensus is here, and it grows every time someone looks for the first time at a sonogram. It needs only leaders—prudent, patient leaders. It doesn't need apologists to soothe us into inaction. It needs statesmen who will work for change—change here and now.

So, we must ask ourselves, what must the role of the pro-life public official be in 1993 in the face of the catastrophic human carnage of abortion?

Let me be specific.

First, relentless, outspoken opposition to passage of the so-called Freedom of Choice Act.

Second, continuous effort to expand and enlarge the protection of human life in state and national laws and policies.

Third, a continuous drumbeat of public expression which makes the American people confront the facts about abortion in all of its evil.

Fourth, advocacy of a New American Compact in this country which seeks to involve all public and private institutions in a fight for policies and programs to offer women

meaningful alternatives to abortion and to offer children and families the help they need to live decent, healthy and happy lives.

Fifth, political action which challenges both major parties and their candidates to protect human life and works for change in national elections.

The need for constancy, activism and relentless effort cannot be overstated. In light of recent events, there is no doubt that this country faces a crisis of awesome dimensions.

National commentators want to treat this issue as settled. We can never let them get away with that. This issue will never die. It will never be "over."

We live in a time of anarchy—when those who claim the right to choose deny pro-life advocates the right to speak. Our voices must be even more determined in response.

In summary, the role of the public official must be to lead—to stand up and say to the people of this country who believe in protecting human life: Press On!

Let this, then, be our clarion call, our call to arms, the keynote of this gathering: Press On!

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET WEGNER

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize a special individual, Margaret Wegner, from Midland, Michigan. Margaret is being honored at the Midland Exchange Club's "Book of Golden Deeds" presentation. As I describe to you Margaret's contributions to and involvement in the community, you will see why she is so deserving of this honor.

Margaret has been a hardworking and generous individual, giving unselfishly of her time to benefit the Midland County Fair Board. The first woman elected President of the Midland County Agricultural and Horticultural Society in 1980 (as the Fair Board is formally known), she is now in her 13th term and is instrumental in organizing the Midland County Fair. There are hundreds of details that go into organizing this event each year, over which Margaret has shown incredible mastery.

Margaret has been responsible for the master plan and upgrading of the fairgrounds. She implemented the purchase of 40 additional acres of property, saw the completion of a new water system for the grounds, and supervised the construction of two livestock buildings and the Hugh Glover arena. She has also computerized the managing facilities.

Margaret's ongoing commitment and dedication to the betterment of the fair allow for hundreds of hours of enjoyment for the people of Midland County. She is a leader in the Larkin Livestock 4-H group and an advisor to the Junior Fairboard, a group of teen-agers who serve as an advisory panel to the fair association's Board of Directors. Through the 4-H, Margaret acts as a liaison among the different age groups attending the fair to see to it that all needs are met.

Margaret is an outstanding role model that others look to because of her community dedi-

cation and involvement. She states that she does her work "for the kids." She strongly believes that children need good direction and encouragement—two characteristics that are vital elements in the building blocks of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, Margaret Wegner is truly a remarkable individual. I know that you will join with me in congratulating Margaret on receiving this truly outstanding recognition and wishing her success in future endeavors.

RECYCLING MARKETS IN WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA

HON. CHARLES H. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, I entered into the RECORD a report on recycling markets in western North Carolina prepared by the Western North Carolina Environmental Council. The end of the report, however, which included the council's recommendations, was mistakenly excluded. I would like to have those recommendations entered into the RECORD at this time:

RECYCLING MARKETS IN WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

Resulting from the presentations given to the Western North Carolina Environmental Council, the sub-committee formulated the following recommendations concerning recycling:

1. Both federal and state governments should pursue alternatives to traditional regulation. Change the primary emphasis of government environmental agencies in dealing with small business from regulator to ombudsman/consultant.
2. To encourage the use of new technologies, restore research and development tax credits at both the state and federal levels.
3. Investigate methods of long-term storage and segregation of used tires until such time as a cost-effective recycling process has been developed.
4. Encourage the purchase of compost equipment by providing tax credits to individuals, businesses, or local governments who utilize such equipment to process yard refuse.
5. Encourage industries and utilities to reuse parts of the waste stream as fuel to offset use of natural resources by publicizing cost-effective, environmentally benign programs that have been used successfully in the past.
6. Review Federal Procurement Specifications and state generated standards to ensure that they do not inhibit use of recycled materials (e.g., use performance-oriented requirements).
7. Increase government purchase of recycled goods.
8. Encourage industries with incentives to develop comprehensive programs such as Dayco's.
9. Institute a moratorium on new legislation impacting recycling until existing regulations can be implemented and tested.
10. Increase public awareness of the impact of existing governmental positions and of the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

status of solid-waste disposal systems in North Carolina. The state could contact a number of residents by including an educational mail piece in on-going state mailing such as tax forms.

11. Encourage firms to conduct waste-stream analyses by publicizing the waste reductions and cost savings achieved by companies who have performed audits.

IV. CONCLUSION

Federal, state and local governments are reviewing their respective roles in the management of municipal solid waste. According to the Congressional Research Service, reauthorization of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the Nation's principal law regulating the management of solid and hazardous waste is one of the top environmental priorities of the 102nd Congress. The CRS says, "The key issues in the RERA debate concern the management of municipal solid waste. About 70% of MSW goes to landfills, but the number of active landfills has declined from 20,000 in 1979 to fewer than 6,000 today (McCarthy 1)."

States are considering mandatory recycled content legislation; and local governments must continue to cope with public objections to landfills and incinerators. Within this broad setting, the recycling industry plays a small role.

However, Russ Duffner holds the view that, "The best thing for a recycling market is to keep government out of it." He continued, "Simple government regulations change the whole market-place." Even the federal Office of Management and Budget concedes:

"Traditional formal rulemaking procedures may not always be the best tools available to EPA to accomplish its goals of reducing environmental risk and protecting human health.

"(The) EPA will continue to experiment with negotiation and other forms of consultation to enable all interested parties to participate more fully in environmental rulemaking" (OMB 514).

To quote J. Winston Porter:

"Aiming for unrealistic recycling rates will not only discourage the public, but may lead to a fool's paradise where needed landfills and waste-to-energy facilities are dismissed. A national goal of 25-30% recycling is plenty ambitious for now. Also, we need to understand that local recycling rates will vary significantly due to market conditions as well as costs of local waste management alternatives.

"We've got a good thing going in recycling. Let's ride this wave awhile and see what we can rationally do before trying to further legislate the law of supply and demand" (Environmental Science and Technology September 1991).

ESSAY BY KENDRA TRACY

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an essay written by a very special constituent, Kendra Tracy. Kendra is making her first visit to our Nation's Capitol with the Lakeside Middle School. Her essay is a very touching explanation of why she would like to

represent her school in the wreath ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. I urge my colleagues to read Kendra's essay as she talks of her grandfather and grandmother and all others who have sacrificed for our country. It is indeed a wonderful essay.

ESSAY BY KENDRA TRACY OF LAKESIDE MIDDLE SCHOOL

There are three main reasons that I would like to represent Lakeside Middle School in the Wreath Ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Each of them is very important to me. I would be very proud to be allowed to be a part of the ceremony.

My first reason is that my grandfather served in the Navy during World War Two. He was stationed on a ship in the South Pacific. My grandfather lost a lot of good friends, many who were lost at sea and never buried so that their families could visit them. My grandfather was never able to visit the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and I would like to do this for him.

My grandma served in the Army during World War Two, working as General Patton's secretary. She was with General Patton in Germany, and knew many people who never came home from that war. A lot of those people are buried somewhere in Europe in unmarked graves. One of her friends could be the unknown soldier who represents those lost in the 2nd World War. My grandma would be very proud if I was able to place the wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

I know how sad it must be for the people who have lost someone in a war and do not have a grave that they can visit when they need to feel close to that person. It's tragic enough that their loved ones died far away from home while serving their country. After what those soldiers went through, and after they've given their lives for their country, they deserve to have a place where their families can come. It's sad that most of these families aren't able to visit the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. I would be proud to represent these families by honoring their heroes at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

These are my reasons for wanting to be in the Wreath Ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. I would be representing my grandfather, my grandma, and the many families who have lost someone in the war, as well as Lakeside Middle School. It would be a great honor, one that I'd always remember proudly.

RADIO FREE EUROPE/RADIO LIBERTY

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, freedom and independence in Russia and Eastern Europe are not yet assured. As the recent events in Russia have so clearly displayed, the democrats in that part of the world still live a precarious existence. The Russian ex-Communist nomenclatura is resurgent, desperately clinging to what power it still has and longing to regain that which it has lost. A victory by these forces could have extremely deleterious consequences not only for Russia, but for all of the former Soviet empire.

This is why I consider efforts to consolidate away the existence of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to be such utter folly. It is by now well known what a key role these organizations played in lighting the way to freedom for the former prisoners behind the iron curtain. The efforts of RFE/RL have been lavished with praise by such notables as Lech Walesa, Vaclav Havel, and Boris Yeltsin. The Estonian Foreign Ministry has even nominated RFE/RL for a Nobel Peace Prize.

The broadcasts of RFE/RL were for years the only source of truth for those who endured the long night of communism. RFE/RL correspondents are afforded the highest levels of trust by politicians, journalists, and the general public in that part of the world. Less known, but no less important, is RFE/RL's unparalleled research and analysis ability. For years, scholars, journalists, and Western policymakers have relied on RFE/RL's research reports as an invaluable source of information on Soviet and East European developments.

Now, however, it seems as though the Clinton administration and Senator RUSS FEINGOLD no longer see the need for this unique and invaluable organization. I could not disagree more. Those forces in Russia that have recently been on the ascendancy have already moved to take some of the media under their thumb. Some hardliners there have called for jamming Radio Liberty again. What is this other than proof that Radio Liberty is still doing something right?

In many of the other former Soviet Republics, especially in the Caucasus and Central Asia, the free press still does not exist or, at best, is one decree away from extinction. Slovak Premier Meciar has tried to intimidate the nascent free press in his country. And, of course, Serbian strongman Slobodan Milosevic has used iron-fisted control of the press to stoke the ethnic embers of the Balkans.

The repression in Yugoslavia and Bosnia has led some to call for the establishment of RFE service in the Balkans. My esteemed colleague HELEN BENTLEY of Maryland has once again sponsored a bill to establish a Radio Free Asia. Mr. Speaker, I ask you, would not it be easier to implement both of these sensible ideas if RFE/RL retained its independence, instead of going through a wrenching consolidation process which would suck it into the labyrinth of the State Department bureaucracy?

Several leading authorities on this subject have registered their opposition to this idea. Former U.N. Ambassador Jeanne Kirkpatrick argued forcefully in a March 8 Washington Post article for retaining the independence of RFE/RL. Likewise, the noted historian and Soviet scholar Walter Laqueur devastated the idea of abolishing the independence of RFE/RL in a March 4 article in the Wall Street Journal. Also, last week, right here in these halls, Yelena Bonner, the heroic human rights activist in the former Soviet Union, said that the disestablishment of Radio Liberty would be a big mistake. Mr. Speaker, you just could not get a more enlightened opinion on this subject than Yelena Bonner's.

Yes, the cold war is over. Yes, all budgets must come under intense scrutiny in this time

of record deficits. But the efforts of the Clinton administration and Senator FEINGOLD are hasty and premature. Both the broadcasting and research arms of this unique organization can still play a key role in assisting the democratic transformations in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD the aforementioned articles by Ambassador Kirkpatrick and Mr. Laqueur:

NEEDED THEN, NEEDED NOW: RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY GIVE INFORMATION ABOUT INTERNAL AFFAIRS THAT IS ESPECIALLY USEFUL DURING THIS TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY

(By Jeane Kirkpatrick)

Once again the most successful international information-broadcasting programs ever run by the U.S. government are facing extinction. The Clinton administration is planning to phase out Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty this year.

From their founding in 1949 and 1951, Radio Free Europe (which broadcasts to Eastern Europe) and Radio Liberty (which broadcasts to the Soviet Union) have had a precarious, controversial, gloriously successful existence—and made some powerful enemies. The diplomats of the State Department have always found them a nuisance and an interference with the department's management of foreign policy. The myth makers who saw Communist repression as a higher form of liberation have found the "radios" a dangerous provocation. The bureaucrats of the United States Information Agency have simultaneously envied the freedom and coveted the budgets of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Only their audiences have been enthusiastic about these independently run, U.S.-financed radios.

By now, so many leaders of so many new democracies in Eastern Europe have heaped so much credit on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty that no one publicly questions their essential contribution to ending the Cold War. Lech Walesa, now the president of Poland, described RFE as indispensable to Solidarity: "The degree [of RFE's importance] cannot even be described. Can you conceive the Earth without the sun?" And Vaclav Havel, now president of the Czech Republic, said of RFE, "You are the surrogate of the free and independent communication media that ought to exist over here, but don't." With this comment Havel described the radios as being exactly what they are intended to be: surrogates for providing the indigenous news and information that would have circulated in Eastern European and Soviet societies had they not fallen under totalitarian controls.

But who needs surrogate media now that the Cold War is over? Can't the countries do the job themselves? Can't the Voice of America do the job, as recommended by a presidential commission that reported to George Bush in August 1992? Its chairman, Tom C. Korologos, concluded, "RFE/RL served the country well, but with political changes, these programs increasingly resemble those of the Voice of America." Apparently, the Clinton administration agrees with George Bush and his commission that the radios have outlived their usefulness.

I believe the presidential commission and the Clinton administration are mistaken when they conclude, first, that the radios are no longer needed, and, second, that the Voice of America can do the same job anyway.

The Cold War is over, but democracy is not yet firmly rooted in formerly Communist societies. Information, news and public discussion are needed now in this time of transition. The radios can fill this need while local independent journalists and media are developing.

The VOA does not and cannot do the same job as RFE and RL. It does not provide news and information from inside the countries it serves, but works from American perspectives and policies. But it is information about internal affairs that is especially needed in this time of transition to democracy.

Studies in 1991 of the two U.S.-sponsored broadcasting systems make the point: A random sample of RFE programs in Hungary found that they devoted more than 42 items, or 40 percent of their first-run broadcast time, to Hungarian affairs, as compared to three items, or 4 percent, of VOA's first-run time. A comparable survey of Russian broadcasting revealed the same pattern. VOA dealt mainly with American topics, but 85 percent of RL's day had a Soviet focus. It is this local focus that makes the broadcasts of the independent radios more interesting and believable to Hungarian and Russian audiences.

RFE and RL will not be needed in Eastern Europe forever, but they are needed now while democratic media take root in the countries that they have served for four decades. And they are urgently needed now in the former Yugoslavia to provide reliable information and news to these societies closed by repression and torn by war.

That is not all. If the Clinton administration is seriously committed to strengthening and extending democracy, then it will want Radio Free Asia to do for China, Tibet, Vietnam, Burma, Laos, Cambodia, and other closed Asian countries what RFE and RL did for Eastern Europe. That will require an approach like that of RFE/RL. It will not be achieved with a cautious approach fashioned inside the U.S. government. It is not a job for the Department of State—or any other foreign office. It is a job for an independent agency with its own priorities.

The incompatibility of conducting foreign policy and running international broadcasting led the British to make the BBC World Service an independent agency. Should the Clinton administration desire to make a substantial, substantive contribution to the quality of U.S.-financed international broadcasting, it should consider moving the Voice of America out of the U.S. government rather than phasing out Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

THE DANGERS OF RADIO SILENCE

(By Walter Laqueur)

Last week in Moscow a collection of essays was published devoted to vilifying Radio Liberty, the Munich-based broadcasting service that beams into the former Soviet Union. One essayist called Radio Liberty a "tool of Satan scheduled to destroy the world."

In the olden days, these campaigns were launched by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Now they are sponsored by the extreme nationalist, antidemocratic forces in the Russian capital. Meanwhile, the Moscow group that functions as the propaganda center of this political camp has called for the renewed jamming of Radio Liberty and its sister station, Radio Free Europe.

These demands are perfectly logical. Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe played an enormous role in the outcome of the Cold

War. Now they are the main bulwark against the strong forces opposing democratization in the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe.

These forces are gaining strength. Because of terrible economic difficulties, antidemocratic extremists are once again trying to control the flow of information in these regions; independent newspapers and TV stations in Russia, Ukraine and elsewhere have been forced to shut down for lack of funds. Yesterday's Communist Party officials, together with some defectors from the democratic camp, feel that victory is in their grasp.

PHASE OUT THREATENED

The greatest danger facing the Munich radios, however, comes from Washington, not Moscow. The new administration apparently wants to close the stations. Mid-level officials, it has been reported, have decided to phase out Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe by 1994 and 1995 through a process of "consolidation" and "streamlining," as outlined in the president's economic plan. The Cold War, they argue, is over, and in any case the Voice of America can take over America's broadcasting tasks.

The two radios never had an easy life. In the 1970s, Sens. William Fulbright and Frank Church tried to close them down and almost succeeded. They thought Leonid Brezhnev would be annoyed by the broadcasts. According to official guidelines issued in the 1970s, the radios "had no mandate to advocate the establishment or disestablishment of any particular system, form of state organization, or ideology in the areas to which they broadcast." How the radios survived I do not know, but survive they did. Nor were they deterred by a few bombs at their broadcast facilities or by the infiltration of some KGB agents.

The new administration's apparent decision to shut down the stations—a decision that requires an executive order to become official, or an act of Congress—is based on several misunderstandings. One is purely tactical. It assumes that closing the stations would result in major savings in the near future. But the entire cost of the stations is negligible as these things go; it is less than the cost of one F-16 airplane, a fraction of the cost of a submarine. Moreover, the stations have contractual commitments that they cannot discard from one day to the next.

In any case, potential savings, or a lack of them, should not be the decisive issue. If the radios do not fulfill a useful function any longer, they should be closed down irrespective of the fact that only the next administration's budget will feel the benefit. On the other hand, if geopolitical realities warrant their continued existence, they deserve the relatively small amount of money their operations require.

In my view, the present situation in Eastern Europe and in the former Soviet states is critical and more than justifies a commitment to America's Munich-based radios. That this critical situation has a direct bearing on U.S. security and interests is known to President Clinton, at least in general terms. In a speech last Friday he said that if America had been willing to spend trillions of dollars to ensure communism's defeat in the Cold War, "surely we should be willing to spend a tiny fraction of that to support democracy's success where communism failed."

Unfortunately, it is not at all clear that the president, his chief advisers and legisla-

tors like Sen. Russ Feingold (D., Wis.), who has introduced legislation to "consolidate" the radios, know about the seriousness of the situation in the East. And how would they? I doubt whether there are more than seven or eight analysts in this country closely following the antidemocratic forces in Eastern Europe and Russia right now. None of them is in government. If tomorrow the president wanted a full and reliable report on this threat, he would not get it from the State Department or the CIA. The only place where this information is available (as any Russian expert would tell him) is the research department of Radio Liberty in Munich, the very entity his administration wants to "consolidate" and "streamline" out of existence.

But why continue the radios, some ask, if they overlap with the Voice of America? This question betrays yet another misunderstanding. There is no overlap. The task of VOA is, to put it inelegantly, to "sell America." The assignment of the Munich radios is to act as a surrogate source of information in countries where the media are not yet free—or where their freedom is threatened. This troubling media-condition can be found in all of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, with the possible exception of the Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Slovenia and perhaps one or two others—out of 27 countries. VOA has many merits, but its direct political impact in Russia and Eastern Europe is almost nil, whereas that of the Munich radios is immense.

What is more, the Munich radios have built up an unrivaled network of correspondents and a unique research library that VOA does not need and cannot use. In any case, the division of labor between the two operations is obvious; the attempt to abolish it would probably ruin them both.

TIME IS RUNNING OUT

Democracy does not have that many weapons against its enemies. Why destroy the few that exist, especially two that have proved themselves so effective in the struggle against tyranny? If a proposal to end the radios had been mooted two or three years ago, it would still have been wrong but at least superficially plausible: The Cold War seemed over, the end of history was at hand. Today Eastern Europe and Russia face a critical period that may decide their fates and that of the world for years to come. To a certain extent America can influence the current struggle, but time is running out fast.

What has the new administration done so far? Short of an executive order or congressional action eliminating the radios, it has made a "negative" decision not to back them. And yes, it has appointed a "coordinator" for its policy vis-a-vis Russia. Poor man, he is likely to coordinate a policy and a budget that will not exist.

LANL FINDS HAPPY UNION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the following article from the Santa Fe New Mexican regarding the future of Los Alamos National Laboratory. As

one of the Nation's premier nuclear weapons research facilities, Los Alamos has an impressive record of achievement. In these days of defense cutbacks, I am pleased to report that Los Alamos has found ways to diversify and utilize the unique talents of the men and women employed there.

As the article illustrates, Los Alamos will retain its commitment to basic science and maintenance of the nuclear weapons arsenal, but lab scientists have also branched out into energy research and development and environmental restoration and management activities. By utilizing cooperative research agreements, Los Alamos and other national laboratories have proven their value to the future of American research and development. I urge my colleagues to read the article that follows.

LANL FINDS HAPPY UNION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR

(By Ann Lolordo)

LOS ALAMOS.—Twice a year, a Maryland biotechnology company's top researcher visits a mountaintop compound here—the birthplace of the atomic bomb—to provide updates on a joint venture that could reduce a day's work mapping human genes to seconds.

The unusual venture links John D. Harding of Gaithersburg, Md.-based Life Technologies Inc. with scientists at one of the nation's top nuclear weapons laboratories. And that blending of skills and lab techniques could revolutionize technology and profits in the drive to tie nuclear weapons architects more closely to business.

The legacy of the Los Alamos National Laboratory has been the Manhattan Project and 50 years of nuclear weapons research, but its future might increasingly depend on linking nuclear, computer, laser and other technologies to the needs of commerce.

President Clinton wants three nuclear weapons labs—Los Alamos, Sandia and Lawrence Livermore in California—to earmark 20 percent of their budgets for research not connected to weapons and that can be transferred to industry.

Los Alamos officials say their lab can meet that challenge. About 40 percent of its \$1.1 billion budget involves nonweapons research, including mapping human genes, disposing of nuclear materials and detecting fingerprints with gold flecks. But only about 3 percent of the budget goes to public-private ventures.

"We want American industry to recognize these labs, which they have felt have been closed to them" said Michael G. Stevenson, Los Alamos' associate director for energy and environment. "We want them to recognize our value."

But Lawrence J. Korb, a defense policy specialist at the Brookings Institution in Washington, is concerned that nuclear weapons experts might be making decisions better left to marketing executives.

"It's an agency like any government bureaucracy trying to stay in business after their basic job is over," Korb said. "You have to realize those folks may understand how to blow up the world, but they don't know what you and I want to buy."

Edward A. Knapp, a former director of the National Science Foundation, summarizes the lab's challenge this way: Can scientists skilled in basic research meet the specialized needs of industry?

"It can be done, but it will be hard," said Knapp, who heads the Santa Fe Institute, an interdisciplinary research forum. "I don't

think there are any opponents to making the shift. I think there are people who are very worried about having some competency in nuclear technology in case the world became a hot spot again."

Los Alamos officials say their commitment to basic research will continue and that the labs will remain "stewards" of the nuclear weapons arsenal. Their priorities, however, will shift toward maintaining the weapons arsenal and, more importantly, toward cleaning up their own nuclear waste dumps, which it is estimated will cost \$100 billion and take decades to complete.

Amid the pinons and cedars of the Jemez Mountains, LANL scientists are working to harness energy from hot rocks at the earth's core, to virtually eliminate the radioactivity of nuclear wastes and to track the movement of radioactive material in air, water and soil.

Supercomputer software once used to determine the ability of a projectile to pierce armor is being adapted to research and transport and storage of nuclear materials, oil exploration and chemical refining.

In the past two years, LANL has entered into 35 research and development agreements worth about \$89 million, a cost shared by the lab and its corporate partners. Those partners include big companies such as Hughes Aircraft Co. and small ones such as Life Technologies.

"The labs have gotten off to a very fast start. They have gone out and solicited cooperative working arrangements with industry," said Rep. George E. Brown Jr., D-Calif., chairman of the House Committee on Science, Space and Technology. "What we don't have at this point is a measure of how successful they have been in terms of transferring technology" to develop products and create jobs.

But Los Alamos has not been in the technology transfer business that long. Most cooperative research agreements were signed last year and cover two to three years.

And the lab has yet to undergo what its director, Siegfried S. Hecker, calls "a business revolution," a fundamental change in the way officials manage the lab's operations.

"There are not many people in the lab that understand the commercial culture of a business corporation," Brown said.

In recent years, Los Alamos' fledgling industrial partnerships have earned a small amount in royalties through such licensing agreements—about \$100,000 annually. But officials say the payoff to lab scientists is usually in research dollars rather than royalty checks.

If lab scientists seek big money, they usually leave the federal payroll to start their own businesses, officials say. At least 38 spinoff companies, almost all in the Los Alamos area, have been formed by former lab researchers. Their work includes selling computer security technology to banks, manufacturing propane valves and marketing lasers.

TRIBUTE TO MONSERRATE FLORES

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great joy that I rise today to pay tribute to my dear

friend Monserrate Flores, a man who will return to Puerto Rico this summer after having exerted outstanding community leadership in New York for the last 37 years.

Monserrate Flores arrived on the United States mainland at the age of 19 just at the end of World War II, when the return of U.S. service men and women brought unemployment to a post-depression peak. His first jobs were simple ones: washing dishes for a local hotel, distributing telephone directories, and working as the only Puerto Rican employee of the Ronay Handbags Corp. at a salary of \$24 per week. By dint of hard work and dedication, Monserrate rose to become production manager at Ronay for a work force of 100 employees.

Monserrate Flores' activist career began in 1956, when he and several other members of the Puerto Rican community began organizing the first New York Puerto Rican Parade, which was held in 1958. Around that same time he joined the Spanish American Representation Movement, was soon elected chairman of the Bronx chapter, and later became the organization's national president.

While leading a fundraising drive in New York for a hospital in his hometown of San German, PR, Monserrate Flores discovered that a great many people from his hometown were living in New York. Impressed by their public spiritedness, he organized many of them into the Sociedad Civica de Sangermenos Ausentes, a civic society comprised of New Yorkers from San German.

Mr. Speaker, in 1960 Monserrate Flores helped found and was later elected the first president of United Organizations of the Bronx [OUB], a federation of Hispanic organizations that very soon proved to be one of New York's most valuable public interest organizations.

Under Monserrate Flores' leadership the OUB undertook a number of important initiatives with lasting impact, such as a successful drive to end capital punishment in New York State, and a police-community program to provide bilingual translators to local police precincts that has attained permanent status in the New York City Police Department. The OUB runs a blood bank which serves the entire United States and has been rated by the American Red Cross one of the best organized blood banks in the world. The organization also sponsors a 361-unit housing complex called OUB Gardens.

In 1962 Monserrate Flores, as president of the OUB, acted upon community complaints to launch an intensive investigation of the old Lincoln Hospital. The investigation revealed that the services being rendered by the hospital were well below acceptable standards, that the building itself was inadequate, and that the hospital's community advisory board did not include and was not accessible to Hispanics and African-Americans.

Monserrate Flores pressed for sweeping changes at Lincoln Hospital, and succeeded in instigating the hospital's reconstruction, and in having Dr. Nasry Michelen appointed the hospital's executive director—the first Hispanic executive director affiliated with the City of New York. Monserrate himself was the first Hispanic appointed to the community advisory board and became the board's chairman.

When Dr. Michelen left Lincoln Hospital in 1969, the commissioner of the Department of Hospitals appointed Monserrate head of the search committee, but then inexplicably rejected Dr. Antero Lacot, the candidate the search committee, the medical board, and all local community groups endorsed.

Mr. Speaker, Monserrate Flores defied a court restraining order and led 500 citizens of the community in a takeover of the hospital that ultimately led to then-Mayor Lindsay overruling the hospitals commissioner and appointing Dr. Lacot the new administrator of the hospital.

In 1972 Monserrate Flores resigned as chairman of the Lincoln Hospital Advisory Board to develop a comprehensive election plan for a new community advisory board. After the election he joined the hospital administration as director of community and public affairs. From that time until he joined Metropolitan Hospital in 1990, Monserrate Flores developed innumerable constructive innovations, including the Patient Advocate Program which he directed until July 1990 and which was used as a model for hospitals throughout New York City.

Mr. Speaker, over the years Monserrate Flores has been a consistent voice for the people. From 1964 to 1975 he produced a daily 15-minute news and commentary program for a local radio station. He has been a frequent columnist for newspaper in New York and Puerto Rico, and for many years was the editor of a weekly newspaper called Pueblo.

He was the first director of community affairs for the school that was later to be called Hostos Community College. He served as a special liaison between Governor Rockefeller, the Puerto Rican community in New York and the Governor of Puerto Rico. He served on the board of directors of the Metropolitan Museum and the U.S. Selective Service System. He was twice elected assembly Democratic leader for New York's District 73.

Mr. Speaker, Monserrate Flores is the recipient of over 300 awards, including the John F. Kennedy Award, the Roberto Clemente Award, and the Distinguished Service to the Nation Award, which was presented by President Gerald Ford. He was appointed to the Equal Opportunity Housing Commission by President Richard Nixon, and was sought by President Jimmy Carter for advice on urban affairs.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, Monserrate is a giant of New York's Hispanic community whose accomplishments can be and are appreciated across the Nation. I am personally very grateful to him for all the wisdom and leadership and love that he has shown me.

I hope my colleagues will join me in paying tribute and wishing the best of luck to this very special man.

TRIBUTE TO MAUREEN STANLEY

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize a spe-

cial individual, Mrs. Maureen Stanley, from Laingsburg, MI. Maureen is being honored as the 1992 Teacher of the Year by the Corunna Public School System.

Maureen has been active in teaching for 20 years, and has served in her current position for 10 years. She has taught in many different areas within the high school since 1981, including pre-school, 5th grade, elementary special education, chapter 1 reading and high school special education. With a concentration in special education, Maureen has contributed much throughout her career to the special needs children of the Corunna school system.

Her educational achievements are many. Beginning with graduation from Owosso High School in 1969, she then went on to obtain a B.A. from Central Michigan University, and an M.A. from Michigan State University. She has also completed pre-med requirements while attending Michigan State, the University of Michigan, and Oakland Universities.

Maureen's involvement goes beyond the classroom. She has been a part of the respiratory therapy team at the Owosso Health Care Center for many years. She is also involved with the American Cancer Society, United Way, Students Against Drunk Drivers, and adult literacy programs. She is also very supportive of a number of her students outside of the classroom as she is the high school coach for the pom-pom squad and the girl's varsity tennis team.

In addition to all of this, Maureen enjoys time with her family, which includes her husband Paul, two stepchildren Melissa and Penney, and her 100-pound English Lab. She and her family enjoy such hobbies as sports, reading, travel, and photography.

Maureen has provided leadership and direction for the students of the Corunna Public School system, and her contributions will reach far beyond their childhood and adolescent years. Through her immeasurable commitment and dedication, Maureen has become a trusted individual to the friends and families of students throughout the area. She continues to actively give of her time towards the betterment of the community through her dedication to education.

Mr. Speaker, Maureen Stanley is truly an amazing individual. I know that you will join with me and the Shiawassee County community in congratulating Maureen on receiving this outstanding award and wishing her continued success in future endeavors.

**PROF. SIDNEY FINE RECEIVES
THE GOLDEN APPLE AWARD**

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Sidney Fine, a history professor at the University of Michigan. The Students Honoring Outstanding University Teaching [SHOUT] have awarded him the 1993 Golden Apple Award. Michigan's student body has honored Professor Fine for providing the

best possible education and learning environment for students. As part of the award process, Professor Fine will present his ideal last lecture to the university community.

The debate over college professors' duties and responsibilities to their students and their research rages on campuses nationwide—the University of Michigan is no exception. University of Michigan students sought to emphasize the importance of professors' teaching responsibilities when they established SHOUT.

Sidney Fine's research is formidable. He has contributed to the history of our State and our Nation. His work has centered on Michigan and the labor movement. His scholarship includes work on Frank Murphy, who served as mayor of Detroit, Governor of Michigan, and U.S. Supreme Court Justice, on the General Motors sitdown strike of 1936-37, and on Detroit during the Great Society era and the 1967 riots.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress and a Michigander, I have the greatest respect for Professor Fine's research. Members of Congress have the greatest respect for Professor Fine's research. Members of Congress rely on the historical record to make decisions. Professor Fine has made a significant contribution to this record on labor and on Michigan.

But, Mr. Speaker, to achieve a well-functioning democracy we must make the historical record useful to all citizens. This process takes a good teacher. Sidney Fine is such a teacher. He has taught at the University of Michigan since earning his doctorate there in 1948. His teaching has brought to students a sense of how our Nation has evolved and a sense of the people who helped shape our Nation. From this, students have been able to better understand present day society and how to help it continue to change for the better.

Professor Fine is known across the campus and across the State for his excellent teaching. He teaches the university's most popular nonrequired classes, U.S. History from 1901 to 1933 and U.S. History since 1933. The first question a University of Michigan history major receives from a fellow alumni is: "Did you have Sidney Fine?" In Professor Fine's lecture hall, the aisles are crowded with students. Many students who previously claimed no interest in history have been converted to history by Professor Fine's classes.

Professor Fine brings history alive. Let me give you an example. Professor Fine lectures on World War II in Michigan's Haven Hall to his undergraduates. He tells them of one of their predecessors, an architecture student who studied in the West engineering building, just across the diag. This architecture student, Raoul Wallenberg, went on to become the University of Michigan's most accomplished student for his work saving Jews in World War II. A Swede, he was honored by the Congress in 1981 as an honorary American. Professor Fine's lectures teach students to know history for they may well be a part of it.

Professor Fine has taught over 25,000 students. His students have not forgotten the value of his work. Working for a State institution, Professor Fine falls under State law regarding retirement. State law had stated that

all public employees must retire when they reach 70 years old. A few years ago, just before his 70th birthday, he prepared for his retirement from the classroom.

No one received this news well. Undergraduates were upset that they would not be able to take his class. His former students could not believe that this man, as much a Michigan institution as the little brown jug, would no longer teach.

So, his students, some of whom served in the State legislature and who learned the right thing to do, changed the retirement law. Sidney Fine, at the age of 72, continues to teach History 466 and History 467. He plans to continue to teach as long as he is able to give all his work 110 percent.

We, Members of Congress, constantly see in this Capitol reminders of our Nation's history. We know the importance of history's lessons. Professor Fine has given his students the same appreciation of and inspiration from history. I can think of no greater compliment than to say that the University of Michigan is a better institution because Sidney Fine teaches there and his students are better off for having him as a teacher.

Mr. Speaker, because I am and will always be a student of history, I plan to read the last lecture that he will present Friday. I will then be privileged to say that I, too, am a student of Prof. Sidney Fine.

**NEW YORK TELEPHONE RESPONSE
TO WORLD TRADE CENTER
BOMBING**

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed the House to condemn the bombing of the World Trade Center and honor heroic New Yorkers who were personally involved in this tragedy. Today, I wish to commend New York Telephone, which kept the lines of communication open on the day of the bombing, providing the only lifeline for trapped and terrified workers after the tragic bombing on February 26, 1993. The staff of New York Telephone planned effectively and worked swiftly to ensure that the network continued to function. I applaud the company and staff for their excellent response to this crisis.

Following the blast, New York Telephone's network continued to function despite the loss of electrical power and the subsequent shutdown of backup diesel generators. Backup batteries kicked in and allowed New York Telephone's three switches in the World Trade Center to operate in the critical hours following the blast. The network never went down.

At great risk, New York Telephone personnel entered the building within 3 hours after the explosion to reduce the power drain on the batteries by eliminating redundant systems. The risk was taken because if the batteries had lost power before commercial electricity could be restored, thousands of people trapped in the twin towers would be severed

from the outside world. By 7 p.m., the lights on the switches were dying, signaling the end of communication with the victims in the towers. Then, at 7:20, light burst from the switches as power was channeled in by Consolidated Edison.

While work proceeded in the World Trade Center, New York Telephone established a special command center at 140 West Street, a company location across the street from the towers. Agencies including the New York Police Department, Fire Department, Emergency Medical Services, the Port authority, and the NYC Transit Authority used the command center to control their emergency operations. This saved on duplication of time and effort and speeded up the rescue process.

New York City's Department of Telecommunications and Energy had led a creation of a mutual aid agreement among the area's telecommunications providers, who worked closely to keep the customers connected. The plan was activated within 26 minutes of the explosion. This cooperation among competitors resulted in New York Telephone providing circuits to many companies. Thousands of new lines were installed, and thousands of displaced customers received services.

The New York City 911 system functioned flawlessly. An additional 30 lines were activated at 1 Police Plaza for 911 operators. A special emergency hotline was also activated for the New York City Police Department.

In light of the extent of the tragedy in Manhattan, business is as close to normal as can be expected thanks to the flexibility of New Yorkers. The people of New York City have reason to be grateful to the New York Telephone Co. for so quickly and skillfully adapting to this crisis. The work done by New York Telephone services as a fine example for those planning emergency response to follow.

CONGRATULATIONS AND THANKS TO NICHOLAS GOLDWARE

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, in his book, "Democracy in America," Alexis de Tocqueville wrote with admiration of the many voluntary associations in which Americans participate, and of the willingness of our citizens to give freely and unselfishly of their time and talents to help make their communities better places in which to live.

Perhaps nowhere in the country is this wonderful American spirit more in evidence than in the county of Riverside, CA, which has been fortunate to have a long line of outstanding men and women willing to accept roles of leadership in our community. They have served without compensation, seeking only to improve life for their families, friends, and neighbors.

One such individual is Mr. Nicholas H. Goldware, who will step down this week as the chairman of the board of the Greater Riv-

erside Chambers of Commerce. Mr. Goldware is native of Riverside, and a graduate of the University of California at Riverside, where he received a bachelor of science in economics in 1969.

In addition to serving as chairman of the board of the chambers of commerce, Nick has served as chairman of Riverside Community Ventures Corp., Riverside Community Hospital, as an executive board-member of the economic development partnership, as president of the University of California Riverside Athletic Association, as an executive board member of the United Way, and as a past board member of the Riverside City and County YMCA's.

In recognition of his contributions to our community, Mr. Goldware has received numerous awards, including recognition by the Riverside Junior Chamber of Commerce as Man of the Year in 1978, the Riverside Police Department's recognition as Reserve Officer of the Year in 1983, and election to UCR's Athletic Hall of Fame in 1988.

With great appreciation for his many years of service to our community, I wish to express the gratitude of the people of Riverside County to Mr. Nicholas Goldware for his leadership as chairman of the board of the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce from 1992 to 1993. Thanks for a job well done.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION REGARDING FEDERAL BRIDGE FUNDS

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to rectify a serious inequity in the interpretation of provisions enacted in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act [ISTEA] of 1991 relating to the use of Federal bridge funds for the seismic retrofitting of bridges.

During the development of ISTEA, it was our intent to make bridge funds eligible for seismic retrofitting activities. However, the Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] has interpreted the ISTEA language as prohibiting the use of bridge program funds for seismic retrofitting activities unless the particular bridge is determined to be structurally deficient.

The legislation I am introducing today amends the bridge rehabilitation and replacement program to permit the use of funds for the seismic retrofit of bridges without regard to whether the bridge is determined to require replacement or rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that the bridge funds continue to fulfill bridge rehabilitation and replacement needs nationwide. This legislation addresses any concern about depletion of funds for rehabilitation work by adjusting future apportionments to reflect the amounts expended for a State's seismic retrofit activities.

Mr. Speaker, by adopting this measure, the House of Representatives will be affirming an

important policy tenet: the value of investment and preventative maintenance. By making relatively minor investments in bridge structures now, we will inevitably save money, and more importantly, lives, in the future. I urge the passage of this commonsense, cost-effective legislation.

TRIBUTE TO LUTHER J. BATTISTE

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor an outstanding individual, Luther J. Battiste, who is being honored on April 10, 1993, at a dinner of family and friends.

Luther graduated from Tomlinson High School in Kingstree, SC. In September 1944, he enrolled at South Carolina State College where he earned both a B.S. and an M.S. degree. Upon graduation, Luther remained at the college to pursue a career. He began as a supply clerk at the college in the Department of Buildings and Grounds and rose to the position of assistant superintendent of buildings and grounds. He presently holds the position of director of physical plant. Luther's creativity, loyalty, and expertise has transformed the campus into a model of beauty for all other institutions to emulate. Since Luther entered the college as a student in 1944, he has witnessed and, in his present role, overseen the construction of 70 campus buildings.

In addition to his achievements at South Carolina State College, Luther has been a leader in his church and community. Luther has served as the senior warden of St. Paul's Episcopal Church and as the polemarch of the Orangeburg Chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity. Luther is also the vice chairman of the South Carolina Association of State Planning and Construction Officials. He is a member of the National Association of Physical Plant Administrators of Colleges and Universities; the Southern Regional Association of Physical Plant Administrators of Universities and Schools; the National Association of Educational Buyers; and the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education's Task Force on Facilities.

The numerous awards Luther has won over the years are further testimony to his dedication and success. A few of the many awards he has received include the Kappa Man of the Year Award and the Army ROTC Award. He also was the first recipient from South Carolina to be given a citation by the National Landscape Association for contributions to environmental and community improvement through landscaping which he received in 1974. In addition Luther received the Distinguished Alumnus Award on Founder's Day, February 25, 1987, from the South Carolina State College. Luther's achievements and contributions to South Carolina have been recognized by Governor Carroll Campbell.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Luther J. Battiste for his commit-

ment to service to South Carolina State College, his community, and his family. He is a citizen worthy of recognition and praise.

THE NEED FOR PBGC REFORM

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, a week does not go by without our hearing one story or another about the financial problems faced by the Government agency known as the PBGC. The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation [PBGC] was created in 1974 under ERISA title IV in order to guarantee the private pension benefits of employees and retirees in the event their company goes bankrupt and leaves their pension plans less than fully funded.

But now the 1992 financial statement released by the PBGC shows the single-employer fund established to make up any pension shortfall to also be underfunded to the tune of over \$2.7 billion. Another S&L crisis in the making? Some critics of the status quo say that, if no action is taken, a taxpayer bailout in the range of \$25 to \$40 billion over the next 30 to 40 years may be necessary. Of course, it should be understood that this pessimistic view of the future course of the PBGC program is by no means a certainty. Subcommittees of both my Committee on Education and Labor and the Ways and Means Committee have held oversight hearings to determine the true extent of PBGC's problems and the remedies that may be needed to avoid such a taxpayer bailout.

At these hearings, the U.S. General Accounting Office [GAO] testified that the PBGC has made significant progress in financial management in the last several years under the leadership of the former PBGC Executive Director, James B. Lockhart III, because of these improvements, the GAO now hopes to be able to certify PBGC's financial statement later this year. However, the GAO considers more important the fact that problems beyond the PBGC's control continue to mount, posing multi-billion-dollar risks, thus creating a need for Congress to act.

That is not to say that PBGC today faces an overnight collapse. Retirees already receiving PBGC guaranteed pensions need reassurance, and should know that the PBGC already has \$6.3 billion in assets on hand to pay out annual benefits of about \$700 million. The GAO testified that the PBGC does not face cash flow problems in the short term. Unlike the savings and loan situation, the PBGC is like a giant pension fund which pays out its pension obligations in monthly installments, not in one lump sum. You might say that PBGC's safety tire can go flat with leaks, but is not likely to incur a sudden blowout.

However, the current cash flow accounting used in the Federal budget to measure the effect of PBGC's evolving obligations is also inadequate. For example, the number of PBGC insured plans has already declined 43 percent,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

so that only 67,000 defined benefit plans remain in the system. This presents an additional challenge to maintaining the program on a self-supporting basis that is maintained solely from the premiums levied on all covered defined benefit plans, and initially set in 1974 at \$1 per plan participant, to pay for any PBGC shortfall. In fact, per capita premiums have escalated to \$19 for fully-funded plans and to \$72 for badly funded ones. These 2,000-plus percent increases have not stemmed PBGC's flow of red ink. The increasing risk which has to be carefully weighed is that merely increasing premiums on the well-funded plans may accelerate their exit from the system, thus shrinking the tax base on which to levy the premiums necessary to finance present and future deficits.

As a result, alternative legislative approaches have been proposed. Last year, the Bush administration, representative JAKE PICKLE, and Senator JIM JEFFORDS proposed legislation to help address PBGC's growing financial problems. Even though the bills differed in their exact approach, they all encouraged faster funding for underfunded pension plans. I am cosponsoring the bill reintroduced by Representative PICKLE, H.R. 298, to encourage my colleagues to take a closer look at the problems of pension underfunding and to consider measures which will put the PBGC on a more sound and insurance-like basis.

Our Nation's pensioners and taxpayers deserve both a full accounting of the PBGC problem and effective and timely legislative action which might prove necessary. I look forward to any recommendations that the newly chosen PBGC Executive Director, Martin Slate, will provide to the Congress on this matter. I urge my colleagues to closely study and participate in the debate over this important retirement income security issue.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICE REFORM

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to protect American consumers from the high and rising costs of prescription drugs.

On February 17, the General Accounting Office released its assessment of the efficacy of Canada's Patented Medicine Prices Review Board in restraining prescription drug costs.

GAO concluded that Canada's board not only restrained price increases for existing drugs, but that drug prices in Canada would be a third higher if their board did not exist.

It's time for the American consumer to have the same protection from excessive prescription drug prices as our Canadian neighbors. It's time for us to protect senior citizens from having to ration their prescriptions to make them last longer. It's time for us to protect cancer patients who can't afford innovative new drugs, even though they were developed in Federal laboratories. And it's time to make

the pharmaceutical manufacturers accountable for their promises to hold down the rate of prescription drug price increases.

My legislation creates a Prescription Drug Price Review Board, modeled after the Canadian board, to review drug prices, determine if they are excessive, and take action against those manufacturers that continue to price their products excessively. The Board will publish pricing information on brand name and generic prescription drugs to assist consumers and health care providers in identifying safe, cost-effective prescription drug options.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation, which will restore a measure of reason to the pricing of prescription drugs.

I include my summary of the legislation to appear in the RECORD following these remarks.

THE PRESCRIPTION DRUG CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1993

1. Creates a Prescription Drug Price Review Board modeled after the Canadian Board.

2. Requires that the Board be made up of 5 members, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, selected from experts in the fields of consumer advocacy, medicine, pharmacology, pharmacy, and prescription drug reimbursement.

3. Empowers the Board to collect from pharmaceutical manufacturers information regarding domestic and international prescription drug pricing, research and development costs, and manufacturing and marketing costs. Requires manufacturers to report each new drug price and price increases to the Board.

4. Requires the Board to determine whether the prices and subsequent price increases of each prescription drug are excessive based upon the following criteria:

Changes in the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Producer Price Index and the prescription drug component of the Producer Price Index.

The price at which the drug was sold to wholesalers in the United States and abroad during the preceding 10 years.

The price at which other drugs in the same therapeutic class were sold to wholesalers in the United States during the preceding 10 years.

The drug's Food and Drug Administration therapeutic potential rating.

The percentage of the drug's research and development costs contributed by the Federal government, and

The cost of manufacturing and marketing the drug.

5. Requires the Board to publish the results of its determinations of whether prescription drug prices are excessive in an easy to understand guide targeted to consumers and health care providers.

6. Requires the Board to notify the manufacturer of an excessively priced drug of the Board's recommendation for pricing the drug such that its price would no longer be considered excessive.

7. Empowers the Board to revoke the patent of an excessively priced drug, if that drug is under patent, or to revoke the patent of another of that manufacturer's drugs, if the excessively priced drug is not under patent.

8. Provides a mechanism for resolving differences between the Board and manufacturers through the use of public hearings.

9. Provides for a study by the National Academy of Sciences' Institute of Medicine to examine critical issues in the development, regulation, marketing and provision of pharmaceutical products.

TRIBUTE TO RUTH ECK

HON. JOEL HEFLEY

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we are all familiar with the inevitable staff turnover which occurs with some frequency in our offices. At the same time, we cannot help but feel a sense of loss when faced with the retirement of a dedicated, long-time staff member who has played such a significant role in the successes we have had.

I rise today in recognition of one such member of our team, Ruth Eck.

Ruth dedicated herself to the Republican Party in Colorado after hearing then-Congressman Ken Kramer speak at a local town meeting. Her volunteer work for Ken eventually led to a permanent receptionist job in 1979. After 3 years, she was promoted to office manager.

When I was elected to represent the Fifth District in 1986, I sought Ruth's expertise and asked her to join my staff in Colorado Springs as district director. She agreed and came on board in February 1987.

Thanks to Ruth and her flair for organization and management, my district office has an excellent reputation for responding to the many people who come to us for assistance. Whether it was the man whose Social Security was terminated because the Social Security Administration had erroneously declared him dead or the small company caught in a jurisdictional dispute between the Government agencies, Ruth was on top of every situation. She brought the cases to my attention and, together, we worked on solving the problems.

Ruth and I share the philosophy that one of the most important jobs of a Congressman is to make Government work for the people. Without exception, Ruth conveyed a sense of compassion and concern for everyone who came to us seeking assistance and instilled that same attitude in those she supervised.

It was Ruth who made sure I was where I needed to be when I was supposed to be there. It was Ruth who kept me informed about what was happening in the district while I was in Washington. And, it was Ruth who gave selflessly of her time, her energy, and her loyalty to serve the people of the Fifth District.

For all of this and so much more, I want to thank Ruth—a true public servant in the best sense of the term—and wish her well as she begins retirement with her husband John, with whom she celebrates 37 years of marriage on April 7, 1993.

Ruth, you will be missed.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING SHARON E. SIGESMUND

HON. JAMES H. BILBRAY

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the magnanimous gift of a generous American to the Jewish Federation of Las Vegas. Sharon E. Sigesmund is a native of Detroit, MI, who has adopted southern Nevada and the city of Las Vegas as her home. Ms. Sigesmund is a strong supporter of the interests of the worldwide Jewish community.

Sharon has played an active role in supporting the community of southern Nevada, taking a particularly vigorous interest in the Las Vegas Jewish community. She has served as president of Temple Beth Shalom Sisterhood and the Silver Meadows B'nai B'rith Women. Sharon is also a member of the regional board of B'nai B'rith Women.

Ms. Sigesmund's generosity and devotion recently made it possible for the Jewish Federation of Las Vegas to acquire a 21,000-square-foot building. The structure will be utilized as headquarters for the federation, as well as by several other affiliated organizations. As a way of recognizing her outstanding support for the many members of the Las Vegas community, the newly acquired building will be dedicated in the name of Sharon E. and Raymond H. Sigesmund.

So today I ask my colleagues to stand and recognize a truly generous Nevadan who has, through her work, made a genuine mark on the First District of Nevada, the Nation, and the world. Her contributions and accomplishments are worthy of recognition by this body.

TURKEY'S HUMANITARIAN EFFORTS IN ARMENIA

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, each day we learn more about the terrible plight of the citizens of Armenia who are enduring unbelievable hardships because of hostilities with their neighboring country of Azerbaijan.

A very good Armenian friend of mine, who lives in Memphis, has shared his own concerns with me, and told me of the humanitarian efforts which are focused on his fellow countrymen. Of particular interest are the efforts being made by Armenia's neighbor, the Republic of Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, the Turks are shipping their own grain to Armenia. This grain is part of a shipment of 100,000 tons that Armenians asked of Turkey when hostilities began. Turkey agreed, and as of March 4 had delivered 47,330 tons of Turkish wheat.

The Turks have done other things to insure the free flow of humanitarian aid to Armenia, including expediting a train carrying 300 tons of French assistance through Turkey to Armenia and passing through 16.5 tons of clothing from the Swedish Red Cross.

Last year, Turkey forwarded 1,690 tons of milk powder and 500 tons of baby food from

March 23, 1993

the European economic community, 6,000 tons of wheat from Syria and other private organizations, and more tons of assistance from Project Hope.

The need continues to be great in Armenia. But countries like Turkey are helping by providing aid and expediting the shipment of assistance from others. Their efforts are greatly appreciated.

TRIBUTE TO THE ORDER OF DEMOLAY

HON. TIM HOLDEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Order of DeMolay, an active young men's organization in my district. DeMolay helps build character in young men and boys who are striving to become better citizens and leaders for our future. Through civic participation, charitable projects, athletic competition, and social activity, these young men have learned and will continue to learn valuable lessons about themselves and the world around them.

And in Reading, PA, the DeMolay chapter is the largest of the 38 DeMolay groups throughout the State. This is a testament to the commitment, strength, and enthusiasm of the local DeMolay chapter. The DeMolay leaders help instill a sense of pride in the accomplishments of all their members.

The Order of DeMolay has declared March 1993 as International DeMolay Month. And, the Reading chapter has announced that they are celebrating their 74th anniversary this year. I would like to honor the Reading chapter of DeMolay on the floor of the House, and commend the members for their fine contributions to the community.

HONORING THE TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY RED RAIDER MEN'S AND WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAMS

HON. BILL SARPALIUS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1993

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Texas Tech Red Raiders and their victories at the Southwest Conference Basketball Tournament. Both the women's and men's teams did an outstanding job in clinching the tournament championships. Mr. Speaker, it is important to note this is only the second time in Southwest Conference history that teams from the same university have swept the championships.

The Lady Raiders, under the direction of Head Coach Marsha Sharp, had several impressive wins including the 78-71 victory against the University of Texas which assured their placing at the NCAA Tournament. There

is no question the Lady Raiders are blessed with talented young women, however, there is a catalyst to their motivation and her name is Sheryl Swoopes. Ms. Swoopes was named 1992-93 women's basketball player of the year by the Women's Basketball News Service. Another of the Lady Raider's assets was Head Coach Marsha Sharp. Marsha has many reasons to be proud of her team, but she can also be proud of her accomplishment of being named coach of the year by the Women's Basketball News Service. The Lady Raiders sparked Texas Tech University at the SWC Tournament and the men were next to follow.

Under the direction of Head Coach James Dickey, the Texas Tech Red Raiders have had an exciting season. They entered the

SWC tournament ranked fifth and went on to upset the University of Houston in the SWC Championship. The win assured them a place at the NCAA Tournament. One thing which is most impressive about The Red Raiders is the depth of their talent, and their youth. Lance Hughes, a sophomore guard, led the Raider's scoring drive with 27 points and he will be returning to the Red Raider squad. Also, Mr. Hughes was named the SWC Tournament MVP which his numbers clearly represent. Lance is not alone—freshmen like Lenny Holly, Koy Smith, and Jason Sasser were no strangers to Tech's win, and they undoubtedly will be a part of Tech's success in years to come.

I've heard it said that a kite rises against the wind and not with it. But to rise, the kite must be anchored to a firm foundation and Texas Tech's young players had two foundations to cling to—seniors Will Flemons and Barron Brown. Mr. Flemons was named to the all-tournament team selection and Mr. Brown's leadership in the guard position was a winning combination for Tech. Head Coach Dickey should be complimented for a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, Texas Tech basketball has been exciting in 1993 and there is no question that the Red Raiders will provide much excitement in 1994. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Red Raiders for a very successful season.