

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE SAFE PIPELINE ACT OF 1986

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979 and the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968. My bill, the Safe Pipeline Act of 1986, would impose much more rigorous requirements for testing pipelines and would also mandate new requirements for community notification, inventories of existing types of pipe in pipeline systems, and the installation of automatic shutoff valves on all pipelines within 10 years. Finally, this legislation would prohibit the construction of any new pipelines within 150 feet of any residential dwelling, school, hospital, nursing home, correctional facility, or other permanently inhabited facility.

On July 8, an underground pipeline owned and operated by Williams Pipeline Co. ruptured in Mounds View, MN spilling an undetermined amount of gasoline into a residential community. A subsequent explosion and fire killed a mother and her young daughter and seriously injured another woman. Many homes in Mounds View suffered extensive damage as a result of this disaster. This was only the latest and most tragic accident in a series of pipeline spills involving Williams Pipeline Co. in Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 1.7 million miles of hazardous liquid and natural gas pipelines in the United States. Unfortunately, all too often, these extensive pipeline systems receive wholly inadequate Federal attention and inspection. Many of these pipelines are old and are corroding thus increasing the probability of their eventual failure. The results of a hazardous liquid or gas pipeline failure can range from serious environmental damage, including soil and ground water contamination, to loss of life and extensive property damage, such as that which occurred in Mounds View.

Our Nation's hazardous pipelines are potential firebombs that run under our neighborhoods and through our communities. The Department of Transportation's Office of Pipeline Safety [OPS] has not had the necessary resources or inclination to regulate this industry as strictly as it should.

I have had a longstanding interest in the issue of pipeline safety. In the 98th Congress, I introduced H.R. 3314 which sought to mandate stricter testing standards for hazardous liquid pipelines. In 1984, I requested the General Accounting Office to undertake a study of pipeline safety. The alarming results of the GAO study (GAO/RCED-84-102) indicated that there were only three OPS inspectors responsible for monitoring pipeline safety in Minnesota and nine other Midwestern States. Nationwide, only 17 field inspectors were respon-

sible for monitoring the safety of 1.7 million miles of pipeline. What we have created is a facade of safety; an illusion in which the public believes that its safety is being protected by the responsible Federal agency; the Office of Pipeline Safety.

Working with my colleague and friend, MARTIN SABO, and with the support of Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee Chairman BILL LEHMAN, we were successful in adding a requirement to the fiscal year 1987 Transportation Appropriation bill (H.R. 5205) which directs that two additional field inspectors be assigned to the OPS central region office in Kansas City. Additionally, the Transportation Appropriation bill directs the Department of Transportation to undertake annual comprehensive inspections of pipeline operators in the central region and to prepare a report assessing the need for mandatory quality assurance requirements for pipeline operators. I am hopeful that the Senate will retain these important provisions in the Transportation Appropriation bill. Mr. Speaker, the Safe Pipeline Act of 1986 attempts to accomplish several important objectives.

First, this bill would require operators of pipeline facilities to provide any local government whose jurisdiction extends to within one-half mile of a pipeline to provide detailed maps, which would also be available for public inspection, showing the location of these pipelines. The bill would also require pipeline operators to provide local governments with an inventory describing all of the types of substances which are transported through such pipelines. These maps and inventories would also have to be filed with local fire departments and public safety agencies and would have to be updated as appropriate.

Second, this bill would require pipeline operators to provide annual written notice to property owners within one-half mile of a pipeline about the presence and location of such pipelines. It is imperative that residents be absolutely aware of such pipelines in order to avoid damaging these lines accidentally through excavation and to take proper precautions and action in the event a pipeline is damaged.

Third, pipeline operators would be required to post conspicuous signs on all public roads and streets under which pipelines pass. Current signs are inadequate to effectively inform the public about the presence of pipeline facilities.

Fourth, this bill would require that within 10 years all manual shutoff valves on existing pipeline systems be converted to automatic valves. New pipelines would have to be built with the automatic shutoff valves.

Fifth, liquid and natural gas pipeline operators would be required to conduct an inventory of their pipelines to determine the types of pipeline which are unknown in their systems.

Sixth, additional integrity testing and inspection requirements would be mandated within 2

years and all pipeline systems would be inspected at least once every 4 years thereafter.

Finally, this bill would prohibit the construction of new pipeline facilities within 150 feet of any home, school, nursing home, or other permanently inhabited facility.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation takes strong action to address what has become a very serious problem. While I fully realize that we can never completely guarantee the safety of any activity, we must admit that surely we can do a much better job in regulating the safety of hazardous liquid and natural gas pipelines than we have done in the past. Clearly, while the Office of Pipeline Safety has not been as vigorous in enforcing existing pipeline safety regulations as some would like, nevertheless, OPS does not have infinite resources to do its job. Therefore, we must insist that the pipeline operators themselves assume a greater share of responsibility for insuring the safety of their pipeline systems.

I hope that the terrible tragedy which occurred in Mounds View, MN on July 8 will never occur anywhere else again. I believe that this legislation which I am introducing today is a step in the right direction. I hope that my colleagues will share my sense of urgency about this important issue and will join me in sponsoring the Safe Pipeline Act of 1986.

H.R. 5401

A bill to amend the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979 and the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 with respect to community notification, additional testing and inspection of pipelines, and siting of new pipelines, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Safe Pipeline Act".

SEC. 2. COMMUNITY NOTIFICATION.

(a) HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1979 AMENDMENT.—Section 203 of the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979 is amended by adding at the end a new subsection as follows:

"(1)(A) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards requiring operators of pipeline facilities subject to this Act to provide, to any local government whose jurisdiction extends to within one-half mile of such pipeline facilities, detailed maps showing the exact location of such pipeline facilities. Such maps shall be made available by such local government for public inspection.

"(B) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards requiring operators of pipeline facilities subject to this Act to provide, to any local government whose jurisdiction extends to within one-half mile of such pipeline facilities, a complete inventory and description of

• 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.

all substances transported through such pipeline facilities.

"(C) Maps, inventories, and descriptions referred to this paragraph shall be updated as appropriate.

"(2) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards requiring operators of pipeline facilities subject to this Act to provide, to any local fire department and public safety agency whose jurisdiction extends to within one-half mile of such pipeline facilities, any maps, inventories, and descriptions required to be provided to local governments under paragraph (1), along with a copy of such operator's operations, maintenance, and emergency manual, to be updated as appropriate.

"(3) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards requiring operators of pipeline facilities subject to this Act to provide annually, to all residential and commercial property owners within one-half mile of such pipeline facilities, written notice informing such property owner that their property is within one-half mile of such pipeline facilities, and including a description of the location of the pipeline facilities and information on how to identify pipeline hazards and what to do if any such hazard is found.

"(4) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards requiring operators of pipeline facilities subject to this Act to post conspicuous signs on all public roads and streets under which such pipeline facilities pass".

(b) NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968 AMENDMENT.—Section 3 of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 is amended by adding at the end a new subsection as follows:

"(e)(1)(A) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards requiring operators of pipeline facilities subject to this Act to provide, to any local government whose jurisdiction extends to within one-half mile of such pipeline facilities, detailed maps showing the exact location of such pipeline facilities. Such maps shall be made available by such local government for public inspection.

"(B) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards requiring operators of pipeline facilities subject to this Act to provide, to any local government whose jurisdiction extends to within one-half mile of such pipeline facilities, a complete inventory and description of all substances transported through such pipeline facilities.

"(C) Maps, inventories, and descriptions referred to this paragraph shall be updated as appropriate.

"(2) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards requiring operators of pipeline facilities subject to this Act to provide, to any local fire department and public safety agency whose jurisdiction extends to within one-half mile of such pipeline facilities, any maps, inventories, and descriptions required to be provided to local governments under paragraph (1), along with a copy of such operator's operations, maintenance, and emergency manual, to be updated as appropriate.

"(3) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards requiring operators of pipeline facilities subject to this Act to provide annually, to all residential and commercial property owners within one-half mile of such pipeline facilities, written notice informing such property owner that their property is within one-half mile of such pipeline facilities, and includ-

ing a description of the location of the pipeline facilities and information on how to identify pipeline hazards and what to do if any such hazard is found.

"(4) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards requiring operators of pipeline facilities subject to this Act to post conspicuous signs on all public roads and streets under which such pipeline facilities pass."

SEC. 3. AUTOMATIC SHUT-OFF VALVES.

(a) HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1979 AMENDMENT.—Section 203 of the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979, as amended by section 2 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end a new subsection as follows:

"(j)(1) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards to require, within 10 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, operators of pipeline facilities subject to this Act to convert all required shut-off valves to automatic shut-off valves.

"(2) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards to require all pipeline facilities subject to this Act constructed after 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection to be equipped with automatic shut-off valves".

(b) NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968 AMENDMENT.—Section 3 of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968, as amended by section 2 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end a new subsection as follows:

"(f)(1) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards to require, within 10 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, operators of pipeline facilities subject to this Act to convert all required shut-off valves to automatic shut-off valves.

"(2) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards to require all pipeline facilities subject to this Act constructed after 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection to be equipped with automatic shut-off valves".

SEC. 4. PIPELINE INVENTORY.

(a) HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1979 AMENDMENT.—Section 203 of the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979, as amended by sections 2 and 3 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end a new subsection as follows:

"(k) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards to require, within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, operators of pipeline facilities subject to this Act to complete and submit to the Secretary an inventory including specifications with respect to all types of pipeline used in such operator's system."

(b) NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968 AMENDMENT.—Section 3 of the Natural Gas Pipeline Act of 1968, as amended by sections 2 and 3 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end a new subsection as follows:

"(g) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum Federal standards to require, within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, operators of pipeline facilities subject to this Act to complete and submit to the Secretary an inventory including specifications with respect to all types of pipeline used in such operator's system."

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL INTEGRITY TESTING AND INSPECTION.

(a) HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1979 AMENDMENT.—Section 210(c) of

the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish additional minimum Federal standards to require testing and inspection of pipeline facilities subject to this Act. Such additional testing and inspection shall be performed using the most reliable technology practicable for assessing the integrity of such pipeline facilities safely. Such additional testing and inspection shall begin immediately after the issuance by the Secretary of regulations under this subsection where feasible, but in no event more than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Safe Pipeline Act, and shall be at intervals no less frequent than once every 4 years thereafter. The frequency and type of such testing and inspection shall be determined by the Secretary on a case-by-case basis after consideration of the following factors:

"(1) The location of the pipeline facilities.
 "(2) The type, size, age, manufacturer, method of construction, frequency of pump stations, and condition of the pipeline facilities.

"(3) The nature and volume of the materials transported through the pipeline facilities, the sequence in which such materials are transported, and the pressure at which they are transported.

"(4) The climatic, geologic, and seismic characteristics of, and conditions (including soil characteristics) associated with the areas in which the pipeline facilities are located, and the existing and projected population and demographic characteristics associated with such areas.

"(5) The frequency of leaks, if any.

"(6) Any other factors determined by the Secretary to be relevant to the safety of pipeline facilities."

(b) NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968 AMENDMENT.—The Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 is amended by redesignating section 13 as section 13(a) and by adding at the end a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish additional minimum Federal standards to require testing and inspection of pipeline facilities subject to this Act. Such additional testing and inspection shall be performed using the most reliable technology practicable for assessing the integrity of such pipeline facilities safely. Such additional testing and inspection shall begin immediately after the issuance by the Secretary of regulations under this subsection where feasible, but in no event more than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Safe Pipeline Act, and shall be at intervals no less frequent than once every 4 years thereafter. The frequency and type of such testing and inspection shall be determined by the Secretary on a case-by-case basis after consideration of the following factors:

"(1) The location of the pipeline facilities.
 "(2) The type, size, age, manufacturer, method of construction, frequency of pump stations, and condition of the pipeline facilities.

"(3) The nature and volume of the materials transported through the pipeline facilities, the sequence in which such materials are transported, and the pressure at which they are transported.

"(4) The climatic, geologic, and seismic characteristics of, and conditions (including soil characteristics) associated with the areas in which the pipeline facilities are located, and the existing and projected population and demographic characteristics associated with such areas.

"(5) The frequency of leaks, if any.

"(6) Any other factors determined by the Secretary to be relevant to the safety of pipeline facilities."

(2) The heading of such section is amended by striking out "Plans".

SEC. 6. SITING OF NEW PIPELINES.

(a) HAZARDOUS LIQUID PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1979 AMENDMENT.—The Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979 is amended by adding at the end a new section as follows:

"SITING OF NEW PIPELINES

"SEC. 219. No pipeline facility subject to this Act may be constructed, after the date of the enactment of this section, within 150 feet of any residential dwelling, school, hospital, nursing home, correctional institution, or other permanently inhabited facility."

(b) NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968 AMENDMENT.—The Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 is amended by adding at the end a new section as follows:

"SITING OF NEW PIPELINES

"SEC. 20. No pipeline facility subject to this Act may be constructed, after the date of the enactment of this section, within 150 feet of any residential dwelling, school, hospital, nursing home, correctional institution, or other permanently inhabited facility."

SEC. 7. DEFINITION AMENDMENT.

Section 202(2) of the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979 is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking "and";

(2) in subparagraph (B) by inserting "and" after "pipeline facilities"; and

(3) by adding at the end a new subparagraph as follows:

"(C) chemical fertilizer products when transported by pipeline facilities;"

SEC. 8. ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), all regulations required to be issued by the amendments made by this Act shall be issued within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The regulations required to be issued by the amendments made by section 5 shall be issued within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

RULE ON H.R. 5395, TO INCREASE THE STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform my colleagues that the Committee on Ways and Means today favorably ordered reported to the House of Representatives H.R. 5395, to increase the statutory limit on the public debt.

I wish to serve notice, pursuant to the rules of the Democratic caucus, that I have been instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to seek less than an open rule for the consideration of this legislation by the House of Representatives.

ALL-AFRICA PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE ON POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the many eloquent speakers who addressed the All-African Conference of Parliamentarians on Population and Development, held in Harare, Zimbabwe, in May, was Mr. James P. Grant, Executive Director of the United Nations Children's Fund [UNICEF].

Mr. Grant said the conference, the first of its kind in Africa, was particularly appropriate because it came at a time when Africa is facing unprecedented population growth that is outstripping Africa's ability to feed itself.

By improving health and nutrition for women and children, demonstrating the benefits of child spacing, providing women with access to education, and promoting a strong family planning program, Mr. Grant said that Africa could reduce its child mortality rate and bring its explosive population growth rate under control.

Mr. Grant called upon African parliamentarians to become "children's advocates and establish the national policies and priorities which are the framework of action affecting children and their families."

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Grant's speech and his recommendations on how to reduce malnutrition and suffering in Africa.

ADDRESS BY MR. JAMES P. GRANT TO THE ALL-AFRICA PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE ON POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT

HARARE, May 13, 1986.—Mr. Chairman, Honourable Minister of Health, distinguished parliamentarians, ladies and gentlemen.

This Conference occurs at a time when the past generation in Africa can be described as both, to paraphrase Charles Dickens, the best of times and the worst of times.

The best of times for many reasons. The great majority of Africans now enjoy National self rule, the most notable recent advance being here in Zimbabwe in 1980. Child death rates have dropped by some 40% since the early 1950s, when one child out of every three died before reaching age 5 and many others were crippled for life from a wide variety of causes. Basic literacy and education rates have soared relative to the 1950s. Millions of Africans have acquired highly developed skills with scores working for UNICEF around the world. African States and leaders now have important roles in the world and Zimbabwe is now the President of the Non-Aligned Movement.

At the same time, we can recite many tragic circumstances in Africa, particularly at a time of continuing severe global economic difficulties which impact most heavily on Africa. Population increase has outstripped food production since 1970, and is now 11% less per capita. Malnutrition has risen in a number of African countries in the 1980s. The rate of infant and child mortality reduction has slowed in many countries and even risen in some, under the impact of drought, civil disturbances and global recession. Of the 22 million children born in 1980, by the end of 1985, approxi-

mately one third were dead or crippled for life, with millions more suffering from malnutrition. The unprecedented rapid population expansion has increased Africa's population to over 500 million. World Bank projections indicate that the population may not stabilize before it tops two billion—well over the total projected for Latin America and Europe combined, even though each today only approximately equal Africa in population.

But I have not come here to bring a message of defeat and despair. I come instead with a message, in the words of Prime Minister Robert Mugabe actionable opportunities for renewed progress for the survival and health of Africa's communities, and for progress toward population stabilization. We all know that Africa is generously endowed with physical and human resources. We also know, as Fred Sai and Nafis Sadik aptly noted yesterday, that nutrition, health and population growth rates are intimately inter-related. Sharply improved health and nutrition can help to significantly increase the desire for fewer births; and slowed population growth, particularly through child spacing with its great beneficial impact on mothers and children, can significantly improve child health and nutrition, contributing to a virtual circle of improved health and slowed population growth.

With respect to the former, the late Prime Minister Indira Gandhi aptly noted at the South Asian Meeting of Parliamentarians before her untimely death: "Parents are more likely to restrict their families if they have reasonable assurance of the healthy survival of their two children."

Former President Julius Nyerere expressed the same conclusion when he said: "The most powerful contraceptive is the knowledge that your children will survive".

My most urgent concern, as Executive Director of the United Nations Children's Fund, is the survival and well being of children. My proposition to you today is that child survival can be a key to developmental progress . . . and to population stabilization as well. And my purpose today is to demonstrate that—despite current economic, political and climatic adversity in Africa—there is not only a new capacity to dramatically reduce the current wanton waste of Africa's children, but also a new capacity to contribute to building a foundation for a broad range of social and economic advances . . . and slow the growth of population as well.

The possibilities for dramatic advance in child survival exist today because of one central new development of recent years—largely a by-product of the development progress of the past decades—that now holds forth the prospect for major breakthroughs, even in these lean times, when combined with recent technological advances. Vigorous use of this new development in the past several years is already saving the lives of more than one million small children each year in developing countries; truly vigorous support could mean by 1990 annually saving the lives of 5 million small children world wide—including more than one million in Africa, and improving the health of more than 100 million more while also contributing to decreasing population growth.

What is this new development? It is the new capacity—the major new potential—to communicate with the poor majority in developing countries. Indeed, it is the revolution in social communications and organization which has occurred in recent times,

now well known to commercial entrepreneur and politics but only now is beginning to be increasingly used for social benefit. An almost incredible transformation has taken place in virtually every country with respect to the capacity to communicate, no matter how poor or under-developed, as a result of general development progress. The ubiquitous radio is everywhere in the rural countryside. In North Africa a majority of homes have access to television. Almost every village now has a school, women organizations, farmers associations and commercial retail outlets in villages have vastly increased in numbers. A growing proportion of young mothers in their 20s and 30s can now read and write. Some countries have party structures that reach down to men and women in every village and urban neighbourhood.

Religious structures—whether Christian or Islamic have a whole new capacity to communicate. And, perhaps to the surprise of those in the "developed" world, people in most less-developed areas of Africa or Asia and Latin America—while they still have per capita incomes lower than those of our Europeans or North Americans of two centuries ago—now have a capacity to communicate not achieved in the industrialized world until it neared the mid 20th century—just two generations ago.

CHILDREN ARE THE FIRST FRONTIER

The revolutionary potential of these advances in social communication on the condition of life for the masses first pioneered with respect to family planning and promoting the Green Revolution in Asia is now being most dramatically experienced in the field of child health, as the evolution in the capacity to communicate in low-income communities coincided with the realization that major, grossly underutilized technological advances of recent years could bring about revolutionary improvement in the well-being of children—a Child Survival and Development Revolution—at extremely low cost . . . a cost so low that virtually all countries could afford them with a modicum of international cooperation, if only they are combined with the new capacity to communicate with the poor who are most in need of these technological advances.

These new, improved, rediscovered or newly appreciated technologies, which are detailed in UNICEF's annual report, The State of the World's Children, 1986, and sometimes referred to, as the Honourable Deputy Minister of Health of Zimbabwe has noted, as the GOBI—FFF measures include:

Growth monitoring through frequent charting (usually monthly) of a child's weight that enables the mother to detect the early signs of malnutrition and in a surprising majority of cases deal with it through means within the parents' own control.

The recently discovered oral rehydration therapy—a remarkable simple treatment with salts, potassium and glucose (sugar) in water—costing only a few cents, which can be applied by parents at home for a child suffering from diarrhoeal dehydration, the number one child killer that claims nearly 5 million lives annually world wide, including one million African children. No wonder Britain's *Lancet* described this as "potentially the most important medical advance of this century".

The recently appreciated, through scientific analysis, merits of breastfeeding and improved weaning practices.

Recent advances in vaccines, now costing only fifty cents to immunize a child for life

against tetanus, measles, polio, whooping cough, diphtheria and tuberculosis which cripple and kill several millions of children every year—including more than one million African children who die from immunizable diseases, and another million or more who are disabled.

Better family spacing of children, when alone, as we have heard, could reduce the infant toll by half.

Greater, female education—basic education—particularly for young women as pioneered in Tanzania in the 1970s, through low cost measures, whether achieved through expansion of primary schools or through informal education, or both.

To be effective, all of these measures require that parents be aware of and use them, whether it is to mix oral rehydration formulas at home or to bring a child the three or four times necessary for full immunization against six killer diseases. We all know how difficult it is to have people adopt new practices, and this is particularly true of mothers from low income and often illiterate families who may be reluctant to bring their children for vaccination, a process which the mother probably doesn't understand in the first place and particularly so after the child runs a fever after each immunization visit, as is often the case.

This, of course, is where the new capacity to communicate with parents is so important, using all channels intensively to reach the parents and local communities. Empowering parents, and particularly mothers, with present knowledge and technologies is the key to unlocking the potential for a revolution in child health. But, and I stress the but, the responsibility for turning that key rests with the whole of society, for the mother cannot act alone.

LIVES ARE BEING SAVED

It has been exhilarating to see how fast this potential has advanced in the just three and one half years since first articulated with respect to primary health care.

Colombia, for example, is a country which has been pioneering since 1983 in pulling this whole group of ideas together. Beginning in 1984, Colombia started on the immunization front. The key was leadership from the top for all sectors of society to be persuaded to participate. President Betancur talked to the media, including the leading opposition papers. He persuaded the press and the radio and television stations to cooperate, and then he recruited parliamentarians, the Church and the Red Cross, the Rotarians, the Lions, the Scouts, schoolteachers, businessmen, and all of his government ministries. Together, they set out to do what had never been done before in history—in one 3-month period, through three national immunization days, to immunize the great majority of the children of a country against five major diseases then killing and crippling more than tens of thousands of Colombian children each year. There were more than 10,000 TV spots; virtually every parish priest devoted three sermons to the importance of families immunizing their children; every school teacher was involved; etc. For the children of the world, with more than 10,000 dying each day from these six diseases, this accomplishment in Colombia was far more significant than even man's landing on the moon 15 years ago.

The Campaign began in June, 1984. By the end of that August more than three-quarters of the under-fives had been fully immunized. Repeated again last fall with particular emphasis on the most vulnerable under-twos, the total rose to over 80 per

cent . . . sufficient in most areas to provide "herd" immunization—a process which, I should mention, President Carter joined in supporting by visiting Colombia for the third and final day over Thanksgiving weekend. So many children were reached that the "campaign" approach has been able to give way to on-going PHC infrastructures which have been vastly bolstered by the intensive efforts of the past two years.

Colombia illustrates the use of communications with a vengeance. The results demonstrated how spectacularly we can, if a country will only mobilize fully, defend children against these brutal mass killers and cripples. The great majority of Colombian children now have been immunized and a significant start made on teaching millions of mothers how to use oral rehydration therapy, thereby saving the lives of more than 10,000 children a year who would have died only two short years ago while simultaneously saving many millions of dollars for Colombians, and greatly strengthening the Primary Health Care system. Similar techniques are beginning to be used in country after country, with each country tailoring the approach to fit the particular structures and cultures of that country.

It is particularly fascinating to watch as these efforts become politically relevant as well as socially. It becomes good politics for leaders to apply these techniques. It is sufficiently good politics that last year in El Salvador all the feuding factions were persuaded to lay down their arms for the Sundays of February 3rd, March 3rd, and April 23rd and pick up their children—and immunize them. When Salvadorans realized that more children died in that war-torn country from not being immunized than all the people who had been killed in all the fighting the year before, they understood the magnitude of the tragedy. And they were willing to cooperate—or, at least, to not shoot at each other—to allow a National Immunization Campaign to go forward. And so the government, and the guerrillas, and dozens of private groups (including notably the Church and the Red Cross) all set out to protect children, rather than to catch them in the crossfire. A second annual round of this campaign—beginning again with a "National Day of Tranquility"—began last month.

Turkey launched its child survival revolution just last September, with a national immunization week for 5 million under-fives vulnerable to the six diseases which in 1984 took the lives of more than 30,000 small children, and crippled tens of thousands more. Within three months, using and improving on many of the same techniques as Colombia, with imams—more than 50,000—taking the lead in each mosque just as Colombian priests had in their churches, and with the active participation of 95,000 village teachers who returned from summer vacations two weeks early for the purpose, some 85 per cent of all young Turks were fully immunized against these dread diseases.

These success stories are not alone. They are being joined by others—in Addis Ababa, Burkina Faso, China, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Uganda, Egypt and many others. In Egypt, the death toll of more than 100,000 small children annually from the dehydration from diarrhoea has been more than halved in just three years. In early 1983, less than one percent of Egyptian mothers were using oral rehydration therapy, by early 1986 this percentage had risen to over 60 per cent. And massive new efforts are begin-

ning—such as in India, where more than 1 million children died last year as a consequence of not being immunized, but where a programme is not underway to achieve universal immunization of Indian children by 1990 as a "living memorial" to the late *Indira Gandhi*.

Recognizing the critical urgency of protecting children especially in emergency situations such as those afflicting so many African children today, the Health Ministers of Africa have proclaimed 1986 "The Year of Immunization" for Africans, and the great majority of African countries have now committed themselves to achieving universal child immunization by 1990. Thus this Immunization Week in Zimbabwe, with many television and radio as well as other special events. I had the privilege on Sunday of watching a televised football match with the field well placarded with such signs as "Protect your Child—Immunize."

PEOPLE TAKING CHARGE

The Child Survival and Development Revolution rests upon one central foundation embodied in the concept of Primary Health Care: that people can and ought to be enabled to take far greater care of themselves. Indeed, there is very much a common tie between these sets of problems affecting the developing countries and the concerns of many people in North America and Europe and other developed countries. The essence of all of this is a new respect for the capacity of the individual and the importance of governments enhancing and encouraging use of that capacity. Consistent with this, these new technologies are must more relevant to the family—enabling people to take action—than to big institutions with experts in "white coats" intervening. The same is true on new agricultural technologies of relevance to subsistence farmers which are becoming available; the potential for a comparable food security revolution for poor farmers in Africa is just now becoming visible on the horizon.

Empowering parents with knowledge of techniques for child protection is the key to unlocking not only a health revolution but the potential for parents—and communities as a whole—to develop greater confidence in their abilities to control life events as they realize that their own actions can make a major difference as to whether their children live or die. This knowledge alone can act as a springboard and mark the beginning of a major frontier of progress towards educating and empowering women to be proactive rather than reactive and to have confidence in their abilities to do more for themselves in other spheres of life—in food production, trade, sanitation, community health services and other sectors.

Fostering such a climate of realistic hope and possibility is an imperative if we are to contribute effectively to improving the condition of the poor, who too often are afflicted by a sense of powerlessness and fatalistic acceptance of life events.

Halving the infant and child death rate through use of these educational means can also be expected to help greatly accelerate the drop in fertility rates from those now projected and, particularly if associated with vigorous family planning education, could be the most important new intervention in the last 15 years of this century toward reducing population rates. The only question is by how much—whether we are talking about a net reduction of births over deaths of a few million per year, or vastly more than that. Thus, if all of Africa had

the low infant and child death rates now prevailing in Sri Lanka, whose per capita income is less than the \$500 per capita average for Africa, two million fewer children would be dying each year. And if all African countries had the birth rates of Sri Lanka, 9 million fewer babies would be born each year, for a net reduction in African population growth by more than 7 million annually. This is not surprising since most mothers, before sharply reducing their number of births, want to be assured, as noted earlier, that their children will survive.

Combined with accelerated family planning education and greater access to family planning methods, as WHO, UNFPA and UNICEF are seeking to do, the drop in fertility could be major.

The beneficial effects of planned births are also reflected in lower infant mortality and the creation of a more favorable climate to stimulate the socio-psychological development of the child. As the International Conference on Population at Mexico City declared of the beneficial synergism:

"... Through breastfeeding, adequate nutrition, clean water, immunisation programme, oral rehydration therapy and birth spacing, a virtual revolution in child survival could be achieved. The impact would be dramatic in humanitarian and fertility terms."

It is precisely because of the relationship between infant and child mortality reduction through these means and fertility reduction that the present potential for dramatically improving child survival and well-being offers a real prospect for accelerating fertility decline and achieving earlier and lower population stabilization as well.

The advantages of such a prospect for parents—and especially for women—cannot be overstated. Our strategy to accelerate child survival and overall well-being through low cost measures such as growth surveillance oral rehydration, promoting of breastfeeding and immunisation brings far-reaching changes to a woman's life that stretch beyond the area of health of her children. It provides women with a technical and psychological capacity to begin to control important events in their lives; it contributes to emotional tranquillity, substantial financial savings and a major time release in their lives as thrust of child death and continuous illness is greatly eased.

MAKING REVOLUTIONARY CHANGE HAPPEN

So far I have stressed the positive elements of a potential Child Survival and Development Revolution. But it will not happen by itself. There are some explicit "ifs" that will determine whether this sea-change can be created and sustained on national and global scales.

This opportunity for accelerated progress for the protection and survival of children is possible.

If governments embrace this opportunity for accelerated basic services and primary health care as national commitments implemented through national efforts at the highest level in each country, and commanding the participation and cooperation of all relevant government sectors.

If the international cooperation community, which includes fora like this All-Africa Parliamentary Conference as well as institutions like WHO, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNDP, The World Bank and the bilateral agencies, commits its efforts to promoting appreciation of the opportunity and to make available resources to help countries to act.

If the campaign is joined in each country by a vast array of those media, religious in-

stitutions, non-governmental organizations, private enterprises and individuals which can provide or contribute to the service delivery systems necessary to extend this opportunity to the poor and the remote.

If planners and implementors constantly remember that this opportunity for a child survival revolution will only succeed in the long-term if it is integrated with other ongoing efforts, so as to be self-sustaining over the years.

If the implementors remember that the ultimate essence of the endeavour is to empower people to take care of themselves and their children. They should not be dependent solely on medical care institutions, government bureaucracies or even pediatricians for their health, but largely on family resources and community basic services. The objective is not, to use an old saying, to provide fish to feed people for a day (useful as that may be), but to teach people how to fish and feed themselves always. We seek to assure more self-reliant power for the parents through knowledge of oral rehydration therapy, securing the immunisation of their children, continuation of breastfeeding, and use of growth charts to monitor and thereby control the nutritional status of their children.

And,

If a very large number of individuals, especially those individuals such as/or with special knowledge, special status, and a special commitment to the health of children, keep constant pressure on their peers, their professional and social organizations, their governments, and their international agencies to ensure that that resolve remains firm and effective regarding all the other "ifs".

It seems to me that you, as Members of Parliament and colleagues in this All-African forum, have a role to play in assuring the realization of each of these "ifs".

THE CHALLENGE FOR PARLIAMENTARIANS

What can you do? What role is there for the Parliaments of Africa in advancing these techniques? For Parliamentarians as civic leaders?

The critical factor required for effective application of the approaches I have discussed is their promotion as "the thing to do" both at the national level and, possibly even more important, at the level of your parliamentary district.

Legislatively, as Members of Parliaments, you can propose the adoption of National Health Policies for Children in your countries. Such policies, of course, should provide for the promotion of these simple low cost techniques and their incorporation within your formal health and education systems. You can work to make implementation of the Year of Immunisation a priority within your country and in your own district during the remainder of 1986. You can provide incentives for the production and marketing of oral rehydration salts. As leaders of your people, you can publicly demonstrate your confidence in ORT and growth charts by distributing sample packets and charts to health centres, community groups, teachers, and constituents in your districts. You can urge the media to encourage their use, and insist that health workers understand them, use them, and help promote them.

Legislatively, as well, you can protect the practice of breastfeeding. WHO and UNICEF jointly engaged in intensive discussions with international medical community, industry, governments and NGOs, over a several year period, resulting in the 1981

adoption by the World Health Assembly of the "International Code on Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes" as a model to governments of the marketing standards they ought to allow in their own countries and of means to promote breastfeeding. It is extremely important that national codes be enacted in every country to control the abuses of breastmilk substitute promotion where those abuses have already caused terrible damage in terms of children's lives and children's deaths, and to prevent the occurrence of such abuses in other countries.

As participants in this and other Africa-wide fora, you can express yourselves regionally and provide for coordinated regional action. I have previously met with Parliamentarians associations in Asia and Latin America, as well as with the League of Red Cross Societies, the International Pediatric Association, and others. Each of those bodies has resolved in support of accelerating and several are planning programs of action to pursue it. I hope that this Conference will do the same. And I hope that you will seek the support of your colleague legislators—the members of state assemblies and other bodies throughout your countries.

CHILDREN'S ADVOCATES

As Parliamentarians, you are in a unique position. In your role as legislators, you and your Governments establish the national policies and priorities which are the framework of action affecting children and their families. In your role as representatives, you have an intimate awareness of the real needs of your constituents, and can work with them in your districts in assuring their opportunities for expressing those needs. You also know the capacities and limitations of the government to respond to those needs. In a very real sense, you are an essential link between people and policy-makers, between need and fulfillment.

It is to you—the Parliamentarians of Africa—whom we turn for partnership in ensuring that children have their chance.

CAROL CHANNING HONORED

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today the Congressional Arts Caucus was honored to recognize one of our country's most versatile and loved actresses—Carol Channing. While her baby blue eyes and little girl voice make her one of the most recognizable women in the entertainment industry, it is her truly endearing performances that have mesmerized audiences throughout the world.

Gracing stage and screen for the past 45 years, she has brought us many unforgettable roles. In 1948, she debuted as the Gladiola Girl in "Lend an Ear" and then progressed to playing the zany Lorelei Lee in "Gentlemen Prefer Blondes." In her most revered and best known role as Dolly Gallagher Levi in "Hello Dolly!", she was so perfectly cast that the actress and character have remained a fixed picture in theatrical history. She broke records as Dolly with 1,273 performances—never missing a single appearance nor playing to an empty seat.

Dazzling audiences at every opportunity, she also gave four Command Performances

for Her Majesty the Queen of England in "Carol Channing and Her Ten Stourhearted Men." Her energy and magnetism during her performance at London's Drury Lane Theatre prompted the Queen of England to elect Ms. Channing to "Her Majesty's Royal Order of Comedians."

When she was not entertaining in theaters, she was appealing to television audiences nationwide on such shows as "Password," "What's My Line?," "Girl Talk," and six of her own television specials. She also captivated audiences in her many night club appearances in Las Vegas and New York City as well as performed for President John F. Kennedy in 1963 and at the Inaugural Gala for President Lyndon B. Johnson. Currently, Ms. Channing is co-starring with Mary Martin in the new comedy "Legends!" at the National Theatre.

Ms. Channing is a remarkable woman with a plethora of talents that has earned her many great honors and awards. She received a Golden Globe award in 1967 as best supporting actress for her role in the film "Thoroughly Modern Millie"; a special Tony Award for "Hello Dolly!" in 1968; and the Harvard University's Hasty Pudding Theatrical Award as "Woman of the Year" in 1971. Thus it is fitting that the Congressional Arts Caucus honors this legendary lady.

Her sparkle and magnetism have captured the hearts of audiences throughout the world generating joy and laughter. One cannot help but love and adore this larger-than-life performer whose unbeatable combination of talent and energy makes her a legend in her own time.

VOTING RECORD

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it has become my practice from time to time to list my votes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I strongly believe that the people of the Second Congressional District of Arizona have a right to know where I stand on the issues decided by this body, and I have found that printing my record here is the best way to provide that information.

This is not an all inclusive list. I have omitted noncontroversial votes such as quorum calls, motions to resolve into the Committee of the Whole House, and motions to approve the Journal of the previous day.

The descriptions are necessarily somewhat short, and I am sure that some of my constituents will have additional questions about the issues described here. So I invite them to write me for more specifics.

The votes are described as follows:

KEY

1. Rollcall number;
2. Number of the bill or resolution;
3. Title of the bill or resolution;
4. A description of the vote;
5. The outcome of the vote;
6. The vote total;
7. My vote, in the form Y=yes, N=no, and NV=not voting;

8. The vote totals of the Arizona delegation (yes-no-not voting);

9. The date.

VOTES

351. H.R. 3669. Temporary Public Debt Limit Increase. Pepper, D-Fla., motion to consider the rule (H. Res. 306) to provide for House floor consideration of the bill to allow an increase in the limit on the public debt by an amount determined by the secretary of the Treasury as necessary to meet the federal government's obligations without disinvesting the Social Security trust funds or other trust funds, but not to exceed \$1.841 trillion. Motion agreed to 343-77: Y(2-3-0), November 1, 1985. A two-thirds majority of those present and voting (280 in this case) is required to consider a privileged report from the Rules Committee on the same day it is presented to the House.

352. H.R. 3669. Temporary Public Debt Limit Increase. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 306) to provide for House floor consideration of the bill to allow an increase in the limit on the public debt by an amount determined by the secretary of the Treasury as necessary to meet the federal government's obligations without disinvesting the Social Security trust funds or other trust funds, but not to exceed \$1.841 trillion. Adopted 374-44: Y(3-2-0), November 1, 1985.

353. H.R. 3669. Temporary Public Debt Limit Increase. Passage of the bill to allow an increase in the limit on the public debt by an amount determined by the secretary of the Treasury as necessary to meet the federal government's obligations without disinvesting the Social Security trust funds or other trust funds, but not to exceed \$1.841 trillion. Passed 357-61: Y(2-3-0), November 1, 1985.

355. H.J. Res. 36. Women in Armed Services Memorial. Oakar, D-Ohio, motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution to authorize the establishment in the Washington, D.C., area of a memorial to women in the armed services. Motion agreed to 405-0: Y(5-0-0), November 6, 1985.

356. H.R. 2205. Korean War Veteran's Memorial. Oakar, D-Ohio, motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize the establishment in the Washington, D.C., area of a memorial to veterans of the Korean War. Motion agreed to 406-0: Y(5-0-0), November 6, 1985.

357. H.J. Res. 142. Black Revolutionary War Patriots' Memorial. Oakar, D-Ohio, motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution to authorize the establishment in the Washington, D.C., area of a memorial to black veterans of the Revolutionary War. Motion agreed to 408-0: Y(5-0-0), November 6, 1985.

358. H.R. 6. Water Resources Development. Edgar, D-Pa., amendment to apply local cost-sharing requirements to new components of the Mississippi River and Tributaries Project (which are exempt from cost-sharing under the bill), except on the main stem of the Mississippi and Atchafalaya rivers. Rejected 124-296: N(0-5-0), November 6, 1985.

359. H.R. 6. Water Resources Development. Weaver, D-Ore., amendment to deauthorize the flood control dam project for Elk Creek Lake, Rogue River Basin, Oregon. Rejected 200-220: Y(1-4-0), November 6, 1985.

360. H.J. Res. 372. Public Debt Limit. Mack, R-Fla., motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment. All the amendments would provide for declining

annual statutory limits on the federal debt, automatic deficit reductions under certain circumstances, and numerous procedural revisions in the congressional budget process. Motion rejected 177-248: N(4-1-0), November 6, 1985.

361. H.J. Res. 372. Public Debt Limit. Lott, R-Miss., motion to instruct the House conferees to agree to a schedule of deficit reductions to eliminate the federal budget deficit by fiscal 1991, and not to agree to language that provided that the entire bill would be nullified if any part were found to be unconstitutional. Motion rejected 181-239: N(4-1-0), November 6, 1985.

362. H.R. 3036. Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations, Fiscal 1986. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to appropriate \$13,154,375,000 in fiscal 1986 for the Treasury Department, Postal Service, Executive Office of the President and other agencies. Adopted 237-171: Y(1-3-1), November 7, 1985.

363. H. Res. 314. Medvid Defection. Lantos, D-Calif., motion to suspend the rules and adopt the resolution to express the sense of the House that Ukrainian sailor Miroslav Medvid should not be allowed to be removed from the United States until a complete investigation can determine whether he has been accorded all rights due him as a possible defector. Motion agreed to 405-3: Y(5-0-0), November 12, 1985.

364. H.R. 2409. National Institutes of Health Authorizations, Fiscal 1986-88. Passage over President Reagan's Nov. 8 veto, of the bill to reauthorize selected biomedical research activities at the National Institutes of Health through fiscal 1988 and to set up a new arthritis research institute and nursing research center at the institutes. Passed 380-32: Y(4-1-0), November 12, 1985.

365. H.R. Res. 441. Further Continuing Appropriations, Fiscal 1986. Passage of the joint resolution to provide continued spending authority from November 14 through December 12, 1985, for programs and agencies for which regular fiscal 1986 appropriations bills had not been signed into law. The resolution provided that funding levels for programs would depend on the status of uncompleted appropriations bills, be the lower amount of that enacted for fiscal year 1985 or that set in appropriations bills passed by one or both houses but not yet signed into law. Once enacted, appropriations bills for fiscal 1986 would supersede levels set by the continuing appropriations resolution. Passed 259-151: Y(2-3-0), November 12, 1985.

366. H.R. 1616. Plant Closing Notification. Adoption of the rule (H.Res. 313) to provide for House floor consideration of the bill to require employers to provide three months' notice before permanently laying off 50 or more employees. Adopted 233-176: Y(1-4-0), November 12, 1985.

368. H.R. 3038. Department of Housing and Urban Development/Independent Agencies Appropriations, Fiscal 1986. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to appropriate \$57,290,141,490 in new budget authority in fiscal 1986 for the Dept. of Housing and Urban Development and 17 independent agencies. Adopted 268-153: Y(3-2-0), November 13, 1985.

369. H.R. 3721. Temporary Public Debt Limit Increase. Passage of the bill to raise temporarily the ceiling on the federal debt to no more than \$1.904 trillion, from \$1.824 trillion, with the ceiling reverting to the lower number after December 13, and also to direct the secretary of the Treasury to re-

store to the Social Security trust funds and any other federal trust funds any securities disinvested since September 30, 1985. Passed 300-121: Y(3-2-0), November 13, 1985.

370. H.R. 6. Water Resources Development. Passage of the bill to authorize appropriations for water resources development and conservation projects, to establish a National Water Resources Policy Board, and for other purposes. (The Congressional Budget Office estimated that authorizations in the bill could result in federal outlays of \$20 billion through 1998.) Passed 358-60: Y(4-1-0), November 13, 1985.

371. H. Con. Res. 232. Philippine Elections. Adoption of the concurrent resolution to urge that Philippine President Ferdinand E. Marcos honor his pledge that the 1986 elections will be free and fair, and to demand certain steps be taken to insure that result. Adopted 407-0: Y(5-0-0), November 14, 1985.

372. H.R. 1616. Plant Closing Notification. Bartlett, R-Texas, amendment to the Ford, D-Mich., substitute, to delete a provision requiring plant owners to consult with employees before closing a plant in an effort to find alternatives to the shutdown. Adopted 215-193: NV(4-0-1), November 14, 1985.

373. S. 583. Cooper-Hewitt Museum. Oaker, D-Ohio, motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize the appropriation of not more than \$11.5 million in fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1988, to plan and construct an expansion of the Cooper-Hewitt Museum, also known as the National Museum of Design of the Smithsonian Institution. Motion rejected 177-234: Y(1-4-0), November 19, 1985.

374. H. Con. Res. 228. International Terrorism Condemnation. Mica, D-Fla., motion to suspend the rules and adopt the concurrent resolution to condemn all acts of terrorism, specifically including the hijacking of the Achille Lauro and the murder of Leon Klinghoffer, and to call for the creation of an international coordinating committee on terrorism and for proposals to protect American's abroad. Motion agreed to 408-1: Y(5-0-0), November 19, 1985.

375. H.R. 3456. Consumer Product Safety. Waxman, D-Calif., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to reauthorize the Consumer Product Safety Commission for fiscal year 1986-88. Motion rejected 264-146: Y(1-4-0), November 19, 1985.

376. H.R. 2419. Intelligence Agencies Authorizations, Fiscal 1986. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to authorize a secret amount in fiscal 1986 for the CIA, the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency and other intelligence agencies. Adopted 387-21: Y(5-0-0), November 19, 1985.

377. H.R. 3244. Transportation Appropriations, Fiscal 1986. Young, R-Fla., motion to instruct the House conferees on the fiscal 1986 transportation appropriations bill to insist on the House position on funding levels for Coast Guard operating expenses. Motion agreed to 400-6: Y(5-0-0), November 20, 1985.

378. H.R. 3622. Joint Chiefs of Staff Reorganization. Bennett, D-Fla., amendment to allow the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to assign undivided authority for any operation to a single officer. Rejected 47-366: N(0-5-0), November 20, 1986.

379. H.R. 3622. Joint Chiefs of Staff Reorganization. Passage of the bill to change the system of the Joint Chiefs of Staff by strengthening the role of the chairman. Passed 383-27: Y(4-1-0), November 20, 1985.

381. H.R. 1616. Plant Closing Notification. Jeffords, R-Vt., amendment to the Ford, D-Mich., substitute, to require employers of at least 50 full-time employees to give workers 90 days' notice of any plant shutdown or layoff involving at least 100 employees or 30 percent of the work force. Adopted 211-201: Y(1-4-0), November 21, 1985.

382. H.R. 1616. Plant Closing Notification. Roemer, D-La., substitute for the Ford, D-Mich., substitute, to require employers of at least 200 full-time employees to give workers 60 days' notice of any plant shutdown or layoff involving 100 or more workers. Rejected 109-298: N(2-3-0), November 21, 1985.

383. H.R. 1616. Plant Closing Notification. Passage of the bill to require employers of at least 50 full-time employees to give workers 90 days' notice of any plant shutdown or layoff involving at least 100 or more employees or 30 percent of the work force. Rejected 203-208: Y(1-4-0), November 21, 1985.

385. H.R. 1562. Textile Import Quotas. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 325) to provide for House floor consideration of the Rostenkowski, D-Ill., motion to concur in the Senate amendment to limit textile, apparel and shoe imports and to call for negotiations leading to voluntary reductions in world copper production. Adopted 298-109: Y(2-3-0), December 3, 1985.

386. H.R. 1562. Textile Import Quotas. Rostenkowski, D-Ill., motion to concur in the Senate amendment to limit textile, apparel and shoe imports and to call for negotiations leading to voluntary productions in world copper reduction. Motion agreed to (thus cleared for the President) 255-161: Y(3-2-0), December 3, 1985.

387. H.R. 3700. Higher Education Amendments. Bartlett, R-Tex., amendment to retain the current requirement that borrowers begin repaying their Guaranteed Student Loans six months after leaving school, striking the provision of the bill extending the period to nine months. Rejected 177-221: N(4-1-0), December 3, 1985.

388. H.J. Res. 465. Further Continuing Appropriations, Fiscal 1986. Conte, R-Mass., motion to recommit to the Appropriations Committee for revision the joint resolution to provide continued spending authority through Sept. 30, 1986, for government agencies whose regular fiscal 1986 appropriations had not become law. Motion Rejected 200-221: Y(4-1-0), December 4, 1985.

389. H.J. Res. 465. Further Continuing Appropriations, Fiscal 1986. Passage of the joint resolution to provide continued spending authority through Sept. 30, 1986, for government agencies whose regular fiscal 1986 appropriations had not become law. Passed 212-208: Y(1-4-0), December 4, 1985.

390. H.R. 3700. Higher Education Amendments. Bartlett, R-Tex., amendment to cut the fiscal 1987 authorization for programs in the bill other than student aid to fiscal 1985 appropriations levels, and to allow increases in fiscal 1988-91 only to compensate for inflation. Rejected 127-289: N(4-1-0), December 4, 1985.

391. H.R. 3700. Higher Education Amendments. Passage of the bill to reauthorize college student aid and other programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-329) through fiscal 1991. Passed 350-67: Y(2-3-0), December 4, 1985.

393. H.R. 3424. Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Appropriations, Fiscal 1986. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to appropriate \$94,861,859,000 in fiscal 1986 funding and \$11,687,750,000 in advance fiscal 1987-88 funding for the Department of Labor, Health and Human

Services, and Education, and related agencies. Adopted 356-54: Y(4-1-0), December 5, 1985.

394. H.R. 2817. Superfund Reauthorization, Fiscal 1986-90. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 331) to provide for House floor consideration of the bill to authorize \$10 billion in fiscal years 1986-90 for the "superfund" hazardous-waste cleanup program. Adopted 376-33: Y(4-1-0), December 5, 1985.

395. H.R. 2817. Superfund Reauthorization, Fiscal 1986-90. Daub, R-Neb., amendment to relieve from liability for hazardous waste cleanup persons who can prove that they had nothing to do with substances leaking from the site. Rejected 62-330: N(2-3-0), December 5, 1985.

396. H.R. 2817. Superfund Reauthorization, Fiscal 1986-90. Edgar, D-Pa., amendment to require companies to make public an inventory of their emissions of chemicals known to cause or suspected of causing cancer, birth defects or other chronic diseases. Adopted 183-166: NV(0-4-1), December 5, 1985.

398. H.R. 2817. Superfund Reauthorization, Fiscal 1986-90. McKernan, R-Maine, amendment to allow eight states with oil spill liability funds to continue to operate those funds after enactment of the federal oil spill liability program contained in the bill. (The bill would phase out state funds in three years.) Rejected 142-256: N(1-4-0), December 6, 1985.

399. H. Con. Res. 239. Ireland-United Kingdom Agreement. Fascell, D-Fla., motion to suspend the rules and adopt the concurrent resolution to commend the governments of Ireland and the United Kingdom for reaching an agreement on measures to begin a peace process in Northern Ireland. Motion agreed to 380-1: Y(5-0-0), December 9, 1985.

400. H.R. 1083. Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal. Udall, D-Ariz., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to establish requirements and deadlines for carrying out interstate compacts for the establishment and operation of regional disposal facilities for low-level radioactive waste. Motion agreed to 378-0: Y(5-0-0), December 9, 1985.

PROSPECTS FOR SDI IN THE NEAR TERM

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the House will take up the question of funding for the President's strategic defense initiative. From a request of \$4.8 billion—only 1.5 percent of the total defense budget—the Armed Services Committee has already cut \$1.4 billion. Amendments are pending that would cut funding even further—taking our various research efforts well below what they would have been if they had followed normal funding paths.

And yet, as Dr. Robert Jastrow writes, "possibilities for early deployment of a robust near-term defense against ballistic missiles have come out of the first 2 years of research on the problem." In short, here is a program where our defense dollars are yielding results more promising and more quickly than we

ever could have hoped—and the Congress is poised to cut the program drastically.

I believe that the time has come for a wide and open national debate on strategic defense for America. Because if we are serious about fielding defenses that will protect us against Soviet ballistic missiles, critics in the Congress should not be permitted to undercut that supremely important effort through inadequate funding or lack of understanding.

And we must reconfigure the program, so that the strategic defense initiative becomes something more than a research only effort. Most importantly, we need a commitment to develop and deploy strategic defenses, at the earliest possible date.

Contrary to some administration spokesmen, SDI is not merely a faraway dream. It can be a present day reality, using technology tried and tested and readily available to us. We are not lacking in technical know-how; we are only lacking the decision to deploy.

In Friday's Washington Times, Dr. Robert Jastrow, one of the Nation's leading experts in strategic defense concepts and technologies, writes of what we can do in the next 5 years to field strategic defenses. Skeptics in both the Congress and the administration would do well to review his words; and then let them answer the question, why not defend America? And why not help defend our allies and friends?

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Dr. Jastrow's challenging article, "SDI Results: A Defense in Five Years", be reprinted in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, Aug. 8, 1986]

SDI RESULTS: A DEFENSE IN 5 YEARS

(By Robert Jastrow)

Some senior government officials have suggested that nothing practical—that is, nothing deployable—can come out of the Strategic Defense Initiative for 15 or 20 years.

It appears that important SDI programs aimed at deployment of a nationwide defense in five years have not been brought to their attention. These possibilities for early deployment of a robust near-term defense against ballistic missiles have come out of the first two years of research on the problem by SDI and its contractors.

The business end of the near-term defense being developed by SDI is the "smart bullet," a slug of metal with a computer brain and a device sensitive to heat. The smart bullet tracks the enemy warhead by the delicate heat it emits, like a snake tracking a small mammal. The smart bullet collides with the enemy warhead at the end of the chase and destroys it by the force of the collision. It is highly effective.

The "smart bullet" projects in SDI haven't received as much attention as the laser and the particle beam, but they have the advantage of using a tried-and-tested technology that could be in place and protecting America in five years.

Smart bullets resemble the heat-seeking missiles used routinely in air defense, except that they are mounted on rockets that can carry them to heights of several hundred miles. An experimental smart bullet developed by Lockheed was tested against a U.S. Minuteman warhead in 1984. The test was completely successful. The smart bullet zeroed in on the oncoming warhead at a height of 100 miles and scored a bull's-eye collision. The speed of the impact gave the smart bullet the explosive power of more

than 10 times its weight in TNT. The collision broke the warhead into an estimated 1 million fragments.

Another smart bullet developed by LTV that weighed less than 50 pounds was tested at a height of hundreds of miles against a target in space last year with complete success—another bull's-eye.

The most effective defense using the smart bullets will deploy them on satellites orbiting the Earth. This satellite-based defense can be available by 1995 and possibly somewhat earlier. In even nearer-term defense planned by SDI, the smart bullets will be carried on small rockets launched from the ground.

That makes it sound as if this defense only protects a small area, like a missile silo. However, while the smart bullets are launched from the ground, they intercept the enemy warheads high up in space, at an altitude of as much as 500 miles. This is a key factor in the usefulness of the defense. As a consequence of the high-altitude interception, the "footprint" of the defense, as the region it protects is called, is a continental-sized area including all of the United States and Canada. This is not a defense of missile silos, but a true area defense of the North American continent.

But smart bullets are not the whole story of the near-term defense. The trouble with the smart bullet is that it is not all that smart. Smart bullets have a deadly accuracy once they get within 20 miles or so of the warhead, but first they have to be told approximately where the warhead is: they aren't clever enough to find it just anywhere in the void of the heavens.

That requires the capability of the Airborne Operational Adjunct, or AOA, one of the most important projects in SDI, perhaps the most important for the near-term defense.

The AOA is a Boeing 767 airliner that has been stripped and reequipped with special instruments for detecting warheads coming at the United States. The AOA has "eyes" that can see the warhead anywhere in space and find out which way it is headed. Another instrument—a laser beam used as a radar—tells the AOA how far away the warhead is. The AOA turns this information over to the launcher sitting on the ground with a smart bullet on its nose, and the launcher then sends the smart bullet in the right direction.

The AOA and its infrared "eyes" and laser radar are as essential to the SDI near-term defense as the smart bullet itself.

Lockheed is working on a plan for the near-term defense of America, based on an experimental system called ERIS, that uses smart bullets and intercepts the warheads at high altitudes, so that the "footprint" covers all of North America. It looks very promising. But the system based on ERIS has two problems. First, it uses radars on the ground to pick up and track the warheads, instead of the airborne "eye" on the AOA. Radars have the advantage that we can deploy the smart bullet ERIS defense more quickly because the United States already has these radars in place. They have the disadvantage that a radar is a large, fragile, and immobile object, which can be blown up by the enemy at the beginning of the attack. The AOA, flying in an irregular flight pattern, cannot be targeted and is relatively invulnerable. ERIS plus AOA is the winning combination.

The second problem is the fact that a high-altitude smart bullet only works well above the atmosphere; it can't catch a ballistic missile when it is lower down and

inside the atmosphere. Another program being managed by SDI provides that capability. It also catches the leakers through the high-altitude layer of defense. The low-altitude smart bullet is called HEDI and is being developed by McDonnell Douglas.

How effective will the defense based on ERIS-HEDI-AOA be?

Once the smart bullet gets off the ground and the AOA points it in the direction of the warhead, the probability of its hitting the warhead is close to 100 percent. The main problem is launching the rocket that gets the smart bullet off the ground. With regular ground crews, the chance of a good launch is 75 to 80 percent. With more expensive and more highly trained crews, the success rate goes up to better than 90 percent; the success rate with the Thor-Delta rocket averages 96 percent.

That's for one layer of defense. We would probably want to take two shots at each warhead—one far out and high up, based on ERIS, and the second close in and lower down, based on HEDI, to catch the low-altitude missiles and the leakers through the first layer. If each layer is 75 percent effective, the two layers together have an effectiveness of 93 percent. With a high-quality launch operation, the combined effectiveness can go up to 99 percent.

We're heading toward the question of costs. Before we get there, we have to answer the question: how many warheads can the enemy throw at the United States? That determines how many smart bullets we need. At present, the Soviets have about 6,000 accurate first-strike warheads. Adding the Soviet submarine-based missiles, their new fifth-generation missiles, and some that are rumored to have squirreled away, we arrive at about 10,000 warheads as the threat probably facing the United States in the 1990s. That means a requirement of 10,000 smart bullets.

But the adversary can also deploy decoys—flimsy, lightweight objects that look like warheads but aren't—to confuse our defense. The smart bullets planned for our near-term defense can't tell a decoy from a warhead. The infrared "eyes" on the AOA probably won't be able to tell them apart, either. That means we will have to shoot at everything in sight, which means that we need more interceptors.

How many decoys will the adversary put up? A credibly disguised decoy weighs about a tenth as much as a genuine warhead. If the Soviets take a couple of warheads off every missile and replace them with decoys, they can throw 20,000 decoys at our defense, in addition to the 10,000 warheads. Shooting at everything in sight, we need 30,000 smart bullets. The second layer of the defense based on HEDI would require another 10,000 smart bullets. That's 40,000 smart bullets in all.

(Forty thousand smart bullets seems an impractically large number. For perspective on the matter, however, the Soviets have more than 13,000 surface-to-air missiles, similar to our smart bullets but somewhat less capable, already deployed for air defense.)

Getting back to costs: each smart bullet with its rocket will cost about \$1 million. For comparison, the Maverick air-to-air missile with a similar degree of sophistication but a smaller rocket, costs \$60,000 in large quantities. At \$1 million each, the necessary 40,000 smart bullets will cost \$40 billion.

The AOA aircraft are expensive and have to be added in. They will cost between \$300 million and \$400 million each, and a fleet of

15 to 20 will be needed to keep three or four in the air at all times. The bill for the AOA fleet may run to \$10 billion dollars in round numbers. The cost of the two-layer defense is \$50 billion, spread over several years.

The U.S. currently spends between \$40 billion and \$50 billion each year on modernizing our offensive nuclear forces—nuclear weapons, missiles, bombers, submarines, and so on. Between now and the late 1990s we will probably spend \$500 billion on these forces, designed to deter a potential adversary's attacks by the threat of mass destruction of his territory.

Viewed against the background of these vast expenditures, the near-term defenses being worked on by the SDI seem to me to be a way of saving the taxpayer's money, as well as his life.

A TRIBUTE TO RICHARD KOSINSKI

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I pay tribute to a remarkable man whose courage and spirit truly serves as an inspiration to all—Mr. Richard Kosinski.

I have corresponded with Mr. Kosinski during the past 2 years regarding my legislation to outlaw employment discrimination against persons on the basis of cancer history. During this time, I have come to know him as a strong ally in my fight to outlaw this violation of rights, but more importantly, I have come to know him as a friend. He is an intelligent, sensitive, and determined man who has battled cancer, employment discrimination, and social prejudice—and finally won.

Richard Kosinski is a native Chicagoan. He attended Notre Dame High School in Niles and then earned a bachelor of science degree in psychology from Loyola University. After working as a pricing analyst for a large food and paper products distributor, he returned to Loyola to manage one of the development programs. At the same time, he began pursuing his master's in public administration degree. Soon, Loyola promoted Rick to be director of dental development at its medical center in Maywood. He then accepted a position with the American Fund for Dental Health.

Unfortunately, life was not all smooth sailing for Rick. In 1980, he was diagnosed as having cancer. After undergoing intensive chemotherapy treatments, he has experienced no recurrence of the disease. Yet, we, as a society, have not allowed Rick to remember his cancer history as just that—a person for whom cancer is history. He endured 5 years of job rejections and social discrimination that would have completely devastated most of us. Yet, Rick was able to pick up the pieces of his life and move forward.

Richard Kosinski is now director of development at the Niles Township Sheltered Workshop, an organization assisting the elderly and handicapped adults. He gratefully acknowledges that "the organization practices what it preaches, focusing on ability rather than 'per-

ceived' disability." It is a lesson that should be taught to employers across the entire Nation.

Rick has told me that his experience with cancer has taught him a great deal about human suffering and the problems of the sick and the handicapped. It has also taught him a great deal about people, and society as well. Yet Rick Kosinski exudes a genuine positive attitude that engulfs you in the spirit of helping and caring. He is an inspiration to the millions of Americans in this Nation with a cancer history. It is for people like Rick that I dedicate my fight to end employment discrimination against persons on the basis of cancer history.

HONORING THE STATUE OF LIBERTY

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, this year we celebrate the 100th anniversary of the quintessential symbol of American freedom—the Statue of Liberty. To commemorate this national event, Walter Kasian, one of my constituents, and a personal friend who came to Ellis Island as an immigrant, wrote a moving tribute which I am pleased to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

THE STATUE OF LIBERTY

My humble memories of long ago
One cold November dawn
Ocean liner was moving very slow
On the deck was hushing sound.
Whispering
America, America, America
Our hearts beating with joy
Tears rolling down our faces
Mother hugging baby boy
Family joined in an embrace.
Whispering
America, America, America
There she was in all her glory
Flaming torch in her hand
Lady Liberty—what a sight, what a story
Showing the way to freedom land.
Whispering
America, America, America
We had almost nothing, clothes on our back
Wealth of courage in our hearts
Few things in our burlap sack
With God's help, we will make our start.
Whispering
America, America, America
We passed through the golden door
To begin new life living free
Following us there will be more
Tired and poor from across the sea.
Whispering
America, America, America
Always remembering the engraved words on
the Statue of Liberty
Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled
Masses yearning to breathe free
The wretched refuse of your teeming shores
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to
me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"
by Walter Kasian.

ADMINISTRATION SCORES
ANOTHER TRADE VICTORY

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, after a 16-year trade dispute, the United States and the European Economic Community [EC] have decided to settle the citrus/pasta/almond war which has intensified in the past few years. In my judgment, that was a stunning victory, even though some of the elements of the agreement have yet to be finalized. The mere fact that the EC has agreed to settle is miraculous.

This dispute began 16 years ago when the United States protested the EC's preferential treatment of citrus from Mediterranean countries. Efforts to negotiate a settlement at the GATT have failed in the past. This caused our Government to retaliate by raising tariffs on EC pasta products which we allege are subsidized. Since the EC felt that our retaliation was unwarranted, it, in turn, retaliated by increasing tariffs on U.S. lemons and walnuts. Without a settlement, this retaliation and counterretaliation could have gone on forever.

Under the agreement, the EC will either lower tariffs or increase the quota on oranges, lemons, and almonds. The United States will make similar concessions to the EC on certain cheeses, olive oil, and olives. The dispute over the allegedly subsidized pasta products has not yet been resolved, but will be in the near future.

Considering the complexity and the political fervor that has arisen over this dispute, the agreement was a remarkable success for the administration. I commend them for it.

PREFERENCE TO AMERICAN-
GROWN FOODS FOR RESALE
IN U.S. COMMISSARIES

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, the House adopted an amendment on August 12, 1986, offered by myself and Chairman DE LA GARZA, that requires the Department of Defense [DOD], when acquiring food products for resale through commissaries located in the United States, to give preference to U.S. companies that use American agricultural commodities in their final food products. My amendment requires the Department to issue guidelines on the implementation of this policy within 60 days of enactment of this act.

I recognize that commissaries are very important to military patrons and are intended to operate similarly to commercial stores. I understand that commissaries now purchase goods primarily from American companies. However, my concern is that American farmers are not benefiting under this policy since an American firm can use foreign commodities in its final products and still get the preference. My amendment requires commissaries located in the United States to alter their pur-

chasing practices to give preference to U.S. companies whose food products use commodities grown in this country.

My amendment is limited to commissaries located in the United States, where the bulk of commissary sales are made; it would not apply to commissaries located in foreign countries. In fiscal year 1985, commissary sales totaled \$4.8 billion, \$4 billion of which were sold in the United States. Food product purchases accounted for about 75 to 85 percent of total sales.

For specific products, commissaries usually carry budget brands and name brands. Companies compete at one of these levels to place their products on commissary shelves. My amendment would not end this system. It only requires that commissaries, in determining which products to use for each category, give preference to U.S. companies using American-grown commodities. It is also my intent that the American terminal market system would be utilized for the purchase of specific products that are unavailable in the United States.

American farmers are under severe financial stress, greater than any encountered since the Great Depression. More than one-third of our Nation's commercial-sized family farms continue to experience serious financial problems. Not only are our farmers in for another dismal year, but farm banks are increasingly more vulnerable—as more and more farmers are unable to service their debt. The FDIC reported that net loan losses at agricultural banks nearly tripled over the past 2 years and that about 40 percent of the Nation's problem banks are farm banks. This year, about 70 farm banks are expected to fail—the highest number of failures since the Depression. Communities throughout the Nation are experiencing the effects of this crisis as many are faced with a loss of population and declining property values, tax revenue, and public services.

A combination of a sharp decline in farm exports and a rising flood of agricultural imports is forcing American farmers out of their traditional markets and pushing many farmers into bankruptcy. In May and June, \$420 million more in farm products was imported into the United States than exported, the first monthly agricultural trade deficits reported since 1959.

But the steady rise in food imports is not always apparent to the American consumer. Fresh fruits and vegetables rarely carry labels of origin, and frozen and canned foods sold under American labels frequently contain foreign commodities. Lower production costs in Mexico and other Latin American countries have prompted a growing number of American food companies to set up food production facilities abroad and enter into contracts with foreign farmers, according to a recent New York Times article. The text of this article follows my statement.

I am also concerned that the American consumer may be exposed to pesticide residue levels that exceed the stricter standards imposed in this country. The inspection of imported raw commodities and processed food products is far from adequate. In addition, certain pesticides banned for use in this country, such as EDB and DDT, may be used legally on imported food products. All food imports should have to meet the same standards as

those required for American-grown products. This would be one step toward restoring fair competition for our American farmers.

These conditions have wreaked havoc with American farmers. In the Salinas area, which is located in my congressional district, seven large farms and food companies closed between April 1985 and February 1986. These closures resulted in the loss of 3,090 jobs.

A recent case in my district illustrates the need for this preference requirement. Shaw's Frozen Foods, a frozen food processing facility, announced this year that it was going to buy raw produce only from American growers. Mr. Shaw explains that he initiated this policy because he was frustrated at buying less and less of his vegetables from local farmers, and more and more from Mexican or Guatemalan farmers. The reason was price. He wanted to support American farmers and help reverse the severe depression in the local farm economy. Mr. Shaw went a step further and set up a nonprofit organization to identify and promote the purchase of American-grown farm products. This organization developed a "Save Our Farmers—Buy American" logo to alert the American consumer to products grown and processed in the United States.

Shaw's Frozen Foods was operating under a purchase agreement with DOD for commissary sales. But, earlier this year, DOD dropped its agreement with Shaw's and instead entered into an agreement with a United States food company that gets most of its raw products from Mexico and Guatemala. It makes no sense at all to penalize American companies that are promoting the products of American farmers.

In conclusion, while I am pleased that DOD now gives preference to American food companies, it does not assure that their products originate with American farmers. The rising flood of imported commodities hurts American farmers and American food processing companies that operate under buy American-grown policies, exacerbates U.S. trade deficits, and exposes U.S. consumers to frequently unknown risks from excessive amounts of pesticides.

I recognize the budget constraints faced by all agencies as we work to reduce the Federal deficit. We must work to ensure that each Federal program is targeted to achieve the greatest good for this country. I believe it is in the best interests of this country to extend this American-grown preference, and thus reward U.S. companies that assist American farmers.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 3, 1986]

LOOKING ABROAD TO FILL OUR BELLIES

(By Keith Schneider)

WASHINGTON.—Every morning, 18-wheelers, gears grinding, back into the loading dock at the Giant Food supermarket on Rockville Pike just north of the capital. Aluminum doors clatter open, clerks scurry inside, and a dazzling array of food begins to move from the trailers to the shelves.

It is a ritual repeated at supermarkets all over America, and one that has not changed much in the last decade. What has changed, though, is the origin of the food being unloaded.

Almost unnoticed in the national anxiety over rising imports of autos, steel, textiles,

and electronic appliances, is the steadily increasing amount of foreign food consumed by Americans. Pork flows in from Canada, beef from Australia, tomatoes, broccoli and cauliflower from Mexico, olives from Portugal, apples from Chile, orange juice from Brazil, mushrooms from Taiwan—a myriad of foods that, despite transportation costs and United States tariffs, still carry lower price tags than their American counterparts.

This makes imported food a blessing for American consumers, but a new nightmare for American farmers—already driven out of many of their traditional export markets and now increasingly unable to undersell foreign competitors even at home. The changing economics is driving American food processors such as the Campbell Soup Company and Pillsbury abroad and prompting American farmers to protest against the foreign growers stealing domestic markets.

"Most Americans have no idea all this is going on," said Steve Teixeira, a community worker with California Rural Legal Assistance, a federally sponsored group that provides legal services to the rural poor. "Our ability to produce fruits and vegetables in this country is disappearing."

Florida farmers, for example, who once dominated the winter vegetable market, now produce less than half of the tomatoes, peppers, cucumbers and other produce eaten by Americans between December and April. Mexican growers, financed by American companies, supply more than 70 percent of the winter vegetables during January and February, and control about half of that market in other months. Imported beef now includes 9 percent of the American market, and rice from Thailand, last year was sold in California for less than the American product, despite a huge domestic harvest and historic surpluses.

The insult of imports appears to be coming from Canada, whose wheat is being shipped to New York and other border states. Wheat was the one food that American farmers thought nobody else could ever supply as inexpensively as they for domestic use.

Imported foods are not newcomers to American pantries, of course. Danish and Polish hams, Iranian and Russian caviar, French wines and cheeses and Italian olive oil have long been considered gourmet foods well beyond their American counterparts in quality, cachet—and price. But now the imported foods flowing into American supermarkets are the staples that until recently were among the mainstays of this country's farm economy.

Brazilian growers, for example, with the help of government subsidies, low-cost land, and inexpensive labor, can produce juice oranges for less than one-third of the costs of Florida growers. Few agricultural economists expect the cost advantages overseas to change very soon, which spells sobering news for American farmers.

Unlike Toyotas or Sonys, imported food is not easily identifiable. Fresh produce rarely bears a label. And often, canned or frozen foods sold under American labels contain foreign ingredients. The Campbell Soup Company, which operates a beef processing plant in Argentina, imports much of the beef used in its chunky soups. Minute Maid, Tropicana and other major brands of frozen and chilled juices use a 50-50 blend of Brazilian and American oranges.

With Americans eating so much foreign food, the nation's balance of trade in agriculture—once a huge source of export earnings—is dipping into deficit. In May and

June, the nation imported \$419.7 million more farm products, edible and non-edible, than it exported, the first monthly agricultural trade deficits in a generation. For the year as a whole, the United States may well import more food than it exports for the first time since 1959.

All told, food imports are expected to total \$24 billion this year, a record amount. Though imports make up only 6 percent of the total \$400 billion spent on food in the United States, the percentage has nearly doubled since 1980. And in some food sectors, imports make up a sizable portion of the market. According to retailers, imports compose 40 percent of the \$6 billion to \$8 billion specialty gourmet food market and 20 percent of the market for fresh fruits and vegetables.

Five years ago, the United States employed a positive balance of trade of more than \$1 billion in international sales of jams, jellies, bakery products, canned goods and other processed foods. Last year, the United States registered a deficit of nearly \$4 billion in the trade of processed food, according to a recent Department of Commerce survey.

Exports still are trying to assess the long-term significance of the decline in the balance of food trade, which reflects—in part at least—the high value of the dollar until recent months. "we're importing a fraction of what we consume, but we can't afford to ignore this sector like we have our other basic industries," said Dave Ingersoll, chief of the agriculture, fisheries and forest products division at the International Trade Commission.

Others insist that the trend could signal a long-term disintegration in the nation's ability to provide food at reasonable prices for American consumers. "This may be a greater threat to the consumer than we realize," said Doyle Conner, Commissioner of Agriculture in Florida.

Indeed, food executives' comments sound ominously like those of steel executives in the 1970's. "We have a five-year-old vegetable processing plant in Wisconsin that is the newest one that I know of," said Gary Klingl, a vice president at the Pillsbury Company in Minneapolis. "Most in our industry are a lot older than that. There just isn't any incentive now to invest in new plants."

America's switch from the world's dominant food exporter to its second largest food importer behind West Germany is likely to strengthen those on Capitol Hill who seek to insulate American industry from foreign competition, and those who are pressuring the Congress for changes in the nation's farm policy. "The entire emphasis in American agriculture has been on sending raw grain overseas," said Bill Janis, an economist at the Department of Commerce. "But that policy is dead as dinosaurs. Argentina, Canada, Brazil, France, China, India—everybody's competing with us in major grains, and we're losing our share of the market. Let's stop pretending we're going to get back to where we were five or ten years ago, and concentrate on exporting higher value products."

Among the most crucial changes affecting American food imports and exports has been the continuing strength of the dollar, which is still rising against the currencies of the nation's principal agricultural competitors—Canada, Mexico, Australia, Argentina and Brazil. The dollar's high value has made foreign farm and food products more attractive here, while raising the cost of American food overseas.

Last year, the high value of the dollar and the lower cost of grain overseas prompted Cargill Inc., a major American grain trader, to buy 15,000 tons of Argentine wheat for distribution in the United States. American farmers learned of the sale, and forced Cargill to divert the load to Europe before it arrived in New Orleans.

But that did not slow the flow of imported grain. Flour mills and bakeries along the Canadian border last year imported 270,000 tons of Canadian wheat for \$37 million; American grain processing companies imported 400,000 tons of Swedish oats; and 50,000 tons of rice from Thailand flowed into California. Even after shipping and duties, Thai rice cost less than American rice.

Last year Congress and the Reagan Administration attempted to correct the grain trade situation by enacting a law that provides American grain farmers with the highest subsidy and income support payments in history. The program is expected to cost the Government more than \$30 billion this year. The new law lowers Government-set grain prices to match those on the world market and make American grain more competitive. Most analysts believe grain exports should stop declining over the next few months as the law takes effect.

But they are not at all sure if American grain farmers will begin to recapture shares of the world market they have been losing since 1981. The reason: foreign nations have vowed to maintain their market shares by subsidizing farmers and pricing their commodities below those of the United States, no matter what the cost. As a result, the trade in grain has broken out into a full-scale global diplomatic war in recent months.

Fruit and vegetable growers, hurt by the high cost of field labor and huge debt payments, are also losing ground.

A farm worker picking grapes in California can earn \$10 an hour. A field worker in Chile earns between \$2 and \$3 a day. The wage rate differences, combined with several other factors like lower costs for land and capital, have made it possible to fly a load of apples all the way from Chile to Boston and sell them for less than apples grown in New York.

These lower costs abroad have provided American food companies with powerful incentives to move some of their food production capacity outside the United States. In Mexico, 25 of the largest American food companies—Campbell Soup, Pillsbury, Castle & Cooke, General Foods—have developed extensive food-producing interests. All have signed contracts with Mexican farmers to grow fruits and vegetables. Most either built or brought canneries, and other processing installations.

American food companies and importing firms now finance, under contracts, loans, and other financial arrangements, virtually all of the Mexican fruit and vegetable production aimed at the United States market, according to professionals familiar with the industry. The American investment has pushed the value of Mexican fruits and vegetables exported to the United States from \$29 million in the mid-1960's to more than \$525 million last year. In all, Mexico exported nearly \$1.5 billion in food to the United States last year. Only Canada and Brazil export more.

American food companies are quick to defend their overseas involvements. "American consumers want the variety," said Barry Scher, a spokesman for Giant Food. "Also, a

fair portion of the imported food is in crops that come from Central and South America during the winter when we aren't growing most of our fruits and vegetables. We now provide a year-round supply of fresh produce."

While Mexico has attracted the lion's share of American investments in recent years, food companies have found other Latin American countries receptive to their production plans.

Castle & Cooke, a Honolulu-based multinational, has interests for fresh fruit production in Chile, the Dominican Republic and Peru. Burger King, a division of Pillsbury, produces six million pounds of beef in Costa Rica under contract with Central American ranchers, enough to supply 2 percent of its hamburger needs in the United States. Orange juice makers are not only using foreign-grown oranges, but some American companies have also established overseas citrus processing plants.

And Chilean grape growers are hoping to have the same impact as their citrus counterparts in other Latin American countries. They have increased their production tenfold in a decade and now are the primary competitors to California growers. Chile table grape sales now account for 22 percent of the \$670 million American market.

"They pay nothing for water down there," said Bruce Obbink, president of the California Table Grape Commission, which represents 1,100 grape growers. "They're paying \$2 or \$3 a day for labor. Our labor costs \$10 an hour or more. And they're getting greedy. We're sending a team down there in September to talk to the growers, and tell them of our concerns, and warn them that unless things change, there's going to be a shootout in Congress over this."

The Pillsbury Company, which markets fresh, frozen, and canned vegetables under the Green Giant label, opened a plant three years ago in Mexico to freeze broccoli and cauliflower. The installation now accounts for one-third of the company's production of the two crops.

"There are cost advantages," said Mr. Klingl, the vice president. "We can freeze a pound of broccoli in our plant in Mexico and bring it to our plant in Belvedere, Ill., for about 35 cents a pound. In California, it costs us about 45 cents a pound."

"But it's not so easy to operate down there. You have to do everything yourself to realize the cost advantages. You have capital investments. It's a foreign country, and more difficult to work in. When you get it all established, it'll pay off. We're not breaking the bank on it, but it does pay."

According to the Campbell Soup Company, the costs of processing tomatoes run more than \$70 a ton in Ohio, where the company operates a tomato paste plant. In California, the cost is roughly \$54 a ton. In Mexico, the company can produce a ton of tomato paste for \$17.

As a result, the amount of land in Mexico devoted to tomato production is expanding. In Baja, California, Mexican growers, financed by American importing companies and produce marketers, have opened more than 20,000 acres of new farmland in recent years, with 15,000 acres used for fresh tomato production, according to a report by the California Farm Bureau Federation.

"Production in Mexico is growing by leaps and bounds," said Rocky Springstead, president of Produce Specialists in Chula Vista, Calif., a marketing and importing company that finances and contracts vegetable production in Mexico. "We can produce an acre

of fresh tomatoes for less than half what it would cost in California. That has brought an awful lot of American money to Mexico."

By far the largest American participant in Mexican fresh produce is Castle & Cooke, which sells fresh and processed fruit under the Dole Label. Though Castle & Cooke continues to produce lettuce, broccoli, cauliflower and celery under contracts to California and Arizona farmers, it has exported much of the high-value fruit and vegetable production to Mexico and other regions of Latin America. The company signed a joint-venture agreement in Mexico with the Canelos Brothers, one of the world's largest produce growers for the production of honeydew melons, tomatoes, cucumbers, bell peppers and other commodities that Castle & Cooke imports to the United States.

The cost savings in Mexico have resulted in sizable reductions in several of California's fruit and vegetable industries despite an increase in the demand by American consumers for fresh produce. In San Diego County, for example, farmers planted 2,000 acres of fresh tomatoes this year. Six years ago, according to the California Farm Bureau Federation, farmers there planted 5,300 acres.

Between April 1985 and February 1986, seven large farms and food companies closed in the Salinas area, an important vegetable and fruit producing region south of San Francisco, resulting in the loss of 3,000 jobs.

The lower production costs in Mexico have become so pronounced in recent years that American farmers themselves have begun building processing facilities in Mexico and importing Mexican food. Diamond Walnut, a cooperative of nut growers, recently opened a new plant in Tijuana. Diamond Walnut now imports processed walnut products into the United States. And Tri-Valley growers, a cooperative of 800 California produce farmers, said earlier this year that it was considering importing tomatoes from Mexico to process in one of its California plants.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4428, AS REPORTED

OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of title III of division A (page 85, after line 12), add the following new section:

SEC. 314. PREFERENCE FOR UNITED STATES AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS IN COMMIS-SARY FOOD PURCHASES.

(a) PREFERENCE REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall require that, when acquiring food products through the use of competitive procedures for resale through commissary stores located in the United States, the Department of Defense gives preference to United States companies that use United States agricultural commodities in the products sold to the Department of Defense.

(b) GUIDELINES.—The Secretary shall develop guidelines to implement the preference required by subsection (a). Such guidelines shall be developed and implemented not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The Secretary shall transmit a copy of the guidelines to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives as soon as they are developed.

(c) REPORT.—The Secretary shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the implementation of this section.

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1987

SPEECH OF

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 6, 1986

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5294), making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, it is important that we look at the administration's record on customs. This is because there is much talk now about the war on drugs, and how the President is committed to eradicate this national problem. I applaud his commitment. However, I am concerned when his focus lies only with instituting a massive drug testing program for Federal employees and not with enforcement or efforts to stop drugs where they often can be found—at our borders.

The administration's record of lack of support for Customs drug enforcement efforts over the course of the last 6 years is clear. Each and every budget request made by the Reagan administration to the Congress has proposed substantial reductions in staff positions for the Customs Service.

For example, in fiscal year 1985, the President requested \$602 million for Customs, and 12,447 average positions. This was a reduction of 954 positions, 612 out of inspection and control; 310 in tariff and trade enforcement; and 32 in tactical interdiction.

The Congress rejected this recommendation, and instead provided 13,418 positions and \$650 million for Customs.

For fiscal year 1986, the President requested only 12,531 average positions, and \$639 million for Customs. This was another recommended cut of 887 positions, 351 in inspection and control; 437 in tariff and trade; 60 in tactical interdiction; and 39 in investigations.

Again, the Congress rejected this recommendation and for this year provided 14,041 average positions and \$717 million, which was subsequently reduced by Gramm/Rudman to \$682 million and 13,264 positions. Fortunately, this cutback was reversed in the supplemental, restoring the original appropriation.

For this year, the year of the "War on Drugs", for which the President has proclaimed his "full" support, he again requested a cutback in customs personnel, only requesting 12,494 positions and \$693 million. This represents a cut of 770 positions, 427 out of inspection and control; 241 out of tariff and trade enforcement; 50 in tactical interdiction and 52 in investigations.

It is clear that when it comes to putting money behind the rhetoric, this administration has shied away from the task. How can we expect to control drug trafficking in our country, our communities and schools if we slash the number of inspectors at our borders, cut our tactical interdiction teams and reduce in-

vestigations units of the U.S. Customs Service? The answer is simple. We cannot.

That is why the subcommittee has recommended an increase of 2,397 positions above the administration's request. We need these positions. The time has come to put our money where our mouths are, and the time has come for this House to take a clear and decisive step in funding the front line effort in our war on drugs. I would urge Members to support the subcommittee's recommendation and reject any attempt to reduce it through across-the-board reductions.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN
JACK KEMP

HON. BOB LIVINGSTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Conference of State Legislatures met in New Orleans. While the conference featured several speakers, I want to share with my distinguished colleagues the remarks of fellow Congressman JACK KEMP. They're worth reading.

The complete text of Representative KEMP's speech follows.

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN JACK KEMP
BEFORE THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF
STATE LEGISLATURES, NEW ORLEANS,
AUGUST 4, 1986

Thank you Ann Compton, Mayor Barthelmy and distinguished ladies and gentlemen. I am delighted to have the opportunity to address your National Conference of State Legislatures. And I compliment you on a particularly well-chosen theme for your conference, "Building America's Future in a Changing Political System." It wasn't long ago that people wondered if we even had a future.

Well, you are the leaders on the front lines helping to build a future of progress in American daily life. You are the ones best informed about local problems and most accessible to respond to local needs. And you have the greatest flexibility to develop new ideas for opportunity, jobs and an adequate social safety net. But we at the Federal level can help.

Under President Reagan, we have witnessed a welcome recovery. But we have not yet seen a truly national and global recovery. And until we have national recovery and world wide growth with all regions of America and the world prospering, we will not have real recovery. And ladies and gentlemen, a national recovery means full employment without inflation. A fully productive, prosperous people moving America and the world forward—this must be more than just rhetoric, more than just a goal, it must be a victory fought for and won here in our time.

I believe President Reagan deserves credit for understanding and articulating the most powerful and progressive idea in history: Freedom and opportunity fuel the creativity that drives the engines of human progress.

There are some, of course, who would never concede him any credit. My friend DICK GEPHARDT of Missouri, one of "the best and brightest" of the Democratic Party recently said he doesn't see any burgeoning opportunity in America; he sees eroding op-

portunity. And he said it's not morning it's twilight, it may even be midnight, and getting darker all the time.

Talk about seeing clouds behind silver linings. Well, of course we have problems. But ladies and gentlemen, that's just bunk. After we lowered tax rates in 1981 on the families and workers and risktakers of America, we helped unleash 44 straight months of expansion without inflation. We are entering the age of the entrepreneur with stunning breakthroughs in new technologies, products, and markets for the future led by 3 straight years of record new business incorporations. The United States has created 10 million new jobs in private enterprise—more new jobs in one year than the entire continent of Europe has created in the last two decades.

That doesn't mean we can ignore that these are also very troubled times for millions of Americans in many States. For the resource rich States. For the farm belt. And for the industrial heartland, which, in some cases, has been depressed for years. The loss of jobs in steel as in my area of Buffalo, farming, automobiles, oil, coal and isolated industries have scared a dozen States.

We can't have an economy where American unemployment is down to 6.9 percent and unemployment in some regions is going up, for example here in Louisiana to 13.6 percent. Ladies and gentlemen, 13.6 percent unemployment in Louisiana and 11.3 percent unemployment in Metropolitan New Orleans, and double-digit unemployment in some cities and areas are more than statistics of economic weakness—they are human cries for help and for hope, it is time that attention be paid and it is time for action.

Now, some people look at America and say things are basically A-OK. Some in my own party are a little too content to sit back and just emphasize good news. I am not one of them. Status quo, you know that used to be an expression to describe the mess we are in. Well, America is a lot better off than at the start of this decade. But isn't it time we offered the over 8 million unemployed, the farmers facing bankruptcy, and the working men and women locked out of factory gates something better than just more of their status quo?

On the left side of the spectrum, we hear a lot about new ideas, one of which is a strategic investment initiative, a national industrial policy for America. Well, when we look closely, we don't see a new idea, we see the same tired formulas for tax increases, austerity and Government spending—policies that failed America in the 1970's, and that are producing 14 percent unemployment in some European countries today.

Let's examine some of the so-called new ideas for a new industrial policy.

The centerpiece would be a Government funded Development Finance Corporation, a modern day version of Herbert Hoover's Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This multi-billion dollar Government fund would subsidize business development with loan guarantees, loans or outright grants. Perhaps some funding would target small young businesses, at least recognizing that small business is the economic dynamo of capitalism.

But let's face it, this is corporate welfare, pure and simple. And regardless of who gets the money, can anyone imagine a worse prescription for American workers and our future? The fund would quickly become mismanaged and subsidize failure and inefficiency. What a national industrial policy really means is constant collusion between

big business and big government. What it really means is special interest groups with political clout in Washington logrolling at the expense of millions of businesses and investors competing honestly in the marketplace.

How would this enormously expensive national industrial policy be financed? Through tax increases of the most regressive kind, tax increases that would hit poor people and working Americans the hardest. One such proposal would nearly double the current price per barrel of oil and cost the average family of four \$1,000 a year.

A national industrial policy is no vision for a pro-growth, pro-people, pro-opportunity future with America leading and competing in the world economy. It is a vision that looks back—straight back to the failures of the 1970's, with an idea from the 1930's.

I see a different America. Not an age of reliving the past, nor a post-industrial age that holds no place for traditional American industries. We are entering a new industrial age—an age that embraces sunrise industries like computers and fiber optics, even as these new technologies help upgrade America's manufacturing and industrial base. We need a strategy that will not single out a favored few, but will give all industry and Americans the opportunity to go forward together.

So, ladies and gentleman, let me suggest what I consider to be a superior vision: A larger view of America that liberates people, enterprises, and human capital through a continuing revolution of Democratic capitalism. There is a new and bipartisan and growing conviction in this nation today. More and more Americans see that only by waging a continuing revolution for liberation, will we win a true victory of economic opportunity and justice for all Americans.

Thomas Jefferson said in 1776, America has sworn eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the minds of men and women.

If we mean to liberate our people and our potential in the fullest possible sense, if we mean to help them build and share in the success of an American opportunity society, we must remove the barriers to growth, dignity, justice and human fulfillment at every level of this Nation.

At the Federal level we must reform the way we spend money, we must reform the way we tax money, and we must reform the way we value our money. We must change our view of the world. There's only one economy and that's the world economy.

Everyone is concerned today that the Federal Government maintain the strictest possible discipline on public expenditures. That is why I so strongly support giving our president a line-item veto—the power to veto individual items within overall spending bills, just as most Governors have the same authority.

But the best way to reduce spending—and in the long run the only way—is to reduce the need for spending. And the best way to reduce the need for spending is through full employment and levels of growth at least 5 percent—now! Why should we listen to the language of limits when we know we can do so much better? Right now, unemployment stands at around 7 percent. Ladies and gentlemen, 4.5 percent unemployment would balance the budget by 1990 and create a \$70 billion surplus by 1991.

Right now, our factories and plants are operating at only 78 percent of capacity. We have only begun to climb the first foothills toward new heights of economic growth and

jobs for all Americans. I say it's time to raise our sights, not our taxes.

Let me emphasize that I am one who believes in the reform of revenue sharing, not the abolishment of revenue sharing. And I believe that Federal aid must be continued, indeed guaranteed, to ensure that all states, and especially those now struggling, can deliver essential services, particularly those that are mandated by Federal policy.

But the greatest obstacles to liberating our economy, to creating stronger economic growth and more healthy State budgets, are the Federal Government's tax and monetary policies.

John F. Kennedy said that the major roadblock to a full employment economy was the heavy burden of taxes on the American people. We are on the verge of passing the most historic tax legislation in our lifetime. The top income tax rate was 70 percent when Reagan was elected, dropped to 50 percent under the Kemp-Roth tax bill in 1981, and this year may drop to a top rate of 27 percent and a flat 15 percent rate for most Americans. We are within an eyelash of abolishing the steeply graduated income tax system.

Democrats and Republicans are no longer debating how high to raise tax rates, we are debating how low to cut them. We are no longer debating how to redistribute wealth, we are debating how to create wealth.

And this American revolution is going to become a worldwide revolution. Other nations will have to lower their own tax rates or risk losing capital and investment, relocation of their industries, and, most importantly, their brightest minds for the future. Margaret Thatcher recently warned that if the Senate tax bill passes, England's lowest tax rate will be higher than America's top tax rate. She expressed concern that some of England's best scientists and wealth creators would decide to move their families or businesses abroad.

This is what we mean by the power of ideas. This is what we mean by the power of incentives. This is proof that freedom works.

But Federal tax reform is just the beginning—it could and must become the first wave in a mighty tide for tax reform in all high tax rate States, including my own New York. The Federal changes will cause taxes to go up. That's because many State taxes piggyback on the Federal tax system, so when the Federal tax base is broadened, the tax base of the States will be broadened, too.

The impact would be as much as \$2 billion more revenues in New York. States like New York are already overtaxed and losing jobs to neighboring States like New Jersey and Connecticut with more enlightened policies of lower rates. This is an historic opportunity. New York and other high-tax, high-welfare States should consider rolling back these automatic tax increases by cutting their own State tax rates and implementing a modified flat tax at the State level.

After all, the best welfare program in the world is the opportunity to work in a productive job. The best way out of the safety net is a safety ladder. The only way to balance the budget is to bring our economy to equilibrium. Ladies and gentlemen, we don't need a tax system that makes rich people poor; we need a tax system that allows poor people to get rich.

We must also reform the way that we value our currency. We don't want a rising dollar anymore than we want a falling dollar. We want a stable dollar. Commodity

deflation is devastating major sectors of the economy here and around the world. Inflation is yesterday's problem. Deflation is today's problem. Oil prices have dropped to levels, adjusted for inflation, not seen since 1976. The falling commodity price index is a warning signal that the dangers of deflation are growing. September corn futures have fallen to \$1.68 a bushel, the lowest price in 13 years. The Federal Reserve Board is keeping interest rates inexcusably high and money inordinately tight (and frankly so are our major trading partners in Asia and Europe).

For the Fed to keep the consumers, farmers, borrowers, and families of America chained to high interest rates during this deflationary period is more than wrong—it is callous. We need a national outcry—we need your help; we need lower interest rates and we need further cuts in the discount rate now.

But we also need monetary reform that makes the dollar a predictable, stable, long term standard of value. Historical experience shows that when the government guaranteed the purchasing price of the dollar interest rates never rose above 7 percent.

Imagine how interest rates at 5 or 6 percent could help liberate our economy and reduce deficits. Imagine what this would mean, the hope it could bring, to farmers, energy producers, small business men and women, homebuyers and every other consumer and industry in America—not to mention how it could reduce the cost of meeting interest payments on the debt for ourselves and our Latin American friends and neighbors.

Let me tell you one other way America must do better in the world economy. We need an international summit conference to restore exchange rate stability and put an end to predatory trade practices against U.S. agriculture and other U.S. industries.

We cannot have free or fair trade without a stable currency and stable exchange rates. America can compete with any nation in the world. But we must remove the barriers other nations have erected to U.S. goods, services, and exports. We exist in a global economy. There is no limit to America's progress, indeed to the world's progress, if exchange rates are stable and trading practices are free and fair among all nations.

I've talked about what we must do at the national level to liberate our economy. I mentioned our highest national priority—full employment with price stability, but that goal will remain beyond our reach until we attack the plague of joblessness in the distressed cities and rural areas of America. We can't put America back to work until all Americans are back to work.

One of the initiatives I am most proud of is the enterprise zone legislation I co-authored in 1980, with my friends and colleagues, BOB GARCIA from the South Bronx and BILL GRAY from Philadelphia. This proposal will help remove the tax and regulatory barriers that prevent inner city residents and entrepreneurs from starting up new businesses.

Enterprise zones offer dramatic changes in tax rates to encourage private sector investment and job creation in the most distressed urban and rural areas of our Nation. I'm heartened that this idea has spread like wildfire in States and cities across the Nation. Today, 29 States have designated a total of 1,400 enterprise zones, and are making them a very successful reality. Their success has even spurred Congress to finally act. In June, the House of Repre-

sentatives took its first vote on enterprise zones, and they passed by a vote of 366-32.

As we create new areas of economic vitality in America, we will need to train or re-train displaced workers and young job seekers entering the workforce. These efforts will require a national commitment to vocational training and the very successful Job Training Partnership Act.

But liberation also means the opportunity to enjoy the blessings of private property—a home can be an island of personal freedom amidst the trials and pressures of daily life. Poor Americans, especially minority Americans living in our Nation's public housing, have too seldom shared in that dream of home ownership.

Walter Fauntroy, of the District of Columbia, and I introduced our Urban Homestead Act to empower public housing residents with the right to buy their apartments or homes in the public housing stock at a deep discount and with a low interest rate loan. I'm pleased that the House of Representatives soundly endorsed our bill, and the Senate should soon follow suit in this campaign to turn renters into homeowners.

But ladies and gentleman, to liberate America's economy, we must also liberate America's spirit—liberate ourselves from the hopelessness, despair, and confusion we see around us: impoverished families forced to break up just to qualify for needed assistance to feed their children. I think it is outrageous to only subsidize the family that breaks up, we should provide welfare to families that stay together. That's why I joined with Representative BILL GRAY, Senator ARLEN SPECTER, and Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN to introduce a welfare and job training reform bill to change the law.

But we see other signs of social and moral stress: Young people, with the brightest of futures, turning to drugs and despair; young women, lonely, confused, frightened, convinced the only answer to their dilemma is to abort a new life, and teachers and students incapable of discerning any moral difference between the United States and the Soviet Union?

The ideals of our Judeo-Christian heritage tell us these are signals that something is wrong in our society. Our hearts and our minds indeed our own history tell us there is a better way.

There is a better way and it begins with us—in our homes, churches, synagogues, schools, and neighborhoods. It begins with molding character, teaching virtue, striving for excellence, and leading by example. It begins with tolerance of differences and a conviction that all men and women are created equal.

Above all, it begins with a love of liberty and a sense of responsibility. As my friend, Secretary of Education Bill Bennett recently said, it is not enough to know what is right; we must also love what is right; love what is right so we have the character and the courage to do what is right.

I can't conclude without saying that all of our great dreams rest upon keeping America strong, secure and free. It is a terrible mistake to see this as a zero-sum contest between defense and social programs. We must have a strong defense, a strong economy, and a strong social safety net.

But there are some who would gut defense when it was already cut 6 percent last year and frozen (or worse) this year—the first absolute decline since the 1970's—and when we

face an enemy as dangerous and aggressive in the Third World as the Soviet Union.

The same holds true for the most hopeful vision for peace in modern times—the President's strategic defense initiative. We know the Soviets have been working on defensive systems for 20 years, while our SDI Program is still in its infancy. We know the Soviets have been cheating on major provisions of the ABM Treaty which prohibit deployment of defensive systems.

For America to decide to continue observing the provisions of this treaty, despite all the evidence of Soviet cheating, is to embrace a policy of increasing vulnerability. I believe we must not only research and test SDI, we must develop and deploy it at the earliest possible date—and this strategic imperative must never be bargained away.

Ladies and gentlemen, next year is the 200th anniversary of the American Constitution. And I'm running for election to the 100th Congress. I believe this is the most exciting time to be alive of any period of history—except perhaps in 1776.

For the first time in the history of the world, we have it within our power to truly eliminate poverty and elevate the dignity of the individual. We can do it within our lifetime. We have the cure. It works in big cities and small cities, in rich States and poor States, in cold climates and in hot climates. Indeed, it will work anywhere in the world.

The answer to poverty? Freedom. Freedom leads to free enterprise and free enterprise leads to growth, opportunity, jobs, and human fulfillment. We have seen the proof that freedom is the most progressive, exciting and revolutionary idea for human progress and peace the world has ever known. Freedom's time has come: It is time to liberate America's economy and make her fully free to reach her potential.

For Americans destiny is not a matter of chance, it is a matter of choice. So let us not follow where the path may lead, but go instead where there is no path and leave a trail. Our trail will be a history created from great dreams and great deeds of great people.

Thank you very much and God bless you all.

THE LEGAL AND CIVIL RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS OF AIDS

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, HENRY WAXMAN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment, gave an excellent speech to the American Bar Association this past weekend on the legal and civil rights implications of AIDS.

I would like to share Chairman WAXMAN's speech with my colleagues.

REMARKS OF HENRY A. WAXMAN

LEGAL LEGACY OF THIS DECADE

I am pleased to be here this afternoon. This session deals with what I believe will be the legal legacy of this decade. The Sixties will be remembered for the War and Protest. The Seventies for Energy and the Environment. The Eighties for the Epidemic.

And the Reagan Administration—for all its sweeping change and sudden shifts in

politics—will not be remembered for its Space Shield, its secret wars, or its tax plans. The Reagan Administration will be remembered for its failure to deal with AIDS:

We will remember and regret saving a few million dollars and losing hundreds of thousands of lives.

We will remember and regret shying away from education and instead moving to mandatory testing.

We will remember the President as showing less foresight with more information than any leader since Herbert Hoover or Neville Chamberlain.

TRAGIC IRONIES OF THE EPIDEMIC

It has been said that the Greek gods could not have created a drama that would be more tragic and more ironic than this disease at this time during this Administration.

We have a Nation under the reign of a budget-slashing Administration and under siege by a budget-busting epidemic.

We have an Administration that finds it difficult to tell heterosexuals about contraception that now must tell homosexuals about safe sex.

We have a press corps that just five years ago could not use the words "gay" or "lover" and that now must explain how "bodily fluids" are exchanged.

We have a legal system that does not recognize sexual privacy among adults that now must deal with lovers' powers of attorney.

And gay people—who wanted only for the government to leave them alone—now have a real need for protection and assistance from governments that they fear more than ever, and with more reason.

It is tragic. It is ironic. And—in many ways—the epidemic has only begun. A vaccine and successful treatment are perhaps a long way away.

SOCIAL DISLOCATION TO COME

In the meanwhile, it will fall to lawyers and politicians to work with medical and public health officials to ensure that the society that lives through the epidemic is a society in which we want to live.

The U.S. Public Health Service—in numbers that it concedes may be as much as twenty percent underestimated—has said that one to two million Americans are already infected with the virus believed to cause AIDS. They go on to say that more than a quarter million Americans will come down with full AIDS within the next five years.

If the epidemic continues at this rate, by the end of the Reagan Presidency, more Americans will have died of AIDS than died in Viet Nam.

I am not reciting these numbers or making this war-time comparison because I think that you need to be made more aware of the epidemic or its consequences. Most of you in this room understand that this disease is not just another chronic social problem and that it cannot be delegated or addressed with recycled ideas and thin budgets.

But I believe these numbers and the Viet Nam comparison are useful in understanding the political problems to come. We face social dislocation unlike any event other than war.

The losses of the Viet Nam war deeply changed this country and the world. International politics were re-aligned. Domestic policy was re-examined. Patriotism, party loyalty, and civil protest were all radically re-defined.

I hope to be proven wrong, but I believe that, in the next few years, AIDS will deeply change America as well. If AIDS claims as many lives as projected and costs the country the billions it appears it will, we can expect serious national stress and division. There will be fundamental changes in those institutions that middle-class Americans have come to take for granted: medical care, insurance, education, employment, and—most of all—privacy.

Groups like this one—in cooperation with our colleagues in medicine and public health—are our best hope for preventing these issues from dividing the country and from disabling our response.

AIDS NOT THE WORST CASE

In important ways, we are assisted in this work by the nature of the epidemic itself. As hard as it is to imagine, AIDS is not as bad as it might have been. It is infectious, but it is not easily caught. This is not the bubonic plague of the Middle Ages. It is not the flu of seventy years ago. AIDS is not the worst case scenario for medicine or public health or good law.

PUBLIC EDUCATION

Our first agenda must be to convey that fact to the public. At a time when public fear of AIDS is growing as fast as the epidemic, everyone who understands the basic facts of the disease is obliged to provide public education. We must face the ongoing dilemma of how to lower irrational fears while increasing the legitimate sense of urgency for research and for changes in sexual and drug practices.

ANTI-GAY IDEOLOGUES

In providing this education, it is clear, however, that because of the politics of sexuality in this country, AIDS may be the worst case scenario not for medicine but for politics. We must deal with those ideologues and evangelists who have always hated gay men and lesbians and who are arming themselves with the new rhetorical weapon of AIDS. These people are AIDS terrorists, who will manipulate public fears, regardless of public health.

Groups like this one must be prepared to rebut these medical McCarthyites. You—with the credibility that you carry—will be able to reveal them for the propagandists that they are and to respond with facts.

HARD LEGAL FIGHTS REMAIN

But even after these educational and plainly political issues are dealt with, there will be many hard problems, many of them legal.

We will have to evaluate what employment rights are in this country of opportunity.

We will have to examine the costs of health care in our high-tech society.

We will have to re-consider what we mean by insurance and risk-pooling in a time of uncertainty.

I don't pretend to have the answers to these issues, but I do have some thoughts about them that I want to discuss briefly.

PUBLIC HEALTH IS NOT VERSUS CIVIL RIGHTS

The first point that must be made loudly and clearly, especially in a legal conference, is that lawyers and politicians should—and do—support defending the public health. The responsible protection of individual rights is not at odds with the protection of public health. This is not—as the media often portray it—a question of individual rights versus public well-being. No one advocates such an extreme defense of individ-

uals. To do so would be to defend yelling "Fire" in a crowded theatre.

During the AIDS epidemic, public health has not conflicted with civil liberties or civil rights. Quarantine is useless medicine and legal tyranny. Keeping a job is not inconsistent with good public health.

What we know and understand about this disease, we understand because AIDS patients and gay men have cooperated with scientists. When civil liberties for these people are threatened, the only outcome will be that the disease will be driven underground. We will know less and our chances of stopping the epidemic will grow smaller.

EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION

Unfortunately, the Department of Justice has chosen to ignore the science and the law and to lend support to discrimination. In a recent opinion on protections for the handicapped, the Justice Department has said that people with AIDS can be fired or refused public services if the employer or service provider is afraid of the disease, whether their fear is rational or not.

In writing this tortured opinion, the Justice Department has ignored the law, which is clearly intended to change the fears and stereotypes that people hold about the disabled.

In endorsing this policy, the Reagan Administration has once more failed to listen to its health experts, who clearly understand that giving unfounded fears legal status encourages misunderstanding and panic.

A clear and coherent policy stance was available to the White House and its lawyers. Once again, they have chosen only to make the epidemic more complicated. Other than the simple politics of punishing the groups that now get AIDS most often, I cannot think of a reason why.

We must work to change this stance and to enforce the law as it was intended. Discrimination is bad private practice and bad public policy. And in this case it is bad for the health of the Nation.

It was not so long ago that people were afraid to work in an office with someone who had cancer? Who knows the lost productivity from such senseless fears? Who knows the human costs of people who dealt with a physical ailment only to be disabled by a social one?

More dramatically, during World War II, American soldiers lost their lives when military doctors refused to transfuse blood from black soldiers to white ones.

We cannot now allow employers to cater to prejudice that is contradicted by all public health. Discrimination against antibody-positive people will create a huge group of unemployables, a caste of people without the ability to provide for themselves.

We cannot afford such actions—economically or ethically. It is agreed that a person with antibodies presents no danger to fellow workers. If he or she can perform his or her work, they should have a right to keep working.

HEALTH CARE

And if they become too sick to work, they should have a right to be cared for. Those of you who know me, know that I have spent a long time working on problems of health care costs and access. AIDS brings these problems into bold relief.

HEALTH INSURANCE

The American health care system is already strained by pressures ranging from the growing number of uninsured people to

the declining adequacy of Federal programs. Many public hospitals—who are left with the responsibility of caring for all those without insurance—may be unable to bear the responsibility of caring for the increasing number of AIDS cases. Medicaid benefits, already impossibly low in many States, are threatened with cuts and are not available to all.

Adding to these pressures is the growing trend of antibody testing for individual insurance. (To my knowledge, no insurer is using antibody testing to underwrite groups.)

The problem is simply this: Costs must be paid. They will be paid by patients and their families, by insurance, by local taxes for hospitals, or by Federal taxes for health programs.

The American system of health insurance is designed to let people pool their risks of illness if they can afford to enter the pool. Some pre-existing condition restrictions have always limited entry, but—by and large—most healthy people are allowed in.

With the HTLV-3 antibody test—still not verified or approved for any use except blood transfusions—insurance companies have begun another restriction, restrictions based not on existing conditions but on potential ones.

We should examine this type of insurance prediction very carefully.

Today we have the science to screen for HTLV-3 antibodies. Soon we will be able to screen for other viruses and for genetic predispositions to heart attack or cancer. We are told that it will not be long before doctors can predict the medical histories almost literally from cradle to grave.

With such abilities available, insurance may become as new industry—pooling healthy people with healthy people and letting the devil take the hindmost.

No one expects insurance in America to be run on a charitable basis. But insurance companies enjoy a number of special treatments under regulation and law. They should be held responsible—at the State and Federal level—for their real debts and for their risk-pooling responsibilities.

COST

Making the issues of insurance more volatile are the questions of the costs of AIDS care. Statistics vary wildly from one study to the next. One says "Diagnosis-to-death" care costs \$20,000, another says seven times that. Hospitals, insurers, and patients are understandably nervous about the discrepancies.

One partial solution has emerged clearly. We must be prepared—with AIDS and with other terminal illnesses—to provide hospice and home care and other alternatives to hospitalization.

I don't mean to suggest that we cut corners. If patients want to struggle to the last breath with every resource available, American medicine has tried to give them that choice. But if a patient wants only to be free of pain and to die with loved ones, we should not force them into institutions.

I have supported both Federal and private demonstration projects for alternative care for AIDS patients. Legislation to allow States to waive Medicaid requirements to provide such community care is a part of the House Budget bill now moving through Congress. I know that many insurers and employers have begun similar programs, and I would hope that there will be more.

CONCLUSION

Let me conclude by asking for your help with resources.

Many of you represent financial and corporate clients who must make private decisions on these issues and who can influence public policy.

If the epidemic continues, life and health insurance companies stand to lose billions of dollars. Hospitals stand to lose hundreds of millions more in care for those without insurance. And the Nation will lose productive citizens and billions in lost productivity.

As purchasers of health care, as taxpayers, and as fellow citizens, we will all share in these losses.

At the time of the initial outbreak of the disease it is easy to understand why it might have been regarded as a small issue. But much of the American financial and corporate community have failed to recognize the significance of the epidemic even now.

Powerful health lobbies have stood by, perhaps afraid of the controversy, as research budgets and education campaigns have gone wanting. Influential insurance lobbies have left the work of protecting their financial reserves to the National Gay Task Force and other diligent but small groups.

We all have a direct financial interest in making certain that the public and private sector respond fully to the epidemic—with research, with drug development, and with education. No market benefits from disease or panic.

But the Reagan Administration—penny-wise and pound-foolish and afraid to be seen helping gay men and drug abusers—has consistently short-changed all efforts. We will pay for that neglect.

Finally, let me enlist your help as people of reason and law. Simply by your presence here, I assume that many of you are aware of the legal problems posed by the epidemic. I urge you to work—as litigators, educators, or politicians—to bring compassion and urgency to our response to the epidemic.

One friend has said to me that this epidemic will bring us National Health Insurance or it will bring us camps.

I know gay men who make it a point to keep their passports in order at all times so that people in this country should feel such anxiety is a sad commentary.

The epidemic has brought tragedy and loss to our country already. We cannot let it bring fear and repression as well.

Thank you.

PRO FOOTBALL'S HALL OF FAME

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, August 2, the Professional Football Hall of Fame in Canton, Ohio inducted five new members into its honored ranks.

They are Paul Hornung, Ken Houston, Willie Lanier, Fran Tarkenton, and Doak Walker. These men are great athletes who strove for perfection and I am honored to call them personal friends.

Selection as a member of the Hall of Fame is one of the most prestigious honors in professional sports. These men have had the courage and tenacity to be great.

They are the best that pro football has to offer. They are symbols of excellence. The

great coach Amos Alanzo Stagg summarized what is at the heart of these men's success in football when he said "bulk, strength, and speed are so much lath and painted plaster if they are not backed up by football temperament, and imagination is the prime ingredient of that temperament—imagination to dramatize the conflict and one's own part in it, imagination to anticipate what and where the foe's next move will be, imagination to capitalize instantly on any break in the game."

The five inductees' hard work and determination to succeed placed them in position to attain greatness. They received that chance because they never gave up, never lost sight of their goal—to be the best at their chosen profession. Samuel Johnson wrote that "every man has a lurking wish to appear considerable in his native place" and now, each of these men have achieved that not only in their hometowns, but across this great Nation of ours.

Each of this year's inductees bring to the Hall of Fame his own spirit which can inspire us all to strive for the best, to face obstacles, to overcome them, and reach our goals.

I would commend the following excerpt from an article by Bob Castello of the Football News to my colleagues. The article highlights the playing careers of each of this year's Hall of Fame inductees. I hope that the inspirational message of the men who are the Hall of Fame will energize all to be the best they can be.

Paul, Ken, Willie, Fran, and Doak and their dear families are not only great athletes but great Americans and I am proud to have Members of Congress know them better.

HALL OPENS DOORS TO FIVE NEW MEMBERS (By Bob Castello)

Maybe it was fate that led Fran Tarkenton to his position as one of the hosts of the television show, *That's Incredible*, following his retirement from pro football. For 18 seasons as a quarterback in the National Football League, Tarkenton was just that—incredible.

Tarkenton, along with running backs Paul Hornung and Doak Walker, middle linebacker Willie Lanier and safety Ken Houston, will be accorded the game's highest honor when the five are inducted into the Pro Football Hall of Fame in Canton, Ohio, on Aug. 2.

The ceremonies for the Class of 1986 will begin at noon. Later that day, the AFC champion New England Patriots will battle the St. Louis Cardinals in the annual AFC-NFC Hall of Fame Game in Canton's Fawcett Stadium.

Born in Richmond, Va., on Aug. 3, 1940, Tarkenton was known for his unorthodox methods and uncanny scrambling ability.

"He runs as if he is in a basketball game," said former Cleveland Browns' cornerback Erich Barnes. "He takes all the skill away from the defensive back. He makes you cover a man for five or six seconds and that's too long. Once the pattern is over, you are fighting for your life."

A two-time All-Southeastern Conference pick at Georgia, Tarkenton was chosen in the third round by the Minnesota Vikings in their first-ever draft. He won the starting job early in the season and finished with a rookie-record 58.1 completion percentage.

Though the team struggled, Tarkenton performed brilliantly through six seasons in Minnesota. Following the 1966 campaign, he

was dealt to a New York Giants' club in need of a boost. The dazzling signal caller steered the Giants to within a game of the NFC Eastern title in 1970.

Tarkenton returned to the Vikings in 1972 and continued his assault on numerous league passing marks. Beginning in 1973, he guided Minnesota to six consecutive NFC Central Division crowns and three Super Bowl berths. Unfortunately for the feisty quarterback, the Vikings lost all three.

"I loved the whole time I spent in the NFL," he said upon his retirement. "I didn't achieve everything I wanted to, but who does? The fun is in the hunt. Now the hunt is over."

Tarkenton's hunt garnered him six Pro Bowl appearances between 1964 and 1970. He was All-Pro in 1972 and 1975 and All-NFC in 1976. He was selected to the Pro Bowl each of the latter three years as well, though injuries forced him to bypass the games.

Tarkenton completed his career with NFL records for attempts (6,467), completions (3,686), passing yards (47,003) and touchdown passes (342). His scrambling netted him 3,674 yards on the ground, a figure which tops those of six modern-era Hall of Fame running backs.

Hornung's 3,711 rushing yards barely topped Tarkenton's total, but they tell very little of his story.

"He may not be the greatest football player in the world," said Green Bay Packers' Coach Vince Lombardi, "but Paul has the special ability to rise to the occasion and to be the greatest of the great when the games are on the line."

It was when Lombardi became the Packers' head coach that Hornung's pro career began to flourish. Hornung won the Heisman Trophy as a quarterback at Notre Dame in 1956, but he spent his first two seasons in the NFL performing dismally while shifting between positions. Lombardi arrived, put Hornung at left halfback and sent the "Golden Boy" soaring.

Hornung, who was born in Louisville, Ky., on Dec. 23 1935, led the NFL in scoring in 1959, 1960 and 1961. He was named the league's MVP in both '60 and '61. While also handling the placekicking duties for Green Bay, Hornung set an all-time NFL record with 176 points in 1960 (15 touchdowns, 41 extra points and 15 field goals). His 760 career points placed fifth on the all-time list at the time of his retirement in 1966.

"I have never seen a guy who was more effective inside the 20-yard line," said former Packers' tackle and current Green Bay Coach Forrest Gregg. "You could hand off to him or throw it to him and somehow he would get the ball in the end zone."

Versatility was the key to Walker becoming the most productive running back of his era. Because he was injured throughout most of the 1952 season, Walker played just over five seasons with the Detroit Lions between 1950 and 1955. However, he rushed for 1,520 yards, caught 152 passes for 2,539 yards and 21 touchdowns. He also averaged 39.1 yards per punt, 15.8 yards per punt return and 25.5 yards per kickoff return.

Walker even recorded a pair of interceptions, as he played defensive back whenever it was necessary.

Like Hornung, Walker had a nose for the end zone. He chalked up 534 points during his career on 34 touchdowns, 183 extra points and 49 field goals.

Walker was praised for his efforts on both sides of the ball.

"I think Doak is the best safety man on kickoffs I've ever seen," Lions' Coach Buddy

Parker once said of Walker. "He's really an outstanding tackler. He has saved many touchdowns for us."

Walker was born on Jan. 1, 1927 and attended Southern Methodist in his hometown of Dallas. He copped the Heisman Trophy as a junior and though many considered him too small (5-11, 173), he began his pro career in 1950.

His initial season was likely his best as Walker scored an NFL-leading, rookie-record 128 points and took rookie of the year honors. In six years as a Lion, he led Detroit to three division titles and a pair of NFL championships.

Even in 1952, when he sat out much of the season, Walker was ready in the clutch. His only touchdown of the season came on a 67-yard scoring burst which provided the clinching touchdown in Detroit's title game win over Cleveland.

While Walker's career was brilliant but short-lived, Lanier excelled for 11 seasons as the heart of the great Kansas City Chiefs' defense of the late '60s and early '70s. Born in Clover, Va., on Aug. 21, 1945, Lanier became the first black to hold down the middle linebacker spot.

"Playing middle linebacker is sort of a science," said Lanier. "The key factor is to make an instantaneous response to a given stimuli. It involves mathematics, geometry and angles. There is, it is true, great joy in exploding into a man, making a tackle they call the big hit. But you cannot do that on every play. So often you must control your aggressiveness."

If playing middle linebacker is a science, then Lanier was a dean's list student.

With the exception of 1969, Lanier was named either All-Pro, All-AFL or All-AFC every year from 1968 through 1976. He played in AFL All-Star Games in 1968 and 1969 and in the first six Pro Bowl games after the AFL-NFL merger.

Selected the defensive MVP in the 1973 Pro Bowl, Lanier was also one of the main cogs as the Chiefs defeated Minnesota in Super Bowl IV for their only world championship.

Lanier is spoken of in the same breath with Dick Butkus, Ray Nitschke and the other greats who have played the middle, but some feel he has no peers.

"Butkus is a friend of mine and a helluva linebacker," said former NFL quarterback Craig Morton, "but Lanier has to be the best."

Houston, a strong safety for 14 years with the Houston Oilers and the Washington Redskins, is also rated near the top at his position—if not the top.

"Ken Houston is the best player I have ever lined up with," said Jake Scott, also a star defensive back and a teammate of Houston's at Washington in the late 70's.

After a relatively unnoticed collegiate career at Prairie View A&M, Houston was selected by the Oilers in the ninth round of the first combined AFL-NFL draft in 1967. Four years later, Houston was selected to the All-AFC team for the first time.

In 1971, Houston notched a career-high nine interceptions, returning four for scores. He also tallied a touchdown on a fumble return. Houston, born Nov. 12, 1944 in Lufkin, Texas, was named either All-Pro or All-NFC for seven straight years after joining Washington in 1973.

However, it was with the Oilers on Dec. 19, 1971 that Houston had his finest day as a pro. On that day, he returned a pair of interceptions for scores, setting a new career mark with nine. He also tied the records for

most scoring returns in a season with four and in a game with two.

Houston completed his illustrious career with 49 interceptions and 12 touchdowns—nine on interceptions and one apiece on a blocked field goal, a fumble and a punt return.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM B. WILLIAMS—A NEW YORK RADIO LEGEND

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as a lifelong New Yorker, I wish to pay tribute today to a modern legend in the world of New York radio, William B. Williams who passed away last week at the age of 62. The strength of New York is best measured in its people, their diversity, and their distinctiveness. One of the most distinguished of these was William B. Williams who for the past 40 years graced the airwaves of the New York area.

For more than three decades, William B. as he was best known to his devoted audience, was the host of the "Make Believe Ballroom" on WNEW. William B. became a fixture in the households of millions of Americans blending his easy listening style with a reservoir or intellect about the music he played on the program.

The result was William B. was far more than a radio program host. He, in fact, was the standard that others in radio modeled themselves after. Despite the competitiveness of the New York radio business, William B. emerged year after year as the class of the league. He was a radio personality in the truest sense of the word. He not only had a loyal audience, he was also responsible for advancing the careers of many in the music business. He was as much of an artist as anyone he featured on his program.

Perhaps William B.'s greatest known contributions to music was his labeling of Frank Sinatra, his dear friend, with the title of "Chairman of the Board." It was a nickname which Sinatra kept proudly over the years. When asked about William B., Sinatra was quoted as saying "He was the greatest friend I ever had. He was the best friend anyone could have had. God rest his soul."

The late mornings will never be the same in New York now that William B.'s voice has been silenced. Many people waited for that moment each morning when William B. would sign on the air with his reassuring "Hello World." It was as regular to many as any other part of their day. William B. Williams leaves a legacy of artistry and accomplishment in his chosen profession of radio. Yet while his voice may have been stilled, it will never be forgotten by those who enjoyed it so much over the years.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GRYCZKO ANNIVERSARY

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to take this opportunity to bring to your attention a couple from Duryea, PA, who are testimony to the abiding strength of devotion to one another.

Anthony and Margaret Gryczko celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary on Wednesday, August 5. Married 50 years ago in St. Hedwig's Church in Kingston, Mr. and Mrs. Gryczko have devoted a lifetime of love to each other and to their family. Their children, Dr. Gerald Gryczko and Mrs. Adrienne Boyle, have produced a total of eight lovely grandchildren.

Active within their community, both Mr. and Mrs. Gryczko have been active in the Holy Rosary Church of Duryea, as well as a variety of civic organizations such as the Knights of Columbus and the Lions Club.

Mr. Speaker, it is rare that we are fortunate enough to witness this depth of love between two people, and I am pleased to be able to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives this very special love story.

WE NEED TO GET SERIOUS ABOUT FIGHTING DRUG ABUSE AND CRIME IN AMERICA

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, the President has made the elimination of illicit drugs in this country a high priority, and the Speaker of the House is putting together a tough, bipartisan bill to address the problem. And this is how it should be, Republicans and Democrats working together to come up with a solution to rid our country of the blight of drug abuse.

Today I am proud to announce my support for a package of legislative initiatives which I believe, taken together, will go a long way toward fighting drug abuse in the United States. And I'm convinced that when we begin seeing the incidence of drug abuse fall we will see the crime rate drop proportionally. Law enforcement officials throughout the country have stated that there is a strong, direct link between drug abuse and violent crime. When we wage a war against drug abuse we wage a simultaneous war against crime.

The complexity of this problem warrants an attack on many fronts. That's why I believe so strongly in the package of bills which I am cosponsoring today. They fight drug abuse on five different levels, all necessary if we are going to approach this problem with the seriousness which it warrants: First, interdicting the supply of drugs coming into the country; second, imposing stiff sentences on drug traffickers; third, making it tougher for drug dealers to do business, fourth, educating our youth

August 13, 1986

on the dangers of drug abuse, and fifth, working to lower production and manufacturing of illicit drugs in foreign countries.

To interdict the supply of drugs coming into this country I have cosponsored a package of bills which will fund additional personnel and equipment for the Customs Service, which is responsible for interdicting air-related smuggling activities, the Coast Guard, which is responsible for stopping illicit drugs from entering our country by sea, the Drug Enforcement Agency, which oversees the investigation of drug smuggling in the United States, and the U.S. attorneys' office, which is charged with prosecuting Federal offenders of our drug laws.

Each of these agencies has seen their budgets reduced in recent years, and if we're serious about slowing the pace of drug smuggling into this country we must be willing to fund the Federal agencies charged with doing the job. But instead of increasing the Federal budget to come up with this funding for drug interdiction, I feel that it would make far more sense to simply transfer the necessary funds from an expensive, unnecessary Federal boondoggle like star wars. The national security of the United States would be better served by funding drug interdiction programs, which have the potential of saving a generation of young Americans, than in funding a system which would inevitably put our entire Nation a hair trigger away from nuclear war.

Right now it is estimated that of the tons and tons of narcotics entering the United States, only 5 to 15 percent is intercepted. The U.S. Customs Service has fewer employees today than it did in 1980, and while it is estimated that 62 percent of the cocaine entering the United States arrives in small, private aircraft the eight antismuggling air bases which Customs operates in the United States only have enough funds to operate 8 hours per day, 5 days per week. Mr. Speaker, stopping drugs from entering our country is more than a 40-hour-per-week job.

Another component of this fight is to insure that those who manufacture, import, and deal in illicit drugs will meet swift and severe punishment. These criminals must be made aware that when they are caught they will serve a mandatory minimum sentence with no possibility of suspended sentences, probation, or parole. For instance, one bill I have endorsed would impose a mandatory 15-year prison term for those who are repeat offenders of drug trafficking and violent crime offenses. It is widely believed that a relatively small group of career criminals is responsible for a large proportion of the violent crimes committed in the United States. This new Federal statute will give State and local law enforcement officials the tool they need to rid our streets of these career criminals.

Also in this package is a bill which will frankly make it harder for drug dealers to do business. Mr. Speaker, money laundering allows criminals to disguise money obtained through drug dealing and other illegal activities by depositing it in a bank or savings institution where the money can then be used legitimately through checks, money orders, and wire transfers. It is estimated that as much as \$10

billion of illegal funds are laundered through U.S. institutions every year. The bill I am endorsing cracks down hard on this practice by creating a new category of Federal crime to punish individuals or institutions which knowingly engage in money-laundering activities. It provides for a 20-year maximum prison term, fines of up to \$1 million for an individual and up to \$5 million for companies, and seizure of assets of those who launder money.

But Mr. Speaker, we will not win this war on drugs and crime simply by busting the drug dealers and bolstering our drug interdiction activities. These efforts concentrate on the supply of drugs entering the country, but do nothing on the demand side. It is going to take a strong, concerted effort by officials at all levels of government, by school officials in communities throughout the Nation, and most importantly by every parent in the country to educate our youth to the dangers of drug abuse. Only then will we begin to make serious inroads in our fight against crime and drug abuse in the United States.

Ponder for a moment estimates from the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control and the National Institute on Drug Abuse: In 1986, 150 tons of cocaine will enter the United States, along with 12 tons of heroin and 30,000 tons of marijuana. Thirty percent of all college graduates will use cocaine at least once before they graduate, and up to 80 percent of all Americans will try an illicit drug by their midtwenties. And what I found particularly alarming was that two-thirds of all high school seniors surveyed by the University of Michigan had used some kind of illicit drugs.

At the same time the U.S. Department of Education is spending only \$2.9 million on drug education programs. This at a time when Americans are spending \$120 billion each year on illicit drugs, and drug abuse is costing our Nation more than \$100 billion annually in increased health costs, lost productivity, and related crime and violence. Mr. Speaker, we simply must commit to do more to educate our youth to the dangers of drug use.

The bills I have cosponsored make this serious commitment. One bill would use the seized assets of drug traffickers to fund drug abuse education and prevention programs in elementary and secondary schools. The idea of drug traffickers paying for programs which will dry up their supply of customers seems like perfect justice to me. But we cannot rely on seized assets alone to fund these necessary education programs. That's why I have also cosponsored a bill which will assist local districts throughout the country to the tune of \$100 million per year for 5 years.

Some may complain that in these times of budget restraints and Gramm-Rudman cuts we cannot afford the expenditures contained in this bill. Mr. Speaker, I would counter that while Americans are currently spending \$120 billion each year on illicit drugs and the demand continues to grow, we simply can't afford not to make this commitment to drug education programs. And again I would suggest that funding can be found in the current budget without having to spend additional funds for these programs. Doesn't it make

sense to transfer a fraction of the money we spend every year on foreign assistance, in a vain attempt to buy friends around the world, to a program which will educate our young people to the dangers of drug abuse? In the long run the money would be far better spent here at home.

Mr. Speaker, we also must have the cooperation of foreign nations in dealing with this problem. The opium used to manufacture heroin and coca plants used in making cocaine are not grown in our country, they are grown in Turkey, Pakistan, Mexico, Thailand, Peru, Colombia, Bolivia, and countries throughout Asia, Latin America, and Africa. I am encouraged by the progress made in many of those countries to get tough with large growers and manufacturers. And we cannot blame other countries for the huge demand which the citizens of our country make for the drugs produced in foreign nations.

However, as part of this drug and crime control package I have cosponsored a bill which would deny special trade benefits to foreign nations which refuse to cooperate with the United States in eliminating the production and distribution of narcotic drugs in their countries. This bill sends a loud and clear message to our foreign trading partners that the huge U.S. market will no longer be open for their exported goods and merchandise unless they assist us in our national priority of eliminating drug abuse.

Mr. Speaker, drug abuse and the crime which it breeds is not isolated in one part of the country. The blight of drug abuse has spread to every town and city in every State of the Union. In Oregon, law enforcement officials are noting that an exceptionally pure form of black tar heroin is widely available at lower and lower prices. There has also been a rise in cocaine use, along with its detestable cousin, crack. It should not be surprising, then, to read that Oregon had the second highest burglary rate in the country in 1985. As Sgt. Jim Baker of the Multnomah County Sheriff's Department said, "There's no question that narcotics usage plays a very large role in burglary and theft."

That's why I feel so strongly about the need to pass the package of drug legislation which I am endorsing today. As I mentioned earlier, this war on drugs and crime requires an attack on five fronts: first, interdicting the supply of drugs into the country; second, imposing stiff sentences on drug traffickers; third, making it tougher for drug dealers to do business; fourth, educating our youth on the dangers of drug abuse; and fifth, working to lower production and manufacturing of illicit drugs in foreign countries. This package of bills deals seriously and effectively with each of these areas, and taken as a whole I am convinced that they will help to alleviate the tragedy of drug abuse and crime which robs our Nation of billions of dollars in increased health costs, lost productivity, and related crime and violence while taking thousands of lives each year.

ILLUSORY DEFICIT REDUCTIONS

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been both promoting the sale of new loans while at the same time cautioning that the resulting deficit reduction is illusory.

The only valid reasons for selling loan assets is to determine the underlying subsidy costs of federally supported loans. When a loan is made and then sold—a mundane occurrence in private financial circles—the government subsidy is revealed as the difference—discount—between the origination—face—amount and the selling price. The resulting acceleration of the loan simply trades a future stream of income for a lump sum that is equivalent to the present value of the asset—loan.

Unlike conventional deficit reductions—program spending reductions or increased taxes—loan asset sales simply shift portfolio ownerships. Thus, there is no reason to expect any economic impact from this sort of deficit reduction. In the case of nonloan asset sales—for example, Conrail—however, there might be a gain in efficiency that could result in a positive economic gain. Nevertheless, any gain in efficiency is no match for the impact resulting from a conventional deficit reduction of the same size.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, we perform no great public service by crafting budgets heavy on asset sales. In fact, because asset sales take us off the deficit-reduction glidepath, we only make it harder to reach a lower deficit in the future. I would argue, reluctantly, that the current interest in asset sales is an indication of our inability to reduce the deficit by conventional means; "necessity—of appearing to reduce the deficit—is the mother of invention."

Mr. Speaker, in this regard, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an article from the current issue of the National Journal by Jonathan Rauch.

The article follows:

PAWNSHOP BUDGETING

[Congress is looking to asset sales to reduce the deficit. But selling off federal loans may provide short-term relief at the expense of long-term solutions]

(By Jonathan Rauch)

Congress needs fast cash. Caught between the flourishing federal deficits on one side and the shrieks of pinched voters on the other, it has turned, with some encouragement from the Reagan Administration, to a new approach: selling federal assets, predominantly federal loans, to private investors.

Of the \$17.7 billion in domestic savings assumed in Congress's recently adopted budget resolution for fiscal 1987, about \$5 billion comes from asset sales—more than \$3 billion of it from the sale of loans. The sales will give lawmakers some relief from the deficit headache, at least in the very short term. But they may create other, newer kinds of headaches. Consider:

Directly or indirectly, most assets produce income. When they are sold, the govern-

ment gets cash up front. But it loses the stream of dollars that the asset would have produced. Future income is converted into present income by converting one kind of asset—a loan, the Consolidated Rail Corp. or whatever—into another: ready cash.

"At best it's a wash," said Barry P. Bosworth, an economist with the Brookings Institution. Asset sales, he and many other economists say, have some advantages, but the one thing they do not do is help solve the deficit problem. "The result is we are able to fool ourselves"—delaying the tough choices that sooner or later must be faced, said former Reagan Administration economist J. Gregory Ballentine, now with the Washington office of the New York accounting firm of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.

Lawton Chiles of Florida, ranking Democrat on the Senate Budget Committee, told his colleagues: "It is much like the kind of fellow who starts going to the pawnshop and starts carrying the furniture and the jewels and everything else . . . until there is nothing else to carry."

No one knows how much the government's holdings, especially loans, are worth until they are sold—and in many cases they may not be worth very much. For example, one of the biggest savings in the budget resolution is the sale of rural housing loans with a book value of \$1.8 billion, for receipts of almost \$1.2 billion, according to congressional estimates.

Just one problem: Miner H. Warner, vice president and manager of government finance at Salomon Brothers Inc., a major New York investment banking firm, says that he doubts anyone will buy the loans. They require too much leniency from the buyer and will sell, he said, only if the government provides guarantees protecting the investors from losses—an arrangement that can prove expensive for taxpayers, and one that the Administration strongly opposes.

Selling federal loans without such government guarantees—in financier terms, without recourse—is not something the government has much experience with. "Government hasn't done this before," said Stephen E. Bell, who until March was the Senate Budget Committee staff director and now manages the Salomon Brothers Washington office. "The permanent bureaucracy doesn't know how to do it effectively." Sales will have to proceed at a snail's pace, despite any congressional expectations to the contrary.

The scramble for short-term cash may push Congress toward fire-sale deals that could cost more than they save over the long term. For example, the budget resolution calls for the sale of the Naval Petroleum Reserve in fiscal 1988. But with prices of oil so low, the reserve's market price may be depressed. "It's extremely doubtful that you're going to get anything out of it even close to what it's really worth," said Frank M. Cushing, the staff director of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. Selling the reserve might be a good idea on the merits, he said, but now would be the worst time to sell.

Whatever questions they raise, asset sales are often more politically palatable than cutting programs, which is part of what gives them their appeal. There is more to it than raising cash, though. To conservatives, selling assets shines with the luster of privatization, a policy of special interest to James C. Miller III, the director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). And many people have long argued that

selling federal loans is a key step toward bringing order to the chaotic array of federal credit programs.

For all those reasons, a new federal effort to sell assets seems to be in the offing. "They're starting to pick up congressional attention right now," said OMB deputy director Joseph R. Wright Jr. "I think something is going to be happening."

GOVERNMENT GUARANTEES

Selling federal assets, and particularly loans, is nothing new. What is new is selling them without recourse, which is to say, without government guarantees. To a financier, the difference is vast.

When the federal government wants to raise cash, its main option is to sell interest-bearing notes to the public. That shows up in the federal accounts as borrowing.

Another way to raise cash is to sell a federal loan with recourse. The government might, for example, sell someone a package of \$100 million worth of rural housing loans. The government would get the cash, and the investors who bought the loans would get the borrowers' payments of them. But taxpayers would carry the risk; if some of the borrowers defaulted, the government would step in and make their payments. Economically, the transaction winds up being identical to government borrowing: The government raises cash by promoting full repayment with interest.

With a few exceptions, most federal loans have been sold with government guarantees, and many congressional committees want to keep selling them that way. Recently, however, OMB and the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) have decided that such sales will be recorded as borrowing, not as reducing the deficit. To get credit toward meeting the fiscal targets in the Balance Budget Act, Congress will have to sell loans without recourse, unless the budget agencies back down under congressional pressure.

Selling without recourse is a whole different proposition. Investors who bought federal loans would have to assume the risk of default—which, because Congress makes many of its loans to people who could not get private credit, is often large. The sale of a \$100 million loan package might bring in \$90 million, if the loans were exceptionally good; much more often, the paper would be more heavily discounted, if it was salable at all.

Moreover, most federal loans are "subsidized to hell," in Bosworth's words. Investors discount them sharply to offset the low interest rates the loans carry and the lenient terms on which the government, a notoriously forgiving creditor, often issues them; thus the market's concern with forbearance in the case of the rural housing loans.

The bottom line is that much of the \$250 billion in federal loans is probably not worth much on the private market. No one knows for sure, though: Taken together, credit programs are a vast, largely unexplored jungle consisting of almost every conceivable kind of loan in almost every conceivable state of repair or disrepair. Over the decades, the government has issued loans to students, veterans, electric utilities, farmers, home buyers and virtually everyone else—loans bearing interest rates from practically zero to well above market rates and carrying documentation ranging from exemplary records to scribbles on index cards. Some agencies have renegotiated loans every time a default is threatened, and so, by now, the loans have become gifts and are basically worthless. Other loans are

in fine shape. Finding out which is which is a monumental task.

"The whole thing is an absolute disaster the way it's going now, because every kind of loan is under different rules," said Bosworth, who is working on a book about federal credit. "It's probably more messed up today than it has ever been."

Warner's guess is that a few tens of billions in federal loans are saleable; ultimately, though, the only way to find out what federal loans are worth is to try to sell them and see what happens. "There are some portfolios that cannot be sold at any reasonable price without recourse," he said.

One example, he said, is Small Business Administration disaster loans. The budget resolution counted on raising about \$400 million over three years from selling such loans. But their default rate is 26 per cent, Warner said, and they bear an average interest rate of 4.4 per cent. The only way to sell those loans without guarantees is at "sub-junk" prices, if at all, he said.

There is no rule, no generalization, that one can rely on in figuring out where to find salable federal paper. "One just has to go program by program and see how things are," Warner said.

That is a long, slow process—one that the Administration is beginning with a pilot program of selling federal loans with a book value of about \$4.4 billion. The primary goal is to begin finding out how much the federal portfolio is worth.

ILLUSORY GAINS

Where the broader aim of reducing the deficit is concerned, selling loans becomes more controversial. Unquestionably, selling loans or other assets brings in income that shows up as lower deficit. Many economists agree, however, that the gains are an illusion—a way of exploiting the inadequacies of federal accounting.

The federal budget is myopic: It reflects only the cash income and outgo in the fiscal year at hand and two-four years ahead. Politics is even more myopic, because the lawmakers' approach is to get this year's deficit down and worry about next year's when the time comes. An action, therefore, that brings in, say, \$3 billion this year but costs \$500 million a year for the 10 years after that looks to politicians like a \$3 billion reduction in the deficit.

For example, selling the Naval Petroleum Reserve in fiscal 1988 would, according to congressional estimates, bring in about \$1.6 billion right away. The annual losses of receipts from selling reserve oil as it is pumped out yearly—beginning at \$600 million-\$700 million in fiscal 1989 and gradually declining—would not show up on the balance sheet.

Fundamentally, asset sales improve this year's budget outlook at the expense of next year's. They use the marketplace to convert future benefits into current cash. The underlying problem—a government that is overcommitted—remains untouched.

Selling assets also doesn't help with the problem that makes people worry about deficits in the first place: massive federal borrowing that drives up the demand for credit and thus pushes up interest rates. Receipts from sales reduce government borrowing needs, but at the same time, someone else has to go out and borrow the money to buy whatever the government is selling, and so it's a wash.

"It's not real program reduction," said former OMB economist Lawrence A. Kudlow, now with the New York investment

banking firm of Bear, Stearns & Co., Inc. "The view from Wall Street is enormous skepticism that government is making permanent spending cuts. All you're doing by selling loans is accommodating the current and the future level of spending."

For that reason, Dave Stockman, Reagan's budget director until a year ago, opposed asset sales, despite believing that they were often a good idea on the merits. Stockman was afraid that Congress would pick them up as a substitute for economically meaningful spending cuts.

"I don't mind the policy of selling the loans," said Ballentine, who was Kudlow's successor as Stockman's chief economist at OMB. "The problem is you're using the sale of loans to avoid doing the other things you have to do to reduce the deficit."

That is what happened this year, at least to an extent. For example, by supporting loan sales, the advocates of rural housing aid were able to stave off cuts to their program, which the Administration wants to curtail drastically.

Stockman's strategy was to force the program cuts by holding asset sales off limits. Miller, by contrast, has regularly offered asset sales to Congress as a way to meet difficult deficit targets. "Jim likes this stuff because he is enamored of the concept of privatization," Kudlow said. "The guy wants to shrink the size of government by unloading some of the businesses the government runs."

Privatization is, for conservatives, a leading purpose of selling federal assets. Private enterprise, they say, can better manage such physical assets as the Naval Petroleum Reserve, which is basically a commercial oil operation. The same goes for loans: The private sector is far likelier than the government to administer them efficiently, conservatives argue.

Turning Stockman's strategy on its head, Miller seems to regard pressure to reduce deficits as an opportunity to put through asset sales that otherwise Congress wouldn't consider.

As those who tend toward cynicism are the first to point out, there is one group that gets real benefits when the government sells loans: investment bankers, who will in many cases handle the complicated business of arranging the sales.

An executive at an East Coast securities-trading firm, who handles a lot of government paper and requested anonymity so as not to prejudice himself with the agencies he deals with, said of investment bankers: "They're going to take their pound of flesh, you can be sure of that, because this is an expensive endeavor. If the philosophy of the government is to get out of these businesses, then the investment bankers are the only ones who can get them out."

THE OIL RIGS ARE STACKED AND SO IS THE DECK

HON. GLENN ENGLISH

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, the administration's free market philosophy is a bad gamble that is causing our basic industries to fold. The administration is betting that lower oil prices are good for consumers and good for economic recovery generally. The administra-

tion is also betting that lower farm prices will eventually sell more farm products overseas.

Many believe that the administration's lack of attention to financial disaster in the oil and farm sectors indicate poor advice being given to the President. That may be true but a recent exchange I had with OMB Director Jim Miller at a hearing of the Government Operations Committee leads me to believe that "buy foreign if it's cheaper" is the driving philosophy behind the administration's gamble. This was the exchange:

The gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Glenn English.

Mr. ENGLISH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was rather intrigued listening to the discussion between the professional economists with regard to the situation that faces us, and it seemed rather sterile, this discussion.

Mr. MILLER. Now, wait a minute. This is the nicest thing anybody has ever said.

Mr. ARMEY. I can only make a plea that I did my degree at Oklahoma, not A&M.

Mr. ENGLISH. I appreciate that, but in the discussion, it is almost as if it is automatic—these are figures out here that no one really has any control over, these things are happening, we are kind of bystanders—but that is not the case. Certainly in our economy the question of the size of the deficit, all of these factors are determined in large part—not totally, but in large part—by our government, and certainly by the philosophy that that government follows.

The Chairman earlier referred to the oil situation, the oil import fee, and certainly my State of Oklahoma is hurt as bad, some might even say worse than the State of Texas. Louisiana is in the same shape. A lot of that has to do with government policy, the policy of the government in Saudi Arabia, who decided that they are going to break their competitors, drive down the market price until they create enough pain that their OPEC allies will agree to quit cheating. That is government imposed.

When we look to our own government to respond to this challenge, this threat by another government against a major segment of our economy, we hear that it is the philosophy of our government to not get involved, to stand aside.

That brings to mind a year ago, whenever Treasury—I first came out of the Treasury Department, which was going to do away with intangible drilling cost deductions, the depletion allowance, and the Deputy Secretary of the Treasury happened to be an Oklahoman from Tulsa, Oklahoma, and a number of my independent oil and gas producers came to Washington to meet with him and talk about what this was going to do, what it was going to mean, how it was going to destroy the economy of the State of Oklahoma and the Southwest, what it was going to mean as far as energy independence was concerned.

The response that these oil and gas producers got was that it was the policy of this administration that if you can produce oil cheaper in Saudi Arabia than you can produce it in Oklahoma, then you guys in Oklahoma ought to be in some other business.

Now, the question I want to ask you is: is that, in fact, a true representation of the philosophy; and second, is it not true that the difficulties that we have got in the oil and gas business, the lack of revenue coming in, the lack of tax revenue, and certainly the same type of problem in agriculture—and I could make the same case and the same type of philosophical approach is

being made in agriculture—but do those not have a great bearing over what the gross national product of this nation is going to be, and does it not have a great bearing with regard to what the size of this deficit is going to be?

Mr. MILLER. Let me answer those questions seriatim in reverse order. I think yes, as a general principle it is the position of this administration that supply and demand should determine which products are produced by whom. If there is an opportunity for U.S. consumers to purchase from abroad products more cheaply produced than could be produced at home, they should have a right to do that.

We do have compassion, however, and concern about transitional effects with respect to the oil industry, with respect to farming and other industries that are adversely impacted by events.

The second part of my answer goes to the question of the effects on the gross national product of actions of other governments. You are entirely correct. From time to time actions taken by foreign governments can have an impact on the United States gross national product. Trade barriers erected by foreign governments restrict the ability of U.S. producers to sell abroad, and as you know, Clayton Yeutter and Mac Baldrige and others in the administration are working very hard to make sure that those barriers are lowered or eliminated.

There have been so-called unfair trading practices that we have taken issue with by importers, or exporters from foreign countries to the United States.

So my answer is that you are absolutely correct that actions of foreign governments can have an impact on U.S. aggregate economic activity.

Mr. ENGLISH. I want to make certain that I am perfectly clear because I want to quote correctly. In effect what you are telling me is that the message I have got to take back to the oil producers in Oklahoma and the farmers in Oklahoma is that the most help that they can expect out of this administration is transition, that we are going to help you out of your business.

Mr. MILLER. Well, I don't think I said exactly that because one anticipates demand that may be low this year to rise in the following year. We do have concern over the transitional effects, but basically, ours is not only a free society in terms of individual freedom and freedom of expression, but it is free also in terms of what actions consumers can take and what opportunities they have, and if they can purchase something more cheaply abroad, they have the right to do so.

Mr. ENGLISH. What happened to fairness, though? Doesn't fairness have to be an ingredient? We talk about free trade. Usually when people talk about free trade, they are talking about it being a two-way street, talking about unimpeded trade. That means that the governments of foreign nations are not, in effect, affecting that trade adversely. That gets into the issue of is it fair?

Do you think it is fair for Saudi Arabia to flood the market and drive the price down to the point that—and they have stated—they want to put out of business oil and gas producers in Oklahoma and Texas and Louisiana?

Do you think it is fair for our government to provide foreign countries such as Argentina with low interest loans that any of us question will ever be paid back so that, in effect, they can sell their products in the

world market cheaper than farmers from Oklahoma or the whole Midwest can do?

Is that fair?

Mr. MILLER. Let me say on the question of fairness, arguably, (a) I think it is fair that consumers have opportunities to purchase at the lowest price. Secondly, I did indicate issues of fairness—when foreign governments restrain our ability to export abroad, that is unfair, and we have taken issue with that. When foreign governments dump in America, that is unfair, and I have taken issue with that.

Mr. ENGLISH. What about our own government?

Mr. MILLER. On the question of export subsidies or providing the kinds of financial subsidies, I think the administration on a number of occasions has taken issue with just that sort of thing.

Mr. ENGLISH. Well, it is our government that is doing it. We just had a few weeks ago the Secretary of the Treasury very proud of the fact that he was able to obtain a \$350 million loan from Argentina, and they were going to be able to export \$1 billion more in agricultural products than what they are doing now. Now, that undercuts the price of my farmers' products. It means that my farmers aren't going to be selling it. It means my farmers are going out of business.

Now, my farmers can compete against farmers from other parts of the world. They cannot compete against those farmers if they are going to have the assistance, and particularly the backing of the Treasury or the resources of the United States Government backing them up. That is what is unfair.

In Oklahoma, the gamble is costing dearly. Another bank failed last week. That makes 30 Oklahoma banks that have failed since 1982. The number of active drilling rigs has dropped from 900 to less than 100. Fifty thousand jobs in energy have been lost. Farm foreclosures are at record numbers.

In the first 7 months of this year almost 7,000 bankruptcy petitions were filed in Oklahoma. Most of these are related in one way or another to the collapse of energy and agriculture prices.

Enough is enough. If the President doesn't agree with Jim Miller's recitation of the administration's "buy foreign if it's cheaper" philosophy, he should fire him. If he doesn't fire him—and doesn't stop gambling—we're in trouble.

**THE DEFICIT COULD BE \$356
MILLION LESS THAN IT IS**

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, last Monday the Congressional Budget Office projected that the 1987 deficit will be \$173 billion, almost \$30 billion above its ceiling in the budget-balancing law. The new projection is high enough to trigger the spending cut process under the law, which set a \$144 billion deficit ceiling for 1987.

Strangely enough however, even in the midst of this horrendous budget crisis the administration may relieve General Motors of a \$356 million fine owed to the U.S. Government for not being in compliance with the cor-

porate auto fuel economy [CAFE] standard. Such foolish moves are what has helped raise the deficit to what it is today.

The CAFE standard was established in the midseventies as a response to the Arab oil embargoes and the resulting energy crisis in the United States. It was primarily created for a better national energy conservation policy and to ease our dependence on foreign oil. Unfortunately, today the administration doesn't see the importance of this energy conservation policy and has consistently moved to weaken it.

Early last fall as a result of pressure from General Motors and Ford Motor Co., the standard was rolled back for a year from 27.5 to 26.0 miles per gallon. This spring pressure was again mounted, urging an extension of the rollback for model years 1987 and 1988. In an unusual move NHTSA issued a supplemental notice to this pending rulemaking. In a further unusual, and very disturbing move NHTSA has raised the issue of issuing the CAFE standard at a level below 26.0 miles per gallon.

If the standard is set below 26.0 miles per gallon, General Motors will be able to accumulate enough credits to wipe out its \$356 million fine. Although most of the Federal Government is being asked to make cuts in their budgets as a result of the budget crisis, the administration may give this very profitable company a \$356 million gift!

I fail to see the justice or wisdom in such a decision. I hope that my colleagues will examine this issue and join with me in expressing outrage over such a foolish move. The CAFE standard should not be moved below 26.0 miles per gallon, but should be increased to 27.5 miles per gallon where it was originally set by law for model years 1986, 1987, and 1988.

PALMDALE'S CENTENNIAL

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pleasure that I announce to my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives the 100th birthday of Palmdale, CA.

There were periods during its first century when Palmdale's future was not all that certain. Several times during its history, Palmdale sagged under the weight of natural and man-made disasters. But each time the city was threatened, its residents stiffened, faced the community's problems with tenacity and determination, and, as the coming centennial celebration attests, prevailed.

The first challenge occurred in 1899, about 15 years after German and Swiss families from Nebraska and Illinois, arrived and called the new land Palmenthal, having mistaken Joshua trees for palm trees. Old Palmdale, the Anglicized version of Palmenthal, with its shops and stores did just fine until a drought hit Southern California in the 1890's. This scourge shocked the young community but it rallied and regrouped in what became "new" Palmdale.

With the memories of the drought fresh in mind, the city began an irrigation district and in 1924 completed the Palmdale Litterlock Dam. The result was a flourishing community of farmers and ranchers who traded at Ickler's Dry Goods Store and Moulton Hardware Store and who raised chickens and turkeys and grew peaches, pears, grapes and melons.

Then came the Depression which drove away many of Palmdale's businesses. Ranchers lost their lands after fruit blight and low crop prices reduced their incomes. But again the strength of the people of Palmdale allowed the community to endure. The last traces of the Depression were banished by the outbreak of World War II.

Palmdale Airport, built by the WPA, served for training B-25 pilots. The military stayed through the war and remained. The Air Force wanted an assembly plant close but not too close to Los Angeles. In 1950 Lockheed became the first defense contractor to locate in Palmdale. Convair, North American Aviation, Rockwell International, Hughes Aircraft, McDonnell Douglas and Northrup Corp. soon followed. Palmdale bloomed anew. But another slump loomed.

In 1957, the Russians launched Sputnik and Pentagon planners decided that the Nation's defense should be manned by missiles not aircraft. The civic fortunes of Palmdale again dipped but not for long. Today, the space shuttle and the B-1 bomber have more than taken up the slack. The city and its residents thrive. They are proud of their 100-year tradition of tenacity, constancy and independence.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent a large portion of Palmdale and I am delighted to play a small part in the city's centennial celebration.

**B-1B AND STEALTH NOT AN
EITHER/OR CHOICE**

HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a great mistake has been made by those who have presented the B-1B and Stealth or advanced technology bombers as an either/or choice.

Last year we, in the Congress, asked the Department of Defense to do an unbiased analysis of our strategic bomber needs and requirements.

It was my impression that we clearly told DOD that the 1981 decision to build 100 B-1B bombers and 132 Stealth was not set in stone. We asked for a basic and fundamental review of the impact of reduced MX deployments, emerging SDI technologies, and other changes in the U.S. strategic picture.

What we got was the same old B-1B versus Stealth business. The DOD report arrived at the 11th hour, and it arrived highly classified. In fact, it was so classified that we still have little idea of the actual cost of the Stealth bomber.

We also do not have answers to questions about the best mix of B-1B's and Stealth bombers or about what we should do with the

hundreds of aging B-52's, which cost us about \$1 billion a year to fly.

I am concerned that while we are debating the DOD Authorization bill, these questions remain largely unanswered.

Likewise, I am concerned that shutting down the B-1B bomber production line before the Stealth bomber is in production and under a firm, fixed contract will prove very costly.

If for some reason—cost, performance, or something yet unknown—the Stealth Program is delayed, we will be left with only 100 modern strategic bombers and a fleet of ancient B-52's and aging FB-111's to face an ever-growing Soviet threat.

Because of these concerns, I strongly support the provision in this bill as reported by the House Armed Services Committee.

Establishment of a strategic bomber contingency fund will help ensure that our deterrent capabilities are maintained, and it will give us another year in which to carefully evaluate the cost performance of the Stealth bomber, while maintaining a low-risk and competitive option to continue producing the B-1B if necessary.

SERVING THEM RIGHT

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, recently one of the restaurants in Santa Fe celebrated its 20th anniversary. During those 20 years, The Compound has become one of the finest restaurants in New Mexico and has established itself as one of the premier restaurants in the United States. The Compound has come to deserve this reputation from the guidance of its owner, Mr. Victor Sagheer. The popularity and consistent excellence of the restaurant is an example of how hard work, a passion for perfection and a deep commitment to success can make dreams come true.

Victor Sagheer came to this country from Lebanon and has worked his way up to becoming the owner of The Compound. Victor's pride and dedication to this establishment extends to his well-trained staff and they all take exceptional joy in their work. Victor's ambition is to see The Compound as a four-star restaurant is now a reality and Santa Feans are all aware that it was because of Victor Sagheer's commitment and pride in his own work that his dream was achieved.

I would like to insert into the RECORD a recent article about The Compound and I'm sure that my colleagues join me in applauding an American success story.

[From the Santa Fe New Mexican, July 13, 1986]

SERVING THEM RIGHT—WAITERS AT COMPOUND DISH UP EXCELLENCE

(By Sam Atwood)

Ten minutes to show time. White-gloved waiters are scurrying around the formal dining room making last-minute adjustments to tables full of fine silver, crystal and china.

The maitre d' checks a full reservation list and feels the adrenaline flowing into his veins. This is an opera night, when the res-

taurant is at its busiest. His mental concentration shifts into high gear.

Like the crumbs of last night's meal, their personal frustrations must be swept out of sight to make room for this performance.

They will not sing or dance or tell jokes. Their act is providing top-notch service at one of the finest restaurants in the country.

They are waiters at the Compound, Santa Fe's most exclusive restaurant. It's the only one in town that requires men to wear a coat and tie. Infants and children under 8 are not allowed.

It is the only restaurant in the state to consistently win Mobil's prestigious Four Star dining award. Gourmet continental dishes like Dover sole and pepper steak are served under silver domes. A dinner for two averages \$100. The wine list includes a 1935 vintage for \$600 a bottle.

Their waiters serve the rich and famous, the stars and celebrities.

"There's definitely a certain glamour to working here," dining room manager Chris Ebner said. Ebner has refused Robert Redford a table several times when the star called too late to reserve a space.

Waiters average \$100 a night in tips; one recently collected \$150 from one table.

"It's quick money. And it's something I can do," waiter Bob Graham said.

Others place less emphasis on their income and more on the privilege of working in a fine restaurant, and the personal commitment of those they work with.

Regardless of their motivation, they all work hard for the money. They must discipline their minds and bodies to work as fine machines. They must memorize the changing shape of a dozen table tops and anticipate a diner's every need.

Night after night, they turn on their waiter's personality to create the magic, to turn a good meal into a fine dining experience.

"Regardless of how down you are, when six o'clock comes around you're going to be up," wine steward Joseph Lyles said.

This month marks The Compound's 20th anniversary. A century ago, the building was a sprawling adobe hacienda surrounded by an apple orchard. In 1966, renowned designer Alexander Girard rebuilt the interior to house an elegant, first-class restaurant.

The walls are white. No curtains hang over the windows. One room is dominated by a patchwork fabric design on the ceiling; another by a hand-woven American flag on the wall. Outside, a formal garden with trim hedges and a cool fountain exudes Old World flavor.

Each place setting is equipped with six pieces of heavy silver, a brightly colored Limoges china platter and two goblets of lead crystal that sing like sopranos when flicked with a finger.

The restaurant is formal, but not pretentious, and it bothers Ebner when people see it that way.

The waiters are young, clean-cut men, and they look honest enough to trust with the family fortune. They wear spit-shined black shoes, blackpant, black tie and the ubiquitous white jacket and white gloves. On a busy night, they will go through three jackets and six pairs of gloves.

Waiters must learn hundreds of nuances important to fine service. They learn the proper way to stand at a table, the proper way to move there, the correct way to fill a water glass.

For about an hour before dinner, waiters ready the dining room for its guests. One of them will spend 40 minutes wiping all the silverware. Their pre-dinner motto is "shut up and set up."

When they are finished, they all sit down to a special meal prepared by the chefs. One of last week's dinners featured ground sirloin steak with marsala and mushroom sauce, homemade mashed potatoes and sautéed vegetables.

Owner Victor Sagheer is the driving force behind The Compound's style and excellence. He started working there as manager in 1967 and bought the restaurant in 1975. A short, round, balding man, he demands perfection and has an unflinching eye for detail.

When Sagheer seats guests at a table, his hands go to work like a watchmaker adjusting a fine Swiss timepiece.

Guests seated, he glides the table toward their torsos. A fresh bunch of flowers is swiveled to face them. Deft fingers adjust the position of candle and ashtray, and smooth minute creases in the linen table cloth.

If a waiter sets a chair or a plate a few inches off its prescribed position, Sagheer or Ebner will call them aside to admonish their careless mistake.

"There is no room for daydreaming * * * it takes 100 percent concentration," Ebner said.

Only one in every three or four waiters * * * and stay beyond the initial trial period of about two weeks. They must show the right blend of intelligence, pleasant character, attention to detail and cool headedness during the heat of a dinner rush.

Most waiters start out as busboys, called captains at The Compound, and work their way into waiter positions after a training period of months or years.

While the restaurant is often host to stars, much of their bread and butter comes from locals who eat there four and five times a week. Sagheer and Ebner know ahead of time which drinks they will order, which tables they prefer and who they would rather not sit next to.

Like Sagheer, Ebner is driven by a desire for perfection.

"Personally, it just kills me when something goes wrong," he said.

Raised in a working class family in Syracuse, NY, Ebner has become an expert on the sensitivities of the rich. Occasionally, his private life and profession show up in stark contrast.

When the Grateful Dead played in Santa Fe, their manager called Ebner to make a reservation for the band at the restaurant. An avid Dead fan, Ebner was eager to please. But he knew that admitting the scraggly musicians to The Compound would be like opening the Oval Office to the homeless.

"I could see how this was just not going to work out," he said.

Johnny Montoya, a native Santa Fean and 16-year-veteran of The Compound, has waited on hundreds of celebrities. He's especially proud of his autograph collection of 106 stars he's served over the years, including Chuck Norris, Gregory Peck and Cary Grant.

Ready to apply for a job there? Ebner has a few words of advice:

"It's a good place for a perfectionist to work."

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE IN AFRICA: A GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE WEST

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to alert my colleagues to the fact that the West stands at a crossroads in its relations with nations on the African Continent. Despite the flirtation of many African countries with closed or socialist economies, the vast majority of these nations now recognize the need for free-market or mixed economies.

What is the reason for this? Why have so many nations drawn back from once-cordial relations with the Soviet Union, and turned their attention westward? The answer is really quite simple; Africans are pragmatists.

The post-colonial era saw many of the new African nation-states reject anything which smacked of the old order. The capitalist West had bled Africa dry, largely without any consideration of how Africans would construct post-colonial economies. Thus, the first instinct of Africans was to begin with planned economies.

Ultimately, the East provided little more than ideology, and African nations found themselves looking for ways to create self-sustaining economies. In essence, they became willing to give the free-market a chance, and are now asking for Western assistance in building productive economies.

Mr. Speaker, the West should now understand that African nations are willing to give the free-market alternative a fair chance. Let us join hands with these nations, and help them build viable economies with Western expertise and assistance. They would like to join us as partners in development.

I would like to submit the following article, written by Bishop John T. Walker, for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, July 22, 1986]
A BREACH OF FAITH WITH AFRICA—IT WILL GET THE SHORT END OF THE GRAMM-RUDMAN STICK

(By John T. Walker)

A new drought—this one man-made—is about to sweep Africa, threatening the brave but tenuous economic reforms that several countries have initiated at the urging of Western donors and international lending agencies.

Draconian cuts in U.S. assistance to Africa, virtually mandated by the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings budget legislation, could reduce FY87 development support by more than 55 percent—\$428 million—below FY85 levels. We spend more to build a single Navy frigate.

It is difficult to understate the irony and the likely economic and political consequences of our imminent abandonment of Africa at the very moment many African governments are conceding that free enterprise works better than socialism. It is as though we had decided to impose sanctions on those who have begun to liberate themselves from the bonds of centrally planned, state-run economies.

Reform has a price, however. Leaders in Zambia, Tanzania, Ghana, Guinea and sev-

eral other countries are willing to take the short-term political risks. We must be prepared to help them through the treacherous rapids of economic transition—with the capital they need to prime the free-market pump.

Governments that have at last guaranteed their farmers a fair price for growing food and export crops still need foreign exchange to guarantee that there are spare parts and tires for the trucks to bring production to market.

Without adequate capital resources in the critical years to come, to encourage and sustain the economic reform process, much of Africa will remain economically stagnant. This, in turn, will undermine the evolution of stable, democratic political systems.

Zambia is an object lesson of the opportunity that could be lost because of blind budget-cutting. After nearly two decades of controlling producer prices and subsidizing urban consumers, Zambia has finally admitted that economic growth is based on incentives to produce, not to consume. Through sometimes difficult dialogue with the U.S. Agency for International Development, the World Bank and others, Zambia has begun to provide the free-market conditions necessary to become agriculturally self-sufficient and to reduce dependence on a rapidly depleting copper-mining industry.

This process poses serious risks to the government of President Kenneth D. Kaunda. A freeze on civil service hiring, a sharp devaluation of the currency and the closing down of uneconomic state-operated companies and mines have greatly reduced the average Zambian's standard of living, especially in the cities. Unemployment and crime have increased hand in hand. And there have been signs of public unrest in a country that has been one of the most stable in Africa.

Having urged the Zambians to walk the tightrope between a controlled economy and its free-market opposite, we have an obligation to ensure that they reach the other side. One way to do that is to inject hard cash into Zambia's innovative biweekly auction of foreign exchange. This is enabling Zambian firms to obtain spare parts, machinery and raw materials they require to get the economy turning over.

Consider, however, what will happen if Gramm-Rudman is allowed to override common sense. Based on original funding allocations, the USAID mission in Zambia is proposing to commit about \$13 million to promote small-scale rural enterprise. The money would be channeled through the foreign exchange auction and generate local currency for training and loans to rural entrepreneurs, with an emphasis on such things as food processing and manufacture of farm implements.

Gramm-Rudman is expected to reduce this program to a pittance. It will also reduce the credibility of patient American preaching on the virtues of free enterprise. U.S. foreign assistance in Africa will have become like a Christmas toy: batteries not included.

The African information has other notable converts. Guinea has come in from the cold, after experimenting with a closed economy for nearly a third of a century; Tanzania, an early proponent of African socialism, has begun reviving its private sector and is restoring nationalized land to individual ownership; and Mozambique has de-emphasized large state farms in favor of rehabilitating peasant agriculture.

Africans are more pragmatic than ideological. Their embrace of socialist theory and

its Eastern bloc prophets was a rational response to a colonial experience that portrayed capitalism as essentially exploitative and dehumanizing. Their turning back to free enterprise is no less rational. They have determined, through trial and error, that socialism is no panacea. Now it is up to us to make sure that capitalism does not fail them a second time.

The Gramm-Rudman exercise seems bound to make certain it does fail Africa at a critical juncture in the continent's political and economic maturation. The current House-Senate budget resolution would allocate \$342 million to Africa, about 39 percent less than estimated FY86 commitments. Not only will this be counterproductive to American interests and objectives, it will be tantamount to a breach of faith with African governments and leaders who have decided to follow our lead down the free-market path.

If hard choices must be made on the federal budget, they should be made as equitably as possible. Cutting \$400 million from the administration's already modest request for African assistance, while treating the annual \$2 billion subsidy to Israel and Egypt as sacrosanct, is a hard choice only for Africa.

That foreign assistance budget has become a tangle of special-interest earmarkings. For the most part, African development needs have been excluded from this most-favored nation process. It is time we rectified this. We should remember that the Soviets and other Eastern bloc nations have failed to exert sustained influence in Africa because, apart from selling—not giving—arms, they have offered little more than rhetoric and theory. We could fail in Africa for the same reason. Nurturing free enterprise has a cost.

FAILURE TO REAUTHORIZE SUPERFUND WOULD BE IRRESPONSIBLE

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, cleanup of hazardous waste sites throughout the country are in dire peril of being shut down because the Congress has thus far failed to reauthorize superfund. Failure to do so by the time we recess this weekend would be extremely irresponsible. I want to share with my colleagues the impact failure to reauthorize will have on my State of Pennsylvania. The impact is detailed in a letter to me from Governor Thornburgh as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
 GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
 Harrisburg, August 12, 1986.

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER,
 House of Representatives,
 Washington, DC.

DEAR BILL: Your help is needed to maintain the momentum of the conference committee considering Superfund reauthorization. Without quick resolution of the remaining issue of how to fund the program, the federal and all the cooperative state superfund programs face dismantlement.

On July 31, House and Senate conferees reached agreement on Superfund's many complex program issues after six months of

discussion. If conferees from the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee decide to wait until September to resolve funding issues, the Environmental Protection Agency will be forced to slow down and in some cases terminate cleanup contracts. These disturbing actions could begin as early as September. If this happens, the cost of restarting the program could be high and, more importantly, the time delay will be detrimental to our environment.

Pennsylvania continues to be a leader in hazardous waste site cleanups. Two of the six Superfund sites EPA has completed are in Pennsylvania. This fiscal year, state appropriations were increased to \$8.7 million to fund the state's share of Superfund cleanups and to continue the Commonwealth's aggressive program to identify and assess abandoned waste sites. If federal money were available and EPA expedites the Superfund program, Pennsylvania could be conducting an \$80 million a year Superfund cleanup program.

I ask you to urge your colleagues who are conferees dealing with the funding issue to act this week. Let them know that only their quick action will ensure the federal Superfund program is reauthorized without a crippling loss of effectiveness.

I appreciate your help on this important issue that directly affects so many citizens of Pennsylvania.

Sincerely,

DICK THORNBURGH,
Governor.

WHAT AMERICA SHOULD DO ABOUT SOUTH AFRICA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, over the years I have warned the proponents of economic sanctions against South Africa of the likely impact of such sanctions on South Africa, the neighboring African states, and on the United States. I have repeatedly cited black leaders in South Africa, such as Lucy Mvubelo of the black National Union of Clothing Workers and Chief Buthelezi of the Zulus, who genuinely believe that economic sanctions will only add to the unrest and violence, and will ultimately do more harm than good for the blacks in that country. Today I am again raising my concerns, this time citing a liberal member of the South African Parliament as my source.

Helen Suzman was first elected to the South African Parliament in 1953. As an opposition member of Parliament, she has long been an articulate and outspoken critic of the Government's policy of apartheid. Although she is morally opposed to the system of apartheid, as am I, she warns, "the United States should exert pressure on apartheid, but not impose punitive measures that will wreck the South African economy. That is the strategy of despair that will destroy the inheritance which blacks will inevitably share."

It remains a mystery to me that, in the face of warnings from a wide array of prominent South Africans, black and white, liberal and conservative, United States legislators still feel a need to take the moral high ground and impose severe sanctions against South Africa.

Before we sign off on punitive measures against South Africa, I urge my colleagues on both the House and the Senate to seriously consider the line of reasoning put forth by Helen Suzman in the following article. Let us not blindly follow our hearts, but also take into account the ramifications of imposing sanctions against South Africa.

[From the New York Times Magazine, Aug. 3, 1986]

WHAT AMERICA SHOULD DO ABOUT SOUTH AFRICA

(By Helen Suzman)

What should the United States do about South Africa? This is a simple question to which there is no simple answer, if there is an answer at all. Of course, if the desire to distance the United States from a morally repugnant system is paramount and if the objective is to punish South Africa for its glaring sins of omission and commission, regardless of the consequences, then sanctions and disinvestment spring readily to mind. And if political expediency is also part of the picture, then calling for economic sanctions must surely be irresistible.

I realized this in November 1984 when I was in the United States and watched on television the landslide victory of Ronald Reagan in the elections. The following morning, I received a call from the New York correspondent of the South African evening newspapers. He asked for my reaction to the election, and I told him I had no doubt that champagne corks were popping in Pretoria. I also said the celebrants were making a great mistake because I believed that the Democrats would seek a rallying cause—and South Africa was going to be it.

I did not need a crystal ball to make that prediction. During visits to the United States over the past seven years, I had observed the buildup of the anti-apartheid campaign in the United States, on campuses in particular. Year after year in the South African Parliament, I had warned that unless the Government began to dismantle apartheid, which is legally sanctioned racial discrimination, and to desist from some of its more abhorrent practices—such as detention without trial and the forced removal of helpless black communities—South Africa would be faced with severe punitive measures. My warnings fell on deaf ears. Events in South Africa throughout 1985 triggered an anti-apartheid explosion in the West.

Day after day, scenes of ugly police brutality, of mass funerals of victims of police shootings in black townships, appeared before horrified American and European television viewers. (Such scenes were not shown on South African television, which is state controlled, although the horrendous black-on-black violence frequently appeared on the screen.) With relentless regularity, newspaper headlines abroad proclaimed the rising death rate, the enormous number of people detained without trial, torture at the hands of the security police, the hordes of children arrested and imprisoned.

By mid-1985, the South African issue had been reduced to a simple equation in the United States: "If you are against sanctions and disinvestment, you must be a racist—Q.E.D." The response was of tidal-wave proportions. In July 1985, Chase Manhattan, followed by other banks, pulled the rug from under South Africa's financial system by refusing to roll over loans; as a result, the value of the rand plummeted. Many colleges and universities divested themselves of stocks in companies doing in South Africa.

Cities and states "cleansed" their pension-fund investments of South African connections.

Last year, unable to withstand the hassle factor at home, fearful of boycotts of their products in the United States and nervous about political and economic instability in South Africa, 28 American companies (according to the American Chamber of Commerce in Johannesburg) withdrew from South Africa. Others have followed suit this year.

In September 1985, hoping to forestall more severe Congressional action, President Reagan, long an opponent of sanctions, signed an executive order that prohibited most new loans to South African businesses. The order also banned the sale of most nuclear-related technology to South Africa and the sale of the Krugerrand, the South African gold coin, in the United States.

Across the Atlantic, the other stalwart opponent of sanctions, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Britain, was experiencing even greater pressures. She was forced to agree to limited measures against Pretoria at the Commonwealth conference in the Bahamas in October 1985. The final report of the Eminent Persons Group—a seven-member mission appointed at the Bahamian conference to conduct an in-depth investigation in South Africa—brought no comfort. The mission originally put forward a "possible negotiating concept" to the South African Government, one calling for steps toward ending apartheid. They included the suspension of violence by both the Government and the African National Congress (A.N.C., the most prominent of exiled groups against apartheid); the release of Nelson Mandela, the black leader who has been in prison for 24 years, and other political prisoners; the removal of the Government's military forces from black townships; the legalization of the A.N.C. and Pan African Congress, another black political organization, and a ban on detention without trial.

Instead of accepting these very reasonable proposals, which have long been advocated by myself and by other opposition politicians in South Africa, the Pretoria regime, as is its wont, embarked on a course of action that could only strengthen the sanctions lobby. Last May, while the Commonwealth mission was still in South Africa and was in the process of preparing its final report, the South African Defense Force carried out raids on Lusaka, Gaborone and Harare, the capitals of three neighboring Commonwealth countries. The official reason given was "to take out" A.N.C. bases. But the gains appeared to be minimal. Politically aware South Africans ascribed the raids to a Government attempt to prove to militant right-wing elements inside the country that the Government had not "gone soft" on the A.N.C. and was not succumbing to outside pressures.

Not surprisingly, diplomatic reaction abroad was totally hostile. The Commonwealth mission was understandably outraged, and its final report made this clear. Shortly afterward, negotiations broke down and the group reported to the Commonwealth heads of government their "reluctant but unequivocal judgment that further talks would not lead anywhere in the current circumstances."

Paradoxically, it was during this tumultuous time that the most far-reaching reforms yet introduced by the South African Government in the direction of dismantling apartheid were enacted. As a result of pressures from inside and outside the country,

during the recent Parliamentary session, the Government offered to restore citizenship to those permanent residents in the republic who ceased to be South African citizens when the four black homelands became "independent." (Even with citizenship, however, the blacks in South Africa will not have Parliamentary voting rights.)

The Government also opened the central business districts in major cities to all races. It made property ownership available to blacks in the townships. Most significant of all, it abolished the hated pass laws and influx control, and replaced the old pass book with a common nonracial identity document. (The pass laws have for many decades inhibited the mobility of blacks and their right to lead family lives. Millions of people have been arrested for infractions of these laws, which have bedeviled the relationship between the police and the black community.)

Although many vital issues remain to be addressed—redistribution of land and the disproportionate living standards of white and black South Africans—there is no doubt that the reforms signify a change of direction: away from apartheid. The recent reforms will undoubtedly have a positive effect on the future well-being of black South Africans. In fact, had these changes taken place five years earlier, the impact would have been far greater among blacks. As it is, they have been totally overshadowed by the reimposition of a state of emergency, the detention of thousands of people and the ongoing violence in the black townships.

The reforms have evoked little reaction in decision-making circles in the United States and Europe. (Ten years ago, they would probably have been considered significant, particularly in the United States, which at the time might still have been harboring vivid recollections of its own civil-rights struggle of the 1960's.)

This response—or lack of it—to changes the South African Government considers to be of major importance has not only increased its intransigence, but confirmed what it has long suspected: that the failure of the West to define precisely what it means by "dismantling apartheid" is part of a ploy to move the goal posts as each demand is met; ultimately, the Government fears, the West will insist on the total transfer of power to the black majority. This is simply not under consideration by the South African Government.

Those who believe that a quick fix is likely to follow the imposition of sanctions, and that the Pretoria regime will collapse within a short time thereafter, are sadly misinformed. Certainly, if I believed in such a possibility, I would back sanctions to the hilt. Far more likely is a retreat into a siege economy, more oppression and more violence. There will be a long, drawn-out confrontation between a well-armed military force shoring up the Government and a popular movement backed by the masses and using Irish Republican Army-type tactics in urban and rural areas. The latter strategy has already been put into effect.

The Reagan Administration's policy of "constructive engagement" may well be dismissed in a great many circles in the United States and elsewhere. It has, at least, aimed for attainable objectives: to prevent forced removals of black communities; to extend funds from the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) to civil-rights organizations and drought-stricken areas; to press for the release of anti-apartheid detainees.

Moreover, together with the Sullivan principles, it encouraged American businessmen and, by example, their South African and European counterparts, to be socially responsible.

Nowadays, the Sullivan principles are also in the doghouse. Drafted almost a decade ago by the Rev. Leon Sullivan, a black Baptist minister from Philadelphia, the code calls for the desegregation of workplaces, equal employment practices, training for nonwhites, social services for black workers and the promotion of trade unionism. The code has been adopted by about 65 percent of the 260 or so American companies now doing business in South Africa. But many black South Africans feel that too much lip service has been paid to the code and not enough action taken.

While realizing that I lay myself open to the accusation of paternalism, I have to say that I have more respect for the American companies that have, so far anyway, remained in South Africa (and have set aside millions of dollars for the education, training and housing of their black employees) than for those that have left the country. The companies that have left have taken with them what influence they could have had inside South Africa, thereby abandoning desperate, jobless breadwinners in a country with no social security safety net, no dole and no food stamps.

The moral outrage and desire for punitive action is something I understand very well, but the reality that will come as a result of a grievously afflicted economy will not be seen by those living thousands of miles away. That reality, compounded by decades of unequal employment opportunities and oppression, is bleak beyond belief. True, many black South Africans say they approve of disinvestment and sanctions, despite the additional hardships they will endure as a result. They fall into four categories: those who have no jobs and nothing to lose; those who have jobs in "sheltered" employment and will lose nothing; those who want everyone to lose everything (therefore, "roll on the revolution"), and, finally, those who believe that the South African Government will crack at the first (or, at worst, second) sign of sanctions. The last category brings to mind a former British prime minister who predicted that it would take "weeks rather than months" to bring down Ian Smith's Unilateral Declaration of Independence in Rhodesia. In the event, it took another 15 years and 30,000 dead.

There are also leaders of the neighboring black states who advocate sanctions against South Africa, despite the fact that southern Africa is one economic unit. Whatever harm is done to South Africa's economy will certainly harm the economies of the country's neighbors, which are dependent on South Africa for jobs, markets and transportation.

The former High Commission territories of Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland are part of a customs union with South Africa from which they derive substantial revenues; Botswana and Lesotho also belong to the rand monetary area. South Africa's Electricity Supply Commission is an important source of power for these countries, which also depend entirely on routes through South Africa for trade. Zaire, Zambia and Zimbabwe are heavily dependent on South African transport and ports for their imports and exports.

More than 250,000 foreign blacks work in South African mines alone, earning almost 1 billion rand (about \$400 million) a year, at least half of which is repatriated. A further

170,000 foreign blacks are employed in other occupations in South Africa, not to mention an estimated one million "illegals." The neighboring states cherish the hope that the Western nations will pick up the tab to make good the substantial losses they will sustain after they cut their links with South Africa. Unfortunately, this hope is probably unfounded.

Unpalatable as it may seem to the sanctions lobby, the most practicable way to get rid of apartheid and to achieve a nonracial democratic society in South Africa is through an expanding, flourishing economy. The process of integrating blacks as skilled workers into such an economy would be expedited. Their economic muscle would then, through increased trade-union action, be a potent force not only in the workplace but also in the sociopolitical sphere. Strike action and consumer boycotts—both of which can be used as temporary expedients, unlike disinvestment and mandatory sanctions—are the most powerful weapons for blacks to use to resolve important issues like political power-sharing.

Indeed, consumer boycotts have already been used to great effect in some parts of the country, such as the eastern Cape Province, where many white-owned shops were brought to the brink of bankruptcy. Conversely, if blacks are unemployed and have nothing to spend, such boycotts would be meaningless. It is astonishing to me that those advocating punitive actions do not realize that, if successful, they will have undermined the most significant power base that blacks could acquire.

Certainly, this approach presupposes a long-term strategy and blacks, especially young blacks, want liberation now. No one should underestimate the fierce spirit of resistance that pervades the black townships, but while incremental change is certainly attainable, the replacement of the white minority government by a black majority government is simply not within reach, even though many blacks believe that the era of white domination is about to end.

Those calling for sanctions and disinvestment often overlook two important factors.

First, while the present white minority Government in South Africa has no pretensions to democratic rule, there are also no guarantees that it would be replaced by a nonracial democracy respecting the rule of law, a free press, free association, free elections and an independent judiciary, not to mention an economy free of state control.

Second, South Africa does not consist only of an oppressed black majority and right-wing white oppressors. Indeed, 250,000 white voters (20 percent of the white electorate) in the last general election in 1981 cast their ballots for the official opposition in the House of Assembly—the Progressive Federal Party, which has for years advocated the ending of apartheid and the establishment of a truly representative government with protection for the legitimate rights of minorities. Although the percentage of those who voted against apartheid is small, it is nonetheless significant. It may be well to remember that from 1961 to 1974 I was the only Member of Parliament elected on such a platform.

Indications of support for such an alternative government from powerful nations like the United States would certainly encourage many move white South Africans to cast their votes against the Pretoria regime at the next election, due at the latest in three years' time. At the very least, there could be a Parliamentary realignment.

It may well be that all such arguments fall on deaf ears, and that they are advanced in a lost cause. Nevertheless, they deserve to be made in the interest of millions of moderate South Africans of all races who abhor apartheid, who have long fought the abominable practices of race discrimination and who are striving for a peaceful transition to a nonracial democracy. For them, at least it is surely not too much to ask that they be spared the violence and misery of a scorched-earth policy.

It is not at all certain whether President Reagan can stave off Congressional imposition of harsh punitive sanctions, as he tried to do in his recent speech on American policies toward South Africa. But if he does—and it is a big if—it is vital that the Pretoria Government use the time so won to accelerate the dismantling of apartheid, to provide better housing and education and, most important, to extend political rights to blacks. The release of Mandela as a prerequisite for negotiations is an obvious first step, as are the release of all persons detained without trial and an end to the state of emergency.

The United States should keep up its condemnation of apartheid. The system of apartheid is an affront to people concerned with civilized values throughout the world. Its eradication would be an important gain for the civil-rights movement and would increase the sum of human freedom worldwide. The United States should exert pressure on apartheid, but not impose punitive measures that will wreck the South African economy. That is the strategy of despair that will destroy the inheritance which blacks will inevitably share.

STEEL IMPORTS GO UNABATED

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, in a report entitled "The Bi-Coastal Economy," the Joint Economic Committee reported that while the east and west coasts have been booming, the Nation's midsection has sunk deeper into a slump during the past 5 years. Hard times linger in the basic manufacturing industries, particularly.

The committee cites as the central cause of this stagnation trade and the "massive imbalance in trade that exists between the United States and its trading partners." In just 5 years, the United States has gone from a surplus of \$1.8 billion to a \$140-billion trade deficit. A major reason behind this reversal has been an influx of imported manufactured goods in competition with American-made products. In many industries—like steel—this hits hard.

President Reagan promised to slow steel imports through a series of individually negotiated voluntary restraint agreements [VRA's] with exporting nations. However, the continued high import levels and the state of the domestic steel industry clearly testify that the President's program is not working as promised. Failure to meet the VRA import target levels promised by the President constitute a crucial missed opportunity for increased production and badly needed jobs in the industry.

The recent performance of the steel industry is a history of struggle and decline. Ten

years ago there were 370,000 workers in the industry and imports occupied only 14 percent domestic consumption. In contrast, employment by the first 4 months of 1986 had fallen to 190,000 workers—a 50-percent reduction in the work force over 10 years.

Imports have steadily climbed during the same period to 15 percent in 1979, to 20.5 percent in 1983, and to 25 percent in 1985—fully 17 months after the President's VRA program went into effect. In September 1985, imports reached a record high of 30.5 percent.

The industry has suffered substantial losses in the last 4 years estimated at \$7.6 billion, while the aggregate net loss in sales since 1982 is close to \$112 billion. Between 1984 and 1985 alone, losses increased dramatically from \$30.5 million to \$1.7 billion. Heavy losses such as these have forced 15 steel companies out of business since 1974, while 30 plants in surviving firms have closed and 560 production units in other plants have been terminated. All told, over 30 million tons of capacity have been eliminated.

The President's program has functioned poorly against this backdrop. While many analysts concede that steel imports could be as high as 38 percent without the VRA's, the program has fallen critically short of its promised import target levels of 18.5 percent for finished steel products and 20.2 percent for all steel products. Imports hit 25 percent in 1985 and hovered at 23.2 percent for the first 4 months of 1986. CRS reports the figures are unlikely to improve, estimating a consistently high market share for imports of 23.3 percent from 1986 to 1989. After 5 years, only half the desired reduction in steel import market share will be realized. According to CRS, this failure represents a crucial "missed opportunity" to raise production levels, boost capital formation, and create jobs in the industry.

If the President's VRA program had achieved the promised reductions in steel market shares, the total increase in output of the steel and steel-related portions of the economy would have amounted to \$2.3 billion and the creation of 52,500 greatly needed jobs.

The reasons for the failure of the President's program are several: The complex and varying nature of each individual agreement; the difficulties of coordinating a strong and consistent enforcement procedure for many agreements with different countries; and loopholes that exporters use to circumvent quota levels. Several countries, in fact, have failed to negotiate agreements, including such substantial steel importing nations as Canada, Sweden, Taiwan, and Argentina.

Furthermore there is evidence that several countries are openly or covertly violating the VRA's they have negotiated. It has been reported that three countries have been importing specialty steel products at levels far exceeding the limits set in their VRA's. Korea imported stainless steel sheet and strip during the first months of 1986 at a rate nearly double their annual quota of 9,000 tons, while Spain and South Africa exceeded their annual rates by several thousand tons.

In addition, further evidence suggests that some exporters may be disguising the country of origin or the final form of their steel products in order to ship them to the United States

in excess of their VRA quotas. Many are concerned about the transshipment of steel whereby steel is passed from a VRA country through a non-VRA country before arriving in the United States. By changing the "country of origin" of such shipments exporters hope to elude U.S. Customs officials and violate their VRA's.

Witnesses have also testified before Congress that steel products can be shipped from a participating country to a nonparticipating country and there undergo "substantial transformation." The altered products may then pass through control uncredited against the allocated export quotas for the real country of origin.

Another disturbing effect of the President's program is that it could legitimize these high import levels by allowing these levels to set the U.S. market share for imports. Participating and nonparticipating nations alike could take the U.S. failure to bring imports down to our stated goals of 20.2 percent as a sign that we are not serious and they would have little incentive for voluntary restraint. In addition, CRS reports that failure to bring imports down to stated levels could accelerate plant closings. Two major U.S. steel producers have conducted corporate restructuring which may lead to the phasing out of their steel divisions. LTV just announced bankruptcy. Cutting corners just continues to drain needed capital from modernization efforts so important to the industry's future survival.

The President's program is a disappointment to me, but more importantly, to many steel communities like mine in Pittsburgh. The continuing slump in the Nation's core industry requires some tough actions, not more empty promises.

WAITING FOR PROSPERITY

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, the Newark Star-Ledger published an editorial today that points out how economic growth is slowing down. It is premature for any of us, Republicans and Democrats, to congratulate ourselves on our recovery when unemployment rates are stuck at around 7 percent, with much higher rates for the minorities and residents of inner city America.

The Ledger is right: the Federal Reserve could afford to bring down interest rates further. No one expects instant results from any policy, but with real interest rate costs at very high levels there is surely room for cutting the discount rate 1 percent or more.

WAITING FOR PROSPERITY

The American economy appears to be approaching a crossroads that could chart our economic health for some time. The scenario, as written by both private economists and those of the Reagan Administration, calls for sluggish growth to be replaced by faster growth. But the economy doesn't seem willing to go by the script.

The gross national product, the major measure of how our economy is faring,

slumped to 1.1 percent growth for the second quarter of 1986. This is far below the revised 3.8 percent growth rate the nation experienced during the year's first three months, and is the slowest quarter experienced since the end of the 1981-82 recession.

Most economists still believe there will be no recession in the near future, but the slow growth has called into question their assumption that the second half of the year would be a time of sharp pickup. If it does nothing more, it at least causes the asking of the familiar question: What are we doing wrong?

The problem is with American manufacturing, which has gone into a long tailspin. The steel industry, long depressed, is more so than ever. LTV Corp., the nation's second largest steelmaker, has had to file for protection under Chapter 11 of the bankruptcy law. Foreign competition has hurt here, as it has with the auto industry and the semiconductor industry.

Most disturbing of all is that the conventional remedies don't seem to be working. The cure for the huge foreign trade deficit is supposed to be a weaker currency. The dollar has been dropping for well over a year now, but the trade deficit, particularly with Japan, continues to swell.

The cure for slow growth is supposed to be lower interest rates. The falling price of petroleum products is also supposed to help. But although rates and oil prices have both been on the downgrade, the slow growth remains.

To all these hard facts, the Reagan Administration has a one-word answer: Patience. In time, the remedies will work and the economy will improve. The cautionary rejoinder to this is also a single word: Maybe. It is also true that there does not seem to be any likely alternative to the paths for recovery that have been chosen.

It is possible, however, that prudence requires that we move a little more quickly along these paths. With the absence of inflation, the Federal Reserve Board can afford to work to bring down both interest rates and the dollar somewhat more—and somewhat more quickly. Beyond that, there is little that can be done besides waiting and hoping things get better.

BANNING CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to address the issue of banning cigarette advertising, which has been the topic of recent congressional hearings.

I should start off by noting what some would consider a skeleton in my closet with regard to this issue: I'm a southerner. My district, the sixth district of South Carolina, is the fourth largest tobacco-growing district in the Nation. More than 20,000 of my constituents are involved in the production of tobacco. Those are the facts.

However, Mr. Speaker, today I'd like to speak not just on behalf of those 20,000 farmers, but for all 520,000 Americans in my district, who live under a Constitution that guarantees the right of free speech and free press. They elected me to protect those and

other fundamental rights. That's why I took an oath, as we all did, to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States."

I take that oath very seriously, as I know my colleagues do. And it's my opinion that a ban on cigarette advertising would be a groundless violation of the right to free speech, and a dangerous restriction on the commercial marketplace.

There's no secret about the goal of those who would ban cigarette advertising. They'd like to get all Americans to stop smoking. But they know they can't do that by direct means. Prohibition won't work, it never did.

So, instead of trying to achieve their goal through the front door, the antismoking people are going through the back, tying knots around the advertising industry. They figure they can't get away with violating the rights of individual citizens, but they might just get away with violating the rights of an industry. Somebody said it's like "trying to control handguns by outlawing the holster."

Mr. Speaker, antismoking groups fought very hard to educate the public about smoking. They insisted that Americans didn't know the true effects of cigarettes, and that they had a right to get that message across. They put warning labels on every package of cigarettes and every advertisement. They undertook broad programs of public information. They did a very effective job, and I suspect we're all the better for it.

But, the fact is, things didn't turn out quite as well as they hoped. Americans understand their message, and some of them smoke anyway. So now the antismokers want to go a step further, and say to the tobacco industry, "We have a right to get our message across, but you don't."

In fact, they want to extend the ban not only to advertising but also to marketing and sponsorship of events. They want to declare that a company producing a legal product doesn't even have the right to put its name on a race car or a tennis player's sweatband.

Some even want to ban smoking from movies scenes. You can plot to overthrow the Government in a movie scene, or have sex with a prostitute, or murder a dozen people, but not smoke a cigarette. I can truly understand the antismokers' frustration, but not the grounds for this kind of extremism.

Some will also argue that smoking is such a clear and enormous danger that it must be singled out for elimination in any way possible. I wonder if similar prohibitionists will be back before Congress in the near future, asking us to ban advertising of red meat, coffee and automobiles.

In addition, it is difficult to support a blanket ban when less restrictive approaches are feasible. And let's keep in mind that the results of a ban may not be as intended. Experience with cigarette advertising bans in most other countries has shown no overall decrease in smoking, and in some cases has even led to an increase.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not here to say that smoking is good for you. I'm saying that in our society we believe in free discussion and individual choice, and that means everybody has a chance to put their cards on the table. When we disagree, the right answer is not to cut off the flow of speech but to add another voice.

That's as true in the marketplace of goods as in the marketplace of ideas.

Cigarettes are legal products, produced by legally existing companies. By prohibiting the commercial promotion of these products, we would be conceding that the most basic constitutional rights are subject to political manipulation—not for some greater good, but for the cause of some overzealous reformers who would force their views on others, regardless of the cost.

TRIBUTE TO MARY MARTIN

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today the Congressional Arts Caucus was honored to pay a special tribute to one of music theatre's greats—Mary Martin. Just as she immortalized the song "Anything You Can Do I Can Do Better" while playing the role of Annie Oakley, Mary Martin has done the best—both as a performer and a humanitarian.

Mary Martin is music theater. Her performances read like a list of everyone's favorite characters. Ensign Nellie Forbush washing that man right out of her hair, Peter Pan sprinkling the magic dust, and Maria Von Trapp filling the world with song—all are synonymous with this remarkable actress. She not only gave life to each role but, quite simply, these characters became Mary Martin.

Miss Martin's incredible career spans triumphant performances on stages around the world. She made her debut at age 5 in her hometown of Weatherford, TX singing "When Apples Grow on the Lilac Tree." Since then, she has starred in such highly acclaimed musicals as: "One Touch of Venus," "South Pacific," "Peter Pan," "The Sound of Music," "I Do! I Do!" and "Hello Dolly."

She has earned just about every show business accolade including Variety New York Drama Critics Polls, Tony, and Emmy Awards. She has also been the recipient of numerous community service honors. Last May, the American Diabetes Association gave Miss Martin the Peter Forsham Award for Outstanding Community Service. She received the American Women Radio and Television Award for Humanitarian Excellence and was honored by Children's Village USA who presented her with the very special Woman of the World Award. In 1984, the San Francisco General Hospital renamed their trauma center after Mary Martin, following her special benefit performance of "Peter Pan."

As if these accomplishments were not impressive enough, Miss Martin has also demonstrated her talent as an author by publishing two books: "Mary Martin's Needlepoint" 1969 and her autobiography "My Heart Belongs" 1976.

To add to Miss Martin's illustrious lifetime achievements and stage credits, she is currently costarring with Carol Channing in the spectacular new comedy "Legends!" at the National Theatre in Washington, DC—a fitting

title for a woman who is truly an American living legend.

SBA DOING EXCELLENT JOB

HON. BOBBI FIEDLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, as a person with a small business background, I have long been a strong advocate of the Small Business Administration. Therefore, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an executive summary of a report which outlines the excellent job that the Small Business Administration is doing.

The text of the summary follows:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

This unpublicized report, the Small Business Administration, was prepared by the agency's Office of Advocacy and provides a program by program cost benefit analysis of S.B.A.'s activities. The report contains and overall positive assessment of the impact of the S.B.A. on small business and the national economy as a whole. The major highlights include the following.

In fiscal year 1984, S.B.A. approved 16,900 loan guarantees, averaging \$145,222 in size and 13.8% in interest. Almost 70% of the loans went to new businesses, and 12% to minorities.

Businesses that have been assisted in the past by the S.B.A. loan guarantee program include NIKE, Winnebago Industries, Bertram Yachts, Healthdyne, Iowa Beef Processors, Totino's Frozen Foods, and Godfather's Pizzeria.

According to a recent general Accounting Office report cited by S.B.A., 82% of the loans guaranteed by the agency would not have been made without the S.B.A.'s involvement, or would have been made on more stringent terms.

Between 30% and 40% of the dollar amount of long-term financing by banks to small business carry an S.B.A. loan guarantee.

Over 550 small business development companies of several different forms approved over 1,600 loans totaling about \$350 million in fiscal year 1984. These loans leveraged over \$800 million in additional private funds, and created an estimated 32,000 new jobs.

In fiscal year 1984, about 240 small firms received loan guarantees totaling over \$325 million through the S.B.A.'s Pollution Control Financing program.

During the past 26 years, over 500 Small Business Investment Companies have provided more than \$5.0 billion to small businesses nationally, including early financing for major American corporations such as Apple Computer, Federal Express, Wang Laboratories, People Express Airlines, Intel, Pandick Press, Cray Research, and Essence Communications.

In fiscal year 1984, 14,128 disaster loans were approved, valued at \$314.2 million. Of S.B.A.'s total loan portfolio of \$16.1 billion, disaster loans account for \$6.2 billion.

In fiscal year 1984, S.B.A.'s procurement and Technical Assistance programs cost \$9.6 million and produced documented savings of about \$550 million.

In 1984 the Small Business Development Center program assisted 50,115 clients with

short-term counseling and provided some form of training to 102,384 individuals with a total budget of \$21.8 million.

Finally, in fiscal year 1983, S.B.A. supported \$3.0 billion in loans to small businesses; this induced \$8.4 billion in "real" GNP and produced 227,000 jobs. The estimated full cost of these loans is \$350 million, or a cost per job of about \$1,550.

For more information contact: Christopher Burke, California State Conference on Small Business (916) 443-1907.

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF ST. IGNATIUS IN CLEVELAND

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, on September 6, 1986, St. Ignatius High School in Cleveland will conclude its centennial celebration. I would like to convey my own best wishes to St. Ignatius and pledge my continued personal support for this fine institution. St. Ignatius has formed a firm covenant with the city of Cleveland by retaining its historic location in the very heart of the city. Through a program of continual renovation and revitalization, St. Ignatius helps to shape the character of the city and is an important catalyst for its growth. Nearly 10,000 alumni, their families, and friends of St. Ignatius will share in the sense of accomplishment and excellence that is embodied in that 100-year-old institution.

St. Ignatius was founded in 1886 by a group of Jesuits who came to this country from Germany. They started the first Catholic institution of higher learning in Cleveland to serve the needs of a growing immigrant community. Originally known as St. Ignatius College, the school combined a high school and college program, offering a 6-year degree. A separate high school department was formed in 1902 and in 1935, the college division took the name of John Carroll University and relocated in suburban University Heights, Ohio.

Located in the Ohio City section on the West Side of Cleveland, St. Ignatius is composed of six buildings on the 13-acre campus. The student body is presently composed of about 1,225 young men from the four-county Greater Cleveland area, under the able direction of its president, Rev. Robert J. Welsh, S.J. and the principal, Rev. Kenneth A. Styles, S.J. The Ignatius alumni include many of our country's leaders in business, law, education, medicine, civic affairs, and numerous other fields.

St. Ignatius has a distinguished faculty who teach a demanding curriculum. One-third of the faculty are members of religious orders. Three-fourths have masters degrees or better. True to the original standards of the school, St. Ignatius places a profound emphasis on classical studies, including languages, as well as all other facets of a 4-year, liberal arts, college preparatory institution.

Many of the students at St. Ignatius participate in the Advanced Placement and Honors Program that offer college-level courses in high school. Electives include computer science, art, and drama. Extracurricular activities are encouraged. In athletics, St. Ignatius has

traditionally excelled in area and statewide competition. Many of the Ignatius student-athletes go on to participate at the collegiate and even professional level.

St. Ignatius graduates are regularly accepted at the academic institutions in America, including the Ivy League schools, service academies, and leading Catholic institutions like Notre Dame, Georgetown, Holy Cross, and Cleveland's own John Carroll. In fact, fully 98 percent of St. Ignatius graduates go directly to college.

At the present time, St. Ignatius is engaged in a major fundraising and capital improvement drive. Part One of this drive was initiated in 1978 with extensive renovation of Loyola Hall, construction of the Wasmer Field and Track and the growth of the endowment fund to \$1.5 million. The school is now prepared to commence part two of a long-range program. Improvements during this phase will include the construction of a new building, built to conform with the Gothic architectural tradition of the school. The new facility will house the new library and completely equipped computer science mathematics department. Other improvements will include a renovation of the administration building and a re-equipped and remodeled Jesuit residence quarters.

St. Ignatius has a solid reputation as one of Cleveland's and indeed America's foremost institutions of college preparatory learning. The revitalization of the St. Ignatius campus will not only enhance the quality of life for all of its students, but also for its neighbors in Ohio City and the rest of Cleveland. St. Ignatius continues to take vital steps forward in its effort to provide the best possible education for many of Cleveland's finest young men.

On a personal note, St. Ignatius has been a neighbor to members of my family for more than 50 years. Two of my brothers are graduates as well as numerous relatives. We are proud of our relationship, proud of the graduates and faculty members.

Congratulations to the entire St. Ignatius family on this 100th birthday. Best wishes for your next 100 years.

NATIONAL GUARD NOW USED AS AUXILIARY FIGHTING FORCE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, as we continue the debate on H.R. 4428, the Department of Defense Authorization Bill, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, an insightful op-ed article from the Los Angeles Times August 10, 1986. The article raises concerns over the use and security of our citizen-soldiers in questionable training exercises. It also questions the propriety of the administration's escalation of these "active" training exercises.

This week, we may enter into the debate of revoking the power of State governors who decline to send their National Guard on specific overseas training missions. I am concerned that we not take such an unwarranted drastic step before the House has had a

chance to hold extensive hearings on the issue.

The article follows.

[From the LA Times, Aug. 10, 1986]

NATIONAL GUARD NOW USED AS AUXILIARY FIGHTING FORCE

(By Anne Nelson)

The U.S. National Guard has played an active part in such foreign operations as the raid on Libya and the invasion of Grenada, according to official sources. These are not the sort of actions associated with a home-grown militia created to protect U.S. borders against foreign invasion or deal with such emergencies as floods, tornadoes and civil unrest.

But over the past 10 years the National Guard has taken on a surprising new identity. In 1986, more than 42,000 National Guardsmen are scheduled to go on training missions in 46 foreign countries, some of questionable legality.

According to the National Guard Bureau, a crew of eight Air National Guardsmen from Washington state took part in the raid on Libya—refueling aircraft used in the operation from a tanker over the Atlantic, while they were officially on a three-week "training mission" in Morocco. Another crew, this one from Arkansas, participated in the Grenada operation, also while on a "training mission." Five other guardsmen from Arkansas went to Chile in August 1985, for "Operation Pegasus," a joint command-post exercise with the Chilean military, which has been barred from receiving U.S. military aid because of the country's human rights record.

Most public controversy surrounding the overseas training activities has focused on Honduras, where the Guard has been involved in exercises since 1981. A total of 5,200 National Guardsmen from 23 states will have gone to Honduras on training missions this year. Governors of at least 12 states, including California, Ohio and New York, have questioned the need to train guardsmen in volatile areas.

In some cases, however, governors are misled regarding their troops' destination. Gov. Bill Clinton of Arkansas, for example, had authorized his state troops to take part in "regular NATO exercises and training." But Chile, located along the Pacific, is not a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. "I was not aware that Chile was part of the package approved," Clinton said, when a reporter told him that Arkansas guardsmen took part in joint exercises there. Within hours after he had been informed of the year-old mission, Clinton stated, "That approval has been withdrawn."

Washington state Gov. Booth Gardner did not have prior knowledge of his state Air National Guard's deployment in the Libya bombing. "Each time we send National Guard troops on a training mission," Gardner said, "they are potentially in some kind of danger. This appears to be no different."

Gardner's press secretary, Richard Milnes, reported that the state military commander, Adjutant Gen. Keith Eggen, told the governor's office on Thursday that the guardsman, "were on standby and did not participate in any active capacity." But the Pentagon's National Guard Bureau said the Washington state guardsman were "not on standby, they were active."

The confrontation between the governors and the Administration began early this year, when Gov. Joseph E. Brennan of Maine refused to authorize 35 combat engi-

neers from his National Guard to participate in maneuvers in Honduras. This triggered a dramatic response from the Pentagon. Under current U.S. law, the Guard "may not be ordered to active duty without the consent of the governor"—except in war or a national emergency. "Active duty" has been interpreted as training outside the United States.

Following Brennan's action—the first time in memory a governor has blocked such a mission—the Pentagon requested that Congress pass legislation removing the need for a governor's consent, and giving the Administration jurisdiction over National Guard overseas training. The Senate Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel of the Armed Services Committee held hearings July 16.

Subcommittee members Pete Wilson (R-Calif.) and Phil Gramm (R-Tex.) drafted a bill on the Pentagon's behalf, and they are expected to introduce it as one of more than 100 proposed amendments to the Defense Authorization bill now on the Senate floor. Rep. G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery (R-Miss.) presented the bill on the House side. It is still uncertain whether the votes will take place before the Aug. 16 recess.

The debate poses urgent questions about the National Guard's role in military and foreign policy concerns. The National Guard was organized in 1792, under the first militia Act. State militias were often stubbornly anti-federal; in 1813, governors of Massachusetts and Connecticut refused the President's mobilization call to repel the British. The state militias considered themselves a domestic force and did not send troops to the 1846 war with Mexico or the Spanish-American War in 1898. But a new era dawned in 1903, when the Dick Act first assigned federal funding to militias.

Legislation passed in 1933 gave the Guard a "dual status" as both a state and a federal institution; units were mobilized and sent overseas to fight in World War I, World War II and the Korean War. The clauses that now permit state governors to exercise their veto were instituted in 1952. Overseas training missions began in the 1960s, and the Mississippi National Guard went on "training missions" that consisted of flying supplies into Vietnam.

With the Total Force Doctrine, introduced in the early 1970s, the National Guard was recast as a vital partner of the active services. As Assistant Secretary of Defense James H. Webb told the Senate subcommittee on July 16, that at the beginning of the "volunteer environment," the Pentagon planned an active force of three million personnel and 750,000 reservists. Those plans have been skewed toward greater emphasis on reserve units—now 1.2 million compared to 2 million on active duty. More than 90% of the National Guard budget comes from the U.S. Treasury; according to Webb, the Pentagon has spent close to \$47 billion for equipment and training since 1981. In return, the Pentagon expects the Guard to serve as an auxiliary combat and support force, capable of instant response in a national emergency.

None of the dissenting governors challenge the principle of overseas training nor do they question the need for preparedness. But they question the characterization of Guard activities in Honduras as "training," asking why jungle training can't be conducted in Panama and Florida, as it has been for 15 years. U.S. Army Col. William Comee, commander of Joint Task Force Bravo in Honduras, helped raise doubts about the

policy by telling Oregon legislators that guardsmen were in Honduras to "intimidate and harass" Nicaragua. In addition, governors are under pressure from public opposition to the Administration's Central America policies.

Gramm and Wilson argue that governors have no role in foreign policy, and should have no say in where the guardsmen are sent. Curiously, this position is challenged by the National Guard itself. Lt. Gen. E.H. Walker, chief of the National Guard Bureau at the Pentagon told the Senate subcommittee that he felt satisfied with existing legal mechanisms. He objected to the proposed amendment on the grounds that they could prejudice relations between National Guard units and state governments. Walker also admitted that his original testimony questioned the constitutionality of the proposed legislation, and the Pentagon had censored his statement.

From the first, Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger's office pursued the change in legislation without consulting Walker, who only learned of Defense's initiative during Senate Appropriations Committee hearings in late May. Walker aired his objections at the hearings. And two weeks later, Webb stated that Defense had indeed decided not to seek the legislation. But, in late June, Walker heard—from a reporter—that Weinberger had written to committee member Sen. Barry M. Goldwater (R-Ariz.), expressing continued support for the measure.

One high ranking Defense Department official summarized the dissenting position last week. "If you use the question of contra aid to measure public opinion," he said, "the states that opposed sending National Guardsmen to Honduras are states where people oppose the Administration's policy in Central America. The governors are representing the will of the people in this, and in a democracy that's exactly what they should be doing." Obviously, this attitude is not universal in the Pentagon; Walker, its most steadfast proponent, will be retiring on Aug. 19. (He will be replaced by Lt. Gen. Herbert Temple, a Weinberger recommendation.)

It would be regrettable if Congress decided such an important issue by passing a precipitous amendment tacked onto a bill before recess. Arguments about the safety of guardsmen in Honduras are not yet compelling—so far, the only recorded 1986 casualty was a Puerto Rican guardsman who shot himself in the finger. There are larger matters. If the Administration justifies deployment of National Guardsmen in the Grenada or Libya strikes by describing them as "training missions," implications for U.S. policy in Central America could be grave.

Anne Nelson, author of "Murder Under Two Flags" a book about political violence in Puerto Rico, writes frequently on Central America.

IN PRAISE OF NICKY CRUZ

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to congratulate a friend of mine, Mr. Nicky Cruz on his 25th anniversary of ministry.

Nicky Cruz is a true success story, a man who has literally picked himself up by his bootstraps through the strength of his faith. My sister Aimee, who is also a minister, has used Nicky as an example of what true faith can bring to an individual. As she has rightly pointed out, Nicky Cruz has not only saved his own life, he has saved the lives of countless other young people, youths who might have gone to jail if it had not been for Nicky.

Nicky Cruz's life story has had a powerful social and religious impact on the lives of literally millions of people throughout our United States. As I mentioned, it has been especially well received by our youth. His Gospel message has transformed the lives of tens of thousands, many of which had been involved with gang activity, and drugs.

Nicky Cruz is an evangelist in the purest sense, like St. Paul who traversed his world in his time to spread the good news, so Nicky Cruz is taking the gospel to the cities of the world. Most recently he was one of the few men evangelists to go to Russia, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

However, there was a time when recognition and respect would not be forthcoming for Nicky Cruz. Before becoming a minister, Nicky was a tough character. There seemed to be no hope for him; life, in the streets of Brooklyn, NY would not last long for one who had so much hatred.

Nicky Cruz was saved over 25 years ago from destruction by the power of his faith. And for 25 years he has been highly motivated as a minister, husband, and father to preach on the perseverance of the family structure, on the importance of morals for a healthy society and on the strength of his religious convictions.

Nick is also the author of multimillion best seller, "Run, Baby, Run", as well as many other books that have brought hope and inspiration to an often confused and hurting world.

I want to thank Nick Cruz for his 25 years of faithful ministry to the individual, his country, and to the world community at large. May God grant you many more years of fruitful ministry.

THE BERLIN WALL—DIVIDING MORE THAN A CITY

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, August 13 marks a black-letter day in the history of mankind. For it was 25 years ago that the Communist Government of East Germany erected a wall around the free city of Berlin. The Berlin Wall symbolized to the world that the "Socialist paradise" purportedly being created in East Germany was not proceeding smoothly.

The Berlin Wall, then, and now, symbolizes all that is wrong with communism—lack of individual liberties through restraints on movement, expression, and thought.

But on this anniversary day we must not be occupied solely by ideological considerations. When the Communists closed the Berlin gateway to the West, they in turn arbitrarily and immorally separated family members from one

another. The cold war raging so bitterly between two hostile camps had descended to inflict untold burdens on them. The real tragedy on the Berlin Wall lies with the people whose lives were destroyed by totalitarianism.

One man seemed to identify with these people and to link their plight with the larger cause of freedom when he said, "freedom is indivisible, and when one man is enslaved, all are not free."

He showed us that the wall was "an offense not only against history but an offense against humanity, dividing husbands and wives and brothers and sisters, and dividing a people who wished to be joined together."

He told us that "Freedom has many difficulties and democracy is not perfect, but we have never had to put up a wall to keep our people in, to prevent them from leaving us."

My colleagues, I know all of you remember that one fine summer day not long after the construction of the ugly, gray wall when an American President seemed to bring a rainbow of hope to a city borne of despair. John F. Kennedy seemed to be speaking not only to the half million Germans gathered that day in the Rudolph Wilder Platz, but to all those in the world fighting to stay the hand of tyranny. President Kennedy's famous phrase, "Ich bin ein Berliner," was an acknowledgment that all humanity was bonded by the desire and need for freedom.

President Kennedy's words still inspire us today to rededicate our efforts to bring forth the fruits of freedom for all the world to enjoy, so that perhaps our children might live in a better world. Tyrants will always attempt to imprison their subjects, to control their lives, to interfere publicly in private lives. The Berlin Wall represents an attempt at this sort of pernicious control. But John F. Kennedy's words, and the courage of the people of Berlin, prove that it will always take more than mortar and stone to still the human spirit.

MIAMISBURG TRAIN DERAILMENT

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last month on July 8, a train carrying hazardous materials, white phosphorus and sulfur, derailed in my congressional district in Miamisburg, OH.

A tanker containing 12,000 pounds of white phosphorus exploded and burned, emitting poisonous fumes, for 5 days. Over 30,000 people in the cities of Miamisburg, Moraine, West Carrollton, Ohio, and in Miami, Jefferson and Washington townships were evacuated, the largest evacuation ever caused by a U.S. train derailment. Nearly 600 residents were treated at local hospitals for respiratory problems and irritated eyes which were caused by breathing phosphorus, and possibly sulfur-laden fumes.

This accident has already cost the local taxpayers \$400,000 in overtime personnel costs and emergency equipment-related costs. That figure will increase as the bills come in. It

does not include the enormous costs to individuals who had to stay home from work, and businesses that were shut down.

For the people of the Miamisburg area who spent 5 days in high school gyms and convention centers, and the businesses and factories that closed, these were tough days. But they could have been worse.

While burning phosphorus and sulfur is bad, it is not as bad as nuclear waste, or nerve gas. There were no deaths directly attributed to the Miamisburg accident.

Our local officials coordinated over 30 jurisdiction bodies, including State and Federal agencies, and demonstrated outstanding leadership in making decisions and solving the crisis.

Mr. Speaker, the Miamisburg case raises some questions about our Federal policies as they pertain to the transportation of hazardous materials by rail. I believe we should correct those policies before we have an even more serious accident by rail.

I am introducing, today, a bill to correct some of the deficiencies we saw in the Miamisburg case. My bill does three things:

First, it requires the Department of Transportation [DOT] to develop emergency response procedures for railroads to follow when these accidents occur. Our Miamisburg firefighters and other emergency officials had trouble getting information about the types of hazardous materials on the train, and where they were located. My bill requires the train engineer or conductor to turn over this information and to work with the local officials in responding to the situation.

Second, my bill will retire old tank cars, like the one that carried phosphorus through Miamisburg. That car was over 20 years old and, according to the National Transportation Safety Board [NTSB], would not meet current design standards. However, because the car was already in operation when the new regulations came into effect in 1971, it was "grandfathered" in. My bill would eliminate that "grandfathering" and not allow these old cars to carry hazardous materials like phosphorus.

Third, my bill requires a DOT study to take a look at the whole design process of tank cars particularly with respect to public safety. Right now, DOT has delegated its authority to the Association of American Railroads [AAR] which designs tank cars. According to the Office of Technology Assessment [OTA], DOT is not involved in the design approval activities and does not attend sessions where designs are analyzed and evaluated. My bill requires DOT to take a look at this process and determine whether public safety considerations require greater control by the Secretary of Transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will help avoid accidents in other communities across our country and save our local taxpayers' money as well as good health. I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in supporting this measure.

GILMAN COSPONSORS RESOLUTION
ENDORING ELLIS
ISLAND MEDALS OF HONOR

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Congressional Ad Hoc Committee on Irish Affairs, Mr. BIAGGI in introducing a resolution, endorsing the Ellis Island Medals of Honor.

Just this past Fourth of July, our Nation joined in a celebration of our history—a history inextricably tied to the experiences of the millions of immigrants who passed through Ellis Island and other ports of entry, to find their new home here in America. Whether one was able to participate in the many festivities held in New York City commemorating the unveiling of the newly refurbished Statue of Liberty, or the Fourth of July was spent with families and friends in a backyard picnic, I believe we all experienced the same awe and pride in America and her many citizens. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me that many, through sheer wits, perseverance, courage, made the trip across the ocean, braving in many cases unbelievable hardships, came to a land where they did not speak the language, had no home, no job and often no friends or relatives, and built a life for themselves. These individuals of whom I speak are our friends, our neighbors, and in many cases our parents and grandparents. And they all exemplify the spirit of America.

On October 28, 1986, this Nation will once again turn its eyes and hearts to the tall proud lady standing on Ellis Island, when we recognize the official rededication of the Statue of Liberty. On that day the Ellis Island Medal of Honor will be awarded to individuals who exemplify the ideal of living a life dedicated to the American way while preserving the values and tenets of their own heritage.

The Ellis Island Medal of Honor will be awarded to those individuals who have made special contributions to the reinforcement of the bonds between a heritage group and the people of its land of origin. These individuals will be further distinguished by their service to humanity in any field, profession of occupation.

I would like to commend the Statue of Liberty Ellis Island Foundation, the New York Statue of Liberty Centennial Commission, and the National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations for their efforts in establishing the Ellis Island Medal of Honor. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution endorsing these very special awards, and to participate in the ceremonies and other commemorations being held throughout the country paying tribute to this portion of the American experience.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

1986 CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, as part of the 1986 Call to Conscience Vigil, I regret that it is again necessary for me to call my colleagues' attention to the continuing plight of Boris and Elena Klotz and their children.

Boris and Elena originally applied to emigrate in September 1980 and were refused on the grounds that Elena had been exposed to "state secrets." However, Elena graduated in 1978 as a French teacher and had worked only briefly as a kindergarten teacher. In March 1981 the Klotz family's application was reviewed and denied again—this time on the grounds of insufficient kinship to their relatives in Israel. In September 1981 the family reapplied and were again denied on the grounds of Elena's supposed "association with state secrets."

These denials clearly demonstrate the inconsistent and arbitrary nature of Soviet policy on family reunification. Our most recent information on the Klotz family includes a report that Boris was offered a promotion at work if he agreed to give up his intention to emigrate.

By granting the Klotz family permission to emigrate, the Soviet Union not only would indicate to the world its respect for the principles outlined in the Helsinki accords, but also would affirm its desire to improve relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

WELCOME TO PRESIDENT DE LA
MADRID

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the congressional border caucus, a bipartisan forum which acts as a clearinghouse for information relative to United States-Mexico border issues. I welcome today's arrival of Mexican President De La Madrid for a series of important meetings with our President.

Although the events of the past several months have unfortunately focused media attention on the histrionics of some public officials who have engaged in what has become known as Mexico bashing, the opportunity afforded both countries by these face-to-face meetings between our leaders must not be squandered. The events of the next several days can represent a fresh beginning for the United States and Mexico as we acknowledge our common problems and devise constructive strategies for solutions instead of assessing blame.

On the part of the United States, it is time that we finally appreciate the political risks that the De La Madrid administration has taken in attempting to reform previously restrictive trade policies, curbing capitol flight, and generally taking steps to bring the Repub-

August 13, 1986

lic of Mexico into an increasingly competitive international economic community.

President De La Madrid, for his part, can hopefully come away from these meetings with a sense that we are sincerely interested in resolving a variety of bilateral concerns—such as narcotics trafficking and illegal immigration—without dictating to our southern neighbor the manner in which these solutions will be carried out.

Over the last several months, I have been encouraged by the frank admission of some administration officials that this country is sorely lacking a comprehensive foreign policy regarding our relationship with Mexico. Clearly, it is time that we realize the degree of economic and social interdependence which so characterizes our relationship with Mexico and take steps to ensure our policies reflect this realization.

In addressing the importance of those topics to be addressed by both Presidents Reagan and De La Madrid, obviously the interdiction of drug smuggling stands as a paramount concern to both countries. The United States needs to understand that the drug problem is not one solely created in Mexico or any other foreign country. The drug industry is one that thrives on supply and demand, and clearly the United States is a voracious consumer for the virtual smorgasboard of international drugs smuggled from offshore. Mexico must be encouraged to continue its cooperation with the United States in ongoing interdiction activities. Just as neither country is to blame for the influx of illegal narcotics, we must both understand that the problem will remain, unless both nations join together.

Like drug trafficking, a variety of bilateral concerns needs to be fully aired during these face to face meetings including cross-border commerce, environmental problems, and health-related issues prevalent along our respective borders. Let us praise the leaders of both countries for taking this opportunity to meet these topics head-on in the spirit of mutual trust and respect.

A TRIBUTE TO JAMES
BRESCIAMI

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions, I have been proud to rise and pay tribute to the outstanding achievements of the Bishop Gallagher High School baseball team of Harper Woods, MI. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the man behind this tradition of excellence, James Bresciami, on the occasion of his retirement as head coach.

The superb record of the Bishop Gallagher High School baseball team over the past 22 years serves as a fine testimony of Jim Bresciami's hard work and dedication. Under his inspiring leadership, their wins totaled 545 while they met with only 149 losses. The team captured 53 titles, including 8 State districts, 6 regionals, 12 invitational championships, 13 league titles, 3 State runners up, and 3 State

championships. Last year's record alone exemplifies Jim Bresciam's excellence in coaching. In 1985 the team achieved 4 titles, winning the Catholic league title, the city and State district championships and regional title. Moreover, they triumphed as State champs, finishing their season with 43 wins and only 6 losses, establishing a new State record.

This impressive set of statistics, however, is only a part of Coach Bresciam's accomplishments. In his field, he has been recognized eight times as coach of the year by such renowned organizations as the Michigan High School Coaches Association, the Detroit News, and the Michigan High School Baseball Association. On June 5, 1980, we celebrated Jim Bresciam Day in Warren, MI, and the following year, in 1981, Jim was honored by the Catholic Coaches' Hall of Fame and awarded the prestigious Lasallian Award. Last year, true to form, the Catholic High School Association named James Bresciam Athletic Director of the Year. In addition, Coach Bresciam held major offices in the Michigan Baseball Coaches Association and in 1982 initiated the popular Michigan-Illinois All Star Game. In this successful career, he has also enjoyed the support and aid of his most devoted fan club, his loving wife, Joann, and his four daughters, Kimberly, Stacy, Amy, and Kristine.

The scope of Jim Bresciam's accomplishments in both sports and community service has, and undoubtedly will continue to inspire many young people to follow his lead. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing James Bresciam all the best in his retirement, and heartily thank him for his dedication and service to our youth.

**CONCERNS FROM A CERTIFIED
PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT ABOUT
THE TAX REFORM ACT OF 1985**

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out a timely and insightful letter from a constituent and friend of mine, Mr. Bob Cornman, of my hometown of Mayfield, KY.

Mr. Cornman, who is a respected certified public accountant whose clients include my wife Carol and me, raises objections to a provision requiring all partnerships, S corporations, and personal service corporations to adopt a calendar year of tax reporting which is contained in H.R. 3838, the Tax Reform Act of 1985.

Mr. Cornman highlights the adverse impact this provision could have on the above mentioned organizations. I encourage my colleagues to read this informative letter and keep it in mind when a final review of H.R. 3838 takes place in the full House:

JULY 17, 1986.

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.,
2182 Rayburn Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CARROLL: It has been brought to my attention by our professional organization that during final hours of debate the Senate adopted an amendment to the Tax Reform Bill that would require all partnerships, S

corporations, and personal service corporations to adopt a calendar year of tax reporting.

This disturbs me greatly inasmuch as our own professional service corporation has a fiscal year that ends on June 30th. This enables us to plan and budget our operations at the end of our natural business year, and we find it much less burdensome than trying to concentrate our efforts during the first two and a half months of the calendar year.

I believe, also, that changing each of these organizations to a calendar year will not, in the long run, increase revenues, but have the effect of bunching them in the year of change without a permanent increase in revenue. Then, too, I believe the Internal Revenue Service will experience an increase in their cost in monitoring and controlling these different cycles.

You are personally aware of the burden placed on tax practitioners during the first three and a half months of the calendar year. It seems to me, that Congress and the Internal Revenue Service should be making an effort to spread out reporting requirements rather than bunch them together. I realize that this proposed Senate bill is now in the conference committee, however, if you have any influence pertaining to the outcome of this particular amendment, I would appreciate your support in opposition.

Yours very truly,

BOB D. CORNMAN,
Certified Public Accountant.

**SUPPORT A 1-YEAR DELAY ON
NERVE GAS PRODUCTION**

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the United States has promised West Germany to remove our huge chemical projectile stockpile that we have maintained in that country since World War II. In return for a German promise to possibly consider redeployment in a crisis, the Pentagon will give up our existing European chemical deterrent.

The Defense Department contends in the event of a military confrontation in Western Europe, we can rush chemical weapons in from the United States. Estimates show that it would take our entire fleet of C-141's over 2 weeks to transport our stockpile to Europe.

To build unnecessary new nerve gas weapons, we are going to give in to one of the Soviet Union's most cherished goals—to unilaterally disarm NATO while keeping its huge stockpile of chemical weapons in Eastern Europe.

If you believe deterrence depends upon prepositioning weapons in Europe, then I urge you to support the Porter-Fascell-Roukema amendment to delay nerve gas production 1 year and prevent the withdrawal of the our European chemical deterrent.

**THE AMERICAN SECURITY
COUNCIL**

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, during today's debate on President Reagan's strategic defense initiative [SDI], I mentioned 174 House Members of the bipartisan American Security Council's Coalition for Peace Through Strength. These Members were recently awarded the 1986 Leadership Award—a foot tall, proud American Eagle—for "Outstanding Service as a Member of the Peace Through Strength Coalition." I observed that these Members were awarded that honor because of their strong support of the President and our national security. This support includes funding the President's SDI effort at his full budget request of \$4.8 billion as my amendment would have done. This is the position of the Coalition for Peace Through Strength and its supporters across the Nation. Yet, only 94 Members voted for the President's budget.

Rather than put the names of the 80 who accepted the leadership award and couldn't find it in their hearts to vote with the President, I simply say, please each time you look at that proud American Eagle, remember all the American citizens who support the American Security Council and the Coalition for Peace Through Strength and were expecting you to support the President.

Anyone who would like to know more about the American Security Council, what it stands for, or how their Representative votes on key national security issues can write to the American Security Council, 499 South Capitol Street, Washington, DC 20003.

**WALLOP AND KEMP WARN OF
THE PERILS OF DEFERRING SDI**

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, true leadership is exemplified by the ability to remember the past and act upon its lessons. As Malcolm Wallop and Jack Kemp write in their New York Times essay, "Perils of Deferring SDI," the current situation with the SDI program "is reminiscent of August 1970, when the United States offered Moscow an arms agreement based on a vastly scaled-down deployment" of our ABM system. Once the ABM program was the subject of negotiations, it ceased to exist as a viable defense program.

After pledging that the SDI program would never be negotiated with a Soviet government that has been spending \$10-\$15 billion per year on strategic defense, the President appears to have been worn down by the State Department and its "Office of Politico-Military Appeasement." Somehow, the President's subsequent promise to deploy SDI systems in the distant future rings hollow against the

ever-present background noise generated by the arms controllers and the mutual assured destruction lobby. Surely his noble vision of a world without nuclear weapons is worthy of more serious consideration. I encourage my like-minded colleagues to read the Wallop/Kemp essay reprinted below.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 12, 1986]

PERILS OF DEFERRING S.D.I.

(By Malcolm Wallop and Jack Kemp¹)

WASHINGTON.—President Reagan's announcement last week that he remains committed to the eventual deployment of strategic defenses deserves applause. But there are some of us who fear that S.D.I.—the Strategic Defense Initiative—still won't happen. The reason we're worried is that Mr. Reagan has also reportedly offered to defer deployment of any American defenses against Soviet missiles for five to seven years.

This is a dangerous change in our arms control policies that invites strategic peril. A moratorium on S.D.I. deployments—at the very time the Russians are violating the ABM treaty and fielding the components for their own nationwide strategic defense system—would place the United States in a no-win position and the Russians in a no-lose position.

Every American should by now be aware that the Soviet Union, from the very first day of negotiations, has had one overriding objective at Geneva—to kill S.D.I. Talk to our negotiators, and they will tell you that their Soviet counterparts are obsessed with S.D.I. But now, astonishingly, we appear ready to accept a limit on American S.D.I. deployments as part of our official negotiating position. Once we've agreed on the principle, we'll be reduced to arguing over the price.

Negotiations can be expected to turn increasingly on what part of the "Star Wars" program we are willing to deliver to Moscow in exchange for offensive reductions on both sides. Soviet cheating—which should be the primary issue—will become a side issue, and the 20-year-old Soviet S.D.I. program a fait accompli. In Congress, meanwhile, support for S.D.I. funding will erode, once people come to believe that our money is being spent on a program we may well give away. Indeed, judging by last week's close votes in the Senate, this process may already have begun. And over time, S.D.I. will increasingly be portrayed as the major obstacle to broader agreement.

All this is reminiscent of August 1970, when the United States offered Moscow an arms agreement based on a vastly scaled-down deployment of its "Safeguard" anti-ballistic missile system. Funding for the program fell immediately, and declined to less than one-fifth of its pre-agreement level by 1976. S.D.I. is vulnerable to the same fate.

It will also become much more difficult to conduct the tests necessary to deploy either near-term defenses—which the Russians are already deploying—or more ambitious defenses. Opponents will argue, as they did after the ABM treaty signing, that such tests are inconsistent with the spirit of the new agreement. Without such tests (the Russians, based on past record, will observe no restraints), the United States will be even more vulnerable to a Soviet ABM "breakout" during or at the end of the

seven years. This is the diplomacy of accommodation at its worst.

Some at the State Department and elsewhere will say the scenario we envision is exaggerated. But these are the same people who say we have nothing to lose by this new offer because there's nothing we can do by way of S.D.I. deployments over the next five to seven years anyway.

These people are wrong. We have the military capability today to do very useful things with our strategic defenses. These options are not limited to the defense of our missile silos, as some would have us believe. Initial deployments would include options to protect all military forces and disrupt a Soviet first strike. Such defenses would introduce significant uncertainty in the minds of Soviet planners, strengthen deterrence and provide an important level of defense against accidental or third-country attacks.

Just last month, the President rightly said that we would end our adherence to the terms of SALT II because Moscow long ago ceased to comply with that treaty. Yet his new offer makes no mention of the Russians' sweeping violations of the core provisions of the ABM treaty. How can we agree to extend a treaty we know the Russians are violating even as they put their name to paper? That's a sure way to lose all credibility and leverage in our efforts to put an end to Soviet cheating.

The purpose of the ABM treaty was to prohibit the things that Moscow is doing now. Signing yet another agreement would do nothing to stop them. It would only keep us from building the defenses we need to protect ourselves and our allies.

The great irony of the new approach is that we are jeopardizing S.D.I. in response to a basically worthless Soviet proposal. The Soviet offer to reduce offensive weapons is little more than a network of SALT II provisions at lower but less stable levels. It contains limits, as on so-called "forward-based systems," that previous Administrations have rejected. And it contains no offer to remedy Soviet treaty violations.

Yet for this we risk seeing S.D.I. reduced to a research program with virtually no promise of providing the strategic defense America so vitally needs. By the end of Mr. Reagan's term, the S.D.I. program could be reduced to a bargaining chip at the negotiating table, something the President has vowed would never happen. We do not believe that this is the legacy that the President wishes to leave the nation.

There is nothing to be gained from trading defensive limitations for offensive reductions. This is the clearest lesson of the past two decades, during which America fell further and further behind. The ABM treaty itself was sold on the basis that it would limit offensive weapons. Those limitations never materialized. The result has been a steady erosion of our deterrent in the wake of an unprecedented Soviet military buildup.

It's time we broke free of this destabilizing cycle. Let us deploy strategic defenses, and under protection of those defenses begin to reduce offensive forces. And let us insist that no arms control agreement is acceptable if it impedes near-term S.D.I. deployment or validates Soviet violations.

Mr. Reagan's magnificent vision of a strategic defense for America and our allies must not be compromised by the sort of bureaucratic equivocation that produced this new and ill-advised offer.

HEALTH PLANNING A GOOD INVESTMENT

HON. JIM CHAPMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the future of the State Health Planning and Development Program. For 5 years, this administration has worked to cast off the Federal Government's responsibilities for health policy to the States and to the private sector. Yet at the same time it has slashed funding for programs that would facilitate such a move.

This has resulted in the duplication of services, higher health care costs, isolated groups of people being forced to go without necessary health care, or worse, being pitted against one another in competition for budget dollars. Certainly, an endless well of Federal money does not exist; however, if the States are to take over the responsibility of dispensing health care services, then it is up to us to help them get ready for that monumental task.

I am fully aware that controversy has been associated with the State health planning program. However, the State of Texas has made great strides in overcoming much of this dispute. It has responded admirably in shouldering the additional burden imposed by the administration and I believe it can serve as a model for other States seeking ways to meet their varied health care priorities.

Texas eliminated the certificate-of-need regulation as well as the excessive and often overlapping health service agencies. It has been successful in building cooperation among the various health agencies and other interested parties in the State by combining the talents and services of regional governmental councils, State agencies, private industry, and individuals throughout local communities. It has made significant accomplishments in providing innovative approaches in working to meet the health care needs of the State and to distribute resources, but it cannot continue, nor can the other State's health planning agencies continue, without further Federal assistance.

I am introducing a bill to reauthorize the Federal Health Planning Program through September 1987. I believe it is extremely critical that this program, and others like it, not be allowed to fall by the wayside. Using a relatively small amount of Federal dollars, the State health planning agencies have proved to be a cost-effective mechanism for determining the specific and unique health problems of our citizens.

In addition, studies estimate that every \$1 spent on health planning has prevented \$8 of duplicated investment in medical facilities. It should come as no surprise to us that health planning is a good investment.

Since 1981, Federal support for this program has decreased, and last year the program for the entire 50 States received just \$28.1 million. Even at that level, Texas has been able to retain the vital elements needed to examine its health status, identify health problems, and has provided reasonable rec-

¹ Malcolm Wallop, Republican, is a U.S. Senator from Wyoming, Jack Kemp, also Republican, is a U.S. Representative from New York.

ommendations to address those problems. If the Congress allows this program to sunset next month, it will greatly undermine the efforts that have been made by Texas, and the other States, to address the specific health care needs within their borders.

States desperately need the health planning agencies in order to address their specific health care needs. With cost containment and deficit reduction at the forefront of every bill we are considering in Congress, with the imposition of prospective payment in Medicare and Medicaid, and with an increasing trend toward the corporate marketing of health care, it is even more important that we help States develop a community-planning program that will ensure no American is ever denied care necessary for good health.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in re-authorizing this vital program.

IN TRIBUTE TO HON. BERKLEY
BEDELL

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1986

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding American, a great legislator, and a fine friend—the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, Mr. BERKLEY BEDELL. I have known Mr. BEDELL since 1974 when he was first elected to Congress. I liked him then, and I love him now like a brother. I have had the pleasure these many years of working with him on the Small Business Committee and I have always found him to be a dedicated proponent of American small business. He knows the issues well, having founded his own company at the tender age of 15. Needless to say Mr. Speaker, preparedness, conviction, and knowledge have been the hallmark of his tenure on our committee. Indeed we all owe him a debt of gratitude for the very persuasive and gentlemanly manner in which he helped to determine American small business policy. I know that the small business community will miss him dearly.

Mr. BEDELL, as you know, has always looked out for the little guy—he has a great sense of justice and fairness. From those strong moral convictions emerged his pioneering legislation in procurement reform—particularly title 12, the Defense Procurement Reform Act of 1984 and the Small Business and Federal Procurement Competition Enhancement Act (Public Law 98-557). Of course, we all remember when he brought his \$100 tool kit on to the floor—that same kit cost the Navy \$10,000 and certainly was a graphic demonstration of the need for reform.

But Mr. BEDELL's concerns range significantly beyond just small business. His work on arms reduction, culminating in House Joint Resolution 3, the Kennedy-Bedell resolution, is the statesman in him looking out for the common man, the common woman. Nuclear arms reduction is the most pervasive issue of our time—affecting all of us. It was appropriate, indeed fitting, that Mr. BEDELL was the catalyst who on the floor and on the phone

raised awareness and garnered the support for his bill to ratify the limited test ban treaty and the peaceful nuclear exposure treaty and calls for a resumption of negotiations on a comprehensive test ban. Mr. BEDELL has shown the country and the world what effective, concerned leadership can do to make our world a safer place.

Mr. BEDELL, Congress paid eloquent tribute to you when it approved House Joint Resolution 3 and I know that this resolution was a labor of love and devotion for you. Your presence here today and these many years we have shared together have been an experience we will all remember fondly. I know I speak for all of us when I say we will miss you dearly—and we all wish you the best now and in the future.

KEVIN GUNDERSON—A YOUNG
HERO

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Kevin Gunderson, a young hero we can all be proud of.

Kevin, the son of Jeffery and Stephanie Gunderson of Overland Park, KS, was fishing with his grandfather in a private lake when their fishing boat capsized. Kevin's grandfather, Ken Gunderson of Sedalia, MO, suffering chest pains and shortness of breath was unable to swim for help. The 6-year-old boy swam 75 feet and ran a quarter of a mile to the nearest house to summon help. Emergency help was telephoned and Mr. Gunderson was rescued by a Pettis County sheriff's deputy.

It is an honor to bring Kevin's heroics to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives. I ask that the Members of this body join me in saluting this very special young man.

TRIBUTE TO YAROSLAV
STETSKO: LEADER OF THE
UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE
MOVEMENT

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I pay special tribute today to the great Ukrainian freedom fighter, Yaroslav Stetsko, who died on July 5. He dedicated his life to promoting the cause of liberty not only for his own people but for all those living in captive nations. As head of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists-Revolutionaries and Prime Minister of Ukraine during World War II, Yaroslav Stetsko led the campaign to make Ukraine a free and independent state.

Mr. Speaker, the following article, from the July 20, 1986, National Tribune deserves the attention of the Congress and I ask that it be included in today's RECORD for all Members to read. Yaroslav Stetsko's leadership in the

struggle for Ukraine's independence and his message of freedom to the captive nations are a lasting tribute to this great patriot's life.

YAROSLAV STETSKO, OUN-R LEADER, PRIME
MINISTER OF UKRAINE, DIES

MUNICH, West Germany.—Yaroslav Stetsko, head of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists-Revolutionaries and Prime Minister of Ukraine during World War II, died here Saturday, July 5, at the age of 74 after a prolonged illness. He is survived by his wife, Slava Stetsko, editor of the ABN Correspondence.

Stetsko, who was born into a priestly family in the Ternopil region of western Ukraine on January 19, 1912, was one of the leading persons in the political and military struggle for Ukraine's independence in the 20th century.

After graduating from the Ternopil gymnasium with exceptional grades, he entered the Lviv university as a student of philosophy and law. Stetsko joined the OUN as a student and among his first responsibilities as a member of the national executive board was ideological chairman and editor-in-chief of the underground publication "Yunak."

During the infamous 1936 trial of Stepan Bandera and others in Lviv, Stetsko declared during the Polish prosecutor's questioning, "I am a citizen of Ukraine. The Ukrainian state exists in our souls!"

In February 1940, following the division of the OUN, Bandera and Stetsko assumed the OUN's revolutionary leadership. Plans were immediately set in motion to proclaim the re-establishment of Ukraine's independence. This was further expanded with other Ukrainian political parties through Stetsko's role in the Ukrainian National Committee.

Independence was proclaimed on June 30, 1941, less than two weeks after Nazi Germany invaded the Soviet Russian occupied territories. Bandera, Stetsko, the revolutionary leadership and other nationalist figures were consequently arrested and imprisoned in concentration camps by the Nazis.

Stetsko's work on behalf of the Ukrainian nation and its independence continued after the war. In 1947, he was elected chairman of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, which had its roots in the clandestine Conference of Captive Nations convened by Gen. Taras Chuprynka in 1943. Stetsko served as its only chairman.

In 1968, Stetsko was elected head of the OUN-R central leadership.

Stetsko's anti-communist activity extended beyond Ukrainian affairs. As member of the honorary presidium of the European Freedom Council and a member of the presidium of the World Anti-Communist League, he met with international leaders and various statesmen, impressing upon them the need to wage a freedom campaign on behalf of the captive nations. Among the Western leaders he met were President Ronald Reagan and Vice-President George Bush.

CITY OF LONDON, OH, BEGINS
175TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 17, the city of London, OH, will begin a week

long celebration of its 175th birthday. Just recently we were able to help in having London's central business district listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

London is indeed an historic town, the county seat of Madison County, which was formed by a special act of the legislature on February 16, 1810. The county was named for James Madison, the fourth President of the United States. Local legend has it that when London was laid out, the street orientation was planned so that every side of each house would have sun at some time each day. Main and High Streets were each to be 99 feet wide with the width selected to allow a two-horse team pulling a loaded wagon to turn around.

The committee formed to celebrate London's 175th birthday noted:

The pioneers felt a responsibility not only to themselves but to future generations in laying the foundation for a prosperous and growing community. In this, our 175th year, we applaud their foresight and wisdom. We also hope that our legacy will be of value to those who come after us.

The President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, noted in a letter to the citizens of London, OH:

We are fortunate to live in a nation of strong and proud communities where everyone has a chance for success and the blessings of liberty and freedom can be enjoyed by all, regardless of background.

I extend my congratulations to the members of the 175th birthday committee: Virginia Hume, Mary Ellen Ardrey, Jay Phillips, Perry Croghan, Doris Goldhardt, Susan Goldhardt, and Bill Holton. Collectively, they have put together a tremendous program that is certain to generate enthusiasm and community spirit through appropriate celebrations beginning August 17 and lasting for 8 days—175 hours. London is a city of resolute people of the kind which have been a significant part of our country's greatness. It is a unique and wonderful community which I am proud to represent in Congress.

SPECIAL RECOGNITION TO ANTONIO GIANETTI A "WORLD FAMOUS BARBER"

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this moment to acknowledge the lifelong dedication which Antonio Gianetti has exhibited toward the children and adults of western Massachusetts and to honor Mr. Gianetti for becoming a most celebrated barber, known both nationally and internationally.

Mr. Gianetti was born in Italy on July 9, 1902, and began his career as a barber upon his arrival in America in 1919. By 1928 he was the owner of his own shop known today as Tony's Famous Barber Shop which during the Depression, was given permission by city officials to open on Sunday and provide free haircuts to the poor. Early in his career, Mr. Gianetti was paying monthly visits to Brightside Orphanage in my First Congressional District,

where he gave 150 free haircuts per month. In 1940, he began what was to become a 30-year tradition of donating his services to the crippled children at Shriner's Hospital.

Throughout the years, he has made an invaluable contribution of his time and business talent by providing charitable donations to the infirmed and less fortunate all around the country. For many years, Mr. Gianetti gave 10 percent of his business gross taken for a 1-week period and donated it to the March of Dimes. He also helped a dying girl realize her last wish to visit the Pope in Rome by donating money for the trip. These are but a few of the charitable deeds Antonio Gianetti has performed and have come to be associated with his altruistic personality.

Antonio Gianetti's numerous achievements over the years have earned him recognition as a great humanitarian and first-rate barber. His many years of hard work have touched the lives of thousands who will never forget his selflessness and caring. I salute you, Mr. Gianetti, for your dedication toward your fellow Americans and wish you a happy and healthy retirement.

SUPPORT FOR THE AMERICAN TEXTILE INDUSTRY

HON. BEVERLY B. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, even though the House of Representatives did not vote to override the President's veto on the Textile and Apparel Trade Enforcement Act (H.R. 1562), last week, I still feel very strongly about supporting the American textile industry.

I represent a congressional district which was once filled with textile and clothing construction factories. Most of those industries have closed, adding to the unemployment in my district.

An organization called America for Kids has been working with retailers, fabric mills, and fiber mills, to improve their relationship with each other and to encourage import substitution with the stores.

America for Kids sponsored an Americana Fair in New York City from August 4 to August 16. The fair takes place during the holiday market when buyers are visiting the garment district, and will bring attention to the "Buy American" program. Their purpose is to promote children's wear produced in the United States through all channels of distribution to the consumer.

Tadd Schwab, of S. Schwab Co., in Cumberland, MD, is on the board of directors of the America for Kids Association. The Schwab Co., which puts "Made in America" tags on all its garments, manufactures 100 percent of its goods domestically. I applaud Mr. Schwab for his work with America for Kids and his efforts in encouraging Americans to "Buy America."

A TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL VERVEER

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 12, 1986

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, for over 3 years, a truly dedicated high school student has served as a congressional intern in my Washington office, largely without compensation. This week, Michael Verveer will leave his position to embark upon a college career at the University of Wisconsin.

Michael represents the best in America's young people. He volunteered his hours in the spirit of apprenticeship and gave of himself unselfishly in his service to the people of Ohio's Ninth District and America.

Michael learned on the job. He developed a keener sense about how government operates and how critical decisions are reached in our Nation's most democratic legislative body.

All of us wish Michael well in his journey into the future. There is no doubt in my mind that his contribution to America in the years ahead will represent not only the best in him but the best in all of us.

CRACKING DOWN ON DRUG ABUSE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the following article needs no introduction. We are all well aware of the devastating effect that drugs and drug abuse have on our society. The tragic deaths of Len Bias and Don Rogers have helped awaken this Nation to the pervasiveness of the problem. As a friend, Dick Capen, publisher of the Miami Herald so aptly points out in his column of July 6, drugs are ruthlessly affecting every segment of society, in every region of this country.

I believe that we must work together, in a bipartisan fashion, to respond to the crisis of drug abuse threatening our Nation. There is no single, easy solution to end this epidemic. As this enlightening article points out, all aspects of the problem must be addressed and all available weapons must be used to fight this battle. I have cosponsored a bipartisan initiative with CHARLIE RANGEL and BEN GILMAN to assist States and localities in more effectively responding to the escalating problem of drug abuse. This legislation will authorize \$750 million per year to provide States with increased resources for enforcement, treatment, rehabilitation and prevention of drug abuse and drug trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all Members of Congress to read the following article. I believe that Congress and the President owe it to the American people to develop a sustained and coordinated Federal response to the crisis of drug abuse that is destroying so many of America's youth.

MR. PRESIDENT: DO SOMETHING!

DRUGS HAVE NATION HOOKED ON DOWNWARD
SLIDE

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT. It has been a spectacular weekend of celebration, patriotism, and the rekindling of fundamental freedoms. Once again your special brand of leadership has helped re-inspire confidence in our nation and in the greatness of its people.

But Mr. President, tomorrow the party's over. It's back to the real world—and it's an ugly scene. An insidious cancer is eating away our nation's viscera, and we desperately need your help. Drugs are devouring us, and there's no cure in sight.

For weeks our focus has been on the symbolism of the Statue of Liberty. But what about the symbolism of Lenny Bias and Don Rogers, star athletes killed by cocaine? What about the thousands of others across the country who are destroying their lives every day through substance abuse?

While millions joined you in New York to salute the Statue of Liberty, millions of others across this land exercised their own brand of liberty—taking cocaine, heroin, and marijuana into their bodies. Cocaine addicts have turned whole neighborhoods into combat zones, invaded homes, stolen from their loved ones, and robbed and even murdered innocent people to get money to fuel their dependency. Across the country, cocaine users are dropping off like flies. Cocaine has killed at least 38 South Floridians so far this year, and Greater Miami now averages one cocaine-related death per week. Nationally, cocaine deaths have increased more than 325 percent since 1980.

The vicious reach of drugs grasps every segment of society: the rich, the poor, the unemployed, the cream and the dregs, star athletes, well-known entertainers, neighbors, juveniles, public officials, friends, and loved ones. No city in America—large or small, rural or suburban—is safe from the ravages of substance abuse.

Despite massive Federal efforts to cut off the supply, there's been a 500 percent increase in the amount of cocaine smuggled into this country from South America. Our nation now has a \$110-billion-a-year drug habit, according to one Government estimate. The Reagan Administration's National Narcotics Border Interdiction System is a valiant and essential effort, but we're shoveling against the tide. Demand has grown beyond anyone's belief, and now the drug dealers have developed "crack" or "rock," a lethal cocaine derivative that reaches the brain in less than 10 seconds. Crack already has captured the ghettos of many cities. It's spreading rapidly to the suburbs.

This epidemic is as dangerous as the plagues of the Middle Ages. Today, an estimated one-half million Americans shoot heroin. Some 20 million smoke marijuana. Five million to six million use cocaine. An estimated 17 percent of America's high-school students have tried cocaine, and about 7 percent use it at least once a month. Drug cases fill 25 percent of the Federal courts' dockets. Among inmates of Federal prisons, 37 percent were convicted of drug offenses. Drug trafficking accounts for 40 percent of America's organized-crime activity. Besides the substantial human toll, drug-related absenteeism, on-the-job accidents, and inefficiency are a \$47-billion-per-year drain on business.

Mr. President, this epidemic cannot be addressed on a business-as-usual basis. Nor should the problem simply be farmed out to the Federal bureaucracy for answers. The

drug crisis demands your personal leadership and at least these White House initiatives:

A Presidential commission should be established immediately. It should consist of high-level Government and private-sector representatives. Their responsibility: Develop a consolidated action to deal with the demand side of substance abuse.

Prosecution of drug-related crimes should be expedited, and courts' staff and Federal prisons should be enlarged to handle the increased load.

Stiff sentences should be imposed on those dealing in cocaine, "crack," and "rock." Fines and sentences should be draconian for dealers who use children in drug trafficking.

Federal spending for drug education and prevention must be increased. While Federal spending for drug-law enforcement has gone up by 70 percent since 1982, Federal spending for education and prevention actually has dropped by 5 percent. That's unacceptable. Such Federal programs should be coordinated with private-sector drug-prevention programs around the country.

The Federal drug-interdiction efforts must be redoubled. Despite budgetary pressures, especially on defense spending, we cannot afford to reduce such actions. Drugs, and the international criminal rings behind them, seriously threaten our national security.

Drug-producing nations, especially those exporting cocaine, must cooperate in our efforts to cut off supply. We cannot accept their willingness to overlook their involvement as producers simply because it's our demand that creates their supply. They too have been victims of bloody shoot-outs and extortion sparked by international drug cartels.

Mr. President, you enjoy unprecedented support from the American people. You've conquered inflation, improved the economy, stood up to terrorism, talked tough with the Soviets, and won a major *contra*-aid victory in Congress. You simply must tap this powerful resource or run the risk that the many accomplishments of the Reagan years—and the nation that you lead—will be overrun by drugs.

IMPROVING THE ACCESS TO
FEDERAL SCIENTIFIC AND
TECHNICAL INFORMATION

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which is entitled the "Government Information Act of 1986."

INFORMATION POLICY LACKING

For many years, I have been dismayed by the lack of a coherent and comprehensive Federal information policy, particularly in the areas of scientific and technical information.

We currently have a large array of Federal agencies which generate (directly or indirectly), collect, analyze, or disseminate a wide variety of scientific and technical information. Virtually every Cabinet department, dozens of agencies and bureaus, all of the Federal laboratories and many legislative entities are actively involved in these processes without the benefit of a clear-cut, unified policy governing

the processing of this information, let alone addressing the issues of who may have access to what and at what price.

Our vaunted technological and innovative powers are in disarray, compared to those of other industrially sophisticated nations. For example, in 1980, the Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry published the JIPDEC report, which stated that: "The obligation now is for Japan to lead the world in this area (i.e., information systems), by means of the development of new technology based on original concepts."

And in France, the publication of the Nora/Minc report, "The Computerization of Society," commissioned by then President d'Estaing in 1978, signaled France's intention to compete vigorously for a large share of the world's information markets, which they have subsequently done.

And so it has gone with West Germany, Great Britain, and so forth. Where does the United States stand in its development of information policies?

If we agree that our political and economic traditions prescribe some fundamental differences in our information posture from that of most other countries, we have a beginning. The first amendment prohibits the Government from interfering with the free flow of information, except in limited and special circumstances, and we have a strong commitment to private ownership and operation of information. These political and economic traditions and the highly pluralistic nature of our society make a coordinated treatment of information policy concerns a difficult and delicate task.

When all the possible excuses have been made, however, I still think that the United States is doing an inadequate job of planning for the information future.

VALUE OF INFORMATION IN RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Lewis Branscomb (in "Improving R&D Productivity: The Federal Role." Science, No. 222, Oct. 14, 1983, p. 133) states that: "When accurate, pertinent data are available, work can proceed. When they are not, work must stop while a researcher invents a different approach, develops (or redevelops) missing data, or experimentally verifies unevaluated data reported in the literature before daring to commit another period of time and effort on a project that is heading down a critical path."

How important this data is, to which Dr. Branscomb refers, can be estimated from a portion of a report written for the U.S. Department of Energy (U.S. Dept. of Energy, King Research, Inc. "Value of the Energy Data Base." Mar. 31, 1982, p.1): "An investment of \$5.3 billion (DOE's R&D budget) in the generation of information and about \$500 million (DOE's information processing and dissemination budget) in processing and using information yields a partial return of about \$13 billion in terms of savings to scientists and engineers in their time and in equipment."

Although the methodology employed in this study may be debated, and the dollar amounts subject to conjecture, the study does offer substantive indications that the availability of appropriate information at the appropriate time

increases the productivity of those working in the R&D arena.

Discussing the value of information in research and development, the following quote is from a Library of Congress' Congressional Research Service report titled "The Impact of Information Technology on Science" authored by Jane Bortnick and Nancy R. Miller (Library of Congress, 1985, p. 43-44): "in 1983 the National Academy of Science's Numerical Data Advisory Board, the Committee on Science and Technology of the U.S. House of Representatives, and the Congressional Research Service coordinated a workshop entitled, 'Toward a National S&T Data Policy.' At that workshop numerous representatives of industry, government, and academia discussed the importance of scientific and technical data for solving research questions and the appropriate role of the U.S. Government. Among the examples offered included those by Dr. Hollis Caswell, Laboratory Director, IBM Corp. In one case, Dr. Caswell stated that in trying to solve memory errors in computer systems, researchers discovered that nuclear particles on semiconductors were at fault. The availability of a symposium paper on this topic 'saved the computer industry much effort since, once the problem was identified, solutions evolved rapidly.'"

In another case, William F. Brown, Jr., a consultant to NASA gave a list of hardware failures traceable to inadequate data bases. He also cited the situation where the test failure of a rocket motor case resulted in a \$17 million loss and the cancellation of that portion of the program. He commented that: "The motor case was fabricated from a relatively new steel using improper welding methods. The information that these methods were unsuitable was at the time not widely disseminated but available in the Aerospace Structural Metals Handbook sponsored by the Air Force. The cost of preparing the handbook chapter for this steel was about \$3,000, or 0.02 percent of the loss."

I'm certain that many scientists and engineers working in R&D could add innumerable such stories, and they would be fascinating. But the point to be made and remembered is that missing information, like the horseshoe nail, can make or break projects, companies or even, quite possibly, nations.

It behooves us now to create a set of policies and guidelines which will efficiently effect the transfer of as much as possible of the technology paid for by American taxpayers back into American enterprises. If this goal can be accomplished, we may well find ourselves regaining some of the international competitive leadership we have lost over the last several years to the West Germans and Japanese, among others.

One of the reasons for the loss of this leadership has been the complacency with which we have viewed our successes. Believing ourselves to be secure in a redoubt fortified by "good old American ingenuity and know-how" coupled to our work ethic, we felt unassailable. We were and are, after all, the greatest, most powerful Nation on the face of the Earth.

But, Mr. Speaker, that complacency has permitted us to reduce our stockpiles of know-how and ingenuity. Our work ethic has been subverted to a "pleasure ethic" based on the

"quick fix" of instant gratification. We became smug, and lazy and full of ourselves. And all the while, our international competitors kept advancing, and not so stealthily at that. There were warnings: We saw our automotive, steel, consumer electronics, textiles and footwear markets being eroded. And for some time, even when that erosion had dramatically changed the configuration of our international marketplace positions, we kept on hoping to be saved by a combination of failures on the part of our competitors and successes by our own businesses and industries.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we now know better. We must not act as if our capacities for innovation, invention, and productivity are limitless resources—as limitless as we once believed our natural resources were. We must nourish and husband all of our resources, including our intellectual energies. We must remember, too, that our research and development funds are limited. The incredible national debt, the ever-increasing deficit, the almost unbelievable negative balance of payments—all take their tolls on that which we can afford, however necessary those things are.

WHY THE GOVERNMENT INFORMATION ACT OF 1986?

Mr. Speaker, before going further, I want to make it clear that the Government Information Act of 1986 in no way overlaps with, or impinges upon, the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (as amended). The Paperwork Reduction Act is quite specific to certain information collected or analyzed by the Federal Government, which information is either generated for the ongoing management of Government, or is collected from the public and which provides the Government with such data as census, or demographics or ascertains public needs or views regarding Federal programs.

Mr. Speaker, we must exercise care and not scatter our informational resources to the winds in the profligate manner to which we are used. We must pool and centralize our informational wealth in order that several ends may be met. And we must develop an overall, logical set of policies which can guide the development and handling of our scientific and technical information resources in order that they be made to work in favor of our national well-being.

For these and the following reasons, I am introducing this bill today:

First, this bill would allow American businesses, industries, academic institutions and private citizens to have access to the majority of unclassified federally sponsored or produced information from one central source. The information previously available for sale from among the Federal Government's largest producers or collectors of scientific, technical, business and economic information and from such agencies as the National Technical Information Service and the Government Printing Office, will be uniformly processed, priced, and available from the one central source.

Second, this bill will enhance the transfer of Federal technology to the private sector by reducing the number of agencies which now make Federal information available for sale to only one such agency. And by mandating the inclusion of a larger number of informational items, American business and industry should have access to larger amounts, and with greater ease, to the kinds of information which

is necessary to the well-being of our economic, business, and industrial health.

Third, this bill would bring much of Federal information handling into the 20th century by mandating that contractually obtained information will be provided in formats which are manipulable by computers. This will reduce the costs of processing, finding, and reproducing this information.

Fourth, for this large mass of information, estimated to be growing at the rate of over 100,000 new items annually, there will be but one data base. This will lessen the time and costs necessary in order to find specifically needed information.

Fifth, through the centralization engendered in this bill, all costs to the Federal Government which are associated with dealing with this information will be reduced because institutional overlaps and redundancies will be reduced. This, in turn, should keep the prices to the customers of the Government Information Agency at the lowest possible level.

Sixth, this bill will reduce the Federal Government's payments on contracts since it prohibits contractors from duplicating specific Government functions.

Seventh, by having but a single data base of this type to consult, the public and private sectors should be able to enjoy a reduction in unnecessarily duplicated research or development. If this bill had but this one benefit to recommend it, I would strongly support it.

Eighth, this bill creates an entity, in the form of the Government Information Agency, which would not only be self-sustaining, but also revenue producing. I estimate that the initial authorization of \$10 million should be returned to the Treasury Department in 3 years or less.

Ninth, this bill would provide greater ease for interaction with the private sector to do that which is best done by the information industry of the private sector and not the Government.

Given the scope and depth of the cogent benefits inherent in this bill, I urge my colleagues to support it with great enthusiasm.

SUMMARY OF THE GOVERNMENT INFORMATION ACT OF 1986

TITLE I

Establishes the Government Information Agency (GIA) as a self-sustaining, independent entity by subsuming in toto the National Technical Information Service of the U.S. Department of Commerce, and the information sales portions of the U.S. Departments of Defense and Energy, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Government Printing Office.

Defines the term "Government information" to include all scientific, technical, business, and economic information and data (in any form) which is in the possession or control of any Federal agency or is obtained by any Federal agency from a State or local government, a foreign entity, or any other public or private source, and which pertains to or derives from federally-performed or federally-sponsored research, development, or analysis or incorporates the results of such research, development, or analysis, except for information which is classified or provided for use in the performance of a contract with a Federal agency.

Specifies the principal officers as the Administrator and Deputy Administrator, both

to be appointed by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate. Sets forth the professional qualifications of the Administrator as having ability in computer science, information science, or library science and in printing and publishing.

Defines the mission of the GIA as being the enhancement of the economic, scientific, and technological position of the U.S. by acquiring, processing and selling primarily the fruits of federally-performed or federally-sponsored research, development or analysis. Indicates that the GIA shall collect Government information in electronic form to the greatest extent possible, and establish and maintain an electronic bibliographic database of all Government information collected, etc. Further requires that the GIA make such information available to business, industry, academe, other Federal agencies, State and local agencies and to the general public and to foreign governments or other foreign entities to the extent not inconsistent with applicable treaties and international agreements, etc.

Directs the GIA to collect, to the maximum extent possible, information on the results of foreign research, development or analysis to ensure that American enterprises will have such information available to them.

Establishes in the Treasury a revolving fund to provide working capital for the GIA, with contents of the fund to come from an initial appropriation of \$10 million for the initial expense of establishing the GIA and an additional \$5 million as initial capital for the revolving fund, with other monies to be gotten from fees for products or services, etc.

Requires each Federal agency to provide the GIA with all information developed or received by the Federal agency in connection with research, development or analysis performed or sponsored by that agency, including information obtained or received pursuant to research, development or analysis contracts. It further requires that such information be provided to the GIA at no cost to the GIA and authorizes that the GIA Administrator may reimburse the supplying Federal agency for the costs of materials and reproduction of such information. Additionally, requires all supplying Federal agencies to deliver to GIA each individual informational item in each form in which the supplying agency receives said information, including electronic forms.

Additional sections cover administrative provisions (including rules, delegation, personnel and services, contracts, use of facilities, acquisition and maintenance of property, copyrights and patents, gifts and bequests, transfers of funds from other Federal agencies, agency seal, annual report, salaries of the Administrator and Deputy Administrator, transitional, savings and conforming provisions transfer and allocations of appropriations and personnel, incidental transfers, effects on personnel, savings provisions, separability, transition, effective date, interim appointments, and authorization of appropriations). Enables the Administrator to establish and impose reasonable fees and charges with respect to the sale of Government information and with respect to the provision of services and assistance, etc.

TITLE II (SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION IN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS)

Requires that if the head of an executive agency determines that familiarity with scientific and technical information is neces-

sary for the effective performance of a contract proposed to be awarded by such executive agency, such contract may not be awarded to offeror unless, before the award, the offeror demonstrates to the agency head that the offeror has conducted an exhaustive review of the available literature on such information, and that if a contract awarded by an executive agency requires the contractor to provide scientific and technical information to such agency as part of the performance of the contract, the contractor shall submit such information in an electronic data processing form prescribed by the agency head.

Requires that Department of Defense may not pay an amount charged by a contractor for indexing, cataloging, or otherwise organizing scientific or technical information furnished to the contractor by the Federal Government pursuant to a Federal Government contract.

TITLE III

Establishes a Joint Committee on Government Information to have oversight responsibility for the Government Information Agency. The Joint Committee shall be composed of eight members: four from the U.S. Senate (appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate on the recommendations of the Majority and Minority Leaders—two from the majority party and two from the minority party) and four from the U.S. House of Representatives (appointed by the Speaker on the recommendations of the Majority and Minority Leaders—two from the majority party and two from the minority party).

Revises the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Printing by providing jurisdiction for the sale of Government publications to the public to the Joint Committee on Government Information.

Expands the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on the Library to include oversight responsibility for the depository library program.

ARE THERE PROBLEMS IN FOLLOWING THROUGH ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S OFFER TO SUBSIDIZE GRAIN SALES TO THE USSR?

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I hope that President Reagan's recent decision to use the export enhancement program to persuade the Soviet Union to buy the American wheat it is pledged to purchase this year will succeed. But there may be some problems to be overcome, and I would like at this time to share with my colleagues a staff review of the situation as it now appears to stand.

To date, the Russians have brought only 150,000 metric tons of wheat out of the 4 million tons they have agreed to purchase during the current 1985/86 season (ending September 30) under the long-term grain agreement [LTA] which runs through the 1986/87 year. The Soviets claim they have not been buying so far because the LTA obligates them to purchase only at competitive prices. They make the point that not only can they buy from other exporters at prices below those they

would have to pay normally at U.S. gulf ports, but other selected U.S. customers can also get grain for less under the Export Enhancement Program [EEP].

Now, of course, the President has announced that EEP subsidies are available to the Russians. But at the subsidy rate which has so far been offered, we may not succeed in making sales. The subsidy set is \$13 a ton, producing a net price of \$90 a ton. This is about equal to the weighted average price the Soviets have paid for Argentine, Canadian and Australian grain, but the grain trade thinks it will take a subsidy of \$20-\$27 a ton to get the Soviets to purchase the full 4 million tons of wheat. A subsidy of that level would let the Soviets get our grain at the same price at which we sold wheat to Egypt last week, or about \$80 a ton. This would also be competitive with EEC sales of inferior feed-grade wheat at \$78 a ton. The total cost of the subsidy for the Soviets, should they buy 4 million tons at a \$20-\$27 subsidy would be about \$80-\$100 million compared to about \$50 million at the \$13 a ton level. All costs, either way, would be within the limits set by Congress for the Export Enhancement Program.

The announced \$13 a ton subsidy level, incidentally, expired on last Friday, August 8, and another announcement of the subsidy level will be made this week.

Just how much the Soviets will actually buy remains to be seen. On the basis of their current purchases from all exporters to date, a total import level of 30-35 million tons has been projected including 16-20 million tons of wheat. At such levels, they would still be short of meeting their expected import needs which—based on a predicted Soviet harvest of 170 million tons—are expected to range between 40-50 million tons.

The Soviets may be holding off their purchases until our prices come down—either through the reduction in our loan rates or through competition as all exporters compete with export subsidies. Another factor which may be leading the Soviets to sharpen their search for lower prices is the shrinkage in their foreign exchange reserves.

If the Soviets buy the 4 million tons sought under the United States program for the current year, the net improvement in our wheat exports may be only 2 million tons. This could happen because other exporters may view our use of the EEP as an escalation of the trade war and may try to take sales away from us in other markets.

THE REVEREND DAVID JAMES BERKEDAL TO ASSUME NEW POST IN SAN DIMAS, CA

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a mixture of sadness and joy that we in Compton, CA, will be bidding farewell next week to one of the city's most active pastors, the Reverend David James Berkedal. We feel our own loss deeply, but knowing Reverend Berkedal, we can feel only joy for the city of San Dimas

where Reverend Berkedal will soon take up a new pastorate.

Compton has a special relationship with Reverend Berkedal. His first pastorate has been in our city. He joined us only 2 weeks after his ordination in July 1977, and has made an astonishing number of contributions to our city in the 9 years of his ministry.

Mindful of the charge that a minister should attend both to the corporal and the spiritual needs of his flock, Reverend Berkedal has administered one of the most active emergency food pantries in Compton. He has been tireless in securing food for the poor and the hungry. He has even been successful in tapping Federal funds for this ministry. Since 1984, his efforts have brought more than \$26,000 from the Federal Emergency Management Agency to his program to feed the hungry of the city.

Reverend Berkedal has served in an area where nearly half the residents are black. He has tried to adapt Lutheran worship to black practices and traditions, and has been quite innovative in this respect. For example, he has organized regular jazz vespers worship services, himself playing the drums for the services. He developed the first Lutheran revival to be held in the past half century. In addition to the traditional Lutheran Sunday service, Reverend Berkedal has instituted a second, experimental Sunday service wherein the traditions of Lutheranism are melded with the worship traditions and practices of the black church.

In his 9 years as a pastor, his ministry has spread well beyond the confines of his church. Through regular contributions to the "Amen Corner" of the Compton Bulletin, through numerous radio interviews, through contributions of theme music for local television, Reverend Berkedal has truly ministered not just to Lutherans but to the whole community of Compton. And most recently, his ministry has extended to the whole South Bay area where, during the past year, he has served as the South Bay Conference Pastor-at-Large.

Pastor David James Berkedal has been a civic leader in the old-fashioned way—through hard work. He has served as a member and often as an officer of key civic organizations in the South Bay region. In line with his desire to get affordable food to the people, he has been president since 1981 of the Hub City Certified Farmer's Market. Since its founding in 1981, he has been a member of the board of directors of the Youth Action Center for Positive Change. Since 1982, he has been a member of the Standing Committee on Crime of the city of Compton. This year, he is serving as that group's vice president. He has served a 4-year term on the Lutheran Social Services of Southern California Board of Directors and has led efforts within that body to remove accounts of this agency from banks doing business with South Africa. He has served as a member of the Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health Services Southeast Region Regional Community Liaison Committee. He has been a member of the President's Advisory Commission for Compton College. He is a member of the Compton Minority Health Task Force. And these are just the highlights.

It is an understatement to say that when the Reverend David James Berkedal assumes his new ministry, Compton will suffer a great loss. We will truly miss Reverend Berkedal. We want him to know that our deepest thanks, our affection, and our best wishes go with him to San Dimas.

PRESERVING THE COUNTRY'S OPTIONS ON ANGOLA

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leader and the entire Republican membership of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence have written to all Members of the House to warn of the dangerous restriction on support to freedom fighters in Angola contained in section fiscal year 1987 intelligence authorization bill, H.R. 4759. I would urge my colleagues to review carefully the letter we have written, which I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 11, 1986.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The House will soon consider H.R. 4759, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986. Section 107 of the bill eliminates the option for covert support for the resistance forces in Angola fighting against the Marxist-Leninist regime which seized power a decade ago. We intend to offer an amendment to strike Section 107, thereby preserving for the United States the full range of options for advancing U.S. interests in Angola.

Section 107 would prohibit aid to the Angolan resistance unless the President publicly requests such aid and the Congress publicly debates and approves it by joint resolution. The supporters of Section 107 fail to recognize that the United States must conduct certain aspects of foreign policy in secret. The Congress and the Executive Branch both should understand that they cannot discuss publicly the subject of the possible conduct of covert action in any particular country.

The floor debate cannot properly include discussion of whether the United States is or is not providing, or planning to provide, covert support to the Angolan resistance. Either way, section 107 is folly. The United States must preserve all options—overt and covert—which may become necessary to protect U.S. interests against Communist aggression around the world, including in Angola.

A majority of the Members of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence have decided to force public discussion in the House of matters which should remain secret, ignoring the appropriate effective mechanisms which exist for Congress to control intelligence activities through the power of the purse while maintaining secrecy. We strongly oppose this breach of the regular process for congressional oversight of intelligence activities.

Our amendment to strike Section 107 is essentially a referendum on the process for congressional oversight of intelligence activities. If you believe, as we do, that Congress must act with appropriate confidentiality in consultation with the President

and his senior advisers on the subject of sensitive national security operations, vote to strike Section 107.

Vote to strike Section 107 of H.R. 4759 and preserve the options for defending U.S. interests in Angola. Vote to tell the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to do the job it was created to do—handle funding and oversight of intelligence programs with the necessary secrecy.

Sincerely,

Bob Stump, Andy Ireland, Henry Hyde,
Dick Cheney, Bob Livingston, Bob
McEwen, Bob Michel.

IMPORTANT NEW MONEYS RE- LEASED FOR ELDERLY BY USDA

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, as the chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging's Subcommittee on Human Services to share with my colleagues some information I have recently received from the U.S. Department of Agriculture with regard to new funds to be provided for congregate and home delivered nutrition services for the elderly, under the Elderly Feeding Program, which is part of the Older Americans Act nutrition program.

The data which follows is broken down on a State-by-State basis and these funds actually represent a reimbursement to the States for meals served during fiscal year 1985 despite a Federal funding cutback. During the final quarter of fiscal year 1985, the reimbursement rate per meal was cut by 3 cents a meal. While cutbacks were not made initially, failure to provide additional funds could have resulted in the reduction and or elimination of more than 2 million daily meals a day for seniors across the Nation.

These additional funds came under terms of several emergency bills passed by Congress including Public Law 99-269, which I authored in the House, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1986. The precise bill that released the funds was a supplemental appropriations bill passed by Congress and signed into law by the President just last month. It provided a total of \$8.5 million for the Elderly Feeding Program. The funds were to be used to pay past due claims and to keep the reimbursement rate at its current 56.76 cents per meal for the rest of this fiscal year.

On July 30, my Subcommittee on Human Services held a special hearing at which time testimony was received from Sonia F. Crow, Associated Administrator of the Food and Nutrition Services of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Ms. Crow assured the subcommittee the Department was prepared to release \$6.2 million for use by the States immediately and the figures that follow represent those 1985 payments from funds provided under Public Law 99-349, the supplemental appropriations bill.

I wish to commend Ms. Crow and the Department of Agriculture for their timely response and expedient implementation of this bill, and wish to thank them on behalf of the

seniors across our Nation who will ultimately benefit from these additional funds.

NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR THE ELDERLY—1985 PAYMENTS FROM FUNDS PROVIDED BY PUBLIC LAW 99-349

State	Earnings from meal rate of 56.33 cents	Estimated additional payment
NORTHEAST		
Connecticut	\$1,543,684	\$74,320
Maine	591,693	28,487
Massachusetts	3,748,495	180,471
New Hampshire	776,315	37,376
New York	11,566,166	556,851
Rhode Island	639,982	30,812
Vermont	465,765	22,617
Maine: Passamaquaddy	5,986	288
New York: Tonawanda Senecas	7,868	379
NERO subtotal	19,349,955	931,601
MID-ATLANTIC		
Delaware	638,123	30,722
District of Columbia	607,655	29,255
Maryland	2,131,706	102,631
New Jersey	3,131,001	150,742
Pennsylvania	6,250,938	300,951
Puerto Rico	1,129,419	54,376
Virginia	1,543,286	74,301
Virgin Islands	64,128	3,087
West Virginia	1,138,930	54,834
MARO subtotal	16,635,187	800,899
SOUTHEAST		
Alabama	2,235,569	107,631
Florida	6,826,498	328,661
Georgia	1,774,967	85,456
Kentucky	2,010,713	96,805
Mississippi	1,863,019	89,695
North Carolina	2,733,959	131,626
South Carolina	1,220,573	58,764
Tennessee	2,157,146	103,855
Mississippi: MS Choctaw	4,143	199
North Carolina: Eastern Cherokee	10,328	487
SERO subtotal	20,836,912	1,003,190
MIDWEST		
Illinois	4,394,979	211,596
Indiana	2,900,649	139,651
Michigan	5,325,311	256,386
Minnesota	2,436,412	117,301
Ohio	3,865,214	186,090
Wisconsin	3,580,143	172,365
Michigan: Keweenaw Bay	8,285	399
Sault Ste Marie	3,982	191
Grand Traverse Band	1,372	66
Intertribal Council	7,006	337
Minnesota: Fond du Lac	5,318	256
Mille Lacs	13,685	659
Chippewa	3,147	151
Red Lake Band	13,939	671
Lower Sioux Ind. Comm	2,892	139
Wisconsin: St. Croix	3,028	146
Stockbridge-Munsee	2,242	108
Winnebago	2,637	127
Bad River	3,383	163
Lac Courte	6,670	321
Menominee	7,602	366
Red Cliff	3,890	187
Oneida Trib. Ind. Wis	663	33
Lac Du Flambeau Band	4,598	221
MWRO subtotal	22,597,050	1,087,932
SOUTHWEST		
Arkansas	1,999,783	96,279
Louisiana	3,016,992	145,253
New Mexico	981,884	47,273
Oklahoma	2,125,598	102,337
Texas	7,609,983	366,382
Louisiana: Inst. Indian Rev	0	0
New Mexico: Pueblo of Acoma	5,563	268
Eight North Pueblo	8,268	398
Pueblo of Isleta	7,461	359
Pueblo of Zuni	15,924	767
Five Sandoval	7,006	337
Santo Domingo	5,522	266
Mescalero Apache	3,013	145
San Clara Pueblo	7,045	339
Pueblo of Taos	5,314	256
San Juan Pueblo	7,315	352
Jicarilla Apache	6,592	317
Pueblo of Laguna	13,572	653
San Felipe	2,887	139
Pueblo of Jemez	2,562	123
Oklahoma: Choctaw Nation	11,470	552
Chickasaw Nation	15,018	723

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR THE ELDERLY—1985 PAYMENTS FROM FUNDS PROVIDED BY PUBLIC LAW 99-349—Continued

State	Earnings from meal rate of 56.33 cents	Estimated additional payment
Muscogee	25,872	1,246
Cheyenne-Arapahoe	967	47
Cherokee Nation	7,509	362
Polawatomi	9,080	437
Comanche Indian	1,676	81
Osage Tribe	9,889	476
Pawnee Tribal	6,274	302
Miami Tribe	11,301	544
Seneca-Cayuga	5,569	268
Kiowa Tribe	9,238	445
Quapaw Tribe	8,713	419
Kickapoo Tribe	6,542	267
Otoe-Missouria	2,868	138
Seminole Nation	8,387	404
Sac and Fox	0	0
Apache	2,477	119
Wyandotte	1,901	92
Ottawa	4,585	221
Pooria	2,604	125
Delaware	1,430	69
Caddo	303	15
SWRO subtotal	15,984,958	769,594
MOUNTAIN PLAINS		
Colorado	1,171,047	56,380
Iowa	2,280,711	109,805
Kansas	1,970,453	94,867
Missouri	3,468,366	166,984
Montana	801,974	38,611
North Dakota	1,194,157	57,493
South Dakota	643,498	30,981
Utah	711,095	34,236
Wyoming	745,689	35,901
Colorado: Southern Ute	7,575	365
Ute Mtn. Tribe	3,199	154
Kansas: Kickapoo	8,854	426
Potawatomi Reservation	4,001	193
Un. Trib. Ks. and Se. N	1,728	83
Montana: Blackfeet Tribe	11,543	556
Assiniboine Sioux	11,945	575
Chippewa-Cree	11,452	551
Northern Cheyenne	3,350	161
Saish and Kootenai	4,768	230
Crow	0	0
Fort Belknap	3,684	177
Nebraska: Omaha	7,380	355
Winnebago NE	2,761	133
Flandreau Santee Sio	7,270	350
North Dakota: Standing Rock	18,548	893
Three Affiliated	210	10
Trutle Mountain Band	2,330	112
Devils Lake Sioux	1,827	88
South Dakota: Oglala Sioux	43,171	2,078
Yankton Sioux	6,797	327
Cheyenne River	16,868	812
Rosebud Sioux	0	0
Sisseton-Wahp Sioux	3,415	164
Crow Creek Sioux	1,150	65
Utah: Uintah Oilray	5,607	270
MPRO subtotal	13,701,402	859,852
WESTERN		
Alaska	204,182	9,830
Arizona	1,358,259	65,393
California	10,845,441	522,152
Guam	181,149	8,721
Hawaii	739,790	35,617
Idaho	601,916	28,979
Nevada	542,169	26,103
Oregon	1,440,499	69,353
Washington	1,711,829	82,416
Northern Marianas	44,294	2,133
Alaska: Kodiak Assoc	2,094	101
Central Council	0	0
Tanana Chiefs Conf	0	0
Arizona: Pascua Yagui	18,910	910
Salt River	6,285	303
Hopi Tribal	6,546	315
White Mt. Apache	12,719	612
Papago Tribe	2,160	104
Navajo Tribe	4,397	212
San Carlos Apache	10,032	483
Intertribal Council	0	0
Quechan Indian	0	0
Colorado River	1,511	73
California: Hupa	5,093	245
Hishop and Toiyabe	1,671	80
Riverside-San Bernad	3,077	148

NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR THE ELDERLY—1985 PAYMENTS FROM FUNDS PROVIDED BY PUBLIC LAW 99-349—Continued

State	Earnings from meal rate of 56.33 cents	Estimated additional payment
Tule River Ind. HC	81	4
Sonoma County	915	44
Round Valley Ind	1,288	62
Toiyabe	3,269	157
Idaho: Nez Perce	5,515	266
Shoshone-Bananoek	13,743	662
Nevada: Washoe Tribe	5,954	287
Walker River Paiute	3,089	149
Intertribal	9,797	472
Shoshone-Paiute	4,582	221
Oregon: Umatilla Reservation	6,576	317
Conf Trib. Warm Spring	688	33
Washington: Yakima	676	33
Eastern Washington	3,452	166
Northwest Service	3,511	169
Colville	2,306	111
Lummi	2,921	141
Muckleshoot	2,629	127
Puyallup	6,402	308
Quinalt	3,552	171
Southern Puget	4,155	200
Makah Tribal	1,081	52
WRO subtotal	17,830,204	858,432

Note.—The "estimated additional payment" column represents the increase in earnings from the previous per meal rate of \$3.618 cents to the current per meal rate of 56.33 cents. Because there have been some minor changes in both the meal counts and the value of commodities credited against a State's entitlement since the last payment was made, the actual payment may vary slightly.

REPORT ON RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE AND POLITICS

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, of the year 1986 has already seen more cases of religious intolerance and unfair tactics than normally occur throughout most entire election years.

As People for the American Way have documented in their 1986 interim report on religious intolerance and politics:

The instances of religious intolerance and deceptive campaign tactics that have already occurred should serve as a warning. Unless these tactics are challenged, American society may become further polarized, our liberties threatened, and our political system distorted—not only for the remainder of this campaign season, but for years to come.

Based on the experience in this year's party primaries, caucuses, and conventions, the study warns that "This year may see some of the most intolerant and deceptive campaign tactics in recent history." Most instances of religious intolerance and unfair campaign tactics have been confined to intraparty battles, such as the extremism and conspiracy theories of the LaRouche movement within the Democratic Party and the increasingly deceptive and intolerant tactics of the religious right operating within the Republican Party. Considering the unfair tactics used in this year's skirmishes, People for the American Way have raised great cause for concern about what will

happen when Republicans and Democrats square off in this fall's elections.

Chairman of People for the American Way John Buchanan, an ordained Southern Baptist minister and former eight-term Republican Congressman from Alabama, observed:

So far in 1986, the main victims of intolerant and deceptive campaign tactics have been Republicans, including traditional conservatives as well as moderates, who have been subjected to theopolitical inquisitions and personal attacks from the religious right.

In its review of the first half of 1986, People for the American Way's report found that instances of political intolerance ranged from the anti-Semitism of the LaRouche movement within the Democratic Party, to an attack on a Christian Scientist in a Republican congressional primary in Texas, to demands that candidates in several States answer questionnaires about their religious views, and even prayers for the death of political opponents.

The report warns that candidates associated with perennial Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche have continued to win Democratic primaries in addition to their upset victories for statewide offices in Illinois, including five Democratic congressional nominations in Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas.

The religious right was found to continue to practice "a new form of intolerance which says there is only one way for godly people to vote, declares Biblical principles require adherence to a narrow set of political opinions, and claims divine endorsement for political candidates."

Calling the death prayers "the ultimate form of intolerance," the report notes that a Republican congressional nominee in Georgia has said he prays for God to remove Supreme Court Justices who support legal abortion, "in any way He sees fit." The report also notes that television evangelist Pat Robertson told the National Right to Life meeting in Denver that he is pleased "the wonderful process of the mortality tables" will change the composition of the Supreme Court.

The religious right, which in the past has been unusually and commendably forthright, has recently turned to "outright deceit" as a political tactic, distributing fliers advising fundamentalists to conceal their real views while seeking positions of power in the Republican Party. The growing influence of the religious right has been reflected in Republican State platform language in Iowa and Texas expressing radical views on constitutional issues. For example, the 1986 Iowa Republican platform is critical of the conception of "separation of church and state," and the Texas platform urges the teaching of Biblical creationism in public schools.

Other examples of intolerant or deceptive campaign tactics uncovered by the People for the American Way report include:

In Alaska, State Sen. Edna DeVries, a candidate for the Republican nomination for Lieutenant Governor, says she is running because God told her to run. She has told the Anchorage Times: "Some would say, 'Edna, you have a safe seat, why are you doing this?' When God speaks, you need to be obedient." According to the magazine Church and State, she believes the United States is a Christian nation and those who

disagree "shouldn't live in the United States."

In California's 27th Congressional District, Republican nominee Rob Scribner said "God * * * called me to run for Congress," and declared electing him is tantamount to "tak[ing] territory" for our Lord Jesus Christ." Scribner is opposing incumbent Democrat Mel Levine.

In Florida, Bob Plimpton, coordinator for television evangelist Pat Robertson's Freedom Council in the Southern part of the state, distributed fliers at Palm Beach churches soliciting "Christian candidates" for the county school board.

In Georgia's 7th Congressional District, Republican nominee the Rev. Joe Morecraft said he prays for God to remove Supreme Court Justices who support legal abortion "in any way He sees fit."

In Indiana's 7th Congressional District, Republican nominee William Costas said he entered the race because of a message from God.

In Indiana's 8th Congressional District, a fundamentalist group called the Agora sent candidates a questionnaire demanding to know how often they attended church and whether they consider the Bible "inerrant."

In Iowa, a flier on "how to participate in a political party" circulated among fundamentalists who took over Republican county caucuses. The flier urged activists to keep their views, goals, and activities secret, advising them to "hide your strength," "to a degree, keep your positions on issues to yourself," and "give the impression that you were there to work for the party, not to push an ideology." These tactics are justified by citing Biblical passages.

In North Carolina, a group called Students for Better Government asked candidates "Can you honestly say that you have a personal relationship with Jesus Christ?"

In Texas' 21st Congressional District, Republican contender Lamar Smith was attacked by his opponent, Van Archer, because of his (Smith's) Christian Scientist religious affiliation. Smith won the nomination, but Van Archer received 46% of the vote.

At state senate district Republican conventions in Texas, delegates were urged to sign a "Believers Decree of Agreement," pledging adherence to "the Christian faith" and other theological and political commitments.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans of every faith, color and creed should be thankful for the efforts of People for the American Way to expose this rising tide of religious and political intolerance as we enter the final stretch of the 1986 political season. Intolerance challenged is intolerance denied, and I urge my colleagues and the American people to study and ponder the results of this most important study.

THE PEACE GARDEN TRADITION

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this week the House acted to establish a National Peace Garden in the Nation's Capital. I commend my colleagues, Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. VENTO of Minnesota for their

leadership in bringing this bill to the floor and rise in support of it.

The legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the National Park Service, to enter into an agreement with the Peace Garden Project, Inc. to design and construct a Peace Garden in Washington, DC. The bill also provides that the Secretary will be responsible for its maintenance, once constructed from private funds.

Having such a Peace Garden in the National Capital will illustrate and embody our country's commitment to peace—on behalf of our citizens and for the millions of foreign visitors who tour our Federal City each year. It's a welcome addition to the tradition of peace gardens.

In my own State of North Dakota and the adjoining Canadian Province of Manitoba, thousands of people visit annually the International Peace Garden. The central attraction of the park is probably the International Peace Chapel, a nonsectarian oasis on the international border dedicated to the universal ideas of peace from the world's great thinkers—Mahatma Gandhi, Dag Hammarskjöld, St. Francis, and Einstein. Its pool and fountain symbolize the continuity in the search for peace, which goal has inspired the work of the garden for over 50 years.

For the information of my colleagues, I am including in my remarks a summary of the unique activities which occur at the International Peace Garden. As we embark on an effort to develop a worldwide network of peace gardens, I want to urge my colleagues to consider the pioneering work for peace and understanding of the International Peace Garden. Currently, the governments of Canada, North Dakota, and Manitoba contribute to its programs and maintenance. I believe that our own Federal Government should make a similar contribution.

Summary follows:

INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN,

Dunseith, ND, July 29, 1986.

The International Peace Garden is a busy place. Over 18,000 tourists registered at the Peace Chapel for the summer of 1985. The registration is not a complete account of the number of tourists to tour the International Peace Garden, as the registration is voluntary. There was 553 people from 53 nations other than U.S. and Canada sign in, all 50 of the United States states were represented, and 11 of the 12 Canadian Provinces were recorded in the guest book.

During the months of May, June, July and August of 1985, North Dakota's registration showed 5,960 people with Manitoba at 4,063.

Over the summer of 1985, 71 motor coaches toured the International Peace Garden, most made use of the Tour Guide services we provide.

The summer of 1986 is promising to be an even better year than 1985.

More than 2,000 students attended the International Music Camp located in the heart of the International Peace Gardens on the border between Manitoba and North Dakota during the summer session of 1986.

Students from approximately 25 states and provinces were able to take advantage of 26 summer school of fine arts programs taught by artist teachers. In addition, the 1986 season saw 67 students enrolled from twelve nations other than the United States

and Canada. Those countries included: the Bahamas, Brazil, Costa Rica, Chile, Egypt, Finland, France, Mexico, Norway, Spain, Switzerland and West Germany.

During the 1986 season the International Music Camp employed 162 staff members from 30 states and provinces as well as two European countries.

THE BILLION DOLLARS ISN'T ALL FOR DROUGHT

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I want to set the record straight about one recent development in efforts to help farmers survive the terrible drought that has done so much damage in the Southeast this year.

Yesterday, August 12, the White House issued a news release from the office of the press secretary. In listing earlier administration actions to assist in the drought emergency, the release mentioned that the administration had approved—and I quote—"increased 1986 advance deficiency payments at a cost of about \$1 billion."

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the increased deficiency payments go to producers of wheat, feed grains, cotton, and rice in all parts of the country. I have no quarrel with the decision to move up the delivery of a portion of the scheduled deficiency payments. This is a welcome bit of help with cash flow problems to farmers in all areas where the crops involved are grown, and is within the limits set by Congress in the 1985 farm bill.

My problem is, however, with the description of the entire \$1 billion amount as drought assistance. The fact is, as Members know, that the payments go to producers wherever the crops involved are grown and most of them are grown outside the drought area. Only a small proportion, less than \$50 million of the \$1 billion, will be paid to farmers in drought areas. This too is welcome, but I wish the White House would keep the record accurate and would stop describing the entire \$1 billion speedup in payments as part of its drought assistance.

NATIONAL HIGH-TECHNOLOGY MONTH RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. LUJAN and I have introduced for the third consecutive year a resolution designating October as "National High-Technology Month." I am pleased to note that we introduce the resolution this year by popular demand. We have received numerous calls over the last several months from State and local government officials, from businesses, from teachers, all asking us to introduce the resolution.

In past years, the resolution has set aside a special time in which teachers and students

and the general public can look in a focused way at the impact of high technology on our lives. There is hardly an aspect of our lives that is not now touched by technological advancement.

I can attest to the impact in my own career in politics. In 1962 when I won my first elected office, I thought it fortunate that my office eventually obtained an electric typewriter. The concept of a memory typewriter did not cross my mind, and I certainly gave no thought to the notion of having a computer in my office.

Today the electric typewriter is almost an anachronism in my office. These words were composed at a computer, one of six in my Washington office. They were stored electronically on a magnetic disk rather than on a piece of paper. If I had wanted to change these words, I wouldn't have had a secretary tied up for an hour retyping. The pushing of a few buttons changes whatever I desire and moves words, phrases, and paragraphs where I want them.

Rather than sending these words to the district in an envelope, I will feed them into a machine which will transmit them through electronic impulses over the telephone line. Or maybe I will have one of my Washington computers call my district computer and transfer the information directly to disk for perfect, hard-copy reprinting there. What would have taken a week to get from Washington to California in 1962 will take less than 45 seconds.

The press release announcing introduction of this bill, likewise, need not be sent conventionally. My press secretary needs only to call the wire service's telecopier number and send the press release instantly. To see how the wire service treats the announcement, I can have my computer dial up the wire services and read the copy almost as soon as it is composed. I could go to the House recording studio and record a discussion of activities that might surround High-Technology Month and have those comments beamed by satellite to news media in California.

As a person in public life, high technology has vastly expanded my opportunities to communicate. While helping a politician to say more to more people may not be viewed by all as a positive byproduct of high technology, it clearly illustrates what high technology has done for us. It has added to our freedom by giving us options and by giving us time. Freedom, and time to use that freedom creatively—those are substantial contributions. I hope our colleagues will join Mr. LUJAN and myself in giving the Nation an opportunity to reflect on and to celebrate the contributions of high-technology to our society.

DISTASTE FOR COVERT ACTIONS

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable HENRY HYDE authored a brilliant article entitled "Distaste for Covert Actions" in the Washington Times of August 13, 1986. The article makes clear the folly of those who support the

prohibition on aid to the freedom fighters in Angola in section 107 of H.R. 4759, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986. The Congress will soon consider the intelligence bill, and every Member of the House should read Mr. HYDE's article before casting a vote on the Angola question:

DISTASTE FOR COVERT ACTIONS

It has been said that Queen Victoria, in rejecting the idea of submarine warfare, called it a decidedly un-British way of fighting. True or not, there are those in positions of power in Congress who express the same fastidiousness about U.S. covert actions. Among those appearing to hold such a view is Democratic Rep. Lee Hamilton of Indiana, the respected chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Earlier this year, what amounts to a new anti-covert action doctrine was enunciated by Mr. Hamilton. Specifically, the Hamilton Doctrine says that any "hotly debated" aspect of U.S. foreign policy with sensitive, covert intelligence ramifications must be openly acknowledged, publicly debated, and approved by Congress before any money can be provided in support of that policy.

More recently, Mr. Hamilton has translated his doctrine into legislation that is designed to sabotage the Reagan Doctrine of aiding anti-Communist resistance forces around the world. This latest Hamilton proposal, which has very damaging foreign-policy implications, is incorporated in the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987 (H.R. 4759), slated to be considered by the full House soon.

The first test case of the Hamilton Doctrine will be Angola. In essence, the Hamilton legislation stipulates that no U.S. covert military or para-military assistance to Jonas Savimbi's National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) can be furnished unless such aid is publicly acknowledged and publicly approved by Congress. In other words, this is a clear attempt to reverse Congress's decision last year to repeal the 10-year-old Clark Amendment, which prohibited U.S. covert para-military activities in Angola.

What particularly disturbs me, as one who shares membership with Mr. Hamilton on the House intelligence committee, is that his doctrine represents a threat, ultimately, to all covert action, not just to what might be undertaken in Angola.

Debating an issue of this nature in open session empties the congressional intelligence oversight process of any real meaning.

And who makes the determination as to what is "hotly debated"—the media, certain senators and representatives, or the American public, which may have an entirely different point of view?

Questions concerning U.S. support of paramilitary operations in any part of the world should be discussed secretly within the confines of Congress's two intelligence committees. That is why those panels were established.

Members of Congress should realize there are instances when our foreign policy must be circumspect, and indeed, even appear ambiguous, to be fruitful. Angola is a case in point. As State Department officials have indicated, a public debate on whether we should have a military support relationship with UNITA might reveal specific, sensitive information to our adversaries.

The Libyan bombing episode of last April demonstrated that the president must have

a covert foreign policy option that lies somewhere between no action and sending the Marines or American bombers. The Hamilton Doctrine would preclude that. Moreover, it jeopardizes clandestine cooperation from other countries who feel that they cannot afford to be identified publicly as backing U.S. foreign-policy objectives and activities.

Some argue that once the general nature of a covert operation is disclosed, there is no sense in trying to protect it further. They fail to recognize, however, that as long as certain aspects of that operation are secret, the other side is kept guessing as to appropriate countermeasures. Dispelling uncertainties by congressional corroboration of information available elsewhere upgrades its probable accuracy, and thus aids our foes.

In addition, the nature of diplomacy is such that a government may diplomatically ignore rumors or even public non-official discussion of the existence of a covert action, but official acknowledgement requires a strong diplomatic response or more.

Furthermore, justifying, as Mr. Hamilton does, open congressional debate of a particular covert action, because of what he views as ostensible administration confirmation of that activity, is really a ruse for torpedoing any such operation. We should bear in mind that the president does not hold a press conference each time he notifies the House and Senate intelligence committees of a new covert plan or activity.

Admittedly, there have been some unfortunate public discussions by administration and congressional officials regarding some covert operations, but frequently these slips have occurred after someone privy to that action has apparently leaked the details. That's how, for example, the past U.S. program for aiding Nicaraguan resistance forces ultimately became the most overt covert program in American history. Although no excuse for these unauthorized revelations, such disclosures make it virtually impossible for the president plausibly to ignore or deny U.S. involvement.

In short, we must protect all covert activities. Congress cannot selectively pick and choose those we want to keep secret. Terminating those we don't like by leaks, or by public congressional debate—as envisioned by Mr. Hamilton—will eventually destroy this nation's covert-action capability. Removing a foreign-policy card from the president's hand that has been played by chief executives since the days of George Washington seriously imperils this nation's security.

As we have painfully learned in our war against terrorism, we cannot go it alone in this increasingly interdependent world. We cannot expect allies to engage in joint covert operations that may be disclosed. If we cannot guarantee confidentiality to otherwise cooperative third countries, we end up perilously isolated.

Mr. Hamilton's initiative is dangerous for everyone concerned. The Hamilton Doctrine sends a signal to the Soviet Union and to our friends alike that eventually all United States covert actions worldwide could be exposed because the U.S. Congress is an unpredictable and undependable "wild card" in the intelligence process.

Such a turn of events would irreparably damage our ability to confront Soviet expansionism, not only in Africa, but in Asia, the middle East and Latin America, with all that ominously portends for the future of the Free World.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF MISSION VIEJO

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, this month marks an historic time for one of the communities located within my 43d Congressional District. It is the 20th anniversary of Mission Viejo.

While 20 years is a relatively short time compared with the long and colorful history of some cities in America, the anniversary of the planned community of Mission Viejo deserves special recognition for its achievements in land planning.

Back in the early 1960's, men with a vision of what has now become known as the "California Promise" sat down and created a spectacular new community on paper. Careful attention was paid to each detail, from the development of school, church, and recreational facilities, to the design of roads and other public needs.

From the start, the men and women of the Mission Viejo Co. had a vision; that vision has grown and blossomed over the past two decades to the point where this community is nationally recognized for its excellence in providing its residents with a wonderful place to live, work, play, and raise families.

In 1984, Mission Viejo's reputation in the Nation was further enhanced when it was selected as the site for the Olympic long-distance cycling races.

Today, over 60,000 people call Mission Viejo home. To them and the Mission Viejo Co., I offer my congratulations on a job well done.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD COURT

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration appears to have believed that its interventionist policy in Nicaragua was totally incompatible with our general commitment to abide by international law. Before Americans accept the inevitability of a forced choice between power and principle, we would do well to read Richard Gardner's review of the avoidable mistakes which the Reagan administration made in its handling of Nicaragua's case before the International Court of Justice. Professor Gardner, who teaches at the School of Law of Columbia University, makes clear that the United States could have demonstrated its respect for international law without necessarily changing our policy on aid to the Contras—as desirable as that would have been. I am including Professor Gardner's essay, which was published in the New York Times on July 2, 1986, for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The essay follows:

[From the New York Times, July 2, 1986]

A REAGAN FIASCO IN THE WORLD COURT

(By Richard N. Gardner)

Suppose you had a lawyer who failed to shield you from an impending lawsuit by neglecting to exercise in a timely manner your right to refuse the court's jurisdiction? And, having missed that opportunity, suppose your lawyer then failed to present the merits of your case to the court, thus helping to assure a judgment against you? That is essentially what our Government has done in the case we lost last week to Nicaragua in the International Court of Justice.

Nicaragua brought its case to the court in April 1984, nearly three years after we started organizing, training and financing a 10,000-man contra army for operations inside Nicaragua. We could easily have blocked the Sandinistas' suit well before it came to the court by refusing to accept the court's jurisdiction in cases involving armed conflict—on the reasonable grounds that the security interests involved are too great, the factual issues too hard to resolve and the law on the subject insufficiently developed. But we failed to do so, and now we stand condemned before the world of breaking international law and violating Nicaraguan sovereignty.

To be sure, the International Court of Justice is not the same as a domestic court. Its decision that we should stop aiding the contras and pay damages to Nicaragua cannot be enforced. Nevertheless, the court's judgment will influence public opinion and policy in other countries, undermining confidence in our foreign policy and tarnish our reputation as a law-abiding nation.

Significantly, no member of the court was prepared to accept President Reagan's argument that we have a right to aid "freedom fighters" seeking to overthrow or force the liberalization of Communist regimes. But even the judges who voted against us acknowledged that our aid to the contras might be justified if it were shown to be part of a "collective self-defense"—if it were proved that Nicaragua was aiding leftist guerrillas in El Salvador and if our response was necessary and proportional.

The United States' refusal to come to court to make that case meant that the court heard only the self-serving arguments of the Sandinista witnesses, many of whom, to put it bluntly, lied through their teeth in denying Nicaragua's substantial involvement in the Salvadoran insurgency.

With such self-destructive behavior on our part, it is not surprising that we obtained scant support from the court, since it is difficult for judges to resolve factual issues in favor of a litigant who does not appear to present his case. In the larger court of international opinion, many will conclude that we have no case at all.

There is a new "realism" in vogue in our country today that considers international law a utopian dream and international institutions irrelevant or worse to the advancement of our national interests. That view, which is not shared by most other democratic countries, is itself unrealistic.

International law is a system of mutual restraints and concessions that nations accept because it serves their interests. The fact that the Soviet Union and its allies repeatedly violate international law does not mean that it does not exist; nor does it justify our doing the same. Democratic governments, unlike totalitarian ones, hold themselves accountable for their actions under a rule of law. When we exercise our lawful right to

use armed force in individual or collective self-defense, as we must in some cases, we should be willing to justify our actions in legal as well as political terms.

To say that we cannot do so in the Nicaraguan case because we would compromise vital intelligence sources is simply not credible. We were willing to show satellite photographs of Soviet missile sites during the Cuban missile crisis, and we revealed intercepts of Libyan messages to help justify our recent air strike against that country. If our case against Nicaragua is a good one, we must also have nonsensitive evidence from Salvadoran sources.

The Administration could still salvage something from its errors by publishing a full statement of the international law basis for aiding the contras. Other nations have the right to expect this from the world's greatest democracy. The American people, who correctly like to think of themselves as a law-abiding nation, have the right to demand no less.

AID CAN WITHHOLD FUNDS FROM U.N.

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia upheld the Agency for International Development's decision to withhold \$10 million from the United Nations Fund for Population Activities because it aids coercive abortion and involuntary sterilization in China.

Particularly in these times of fiscal despair, we should not be providing millions of dollars for a program which supports involuntary abortions and sterilization. These coercive measures constitute a gross violation of the rights of the individual and demonstrate a disregard for the value of human life. In my view human life is sacred and precious. No government should be allowed to require the termination of a human life, and certainly not with the assistance of an organization funded by the United States.

[From the Washington Post]

AID CAN WITHHOLD FUNDS FROM U.N.

(By Nancy Lewis)

The Agency for International Development's decision to withhold \$10 million from the U.N. Fund for Population Activities on grounds that its work aids coercive abortion and involuntary sterilization in China was upheld yesterday by the U.S. Court of Appeals here.

But the three-judge panel, in a decision written by Circuit Judge Abner J. Mikva, turned aside claims by AID that the decision was political and therefore could not be reviewed by the courts.

Noting that the court must defer to the intent of Congress and, to some extent, the executive in matters that affect foreign affairs, Mikva stated, "These principles of deference do not alter our conclusion, however, that this case does not present a nonjusticiable political question and that we may review the administrator's determination."

The decision came in a case brought by the Population Institute, the Population Council and Reps. William S. Green (R-N.Y.) and Peter H. Kostmayer (D-Pa.) chal-

lenging AID Administrator M. Peter McPherson's Sept. 26, 1985, decision to withhold the funds appropriated for fiscal 1985.

An amendment to the supplemental fiscal 1985 appropriations bill prohibited distribution of AID funds to any organization or program that "supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion of involuntary sterilization."

In challenging McPherson's decision to withhold the funds, the Population Institute and others argued that the U.N. agency did not support coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization in its programs in China and that the funds should be distributed.

U.S. District Judge Louis F. Oberdorfer threw out the suit, saying that the decision by AID was a political one and could not be reviewed by the courts.

An appeals court panel last November blocked AID from distributing the \$10 million to other recipients, but lifted the order less than two weeks later when McPherson submitted a new rationale, saying that the U.N. agency primarily provided demographic expertise to China, which in turn allowed "the Chinese to more effectively implement not their population planning program in general but their program of coercive abortion."

Mikva, joined by Circuit Judge Robert H. Bork and U.S. District Judge Harold Greene, said McPherson's interpretation was "reasonably grounded in a reasonable view of the amendment."

Officials of the Population Institute and the Population Council could not be reached for comment. Officials of the National Right to Life group, which had lobbied for the congressional amendment, said they applauded the decision.

AARONSBURG, PA CELEBRATES ITS BICENTENNIAL

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the town of Aaronsburg, PA, located in my congressional district, will celebrate its bicentennial on September 20 and 21, and a young constituent of mine from Aaronsburg, Andrea Vonada, researched and wrote a short history of the town that I would like to submit into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues who I know all join me in congratulating the people of Aaronsburg on the occasion of the town's Bicentennial.

The town's history is as follows:

AARONSBURG, PA

As early as 1775 the first German families to come to Centre County settled in Haines Township. The Germans, most of whom were farmers, found the limestone soil very pleasing for growing their crops.

They settled in the surrounding areas of Haines Township, but soon Aaronsburg became the largest village in the township. Aaronsburg is also the oldest town in Centre County. In 1786 Aaron Levy laid out lots and in October he began selling them. The town was, therefore, named for this early settler. This town is unusual in that when Mr. Levy planned it, he thought that it might some day be the capital of Pennsylvania. Therefore, he made the main street very wide. Even though the town never

became the capital, the wide street was left that way. In the past one could travel down main street and observe the freshly painted houses and fences around each lot.

Aaron Levy is also remembered for giving lot number 167 for the Salem Lutheran Church when he planned the town. On November 16, 1789 he conveyed Jacob Stover and Michael Motz as trustees for the lot, for the use of the members in communion with the church called Luthran for a school, church, and burial-ground.

Aaronsburg was the center of many small businesses because of its location on the main road of travel between Union and Centre counties. Many businesses cared for the wants of the travelers and for the townspeople. Some of the many businesses were: hotels, general stores, chairmakers, tinsmiths, carpet weavers, hatters, blacksmiths, weavers, tanners, and carpenters. There were also two early doctors in the town by the names of Dr. Kloepper and Charles Coburn.

Aaronsburg grew and developed and in 1949 the "Aaronsburg Story" was celebrated. People thought Mr. Levy's idea of brotherhood was an important value to keep strong in the little community. The ideals of peace and brotherhood were displayed in a pageant that was held in the lot across from the church that Mr. Levy helped to start.

Then tragedy struck the town when in 1958 lightning struck the steeple of the Salem Lutheran Church and the building was destroyed. After much debate, it was decided that the historical landmark and church should be rebuilt. The other church still in use today in Aaronsburg is the St. Peter's United Church of Christ. It was started by a reformed group in 1842. The Evangelical United Brethren at Aaronsburg dates back to 1850. It went out of use in the 1960's and is now the Aaronsburg Library and Museum. The people who worshipped there joined the St. Peter's United Church of Christ in Aaronsburg, the United Methodist churches in Milheim and Woodward.

In October of 1976, Aaronsburg got into the celebration of our country's bicentennial by having its first annual Haines Township Dutch Fall Festival. Each year since then, on a weekend in the fall, the town takes two days to enjoy some of the arts, crafts, and foods of a time gone but not forgotten. On September 20 and 21, 1986 the tradition continues, but this is a special year for the little town. The town that Aaron Levy helped to lay out on maps and charts will be celebrating its own bicentennial. The traditions of the past will be displayed by townspeople and local craftsmen. It will be a very special celebration for the people of Aaronsburg.

THE CLOSING OF PEIRANO'S GROCERY

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to rise and pay tribute to Nick Peirano on the occasion of his retirement and the closing of his business, Peirano's Grocery in Ventura, CA.

Nick Peirano bought the market from his father in 1931 and has run the store ever since. Peirano has resisted the temptation to

modernize and has, instead, kept the charm missing from most modern-day convenience stores. You won't find microwave hot dogs, video games, or flashy displays at Peirano's Grocery. Instead, you'll find a brick building with wooden floors and a selection of hard-to-find pasta, salami, wine, and cheese. You'll also find Nick Peirano, the colorful owner, behind the counter.

Peirano's Grocery has become an institution in Ventura, CA. Right across the street from Holy Cross School, Peirano's Grocery was always a favorite with the students who would visit Nick's market to buy penny candy.

Nick Peirano has hung up his trademark blue apron for the last time and will be retiring to Oak View, CA. On behalf of all of the residents of Ventura, CA, I would like to say that we will all miss Peirano's Grocery but most of all, we'll miss Nick Peirano himself. I wish him the best during his retirement.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would say the same even if Nick were not a relative.

A TRIBUTE TO ARTHUR J. KIRSCH

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an individual whose commitment to excellence in education has been the hallmark of his career. His name is Mr. Arthur J. Kirsch and he is retiring this August as a member of the Merrick Union Free School District Board of Education.

Mr. Kirsch has served on the local school board for the past 8 years in the capacities as both president and vice president. In addition, he served on the Bellmore-Merrick Central High School District Board of Education since 1983.

Clearly, Mr. Kirsch is committed to providing our students with the finest education possible. He worked closely with students, teachers, parents, and residents of the school district to ensure that the community's education needs were met.

Mr. Kirsch's outstanding records of achievement and many years of service to the community are worthy of the highest commendation.

On August 18, Mr. Kirsch's many friends and colleagues will honor him with a testimonial dinner. On this memorable occasion, I'd like to express my sincere appreciation to Mr. Arthur Kirsch for his significant contributions to better education and for his dedicated efforts on behalf of the community.

A TRIBUTE TO THE RECIPIENTS OF THE PURPLE HEART AWARD

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, last week August 7, we marked the 204th anniversary of the Purple Heart Award. This military decora-

tion, first bestowed by Gen. George Washington and which today bears his likeness, was first granted in 1782. Since that day, it has been given to Americans who have been either wounded or slain in the defense of their country and all that it stands for.

These brave men and women came from all walks of life. What has bound them together is the courage to make great personal sacrifices so that we may enjoy our freedom today.

My fellow colleagues, I ask that each of you take a moment out of your busy schedule to remember our recipients of the Purple Heart, who have given so much of themselves to these United States.

CONGRATULATIONS TO BOB TWAY

HON. GEORGE (BUDDY) DARDEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, young Bob Tway gave new meaning to the terms "sudden death" and "sudden victory" on Monday at the PGA Championship in Toledo, OH. Once trailing by nine strokes, his chances of winning the prestigious tournament seemed doomed, or at least to hinge on a sudden death playoff with Greg Norman, another rising star of professional golf.

But Bob Tway fought back to sudden victory over the final holes of the Inverness course. When he sank a dramatic 25-foot sand shot on the 18th hole to take the lead for good, I am sure all of us watching on TV joined—at least in spirit—in his leaps of joy. Moments later, of course, tears came to his eyes as he realized the magnitude of his feat.

Mr. Speaker, although Bob Tway now calls Oklahoma home, I am proud to say that he grew up and learned his golf game in my hometown of Marietta, GA. He was an outstanding golfer at Cobb County's Wheeler High School before going on to Oklahoma State University and the PGA tour.

All of us in Marietta and Cobb County share his pride in winning one of the top prizes of professional golf. We wish him well as he strives for more great accomplishments on the golf courses of America and the world.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information

for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, August 14, 1986, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 9

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review graduate medical education in ambulatory settings.

SD-430

SEPTEMBER 10

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings to review the human resources impact on drug research and space technology.

SD-430

SEPTEMBER 11

9:00 a.m.

Armed Services

Closed business meeting, to consider pending nominations, and to review the committee's agenda for the remainder of the 99th Congress.

SR-222

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

SEPTEMBER 16

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on pending nominations.

SD-430

SEPTEMBER 17

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

SEPTEMBER 18

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

SEPTEMBER 24

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

August 13, 1986

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

21459

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending
calendar business. SD-430

SEPTEMBER 25

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending
calendar business. SD-366

OCTOBER 1

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending
calendar business. SD-366

OCTOBER 2

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending cal-
endar business. SD-366