

prior to that, in the OSS and in the military during the war. But it was really in the years after I left my service at the CIA, entered the private practice of law in Georgia, served as the U.S. Attorney in Georgia, and now as a Member of Congress that I have really come to know the William Colby that was such a tribute to his country, to his family and to his friends.

Mr. Colby's passing, of course, is the signal of the passing of an era in some ways. The tremendous years, decades of service to his country, the selfless service that he embodied, the service that forsook the lucrative call of private practice for many years, that drew him away from his family for many years, that kept him apart indeed in many ways from his fellow citizens for many years because of the very nature of his work, the secrecy of it, are the sorts of things that we see far too infrequently in public life nowadays.

Mr. Speaker, something else about Mr. Colby that I know from personal experience that is, if not unique, certainly something that we again do not see too often. That is the fact that, despite the man's tremendous intellect, despite the tremendous responsibilities that he continued to carry with him, even after leaving Government service, despite the fact that he could be jetting around the world anywhere at a moment's notice and meeting with world leaders, meeting with business leaders, large and small, he would always, and I emphasize always, find the time to take a call from a friend, to chat for a few minutes, to answer a question, to promise to get back to that old friend, that former junior colleague of his with an answer that might help with providing some information to an American citizen contemplating traveling abroad and who wanted to learn something about the inside scoop on a foreign nation.

In listening to the tributes today at the National Cathedral to my old friend, Bill Colby, I really was struck by the depth of public service embodied in this man. It is something that I cherish very much, and I commend to my colleagues here in this House and to the American people to learn about this man, to study him, to take heart in the selfless public service, the non-partisan public service. In all the years that I knew Bill Colby, and he supported me politically, he supported me in many ways, I never asked him whether he was a Republican or a Democrat, and I do not know. It is not something that he demanded as a litmus test of anybody, and probably most people never demanded it of him.

Mr. Speaker, he responded to me as he responded to American citizens, many of whom he never knew, because he was that kind of man. He was a man that would constantly reach out, give of himself whether it was simply answering a question or whether it was parachuting behind enemies lines in World War II or serving this country

very valiantly for many years in Vietnam. Mr. Colby truly was the professional's professional. He was the patriot's patriot for this country. He has indeed now come in from the cold, for he is now in the bosom of our Lord. I commend him to the American people.

GOLDEN EAGLE AND CORPORATE VULTURE AWARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last month as a cochair of the Jobs and Fair Trade Caucus, I proudly presented our group's first monthly Golden Eagle Award to Malden Mills in Methuen, MA.

If you will recall, the Gold Eagle Award recognizes fine U.S. companies that exemplify the best that is in us as a nation, companies which treat their workers with dignity while making decent profits, companies which contribute to strengthening their communities, companies which charge a reasonable price for their products and remain and prosper in these United States. When all of these practices are undertaken by one company, that company deserves our praise as a Golden Eagle U.S. company.

On the other hand, the Corporate Vulture designation, like the scavenger it represents, is given to a company in need of vast improvement, a company which exploits our marketplace yet downsizes its work force in America and outsources most of its production to foreign countries using sweatshop labor abroad. These firms then import their transhipped products back to the United States while keeping their prices high here at home and maintaining all of the benefits of being called an American company.

□ 2130

Corporate vultures deserve the consumers' disdain. Now, let me acknowledge this month's Golden Eagle company. The March 18 issue of Business Week detailed the unprecedented stock ownership of the company we all know as United Airlines, our Nation's leading airline company. Tonight, the Jobs and Fair Trade Caucus awards the employee owners of United Airlines our Golden Eagle Award and this new U.S. flag flown over the Capitol for your leadership, your rising productivity, and the example you set for all other companies in these United States.

United Airlines and its employee owners fit our description of a golden Eagle company in every respect. In the 18 months since United employees bought 55 percent of their company for \$5 billion, United Airlines has confounded all the skeptics by their success. The Nation's No. 1 airline is outperforming most of its rivals, gaining markets share from the other top two airlines. The company is posting fatter operating margins and higher stock

gains, with the stock price more than doubling since the purchase of the company.

The American workers of United and its chief executive officer Gerry Greenwald have made the company the success it is. By taking a huge risk in accepting pay cuts of 15 percent or more in the short term, United employees have shown that hard work over the long haul pays dividends. Operating revenue per worker jumped by 10 percent last year. Employee complaints, down by over half, have turned into new ideas about how to better work together with management. And unlike many large corporations these days, which relentlessly downsize their work force, United is a job creator, hiring 7,000 new people since the buyout.

In marked contrast to our Golden Eagle Award, this month's Corporate Vulture designation goes to Hershey Foods, a company no longer so sweet to America. Hershey Foods, America's largest producer of chocolate, continues to outsource its production to countries like Mexico and cut its U.S. work force. Last fall, Hershey Foods announced layoffs of approximately 500 workers and then announced the company was moving the production line of its giant kiss from Hershey, PA, to its plant in Guadalajara, Mexico, which employs approximately 260 workers. The U.S. workers laid off were earning \$15.40 an hour, and as one old-timer stated, as a part of that enjoyed health insurance, dental, eye, along with a pension plan.

Hershey's Mexican workers are paid 50 cents an hour with almost no benefits. The chief executive officer of Hershey Foods, Chairman Kenneth Wolfe, says he understands the pain he has caused the workers and their families in Hershey, PA. I frankly find that hard to believe. Chairman Wolfe earned an annual compensation of \$1.2 million in 1994, not counting his stock options. Moreover, Hershey Foods is earning increased profits. The latest annual report shows that Hershey Foods enjoyed a net profit of \$184 million, while total sales have increased to \$3.6 billion. A company and a chief executive officer earning millions of dollars every year have no idea what it means to lose your job and worry about your family's future.

Economists will claim that Hershey's move to Mexico is good for American consumers. After all, when you are only paying your Mexican workers a few cents an hour and earning millions of dollars, your product will be cheaper, right? Take a look at the shelf. Hershey prices on chocolate have gone up in bars. So this evening, this month, Hershey Foods definitely fits the bill as this month's Corporate Vulture, May 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will

appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. McDERMOTT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

COMMENTS ON REPUBLICAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to once again talk about the proposed Republican cuts in Medicare and Medicaid that are included in the budget, which we are most likely going to be voting on this Thursday in the House of Representatives.

I had the opportunity on Monday of this week, just this past Monday in fact, to speak before the Edison Senior Center. Edison is the largest municipality in my district in New Jersey, and there must have been 100 senior citizens at the Edison Senior Center when I was there.

I talked to them about what the Republican leadership was proposing to do with Medicare and Medicaid once again, and how similar the proposals in this budget we will be voting on are to the cuts and fundamental changes in Medicare and Medicaid that the Republican leadership proposed last year, and which the President and which the Democrats in the House of Representatives fought so hard to keep from becoming law.

We were successful. We were successful in stopping those changes to Medicare and Medicaid last year, and many of the seniors at the Edison Senior Center, I indicated to them I felt very strongly that they and the seniors throughout the country were a big part in our effort to try to stop those changes in Medicare, because many of them wrote to their Congressmen or Congresswomen and wrote to their Senators and said they did not like the changes that the Republicans were proposing.

So I asked them to once again start a writing campaign, and talk to other seniors that they know and their family members to say we do not want these radical changes being proposed by the Republicans.

Now, as we know, this current budget plan, this current Republican plan would cut Medicare by \$168 billion over the next 6 or 7 years, and cut Medicaid by \$72 billion. Most of the Medicare cuts this time would be in hospital care. That is particularly important to the State of New Jersey, because many of the hospitals in New Jersey, particularly in urban areas, but also in suburban and rural areas, are having a very difficult time making ends meet. Many of them are more than 50 percent, sometimes 60 percent dependent on Medicare and Medicaid, to keep their operations going. A significant cut in either of those programs really could cause many of those hospitals to close, particularly in the urban areas.

The whole reason we started the Medicare program that was started under President Johnson back in 1963 is because many seniors did not have health insurance, and found it difficult because of lack of funds or because of their condition, their physical condition, to buy health insurance. I think a lot of times we forget what it was like prior to Medicare coming into existence, how many senior citizens did not have health insurance, how many basically were so poor and had to pay money out of their pocket if they wanted health care, so they just basically delayed it, did not go to the hospital or the doctor.

We do not want to go back to that era, the era when seniors were impoverished in order to provide health care for themselves, or when so many of them did not have any health insurance coverage.

One of the things that I told the seniors in my district on Monday is that we are not just talking about money here. I think the money aspect is important, because essentially these large cuts in Medicare and Medicaid are being used to finance tax breaks for mostly wealthy Americans. So the money is an important part of this.

But there are also some fundamental changes in the Medicare program and the Medicaid program that are being proposed here by the Republican leadership that go way beyond the monetary aspect. Essentially what it amounts to is choice, the fact that senior citizens are going to have less choices of doctors and less choices of hospitals. Because what is happening is the way that Republicans have structured these changes in Medicare and Medicaid, they are pushing more and more seniors into HMO's or managed care, where often times they do not have the choice of doctors. They cannot go to the doctor, the specialist they traditionally go to, or sometimes cannot even go to the hospital that they traditionally go to that may be nearby.

I guess one of the things that really bothers me about the Republican rhetoric on the Medicare issue is they keep stressing what they are doing with Medicare is providing more choices. That somehow choice is sort of the

linchpin, if you will, of their recommendation. And I would maintain that just the opposite is true, that the way the reimbursement rate is set up is so that seniors, basically a higher reimbursement rate goes to managed and HMO's, and less to traditional fee for service, where you have your choice of doctors or hospitals. That means seniors are going to have less choices as more and more are pushed into managed care.

I am being joined here tonight by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] and I wanted to yield some time to her. But I did want to mention, because there was one thing before I do yield, that there was an article in the New York Times this Sunday, that although it did not mention what was happening here in the House with regard to Medicare and Medicaid per se, I think is relevant, and I mention it because they specifically mention our two States, New Jersey and Connecticut.

The article is entitled "The high cost of plugging the gaps in Medicare." Basically what the article says is that Medigap insurance, which is the insurance that seniors buy in order to cover the health care programs or the health care costs that are not covered by Medicare, and about 50 percent of the seniors in this country have Medigap because they want additional coverage, that the cost of Medigap insurance is skyrocketing.

They mentioned the AARP, which has a policy sold by Prudential, that will go up an average of 26 percent more this year. They specifically mention that in New York, the average premium of the five largest Medigap insurers soared 11 percent in a year, a rate equalled or topped in Connecticut or New Jersey. In both our States, we are talking about increases in Medigap insurance that are at least 11 percent in 1 year.

I think that this is directly related to what is happening in Washington with Medicare, because as you make cuts in Medicare, and, of course, the Republicans are talking about much deeper cuts than the President or anything that the Democrats have put forward, as you make these huge cuts in Medicare, and also in Medicaid, what is going to happen is that you are going to find less services that are covered or quality of services that are covered, more out-of-pocket expenses for senior citizens, and I think that that is going to be reflected more and more in higher Medigap premiums.

The other thing it will result in is that more and more people again will be pushed into managed care or HMO's, where they do not have a lot of choices because they will opt for that, rather than have to pay for the large premium increases in the Medigap program.

I would like to yield at this time to Ms. DELAURO, who has been an outspoken advocate of protecting the Medicare program, and I believe has had a lot of impact over the last year when