

some of the testing methods used to determine if certain toys are risks to children. The article quotes Robert Garrett, acting director of the lab: "I walk out of here every day thinking we're made the world a better place," adding, "I am not sure every government agency can say that."

As the new Chairman of the VA-HUD Independent Agency Appropriations Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over the CPSC, I am delighted to read about Federal employees who are so devoted to the mission of their agency.

I commend this article to my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, December 25, 1998]

IN PARADISE OF TOYS, THE GAME PLAN IS TO  
SAVE LIVES

WASHINGTON, Dec. 24.—In the Washington suburb of Gaithersburg, Md., far from the intrigue of the capital and even farther from the North Pole, employees of the Consumer Product Safety Commission test toys of every description for dangers and defects.

Bob Hundemer, an engineering technician, has tested toys at the agency for two decades. He has cultivated a scrupulous and unforgiving eye for potential hazards and quickly detects whether a toy is up to standard—whether it is safe as well as inviting beneath the Christmas tree.

"This is a killer," Mr. Hundemer said, pointing to a fluorescent yellow rattle with an unusually thin stem and tiny ball at the tip. "The end could get jammed in a baby's mouth so easily and cause choking."

Mr. Hundemer's office is a 5-year-old's paradise. A bookcase overflowing with brightly colored tops, dolls, toy cars, and jacks-in-the-box covers the back wall. A sign reading "Caution: Adults at Play" adorns his door.

Robert Garrett, the acting director of the engineering laboratory, said: "After years in the private sector, I realized that I could get a job with the Government doing about the same thing. I thought I'd died and gone to heaven."

At the annual Toy Fair in February, giant manufacturers like Mattel and Hasbro, as well as small toy companies from around the country, gather in New York City to display their wares. Representatives from the commission attend the show and examine all the new toys. They discuss potential problems with the manufacturers and then work with them to insure that potential hazards are eliminated.

"The big retailers don't want to recall their products," said Kathleen P. Begala, the commission's director of public affairs. "With mailings and bad press, it's a very expensive process for them, and so there is an incentive to cooperate with us."

Mindful that injuries kill more children than any illnesses, the agency, which has requested just over \$57 million for its 2000 budget, performs four tests on toys it reviews.

One, the template test, examines small parts of a toy that could catch in a child's throat and affect breathing. Mr. Hundemer uses a truncated cylinder that represents an average child's mouth and throat. Any piece of a toy that fits into the cylinder is considered dangerous.

The sharp-edge test uses a special tape to indicate whether any side of an object could cut the skin.

The force test determines how easily parts of the stuffed animals, like eyes and noses, can be removed from the toy. Mr. Hundemer uses an instrument that resembles pliers to grasp the eye of a stuffed toy, for example, and applies 15 pounds of pressure, about the strength of a 2-year-old. He tries to rip off the part for about 20 seconds.

In the impact test, a toy is dropped four and a half feet to test durability. "We use something pretty cheap," Mr. Hundemer said. "It's called gravity." If pieces of the toy break off, and the shards of plastic fail the template test, the toy is considered not safe.

The commission officially approves toys that survive the tests.

Like veterans telling war stories, Ms. Begala and Mr. Hundemer recalled some of the most troublesome toys. They remembered the Cabbage Patch doll accused of "eating" a child's hair, the Chinese slap bracelets made with cloth and sharp metal that could cut a child and Woody, the cowboy with plastic spurs that had sharp edges and a small plastic blade.

Mr. Hundemer added that this year's hot toy, the Furby, was safe.

"People shopping for toys need to be sure that toys do not contain parts smaller than their child's fist," Mr. Hundemer said.

Mr. Garrett mused happily on his career.

"I walk out of here every day thinking we've made the world a better place," he said.

Then, pausing, he added, "I am not sure every government agency can say that."

CONGRESSIONAL COMMISSION ON  
SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS  
TRANSITION ASSISTANCE

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be an original cosponsor of the "Servicemembers and Veterans Transition Services Improvement Act of 1999." This measure contains the improvements in benefits and services for America's service members and veterans recommended by the Congressional Commission on Servicemembers and Veterans Transition Assistance.

By way of background, the Commission was established by Public Law 94-275 and was directed to review the programs and benefits designed to facilitate the transition from military service to civilian life for those who have served in uniform. The Commission was encouraged to be thorough in its analysis of existing programs and to be bold in its recommendations for program changes and improvements. Without question, the Commission has met those challenges and transmitted to Congress a meticulous examination of transition programs in place today and an impressive list of recommendations to improve and enhance those existing programs and benefits.

Many of the Commission's proposals, particularly those related to veterans' education and training, can serve as a blueprint for the 106th Congress. Of particular interest to me is the recommendation to significantly increase and expand educational opportunities under the Montgomery GI Bill. I agree with the Commission's statement that education ". . . is the most valuable benefit our Nation can offer the men and women whose military service preserves our liberty." I know from first hand experience the benefits of these educational benefits and I look forward to discussing this and the Commission's other initiatives in depth during upcoming hearings.

I want to commend Tony Principi, chairman of the Transition Commission, and all of the

Commissioners for their excellent service, dedication, and hard work on behalf of America's servicemembers and veterans.

There will be those who will say the recommendations made by the Transition Commission are too costly. If we value a strong defense and believe our Armed Forces and society in general will reap real benefits from the service of our best and brightest in our military, we cannot afford not to improve the transition benefits we offer to those who serve our nation in uniform.

CONGRESSMAN PETE STARK  
PROFILED IN U.U. WORLD

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1999

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following remarks for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The magazine U.U. World, which is published by the Unitarian Universalist Church, recently published a profile of Congressman PETE STARK, my long-time Ways and Means colleague. The article highlights some of Congressman STARK's concerns about the effects of welfare reform. I believe many of us share those concerns. I commend this article to my colleagues' attention.

[From the U.U. World, Jan./Feb. 1999]

A STARK ASSESSMENT: U.S. REP. PETE STARK SPEAKS OUT ON HEALTH CARE AND WELFARE REFORM

(By David Reich)

When President Clinton signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, more commonly known as the welfare reform bill, U.S. Rep. Fortney Pete Stark didn't make a secret of his displeasure. "The president sold out children to get reelected. He's no better than the Republicans," fumed Stark, a longtime Unitarian Universalist whose voting record in Congress regularly wins him 100 percent ratings from groups like the AFL-CIO and Americans for Democratic Action.

One of the Congress's resident experts on health and welfare policy, the northern California Democrat has earned a reputation for outspokenness, often showing a talent for colorful invective, not to say name-calling. First elected to the House as an anti-Vietnam War "bomb-thrower" (his term) in 1972, Stark has called Clinton healthcare guru Ira Magaziner "a latter-day Rasputin" and House Speaker Newt Gingrich "a messianic megalomaniac." When the American Medical Association lobbied Congress to raise Medicare payments to physicians, Stark, who chaired the Health Subcommittee of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee, called them "greedy troglodytes," unleashing a \$600,000 AMA donation to Stark's next Republican opponent.

"I've gotten in a lot of trouble speaking my mind," the congressman admits with a rueful smile. For all his outspokenness on politics, Stark appears to have a droll sense of himself, and he tends to talk softly, his voice often trailing off at the ends of phrases or sentences.

Back in the 1960s, as a 30-something banker and nominal member of the Berkeley, California, Unitarian Universalist congregation, Stark upped his commitment to the U.U. movement after his minister asked him to give financial advice to Berkeley's Starr King School for the Ministry. "I think I was

sandbagged," he theorizes. After a day of poring over Starr King's books ("The place was going broke," he says), he was invited by their board chair to serve as the seminary's treasurer. "I said, 'Okay,'" Stark recalls. "He said, 'Then you have to join the board,' 'I said, I don't know, I guess I could.'"

The UUing of Pete Stark culminated at his first board meeting, when the long-serving board chair announced his resignation, and Stark, to his astonishment, found himself elected to take the old chair's place. "There I was," he reminisces, his long, slim body curled up in a wing chair in a corner of his Capitol Hill office. "And I presided over a change in leadership and then spent a lot of time raising a lot of money for it and actually in the process had a lot of fun and met a lot of terrific people."

The World spoke with Stark in early October, as rumors of the possible impeachment of a president swirled around the capital. But aside from a few pro forma remarks about the presidential woes ("His behavior is despicable, but nothing in it rises to the level of impeachment"), our conversation mainly stuck to healthcare and welfare the areas where Stark has made his mark in government.

World: You have strong feelings about the welfare reform bill. Do the specifics of the bill imply a particular theory of poverty?

PS: They imply that if you're poor, it's your fault, and if I'm not poor, it's because I belong to the right religion or have the right genes. That the poor are poor by choice, and we ought not to have to worry about them. It's akin to how people felt about lepers early in this century.

World: Does the welfare reform law also imply any thinking about women and their role in the world?

PS: Ronald Reagan for years defined welfare cheat as a black woman in a white ermine cape driving a white El Dorado convertible and commonly seen in food check-out lines using food stamps to buy caviar and filet mignon and champagne and then getting in her car and driving on to the next supermarket to load up again. And I want to tell you she was sighted by no less than 150 of my constituents in various supermarkets back in my district. They were all nuts. They were hallucinating. But they believed this garbage.

And then you've got the myth that, as one of my Republican neighbors put it, "these welfare woman are nothing but breeders"—a different class of humanity.

World: You raised the idea of belonging to "the right religion." Do these views of poor people, and poor women in particular, come out of people's religious training?

PS: No, my sense of what makes a reactionary is that it's a person younger than me, a 40- or 50-year-old man who comes to realize he isn't going to become vice president of his firm. His kids aren't going to get into Stanford or Harvard or make the crew team. His wife is not very attractive-looking. His sex life is gone, and he's run to flab and alcohol.

World: So it's disappointment.

PS: Yes. And when the expectations you've been brought up with are not within your grasp, you look around for a scapegoat. "It's these big-spending congressmen" or "It's these women who have children just to get my tax dollar. The reason I'm not rich is that I pay so much in taxes, the reason my children don't respect me is that the moral fabric has been torn apart by schools that fail to teach religion."

And then there's a group that I've learned to call the modern-day Pharisees, people from the right wing of the Republican party who have decided the laws of the temple are the laws of the land.

World: Then religion figures into it, after all.

PS: Oh, yeah, but to me that's a religion of convenience. In my book those are people with little intellect who listen to the Bible on the radio when they're driving the tractor or whatever. But I do credit them with being seven-day-a-week activists, unlike so many other Christians.

World: Going back to the welfare reform bill itself, how does it comport with the values implied by the UU Principles, especially the principle about equity and compassion in social relations?

PS: If you assume we have some obligation to help those who can't help themselves, if that's a role of society, then supporters of the welfare reform bill trample on those values. "I'm not sure that's the government's job," they would say. "It's the church's job, or it's your job. Just don't take my money. I give my cleaning lady food scraps for her family and my castaway clothes to dress her children. I put money in the poor box. What more do you want?"

The bill we reported out, the president's bill, was motivated by the belief that paying money to people on public assistance was, one-squandering public funds and, two preventing us from lowering the taxes on the overtaxed rich. I used to try and hammer at some of my colleagues, and occasionally, when I could show them they were harming children, they would relent a little, or at least they would blush.

World: Did you shame anyone into changing his or her vote or making some concessions on the language of the bill?

PS: We got a few concessions but not many. Allowing a young woman to complete high school before she had to look for a job because she'd be more productive with a high school education—you could maybe shame them into technicalities like that. But beyond that they were convinced that if you just got off the dole and went to work, you would grow into—a Republican, I suppose.

World: It's been pointed out often that many people who supported the bill believe, as a matter of religious conviction, that women should be at home raising kids, yet the bill doesn't apply this standard to poor women. Can the bill's supporters resolve that apparent contradiction?

PS: Yes. I hate to lay out for you what you're obviously missing. The bill's supporters would say that if a woman had been married and the family has stayed together as God intended, with a father around to bring home the bacon, then the mother could stay home and do the household chores and raise the children. They miss the fact that they haven't divided the economic pie in such a manner that the father can make enough money to support mother and child.

Now, I do think young children benefit grandly, beyond belief, by having a mother in full-time attendance for at least the first four years of life. But given the reality that a single mother has to work, you have to move to the idea of reasonable care for that mother's child. And by reasonable care I do not mean a day care worker on minimum wage who's had four hours of instruction and doesn't know enough to wash his or her hands after changing diapers and before feeding the kid. Or who's been hired without a criminal check to screen out pedophiles. Because it's that bad.

World: Did the welfare system as it existed before the 1996 bill need reform?

PS: Sure. The Stark theory—which I used to peddle a thousand years ago, when I chaired the House Public Assistance Committee—is that people have to be allowed to fail and try again and again—and again. We can't let people starve, but they've got to learn to budget money and not spend it all

on frivolous things. So I'd have cashed out many of the benefits. For instance, instead of giving you food stamps worth 50 bucks, why don't I give you the 50 bucks? The theory behind food stamps was that you'd be so irresponsible you'd buy caviar and wine and beer and cigarettes and not have any money left for tuna fish and rice. And that kind of voucher doesn't give you the chance to learn.

We did a study, good Lord, in the 1960s in Contra Costa County, California. Our church was involved, along with the United Crusade charity, and some federal money went into it, too. We identified in the community some people who had never held a regular job—other women who had done day work or men who were nominally, say, real estate brokers but hadn't sold a house in years. And in this study we took maybe 20 of them and made them community organizers—without much to do but with an office and a job title. All this was to study what happened to those people when they had regular hours and a regular paycheck, having come from a neighborhood where people didn't necessarily leave for the office every morning at 7:30.

And we found that these people suddenly became leaders, that people in the neighborhood came to them for advice. They even talked about going into politics, just because of the fact that they fit into the structure and what that did for their self-image and their neighbors image of them.

Another part of that program: in the poorest parts of our community people were given loans to start new stores—wig shops and fingernail parlors and liquor stores and sub shops and soul food places and barbecue pits. The stores had little economic value but lots of social value. They were places where children of the families who owned them went after school, and people didn't sleep or piss in the doorways or leave their bottles there because the street with these shops became a community that had some cohesion—though when the funds were cut back, it reverted to boarded-up shops.

World: Are you suggesting that this kind of program might work for current welfare recipients?

PS: Absolutely. I don't believe for a minute that 99 percent of people, given the opportunity, wouldn't work. They see you and me and whoever—the cop on the beat, the school teacher, the factory worker, the sales clerk—going to work. People want to be part of that. It's just like kids won't stay home from school for very long. That's where the other kids are, that's where they talk about their social lives. That's where the athletics are. And so it is with adults: they want to be part of the fun, of the action.

Inefficient as some people's labor may be, as a last resort, bring them to work in the government. It would be so much more efficient than having to pay caseworkers and making sure they're spending their welfare checks the right way. Give them a living wage, damn it. They'll learn. And given time, their efficiency as economic engines will improve.

World: Do you have a clear sense of how the changes in the system are affecting welfare clients so far?

PS: No, and I'm having a major fight with our own administration over it. Olivia Golden, who until recently headed up the family, youth, and children office in the Health and Human Services Department, sat there blithely and told me, "Welfare reform is working!" I said, "Olivia, what do you mean it's working?" "Well, people all over the country have told me—" "How many?" "Maybe 12." I said, "Are you kidding? You've talked to maybe 12 people?"

They won't give us the statistics. They say, "The states don't want to give them to

us." All we know—the only figures we have—is how many people are being ticked off the rolls. What's happened to the people who leave the rolls? What's happened to the kids? The number of children in poverty is starting to go up—substantially, even when their family has gotten off welfare and is working.

World: One of the arguments in favor of the welfare bill involved "devolution." Do you accept the general proposition that states can provide welfare better than the federal government?

PS: Well, the states were always doing it, under federal guidelines. Now we've taken away the guidelines and given the states money with some broad limitations.

I have no problem with local communities running public assistance programs. They're much closer to the people and much more concerned, and somebody from Brooklyn doesn't know squat about what's needed in Monroe County, Wyoming, where an Indian reservation may be the sole source of your poverty population. But I want some standards—minimum standards for day care, minimum standards for job training. I'm talking about support standards, not punishment standards.

World: And the current bill has only punishment standards?

PS: Basically. It's a threat, it's a time limit, it's a plank to walk.

World: What about the idea that welfare reform would save the government money? How much money has been saved?

PS: I can get the budget figures for you, but I suspect we haven't saved one cent. I mean, do homeless people cost us? What is the cost in increased crime? We're building jails like they're going out of style. Does the welfare bill have anything to do with that? I don't know, but I wouldn't make the case that they're unrelated.

So if you take the societal costs—are we saving? And it's such a minuscule part of the budget anyway. It's like foreign aid. I could get standing applause in my district by saying, "I don't like foreign aid." And if I ask people what we're spending on it, they say, "Billions, billions!" We spend diddly on foreign aid. The same is true for welfare. Any one of the Defense Department's bomber programs far exceeds the total cost of welfare.

World: Is there any hope of improving the country's welfare system in the short or medium term, given that the 1996 bill did have bipartisan support?

PS: It had precious little bipartisan support, but it had the president. No, I don't think we're apt to make changes. And what's fascinating is that with the turn in global events our economy may have peaked out. We may be heading down. And while this welfare reform may have worked in a booming economy, when the economy turns down, those grants to the states won't begin to cover what we'll need.

World: If Congress isn't likely to do anything, what can people in religious communities do to make sure the system is humane?

PS: They can get active at the state and local level. Various states may do better things or have better programs or more humane programs. And the lower the level of jurisdiction, the easier it is to make the change, whether it's in local schools or local social service delivery programs.

The other thing is to take the lead in going to court. It's the courts that have saved us time after time—in education, women's rights, abortion rights. We need to look for those occasions where a welfare agency does something illegal—and there will be some—and take up the cause of children whose civil rights are being violated.

World: Let's shift over to healthcare. In the 1992 presidential campaign, the idea of a

universal healthcare plan was seen as very popular with the voters. Why did the Clinton health plan fail?

PS: I'd like to blame it on Ira Magaziner and all the monkey business that went on at the White House—the secret meetings and this hundred-person panel that ignored the legislative process. Their proposal became discredited before it ever got to Congress. We paid no attention to it. My subcommittee wrote our own bill, which accomplished what the president said he wanted. It provided universal coverage, it was budget-neutral, and it was paid for on a progressive basis.

World: And it did that by expanding Medicare?

PS: Basically it required every employer to pay, in effect, an increase in the minimum wage, to provide either a payment of so much an hour or add insurance. And if they couldn't buy private insurance at a price equivalent to the minimum wage increase, they could buy into Medicare—at no cost to the government on a budget-neutral basis. But the bill allowed private insurance to continue, with the government as insurer of last resort.

We got it out of committee by a vote or two, but then on the House floor, we couldn't get any Republican votes. They unified against it, so we never had the votes to bring it up.

The Harry and Louise ads beat us badly. People were convinced that government regulation was bad, *per se*. It was just the beginning of the free market in medical care, which we're seeing the culmination of now in the for-profit HMOs and the Medicare choice plans that are collapsing like houses of cards all over the country. But back in 1993 the idea was "Let the free market decide HMOs will be created. They'll make a profit, they'll give people what they want. People will vote with their feet and the free market will apply its wonderful choice."

World: Did that bill's defeat doom universal healthcare for a long time to come?

PS: It certainly doomed it for this decade, and things are only getting worse. We now have a couple of million more people uninsured. We're up to about 43.5 million uninsured, and we were talking about 41 million back in 1993. And people on employer-paid health plans are either paying higher copays or getting more and more restricted benefits. Plus early retirement benefits are disappearing, so that if people retire before 65, they often can't get affordable insurance. It will have to get just a little worse before we'll have a popular rebellion. We're seeing in the managed care bill of rights issue where people are today. To me, that the most potent force out there in the public.

World: In both areas we've been discussing assistance to the poor and health insurance, the US government is taking less responsibility than virtually all the other industrial democracies.

PS: Why take just democracies? Even in the fascist countries, everybody's got healthcare. We are the only nation extant that doesn't offer healthcare to everybody.

Take our neighbor Canada. There is no more conservative government on this continent, north or south. I've heard the wealthiest right-wing Canadian government minister say, "I went to private prep schools, but it never would it occur to us Canadians to jump the queue, go to the head of the line in healthcare. We believe healthcare is universal. Now, we fight about spending levels, we fight about the bureaucracy, and we fight about how we're working the payment system." But they don't question it.

World: In the US we do question it—the right to healthcare, that is, Why?

PS: It's connected with this idea of independence. Where do we get the *militas* from,

and those yahoos who run around in soldier suits and shoot paint guns at each other?

World: The frontier ethos?

PS: Maybe, maybe. And the American Medical Association is not exactly exempt from blame. The physicians are the most antigovernment group of all. They're the highest paid profession in America by far, and so they are protecting their economic interests. Though the government now looks a little better to them than the insurance industry because they have more control over government than over the insurance companies.

Look, the country was barely ready for Medicare when that went through. It just made it through Congress by a few votes. There are some of us who would have liked to see it include nursing home or long-term convalescent care. That can only be done through social insurance, but people won't admit it. They say, "There's got to be a better way." It's a mantra. On healthcare: "There's got to be a better way." Education: "There's got to be a better way."

They've yet to say it for defense though. I'm waiting for them to privatize the Defense Department and turn it over to Pinkerton. Although in a way they have. There's a bunch of retired generals right outside the Beltway making millions of dollars of government money training the armed forces in Bosnia. I was there and what a bunch of crackpots! They've got these former drill sergeants over there, including people out to try to start wars on our ticket.

World: A few more short questions. Have the culture and atmosphere of the House changed in the years since you arrived here?

PS: Yes, though I spent 22 years in the majority and now four in the minority, so I may just be remembering good old days that weren't so good. Back when I was trying to end the Vietnam War, I was in just as much of a minority as I am now, and I didn't have a subcommittee chair to give me any power or leverage.

On the other hand, look at the country now. Look at tv talk shows—they argue and shout and scream, and then they call it journalism. Maybe we're just following in their footsteps.

World: Is it a spiritual challenge for you to have to work with, or at least alongside, people with whom you disagree, sometimes violently?

PS: Yes, and I don't do a very good job. My wife says, "When you retire, why don't you become an ambassador?" And I say, "Diplomacy doesn't run deep in these genes." But it's tough if you internalize your politics and believe in them.

Still, I like legislating—to make it all work to take all the pieces that are pushing on you, to make the legislation fit, to accommodate and accomplish a goal. It really makes the job kind of fascinating. I once reformed the part of the income tax bill that applies to life insurance, and that's one of the most arcane and complex parts of the tax bill. It was fun—bringing people together and getting something like that. And actually, writing that health bill was fun.

But not now. We don't have any committee hearings or meetings anymore. It's all done in back rooms. Under the Democratic leadership we used to go into the back room, but there were a lot of us in the room. Now they write bills in the speaker's office and avoid the committee system. I mean, it's done deals. We're not doing any legislating, or not very much.

World: Do you think about quitting?

PS: No, I don't think about quitting. I'd consider doing something else, but I don't know what that is. Secretary of health and human services? Sure, but don't hold your breath until I'm offered the job. Even in the

minority, being in the Congress is fascinating, and as long as my health and facilities hold out. . . . I mean, I'm not much interested in shuffleboard or model airplanes.

IN TRIBUTE TO BILL SEREGI

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 4, 1999*

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad responsibility to advise our colleagues of the recent passing of an outstanding American, a remarkable individual, and a tremendous philanthropist.

Bill Seregi was born in Budapest, Hungary in 1903. Although as a youth he aspired to a career in engineering, he found this avenue closed to him by the blatant anti-Semitism which permeated that part of Europe at that time. Instead, Bill went into the jewelry trade at a young age, and soon was considered a master of that trade in his home nation.

In 1928, he married the lovely Lily and thus began a marriage which lasted seventy years. The union between Bill and Lily is an inspiration to all of us.

By 1939, Bill and Lily were considered leading citizens of Budapest. That year, World War II struck Europe like a dreaded thunderstorm, and no life was left untouched. As devout Jews, Bill and Lily found themselves targeted by the oncoming Nazi hordes. Bill was sentenced to a concentration camp. Torn from his family, Bill was forced to toil at slave labor in the Nazi labor camps. It was only his hope of reuniting with his family which kept Bill alive during the horrible years of the Holocaust.

After the defeat of Nazi Germany, Bill was reunited with Lily and they brought together the survivors of their family. Bill and Lily spent the post-war years trying to rebuild their shattered lives. But the respite was short-lived. Hungary was soon taken over by Soviet dictators and, in many ways, life was no better than under Nazi domination. In 1951, Bill and Lily emigrated to the United States to start a new life, for themselves and their family.

Once he had emigrated to the U.S., Bill found the peace and freedom which he so vainly sought all of his life. No freedom did he cherish more than his right to worship according to his own beliefs and the beliefs of his faith. Bill learned very soon after arriving in America about B'nai Zion, the brotherhood organization of people desiring a homeland for Jews in Palestine. Bill soon threw most of his energies into the many philanthropic works of B'nai Zion. He became President of one of the local chapters of B'nai Zion, the Theodore Herzl Lodge.

Bill Seregi devoted a great part of his life to the B'nai Zion Foundation, as well as to various fund raising efforts for the State of Israel. Bill earned a name for himself throughout the greater New York region, and became highly respected as a superb spokesperson. He was active in the America Israel Friendship League, which cemented a good relationship between our nations. Bill also established a "Gift of Giving Scholarship" award presented to students of New York City high schools.

In presenting the scholarship to the worthy students, Bill Seregi summed up his philosophy of life to them:

- "a. Help those in need
- b. Fight against intolerance
- c. Study more than you want to
- d. Be grateful to those who teach you; and
- e. Knowledge is your fortune."

A few years ago, Bill Seregi was the recipient of the Dr. Harris J. Levine Award, the highest honor possible from the B'nai Zion organization. At that time, Norman G. Levine, the son of the philanthropist for whom the award was named, stated: "There could not possibly be any better candidate or anyone more dedicated to the same principles as my father than Bill."

Bill left us on Dec. 16th, 1998, at his golden age of 95. He leaves behind his widow Lily, to whom he had been married for more than 70 years. He also leaves his children, Ann and Larry, his grandchildren Ellie and Lewis, and many loving nieces and nephews and their families.

By fleeing the tyranny of Communism in 1951, Bill Seregi demonstrated that it is never too late for any individual to seek freedom, liberty and justice for themselves and their families. By continuing his career as a master of the art of jewelry as well as his advocacy of Zionist and philanthropic causes, Bill underscores the old adage that if you want something done, ask a busy person. No one will ever fully know the suffering Bill and Lily experienced under both Nazism and Communism, and no one will ever know how many lives they touched and how many people were positively impacted by their decision to help others rather than curse their own misfortune.

Mr. Speaker, our condolences are extended to the many loved ones Bill leaves behind, and the countless individuals who were inspired by this outstanding human being.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. JAMES CALVIN PIGG

**HON. LARRY COMBEST**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 4, 1999*

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, It is my distinct privilege to rise today to honor one of Texas' finest agricultural journalists, Mr. James Calvin Pigg, editor of the Southwest Farm Press magazine in Dallas, Texas. Calvin has served as editor since the magazine's founding in 1974, faithfully reporting agricultural news for Southwest Farm Press for 25 years. A native Texan, Calvin has practiced his craft on radio, television, and print coverage of agriculture in the Southwest since 1955. After more than 40 years on the Texas and Oklahoma agricultural scene, his hands-on reporting style keeps stories fresh and interesting. Reporting the dynamic and ever-changing events within the agriculture industry is an important duty since farmers and ranchers across the Southwest depend on this information.

In addition to his Farm Press duties, he has served as a member of the Dean's Advisory Committee for Texas Tech University's College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources and has received the college's prestigious Gerald W. Thomas Outstanding Agriculturists Award in 1985. His unsurpassed dedication and genuine concern for the South Plains agricultural industry is legendary. He

also was honored for his distinguished service to Texas agriculture by the Professional Agricultural Workers of Texas in 1980. Calvin was the president of the Dallas Agricultural Club in 1989, and his active involvement in various professional and honor societies proves he truly is a friend of agriculturists.

It is with great honor that I recognize Mr. James Calvin Pigg on his commitment to the agricultural industry and his tireless dedication and service to Southwest Farm Press.

LEGISLATION TO BENEFIT THE AGRICULTURE COMMUNITY NATIONWIDE

**HON. GARY A. CONDIT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 4, 1999*

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced several pieces of legislation that I believe should be considered during the 106th Congress. These bills represent a broad array of policy initiatives that will benefit the agriculture community nationwide.

AGRICULTURAL WATER CONSERVATION ACT

Over the past few years I have read countless articles on the need to conserve water and the role federal government has with this mission. While discussing water conservation methods with farmers in my district, I found cost was their overriding concern. The outlays required to implement water conservation systems, (i.e., drip irrigation, sprinkler systems, ditch lining) are a tremendous burden on the agriculture industry. While I firmly believe most agriculture interests are genuinely concerned about conserving water, cost has crippled the ability to implement conservation methods on farms.

The Agricultural Water Conservation Act is not a mandate for expensive water conservation systems, it is a tool and an option for farmers. Specifically, it will allow farmers to receive up to a 30% tax credit for the cost of developing and implementing water conservation plans on their farm land with a cap of \$500 per acre. The tax credit could be used primarily for the cost of materials and equipment. This legislation would not require them to change their irrigation practices. However, it would allow those farmers who want to move toward a more conservation approach of irrigation but cannot afford to do it during these tough economic times.

CANNED PEACH RESOLUTION

For almost two decades, the European Union (EU) has been heavily subsidizing its canned fruit industry to the detriment of California cling peach producers and processors. Despite a Section 301 investigation, a favorable GATT ruling against the EU, and a subsequent US/EU agreement intended to contain the problem, the EU canned fruit regime has in fact grown considerably more disruptive over time. In recent years, EU canned fruit subsidies have greatly increased (now totaling between \$160-\$213 million annually), as has injury to the California industry in every one of its markets.

The resolution I introduced today details the problem, identifies it to be of priority concern, and calls for corrective action. I hope by introducing this resolution we can highlight this dispute as a trade priority, underscore that relief