worked only for them, onto other coal companies.

Prior to enactment of the Coal Industry Retiree Benefit Act of 1992—Coal Act—47 percent of Ohio Valley's payments to the United Mine Workers of America health and retirement funds were contributed to cover obligations of other coal companies for people who never worked for Ohio Valley or its predecessor. Yet these companies have the audacity to claim that their obligations for their former employees are no longer theirs. They would have gotten away with this dumping of their bona fide liabilities onto Ohio Valley and other coal companies had it not been for enactment of the Coal Act.

H.R. 1370 would overturn much of the Coal Act, which was a carefully crafted compromise among Democratic and Republican legislators and the Bush administration. The concept of this compromise was to require present and former employers of UMWA-represented persons to be responsible for their retirees and to avoid imposing UMWA retiree cost on other companies, such as Ohio Valley, that never employed these UMWA retirees.

Further, the limited number of corporations lobbying for H.R. 1370 and the repeal of much of the 1992 Coal Act are simply not being truthful when they claim that the UMWA combined fund will have a long-term surplus. A recent study by Ernst and Young shows that the fund will have a deficit as early as 1998 and up to \$147 million in 2004.

To claim that H.R. 1370 protects companies, such as Ohio Valley, because no funding would be required pursuant to formula to increase operators' premiums if there is a shortfall, is a total smoke screen. If the large corporate dumpers of their liabilities on the funds and other coal companies, such as Ohio Valley, are not required to pay their fair share, the time at which and the amount that a company, such as Ohio Valley, will be required to pay to the funds will be accelerated.

Having served as the chief executive officer of one of the companies lobbying for H.R. 1370, I can personally assure you that their game is to dump their retiree liabilities onto other coal companies. The Coal Act, which H.R. 1370 will largely overturn, stopped this practice.

There is no question that, if the situation is returned to that which existed prior to passage of the Rockefeller legislation, Ohio Valley will be put out of business and the 4,400 jobs that it accounts for in Ohio, according to the Pennsylvania State University, will be eliminated. Congress must do everything possible to see that H.R. 1370, or any legislation like it, is not passed.

TRIBUTE TO JENNIFER FINZEL

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Monday, July 24, 1995

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to day to honor the accomplishments of Jennifer Finzel. As much as the Special Olympics are a thrill for the athletes and their families, they also teach all of us a valuable lesson in determination, achievement and the human spirit. I want to share with you a story of Jennifer Finzel of Midland, Ml. Earlier this month, Jennifer trav-

eled to New Haven, CT, with a goal on her mind and determination in her heart. She knew what she wanted, and went for it. The result was two gold medals and two silver medals in four different swimming events. For her effort and for her success, I say congratulations.

But Jennifer Finzel was special long before they draped medals around her neck. Jennifer has been working hard in my office for the people of Michigan's Fourth Congressional District for over 4 years now. When she's not working at McDonalds, she's in our district office in Midland making a difference for the residents of mid-Michigan. Jennifer truly is an inspiration to everyone who seeks to achieve. Anyone who visits our district office or the McDonalds on Eastman Ave. might hear Jennifer say a lot of things. But one thing they won't hear is "I can't."

PROTECTING AMERICA'S HOUSING PROGRAMS

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for reserving this special order. I am pleased to participate in this discussion which is focused on the importance of housing, and the role of the Federal Government in ensuring that all Americans have affordable housing opportunities. The special order this evening is extremely timely and necessary in light of the attacks on the Department of Housing and Urban Development by the GOP leadership in this Congress.

I have a firsthand knowledge of some of the housing problems confronting the Nation. I serve as the ranking member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs-Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies. This panel oversees the Nation's \$25.5 million housing budget. Through our subcommittee hearings, field trips, and studies and examinations, we are provided a closeup look at the increasingly grave housing situation in this Nation. In order to legislate solutions in the Halls of Congress, we all realize that you must first have a clear understanding of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, our Federal housing programs assist 4.7 million households through public housing and Section 8 rental assistance. We know that: 36 percent of the households are elderly; 15 percent are persons with disabilities; and 43 percent are families with children. We also understanding that the median income of these households is \$8,000 per year.

This week, the Appropriations Committee completed mark-up of the fiscal year 1996 VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill. As the ranking member on the panel, I am deeply disturbed by the funding cuts which the Republican leadership has advanced in this bill. When we look at cuts to housing programs, we note that hardest hit are those programs that provide affordable and decent housing for the elderly and poor.

The appropriations bill cuts HUD's funding by \$5.5 billion. They saw fit to cut funding for homeless assistance grants by nearly 50 percent. In addition, funding for development and

severely distressed public housing is eliminated, as well as new housing vouchers and certificates for the poor. Further, in this bill, modernization funds are cut by over \$1 billion and operating subsidies are reduced by \$400 million.

These cuts are in addition to damaging legislation that would repeal the Brooke amendment. The Brooke amendment is legislation which limits the percentage of income that poor people living in federally assisted housing can pay. Repealing this amendment increases the costs borne by the Nation's poor. Several other harmful provisions with regard to rent increases are also in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this callous action by the appropriations panel represents a critical assault on our Nation's housing programs. The bill guts many of the critical safety net and human needs programs upon which the elderly, the poor, and low-income families depend. I am concerned that we are retreating on our commitment of affordable and decent housing as a national priority. For this reason, I am pleased to join my colleagues for this special order. Our participation this evening demonstrates our strong commitment to ensuring a strong and significant role in providing housing for all Americans.

HOUSING SPECIAL ORDER TOMORROW NIGHT (JULY 19)

To members of Dem. Task Force on Housing and other Housing supporters

Fr Representatives Joe Kennedy, Henry Gonzalez, Vic Fazio, Barbara B. Ken-Nelly

Re Housing Special Order on Wednesday, July 19

Dt July 18, 1995

This is a reminder that tomorrow night after regular business there will be a special order on the importance of housing and the role the Federal government has played in trying to ensure that all Americans have affordable housing opportunities.

The Appropriations committee has targeted housing for extremely deep and very serious cuts which will undermine this mission.

We need to move quickly and forcefully to restore these crucial funds for housing, and to explain to the American people how important and successful most federal housing programs have been in serving working and poor Americans.

Please have your staff contact Jonathan Miller in Rep. Kennedy's office (5–5111) or Nancy Libson of the Housing Subcommittee (5–7054) if you would like to participate in this special order.

TURKEY AS A STRATEGIC ASSET

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1995

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention a recent op-ed piece which appeared in the Washington Times and which I believe deserves attention.

Alexander Haig writes from the point of view of both a former Secretary of State and NATO's former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe. I hope my colleagues will take time to read this valuable piece and carefully consider its message.

[From the Washington Times, June 25, 1995] UNDERVALUATION OF A KEY STRATEGIC ASSET

Years ago, a Turkish general was quoted as saying that the trouble with being allied to the Americans was that you never knew when they would stab themselves in the back. This half-serious observation expressed the U.S.-Turkish relationship well. It was solid overall but subject to inexplicable actions, often on Washington's part, that simply negated America's own self-interest.

That is in fact what we are doing once again today. American aid to Turkey has been steadily reduced. Much of it is no longer grant aid at all but loans that since 1994 have been financed at market interest rates. For 1995, even this package has been subjected to restriction, including attempts to tie it to Cyprus, various human rights issues and Turkey's relationship with Armenia.

The generally punitive approach of these amendments reflect American politics at their worst—totally bereft of any consideration of our own strategic interests. A familiar complaint about our relationship with Turkey is that it should be re-examined in light of the end of the Cold War. The implication, of course, is to devalue the alliance as no longer so necessary in the absence of a Soviet threat.

The alliance should be re-examined but the critics will be disappointed. A strong U.S.-Turkish partnership remains fundamental to American interests.

First, Turkey's geographical position puts it in a bad neighborhood that is still vital to U.S. security. This was illustrated dramatically by the Persian Gulf war. There should be no doubt that without Turkey's help in closing Iraq's pipelines, allowing use of North Atlantic Treaty Organization air bases and general political support we could not have defeated Saddam Hussein. Turkey was and is fundamental to an anti-Saddam coalition.

Second, the outcome of the war, as we know, was not to create a new Gulf security order, much less a new world order. Instead we have seen four years of broken-back warfare against Saddam's regime. For this Turkey has paid a very large economic price exacted through disrupted trade and oil flows. The consequences for the Kurdish-populated regions of Turkey and Iraq have been even more troublesome. Operation Provide Comfort, run from Turkey, has averted the worst for the northern Kurds but not established security or peace. Instead the PKK, an authentic terrorist movement helped by such human rights activists as the Assad regime in Syria, among others, has found save haven in northern Iraq. Turkey's recent military incursion was intended to settle this issue or at least to diminish the problem. But whatever the outcome this is indisputable: The failure of American policy to settle with Saddam has been borne very heavily by Tur-

To this trouble must be added another. The newly independent states of the former Soviet-run Central Asia see new economic and political relationships with such countries as Turkey and Iran as the best route to secure their future. The oil and gas of Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan must flow through these countries or be controlled again by Russian hands on the tap.

Whatever the potential today the Caucasus is torn by war, the Chechnya slaughter; the Russian-manipulated civil war in Georgia; and the Russian-influenced contest between Armenia and Azerbijan.

Seen from Ankara, the once-promising prospect of a less dangerous Central Asia has dissolved into bloodshed and a revival of Russian ambitions. The Turks must view

with great alarm, and so should we, the idea that the Russians will be allowed to station large forces there in violation of the conventional arms-reduction treaty (CFE) about to come into force. It is inexplicable that at the recent Moscow summit President Clinton supported revisions in these force levels in the name of stability; in virtually every instance, Russian military action has made things worse not better.

Finally, there is the frightening consequence of continued mismanagement of the Bosnian crises by the United Nations and NATO, and especially the U.S. failure to act clearheadedly in this crisis, which risks the continuation of essential secular leadership in Ankara. A worst case outcome of Bosnia could well broaden the conflict in a way that might result in Turkey's involvement, with unforeseeable consequences for Western interests

Against this geopolitical backdrop, the paragons of human rights have railed against Turkey's democracy—and Prime Minister Tansu Cillar has admitted that Turkish democracy is a less-than-perfect mechanism with plenty of rough edges.

We must all be alarmed at the growth of anti-Western sentiment disguised as a return to Islam. In Turkey, as in many other countries, the end of the Cold War has given rise to a struggle for national identity. But whose side shall we take? That of the less-than-perfect democrats or that of the authentic anti-democrats?

At this critical juncture, those who support cuts in assistance or in support for Turkey are willfully blind to U.S. strategic interests. The Turks are a hardy people; they will survive as best they can. But this is not the time for America to stab its own interests in the back. The stakes are too high.

In the absence of an effective U.S.-Turkish partnership, the entire U.S. position in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East will be the biggest loser. The winners will be neither pro-Western nor those interested in human rights. It is high time that we recovered from strategic amnesia.

SPECIAL PEOPLE PROGRAM OF IBPOE OF W

HON. LYNN N. RIVERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Monday, July 24, 1995

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Special People Program of the Improved Benevolent Protective Order of the Elks of the World [IBPOE of W]. This program was established to promote assistance to young persons who have special needs because of physical or mental challenges. The members of the IBPOE of W have dedicated their time and efforts to make this very important program a success, to reach out to the special people of their community and to focus attention on the contributions of those special people.

This year Shaun-Keith Pierre Thomas from Ann Arbor, MI has been selected as the 1995 Special People Poster Child and will be honored at a ceremony on August 7. Five-year-old Shaun-Keith represents all special people who face additional physical and mental challenges. In Shaun-Keith's case, cerebral palsy, sometimes prevents him from participating in favorite activities. Daily he struggles to accomplish tasks that most of us take for granted yet he somehow always shows his courage and

his strength. His determination, perseverance, and courage are an excellent model to us all. I offer Shaun-Keith my sincere congratulations and admiration and together with his friends and family wish him all the best.

A CAREER THAT MADE A DIFFERENCE

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1995

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the people of Michigan are about to lose one of the greatest friends they have ever had. Jim Collison is retiring after 21 years of service in the Economic Development Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce. He has had responsibility for EDA programs for the entire State, overseeing more than \$600 million in more than 1,000 projects.

Jim Collison helped make EDA programs succeed because he knew the people of Michigan, and he knew the realities of doing business in Michigan as a result of his being a life long resident of our State, and himself having been involved in a number of businesses and serving as an official of local governments. His dedication to his home State is a great example of how people can be productive in their own areas, rather than looking for the American dream in some place away from home.

His presence in Saginaw goes back to his days at Holy Family High School in Saginaw, and his work at Saginaw Lumber Co. He then became involved in real estate development until he was appointed to the Zilwaukee Township planning department where he developed the city's master plan. He also served at Township Supervisor, and chairman of the county board of supervisors, before it became the board of commissioners.

His sense of community extended beyond his professional activities. He serves as a lecturer and communion assistant at St. Matthew's Catholic Church. He also is a member of the Northwest Utilities Consortium and organized the board of urban renewal.

In addition, he has been blessed with his wife of 44 years, Lozamae, and their five children and six grandchildren. There is no doubt that the support provided by his family has helped him succeed in being the kind of public servant that everyone can respect.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when those who work for governmental agencies fail to receive the proper accolades for the excellent job that they are doing, I believe it is particularly appropriate to recognize and thank Jim Collison for his years of service. His work has meant a great deal to business development in Michigan, and more importantly, to the thousands of people who have benefited from the projects that have gone forward as a result of his careful consideration. His career truly has made a difference. I ask that you and all of our colleagues join me in thanking Jim Collison for his years of service, and wish him the very best with the new challenges and opportunities that lie ahead.