

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE
DAY

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 68th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. I am of Lithuanian descent and am justifiably proud of my heritage. Lithuania is a nation that for most of its history has had its sovereignty violated and its freedom suppressed by the Soviet Union, and yet the spirit of its people had never been broken. They have never abandoned their struggle for freedom, and we must let them know that we have not abandoned them.

The brave people of Lithuania have resisted repeated attempts to replace their language and culture with that of their Russian oppressors. They have remained faithful to their religions, language, and traditions, forcing the Soviets to abandon the policy of forced russification. The two brief decades of independence that Lithuania enjoyed were marked by a flourishing of education, literature, and art, as well as great achievements in opera and music. Clearly, this is a nation of great resources that has tragically been cut off from the outside world.

Let us take this opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to the people of Lithuania in their struggle for freedom. As Americans, we share with them a common love of democracy and freedom. It is our responsibility as a free nation to see that these brave people are not forgotten.

STRANGLING SUPERFUND WITH
AFFECTION

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, one of the pressing issues before the Congress is the reauthorization of the funding for Superfund and the strengthening of the program. Even though both bodies passed bills funding and revising the Superfund Program last year, the Superfund Program is about to come to a halt because of the Congress' inability to reconcile the differences between the two bills.

The taxing authority for this important program expired on September 30, 1985. Lee Thomas, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, took action last summer to conserve some program funds and has been able to provide essential Superfund services notwithstanding the lack of additional revenues. Mr. Thomas has recently announced,

however, that he is preparing to terminate Superfund contracts and furlough employees. This action will disrupt not only the Superfund Program but all EPA programs as Superfund employees with seniority "bump" other EPA employees.

While it is important that we be deliberate in our efforts to refund and revamp the Superfund Program, we must replenish the Superfund soon. An editorial in the February 11, 1986, edition of the New York Times entitled "Strangling Superfund With Affection" notes the problems with unrealistic goals for this program. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues, and ask that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

[From the New York Times Feb. 11, 1986]

STRANGLING SUPERFUND WITH AFFECTION

Toxic chemicals leak into the water supply from thousands of abandoned dumps around the country. Five years of the Superfund, the Federal program to clean up the dumps, has barely scratched the surface. Yet within weeks the Environmental Protection Agency will have to wind down even this program, for lack of funds.

Congress is perfectly willing to give Lee Thomas, the head of the agency, the money needed. Indeed, the House and Senate have vied to give him more. The vast round sums they proposed—\$7.5 billion in the Senate, \$10 billion in the House—required new taxes, and each house repudiated the other's way of raising them. In the impasse, the Superfund's taxing authority has run out and Mr. Thomas is preparing to terminate contracts and furlough employees.

Congress shares the blame with environmental lobbyists, who pushed for the Superfund to be renewed at twice the \$5 billion Mr. Thomas requested but who professed indifference about how to raise it. The House proposed increasing the present feedstock tax levied on the oil and chemical industry. But the industry persuaded the Senate that a value-added tax on all manufacturing industries would distribute the burden more fairly. There are valid objections to both taxes.

Mr. Thomas asserts that \$5 billion for the Superfund, over five years, is all he can efficiently spend. Environmental groups have pressed for more, citing the immensity of the task and the need to clean up sites permanently. Everyone agrees that dumps should be cleaned up as fast as possible, and the E.P.A. probably could spend more than Mr. Thomas has asked for.

But the health threat posed by most dumps is not a Bhopal-type poison that kills in seconds; it is low-level pollution that acts over years. The steady progress of a \$5 billion cleanup would not necessarily be so much worse than a \$10 billion program that might stumble in its haste. A slower program is clearly preferable to legislative paralysis.

Moreover, the House Superfund renewal bill would ask E.P.A. to move twice as fast with mandatory deadlines that it cannot meet. The bill would also let citizens sue for not meeting the deadlines, guaranteeing still more delay. In Mr. Thomas's view, it

could take two years longer to clean up each site under the House provisions. The net result of its simultaneous speedup and slowdown stipulations is likely to be nil.

The House and Senate conferees can break the impasse by agreeing at least on a simple one-year extension of the Superfund, with feedstock taxes continued at the present rate. Better still would be a five-year authorization on the same basis, with provision for extra funds to be borrowed from general revenues on evidence that the E.P.A. could usefully spend them.

Excessive goals for the Superfund have produced a ludicrous impasse that threatens to destroy the program. The obvious way out is to settle on goals that are realistic as well as virtuous.

ESTONIA RIGHTS BEING DENIED
BY SOVIETS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marked the 68th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia. While this anniversary will be recognized by millions throughout the free world, no observance will be allowed in Soviet-occupied Estonia.

On February 24, 1918, the Republic of Estonia declared its independence and soon after became a model of justice and liberty. In 1925, for example, Estonia became the first country to recognize the importance of the Latvian, German, Russian and Jewish cultures through government subsidized ethnic schools, libraries and theaters. This tiny republic flourished until 1940 when the Soviet armies occupied Estonia and subsequently annexed Estonia and the other Baltic States to the Soviet empire.

Throughout the past 45 years brave Estonians have suffered under repressive Soviet rule. Later this week Members of Congress will have an opportunity to learn firsthand about life in Estonia when Valdo Randpere and Leila Miller visit the Capitol. Valdo and Leila are the parents of the world's youngest political prisoner, Kaisa Randpere. Valdo and Leila were forced to leave the 2-year-old Kaisa behind when they defected to Sweden in 1984. Kaisa is currently living in Tallinn, in Estonia, where both she and her grandmother, Hilga Uuskule, have been the subject of constant harassment and persecution by the Soviet authorities. Recent reports indicate that the Soviet authorities have fired the grandmother from her job, threatened to place Kaisa in an orphanage, denied correspondence privileges, and even threatened the grandmother with psychiatric imprisonment. Unfortunately the Randperes are just one of countless Estonian families whose basic

● 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.

human rights are being systematically denied by their Soviet captors.

I recently received a statement from the Estonian National Council in New York City on the current situation in Estonia. It is a clear, moving example of the repressive lifestyle the people of Estonia endure under Soviet occupation. I wish to bring this essay to the attention of my colleagues by including it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT OF THE ESTONIAN AMERICAN NATIONAL COUNCIL

The people of Estonian ancestry everywhere commemorate the 68th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Estonia on February 24, 1918. At the same time, they note with sadness the continued brutality of the Soviet occupation of Estonia which began in June, 1940, when the Red Army rolled across the border to annex its neutral and peaceful neighbor. The Soviet aggression against the Baltic states—Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania—was such a blatant violation of international law that the United States and almost all other Western countries to this day refuse to accord de jure recognition to the Soviet rule there.

As Soviet rulers even today seek to expand the tentacles of their oppressive system of governance in Afghanistan and elsewhere, we would do well to recall the fate of Estonia. During the brief period of its modern statehood the Republic of Estonia was in many respects a model country. Universal suffrage and the eight-hour work day were introduced at the outset, and records of the International Labor Office in Geneva attest that the Republic of Estonia was in the forefront of humane social and labor legislation in general.

Estonia's land reform and its minorities' laws gained international fame and were often cited by the League of Nations as examples to emulate. Indeed, in recognition and appreciation of ethnic justice, the Jewish National Fund in Palestine in 1927 awarded its special "Golden Book Certificate" to the Republic of Estonia, the only country ever so honored by the Jewish people. The American author Marion Foster Washburne traveled around the world in search of "the happy country." And in her 1940, *A Search for a Happy Country* (Washington: National Home Library Foundation), she concludes that the Republic of Estonia was that happy country.

Under Soviet domination Estonia has suffered tremendously—demographically, politically, culturally. Thus, the country lost almost one-third of its prewar population between 1939 and 1949, due foremost to Soviet atrocities; especially brutal were the mass deportations of 1941 and 1949. After the war, there has been a steady influx of Russians; the share of the population which is ethnic Estonian declined in the present territory from 92 percent in 1939 to 68 percent by 1970.

While the minority laws of the Republic of Estonia were renowned internationally, Estonians today face grave pressures of russification and sovietization in the own ancestral territory. Creative freedoms in all fields of artistic endeavor have been severely curtailed. Russian language encroachment at all educational levels, in the mass media, and in public affairs threatens to undermine the Estonian national identity. A few years ago Soviet authorities prohibited the use of Estonian in the defense of doctoral dissertations. More recently, the Communist Party's press in the university town of Tartu announced that the forced teaching

of Russian would be introduced already at the level of day care centers.

Today, it is virtually impossible for Estonians in their Soviet occupied homeland to travel abroad or to emigrate. Contrast this with the fact that in 1936 alone, for example, 120,889 Estonian citizens were able to travel abroad, and a few of them chose to emigrate. In the grips of the Soviet bear Estonia today has the sad distinction of having the world's youngest political prisoner, two year old Kaisa Randpere, who is forbidden by Moscow from joining her parents in the West. The Soviet aggression against Estonia and the unremitting, systematic violation of political and human rights, have been well documented by the United States Congress and the Department of State.

From the outset of the Soviet occupation Estonians have actively resisted and protested Moscow's actions. In the ancestral homeland such protests, even when they are nothing more than peaceful memoranda, result in long periods of banishment to the infamous Gulag, tortuous confinement to psychiatric institutions, and at times even murder in confinement, as happened with the late Juri Kukk. In spite of this, Estonians in their Soviet occupied homeland as well as those in the diaspora in the Free World, will mark Estonian Independence Day once more on February 24th. The dream of the restoration of sovereignty, of political and human rights, of freedom from the Soviet Russia oppression lives on in the hearts of Estonians everywhere. Their aspirations, hopes and struggle for freedom are shared by freedom-loving people everywhere.

Elagu Vava Eesti! (Long live Free Estonia!)

PEACE ACTIVISTS APPEAL TO GORBACHEV

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, a recent crackdown on the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Trust Group, an independent peace organization in Moscow, has spurred U.S. peace activists, as well as Members of Congress, to appeal to General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev.

Sixteen of the peace group's members were arrested, and one member, Nina Kovalenko, was badly beaten by police after the group attempted to hold a meeting Tuesday, February 4.

I, along with 28 of my colleagues, sent a letter to General Secretary Gorbachev on February 12, calling for his intervention on behalf of the Soviet peace activists.

A telegram of protest, cowritten by the Campaign for Peace and Democracy/East and West and Peace Activists East and West and signed by 32 major American peace activists, was also sent to Mr. Gorbachev. On February 21 the telegram was hand-delivered to the First Secretary of the Soviet Embassy by a delegation of American peace activists, who protested the repressive activities against the Trust Group while affirming their commitment to constructive nuclear arms control negotiations.

The text of the telegram follows:

MIKHAIL S. GORBACHEV,
General Secretary,
The Kremlin,
Moscow, U.S.S.R.

DEAR GENERAL SECRETARY GORBACHEV: We are activists and supporters of the U.S. peace movement who have condemned our government's dangerous insistence on the Star Wars program, and its failure to respond constructively to recent Soviet arms proposals and initiatives.

We are writing now because we are alarmed by news of crackdown on independent Soviet peace activists, which has included arrests, psychiatric confinement and expulsions. We call on you to ensure that all harassment of these independent activists ceases immediately.

Sincerely,

Virginia Baron, Fellowship magazine; Steven Becker, Campaign for Peace and Democracy/East and West; Noam Chomsky; Richard Baggett Deats, Fellowship of Reconciliation; Gail Daneker, Campaign for Peace and Democracy/East and West; Tom DeLuca; Ralph DiGia, War Resisters League; Polly Duncan, Sojourners; Daniel Ellsberg; Richard Falk.

Melinda Fine, Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign; Erica Foldy, Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy; Randall Forsberg, Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies; Meg Gage, Peace Development Fund; Matthew Goodman, Defense and Disarmament News; Sanford Gottlieb; Judy Hempfling, Peace Activists East and West; Nancy L. Heskett, American Peace Test; Adam Hochschild, Mother Jones.

A. Winton Jackson, Across Frontiers; Randy Kehler; Joanne Landy, Campaign for Peace and Democracy/East and West; Robert J. Lifton, M.D.; Deborah Lubar, Peace Activists East and West; David McReynolds, War Resisters League; Seymour Melman, Mobilization for Survival; Roy Morrison, American Peace Test; Marcus Raskin, SANE; Raoul Rosenberg, Physicians for Social Responsibility; Jim Wallis, Sojourners; Beverly Woodward, ISTNA; Barbara Zheutlin, PRO-Peace.

A TRIBUTE TO HARRY VAN ARSDALE

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 16, Harry Van Arsdale, Jr., passed away. Mr. Van Arsdale was the president of the New York City Central Labor Council. He was 80 years old.

Anyone who has been connected with the labor movement in New York City over the past few decades knew Harry Van Arsdale. He was a legend in his time. As John Cardinal O'Connor said at his funeral, "Few people have contributed more and not many have contributed as much as Harry Van Arsdale in trying to promote the dignity of the worker."

Cardinal O'Connor was right. Harry Van Arsdale was a giant of the labor movement. He believed in the dignity of the working man. My father belonged to local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers where Mr. Van Arsdale was a past president. My father

had a great deal of respect for him because Harry treated him and his fellow members with dignity. Race or creed did not matter to Harry.

When I first became involved with politics, Harry supported me. He knew my father; he knew me; and he believed in me. I owe him a great deal. His support meant a lot to a young kid starting out in public life.

Harry was born in Hell's Kitchen, and it made him a scrapper. When he was 19, he followed his father into local 3 and became a strong defender and student of the labor movement. He fought to keep his union strong and clean—sometimes he literally had to fight to make his point. In 1933 at the age of 28, he became head of local 3, and he stayed as its leader until 1968 when he stepped down.

Harry worked hard for local 3. He worked for union rights, better working conditions, and opportunity for better training and education for his union members. He encouraged his members to further their education, and set up a scholarship fund for the daughters and sons of union members.

In 1957 he was elected head of the Central Labor Council and became involved with all the city's labor unions. He became an adviser to political leaders, including mayors and Governors. His influence was wide and respect for him throughout the city was great. The council, during his presidency, represented close to 1 million union members. He was called "Mr. Labor." He was their leader.

We will miss Harry Van Arsdale. He was an institution. Cardinal O'Connor eulogized him quite aptly when he said, "God will look at the work of his hands, his laborer's hands, his union hands and say it was good."

I would like to have included as part of my statement an article on Harry Van Arsdale from the February 23 edition of the New York Times.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 23, 1986]

A UNION LEADER MADE IN NEW YORK
(By A.H. Raskin)

In the 1960's, when Nelson Rockefeller was Governor and Robert F. Wagner Mayor, no one had greater influence in Albany or City Hall than Harry Van Arsdale Jr., the pint-sized president of the million-member New York City Central Labor Council, who died last Sunday at 80.

But even at the zenith of his potency as a wheeler-dealer capable of shaping state and municipal labor policies, Mr. Van Arsdale's most passionate battles were fought not for the establishment unions enjoying the highest wage scales but for the workers at the bottom of the economic heap, organized and unorganized. He championed the emptiers of bedpans and pushers of carts in the city's hospitals, the grooms and stablehands at Aqueduct and Belmont, the taxi drivers in bondage to loansharks, the tens of thousands of exploited women in a new plague of sweatshops engulfing the five boroughs.

Not for him were the chauffeured Cadillacs that have increasingly become a badge of union prestige and power. During his tenure as a director of Lincoln Center, the bankers, industrialists and society leaders with whom he served rode to board meetings in limousines. More often than not, Mr. Van Arsdale roared up on a motor scooter driven by the editor of his union paper.

The pressures he exerted in behalf of his flock frequently squeezed the community in ways that brought him detractors as well as

admirers. His backroom maneuvers were a major factor in delivering the contracts that gave many newly created public employees' unions their start, but the chain of "me-too" pay raises initiated by those early break-throughs contributed to the ballooning cost of city government, which brought New York to the brink of bankruptcy in the mid-1970's.

When John V. Lindsay came to the mayoralty in 1966, it was no secret that Mr. Van Arsdale was No. 1 among the "power brokers" he hoped to strip of the muscle that was pushing up municipal costs. But a combination of the Mayor's inexperience and the lifelines thrown to Mr. Van Arsdale at every critical juncture by his Albany buddy, Governor Rockefeller, kept Mr. Lindsay from exorcising the Van Arsdale power. The antagonists eventually developed a mutual respect that made them firm friends.

The deepening fiscal crisis after Abraham D. Beame became Mayor in 1974 projected the chief of the city's unions into a key role in staving off municipal collapse. He worked to line up union, governmental and statutory support for a bailout of the city through the investment of billions of dollars held by municipal pension funds.

His political clout was rooted in command of the central body embracing the bulk of New York City's unions, but the heartland of the Van Arsdale domain was Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, which this rock-fisted alumnus of Hell's Kitchen transformed from a jungle into a union version of the welfare state.

A GENTLER ERA

When he was elected business manager after ousting a corrupt Old Guard in 1934, the local's meetings were often so unruly that chairs had been banished lest they be used to break heads. Over the years, Mr. Van Arsdale's civilizing influence made Local 3 the hub of employer-financed educational programs that ranged from college scholarships for members' children to unionists' subsidized study of the classics in a converted Southampton mansion so sumptuous that even its bathrooms have marble fireplaces.

Along with that went bread-and-butter gains that put the electricians in a pay bracket far above that of most working stiffs, and gave them and their families unparalleled cradle-to-grave benefits.

Long before Congress prescribed rigorous accounting standards for labor, Mr. Van Arsdale required that every Local 3 expenditure, from soap to paper clips, be reported to the rank and file. When featherbedding was the rule in the New York construction crafts, he organized seminars on efficiency and sponsored contests among his electricians to encourage the use of power-driven tools and the elimination of waste time. "To get more," he often admonished, "you must give more."

Local 3 became a magnet for inspection by academics and labor management delegations from all over the world, but not all Mr. Van Arsdale's goals were universally applauded. A landmark decision of the United States Supreme Court in 1945 struck down as monopolistic a compact with New York electrical contractors banning the installation of equipment not made or assembled by New York union members.

In 1962, a successful Van Arsdale campaign for a five-hour basic work day so alarmed White House inflation-fighters that it drew a public rebuke from President John F. Kennedy, whose autographed portrait occupied a place of honor in the union chief's

office. But the New Yorker felt no need to turn the picture to the wall. On the contrary, "You get unrealistic when everyone is treating you so nice," he said at the time. "Too many unions feel the size of their balance sheet is their strength, or the number of friendly gestures they get from politicians when everything is peaceful."

In his twilight years, it became the fashion among some younger unionists whose climb he had aided to grumble that Mr. Van Arsdale had become an anachronism, that it was time for mastery of the Central Labor Council to pass from the troglodytes of the building trades to the burgeoning public employee and service unions. But whatever the outcome of the impending scramble for power, it will not alter the reality that over the last half-century Mr. Van Arsdale put a distinctive "made in New York" label on many salutary aspects of American unionism.

**ANNIVERSARY OF RISE OF
KHOMEINI REGIME**

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the anniversary of the rise of the Khomeini regime to power. At a time, when freedom loving people in Haiti and the Philippines have demanded an end to human rights abuses, tyranny, and corruption, Iran remains on the back burner in terms of human rights concerns.

In part this attitude is due to the ability of human rights organizations internationally to monitor the situation in Iran. Without the reports of escaped political prisoners, it would be difficult to ascertain the true horrors of this regime. Many Members, Mr. Speaker, had an opportunity to meet with three torture victims late last year when they appeared before the U.N. Commission on Human Rights and during their nationwide tour of the United States. The stories of Ms. Mojgan Homayounfar, Ms. Narges Shayesteh, and Mr. Hossein Dadkhah, describe a level of systematic torture and human rights that has not been equaled by any other human rights abuser, with the possible exception of the Nazis. Amnesty International in November of last year said, "there is no limit to the amount of time a political detainee may be held incommunicado, without charge or trial."

The present government also summarily executes Iranian citizens for the slightest opposition or perceived opposition to the government. It is also well documented that some 30,000 Iranians have died in the Iranian-Iraq war, many of whom are school age children who have forcibly been conscripted into the army. The abuses of Khomeini must be opposed. The world often ignored the abuses of the Shah of Iran and many innocent people suffered as a result. We must not make the same mistake with the current Iranian Government.

SALUTE TO CATHOLIC SCHOOLS IN THE DIOCESE OF STEUBENVILLE

HON. DOUGLAS APPLIGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. APPLIGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like you to join me today in paying tribute to the Catholic schools in my congressional district in the diocese of Steubenville. The Catholic schools play an important role in the diocese, consisting of 13 counties in southeastern Ohio, by furnishing our leaders of tomorrow with basic human, moral, and spiritual foundations.

I am pleased to honor the Catholic schools in the diocese of Steubenville with their theme, "Catholic Schools: A Rainbow of Excellence," for their excellent work in the field of learning. The Catholic education fosters the religious fervor that originates deep within our Nation's heritage encouraging all Americans to depend on God for daily strength and fulfills the threefold purpose of message, community, and service. The faith and stability demonstrated by Catholic schools perpetuate the rich tradition of education by raising levels of knowledge, competence, and experience. The longstanding tradition of Catholic education strengthens the community and the Nation by keeping viable the right to freedom of religion under law.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in commemorating the Catholic schools in the diocese of Steubenville. I hope you will join me in expressing appreciation for the dedication with which the faculty, staff, and students approach their respective jobs. It is to individuals such as these that we owe the continuation of, and commitment to, the Christian faith in our country.

TAX POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, recently, several groups and individuals have made claims about the detrimental or beneficial impact of tax changes on this country's ability to compete in world markets. The more prevalent assertions are that the recently House-passed tax bill (H.R. 3838) would significantly worsen our international trade posture as reflected in the trade deficit, and that consumption taxes, such as Senator ROTH's proposed "business transfer tax" would significantly improve our international competitiveness. However sincere the intent of these claims, supportive evidence has, up to now, been weak or nonexistent.

Fortunately, this situation has just changed. A major study has just been released by the Congressional Research Service which tackles this question head on. If this study doesn't resolve the matter, it certainly goes a long way toward clarifying it. I take this opportunity

to summarize the findings. The study is CRS Report No. 86-42E, "Corporate Tax Reform and International Competitiveness," by Jane G. Gravelle.

Using generally accepted economic theory and conventional methodology, CRS analyzed the consequences of three major tax proposals: The administration's proposal, H.R. 3838, and Senator ROTH's business transfer tax. The bottom line finding is that tax changes generally are not likely to affect international competitiveness because their impact—on relative prices and the trade deficit—will necessarily be quite small.

Put another way, considerations of international competitiveness as they pertain to tax reform should not be placed ahead of traditional issues of tax reform: economic efficiency—resource allocation—and growth, simplicity, and fairness.

I point this out even though I am a strong supporter of tax reform. I voted for both the rule and final passage of H.R. 3838. And I like Senator ROTH's tax proposal. But there are plenty of valid reasons to support tax reform generally and consumption taxes specifically without having to rely on arguments that fail to hold up under careful analysis.

This is not to say that taxes are inconsequential to trade, especially to the composition of trade. Nevertheless, the CRS study points out that a change in tax policy can only alter the trade deficit if the change alters capital flows. And as this study points out, this outcome is essentially unchanged whether or not a tax is rebated at the border.

I would also add that this is true regardless of whether the world's economy operates under a system of flexible or fixed exchange rates; the system must—sooner under flexible rates, later under fixed rates as inflation rates adjust—return to a state of balance between the demand for and supply of dollars.

What this study confirms is that there are no easy solutions to our trade woes. The principal culprit is the deficit. The Government's credit demands, as reflected in the deficit, raise interest rates, inducing more capital inflows and less capital outflows. In other words, the deficit leads to an increased demand for dollars which hurts U.S. exporters—because prices of exports go up—while flooding us with imports—because the prices of imports go down. And the dollar market necessarily equilibrates by matching the increase in net capital inflows with an increase in the trade deficit.

The identical mechanism is at work with respect to changes in tax policy. For example, the business transfer tax will actually increase the trade deficit in the short run. Why? Because reducing the taxation of capital causes investment demand to expand, which in turn raises interest rates, which in turn causes investment dollars—capital—to flow into the United States and fewer dollars to flow out. In the absence of meaningful deficit reduction, the resulting net inflow will be offset by an equivalent increase in our trade deficit.

For the very opposite reason, the House bill, which increases capital taxation, will decrease the trade deficit in the short run.

These effects decline and reverse over the long run. For example, foreign capital inflows will at first cause an increase in the trade defi-

cit. But over time, as foreigners accumulate capital in this country, outflows of the earnings from this capital will exceed investment inflows, causing a smaller trade deficit.

The following table, taken from the CRS study, shows both the direction and magnitude of change in the trade deficit for the three tax proposals over the short run—approximately 1 year—and the long run. While they do not reflect the latest refinement in Senator ROTH's proposal, as announced late last week, there is no reason to expect any directional change.

MAXIMUM CHANGE IN RELATIVE PRICE OF EXPORTS AND DOMESTIC IMPORT-COMPETING PRODUCTION DUE TO CAPITAL FLOWS

[Percentage changes]

	Short run	Long run
Administration proposal	-0.3	-0.3
House bill (H.R. 3838)	-5.0	.9
Roth amendments	1.8	-5

Note that, in this table, negative price changes reflect a reduction in the trade deficit, while positive changes reflect an increase. A negative change means the dollar and the trade deficit fall, and that exports are more competitive. The total effect of the administration's proposal as amended by Roth would equal the sum of the two changes in either column.

These numbers are deliberately overstated, perhaps by a magnitude of 10. The reason is that the CRS study was designed as a "sensitivity" analysis; that is, it relies on assumptions that would necessarily generate maximum price changes. According to Dr. Jane Gravelle, who authored the CRS study, these numbers are "overwhelmed by measurement error and unrelated fluctuations in the exchange rate."

Finally, to further illustrate the minimal impact of changes in tax policies on prices, I point out the relative price changes for specific industries. Keep in mind that, again owing to the deliberate underlying assumptions of the investigation, these very small price changes are nevertheless unrealistically high.

MAXIMUM RELATIVE PRICE EFFECTS ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, BY INDUSTRY

[Percentage change in price]

	Adminis- tration	House bill	Roth amend- ments
Agriculture	-3	1.3	-1
Mining	.6	.4	.4
Crude oil	.5	.3	.8
Construction	.4	.3	.7
Manufacturing:			
Wood products	.1	.2	.1
Stone, clay and glass	.3	1.0	.2
Primary metals	.1	.4	.3
Fabricated metals	.1	.1	.3
Machinery	-1	-6	.4
Electronics	0	-2	.2
Motor vehicles	.2	.8	.2
Other transportation equipment	0	-5	.3
Instruments	0	-6	.4
Miscellaneous	-1	-1	.3
Food	-2	.6	0
Textiles	-4	-2	0
Paper	.2	.4	.2
Tobacco	.3	.7	.2
Printing	.5	.3	.3
Chemicals	-1	.7	.1
Petroleum	.2	.2	.5

MAXIMUM RELATIVE PRICE EFFECTS ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, BY INDUSTRY—Continued

(Percentage change in price)

	Adminis- tration	House bill	Roth amend- ments
Rubber.....	.2	.8	0
Leather.....	-.2	-.6	.3
Transportation.....	1.2	1.7	.5
Communications.....	2.0	3.7	-.2
Electric, gas utilities.....	-.1	4.6	.4
Trade.....	-1.0	-1.0	1.1
Services.....	.3	.3	0
General price change.....	-.7	1.6	-.7
Exchange rate change.....	1.0	-1.3	.8

Congress will produce better tax policy if we keep our focus on the generally accepted goals of tax reform—growth and efficiency, fairness, and simplicity—as well as generally accepted economic principles.

DEMOCRACY TRIUMPHS

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the President, the Secretaries of our State and Defense Departments, and most of all President Corazon Aquino and the Philippine people, on the occasion of the peaceful transfer of power to the new Government of the Philippines. Coupled with the recent triumph of justice in Haiti, where America helped facilitate the establishment of a transitional government dedicated to democracy and human rights, America's recent diplomatic actions have been forward-thinking and laudable. President Reagan deserves our hearty acclaim for his key role in these critical events.

America's actions in both of these crises have been accompanied by the deeds of true heroes—the people of the Philippines and Haiti—who often in recent days have subjected themselves to the possibility of violence committed by security forces loyal to rejected autocrats, and in some cases, have paid the ultimate price. But their dreams, and the dreams of their countrymen, it appears, will soon come true. Democracy will flourish in these countries, I believe, and will be resolutely defended by the people there.

America's involvement in these events should serve to show all friends of justice and freedom around the world—as well as the enemies of these all-important ideals—that America stands for the progress of mankind and man's inevitable march toward democracy. Dictatorships still exist in many parts of the world; they will, no doubt, continue for years to come. But the restoration of civil rights and the realization of democracy have been the primary goals of this administration's foreign policy in countries where the citizenry is disenfranchised and disabused, and this Nation will continue to pursue these goals in the future.

I hope that the doubters in Congress and elsewhere will recognize that the policy of this administration—and America's policy—is and always has been to encourage democratic political institutions and free enterprise economic

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

systems. I hope they will join in action against tyranny of the left as well as against tyranny of the right.

Again, my heartiest congratulations to President Reagan, President Aquino, and all those who cherish justice and democracy, on these recent events.

INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION ON HAITI

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today on behalf of myself, and Representatives FAUNTROY, LEVINE, BEREUTER, LELAND, TOWNS, STUDDS, BARNES, BUSTAMANTE, DE LUGO, RICHARDSON, FUSTER, COELHO, TORRES, and ROYBAL, a sense of the House resolution expressing our support for the people of Haiti, as they try to rebuild their nation economically and politically.

The Haitian people suffered for three decades under the yoke of the Duvalier dynasty. Finally, about 3 weeks ago, that dynasty came to an end. That was the first step. Now the work and struggle to rebuild Haiti must begin. Unfortunately, our resources are limited so we will not be able to give the Haitian people nearly as much as they need and deserve. This does not mean, however, that we can abdicate our responsibility to Haiti. We supported that nation during the Duvalier years. We must, therefore, now offer them help, at least some measure of help, as they try to build a democracy.

The Haitian economy is in shambles. They are running out of food. There is only \$500,000 left in foreign reserves. The list of problems confronting them is nearly endless. It is in that light that I hope my colleagues will support this resolution, so that we can send a sign to the Haitian people of our support.

H. RES. 382

Resolution expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the Haitian people as they try to rebuild their nation and make a peaceful transition to democracy

Whereas the friendship between the Haitian and the American people is longstanding;

Whereas the fall of the Duvalier government has presented the Haitian people with an historic opportunity to rebuild their nation;

Whereas the United States is watching events in Haiti with great interest and hope for the future;

Whereas it is the hope of the United States that there will be respect for human rights in Haiti by the Government and the people of Haiti; and

Whereas it is the hope of the United States that there will also be respect for freedom by the Government of Haiti, including a commitment to free elections, free political parties, freedom of religion, free labor unions, and freedom of the press: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives expresses—

(1) its support for the Haitian people as they try to rebuild their nation;

February 27, 1986

(2) its support for a peaceful transition to democracy in Haiti;

(3) its desire to strengthen the bond of friendship between the Haitian people and the United States; and

(4) its commitment to aid the Haitian people, while respecting their desire for self-determination.

VOTING RECORD

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 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.

101. HR 1157. Maritime Programs Authorization, Fiscal 1986. Walker, R-Pa., perfecting amendment to the Jones, D-N.C., substitute to the Walker amendment, to cut the authorization for maritime programs of the Maritime Administration and the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal 1986 by 10 percent. Rejected 100-318: NV(4-0-1), May 14, 1985. (The Jones amendment, to state that the authorization was not an increase over fiscal 1985 levels, was subsequently adopted by a voice vote).

102. HR 1157. Maritime Programs Authorization, Fiscal 1986. Passage of the bill to authorize maritime programs of the Maritime Administration and the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal 1986. Passed 371-46: NV(2-2-1), May 14, 1985.

103. HR 2005. Social Security Minor and Technical Changes Act. Rostenkowski, D-Ill., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to make minor and technical changes in the Social Security and Disability Insurance programs. Motion agreed to 413-0: NV(4-0-1), May 14, 1985.

104. HR 1555. Foreign Assistance Authorization, Fiscal 1986. Adoption of the rule (H Res 140) to provide for House consideration of the bill to authorize \$12.8 billion for development and security assistance programs

for fiscal year 1986. Adopted 400-2: NV(3-1-1), May 14, 1985.

107. HR 1872. Department of Defense Authorization, Fiscal 1986. Adoption of the rule (H Res 169) to provide for House floor consideration of the bill to authorize \$223.8 billion for research and development, weapons procurement, test and evaluation, and operation and maintenance in the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1986. Adopted 366-25: Y(5-0-0), May 15, 1985.

108. HR 2475. Imputed Interest Rules. Rostenkowski, D-Ill., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to ease provisions of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 (P.L. 98-369) aimed at restricting the use of below-market, seller-financed real estate transactions to avoid tax payments. Motion agreed to 425-0: Y(4-0-1), May 21, 1985.

109. HR 1460. Anti-Apartheid Act. Adoption of the rule (H Res 174) to provide for House floor consideration of the bill to punish the white minority government of South Africa for its racial policy of apartheid. Adopted 414-4: Y(2-1-2), May 21, 1985.

110. HR 1460. Anti-Apartheid Act. Zschau, R-Calif., amendment to let U.S. firms continue investing in South Africa if their South African units comply with a code of worker rights. Rejected 148-256: NV(3-0-2), May 21, 1985.

111. H Con Res 152. First Budget Resolution, Fiscal 1986. Derrick, D-S.C., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and the possibility of amendment) on the rule (H Res 177) to provide for House floor consideration of the concurrent resolution to set budget targets for the fiscal year ending Sept. 30, 1986. Motion agreed to 255-159: Y(1-4-0), May 22, 1985.

112. H Con Res 152. First Budget Resolution, Fiscal 1986. Adoption of the rule (H Res 177) to provide for House floor consideration of the concurrent resolution to set budget targets for the fiscal year ending Sept. 30, 1986, as follows: budget authority, \$1,051.5 billion; outlays, \$959.1 billion; revenues, \$794.1 billion; deficit, \$165 billion. The concurrent resolution also revised budget levels for fiscal 1985 and included reconciliation instructions requiring House committees, within 30 days after final approval of the resolution, to submit measures to meet budget targets to the Budget Committee. Adopted 273-141: Y(2-3-0), May 22, 1985.

113. H Con Res 152. First Budget Resolution, Fiscal 1986. Dannemeyer, R-Calif., substitute to set budget targets for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, as follows: budget authority, \$1,050.9 billion; outlays, \$961.3 billion; revenues, \$793 billion; deficit, \$168.2 billion. The amendment also revised budget levels for fiscal 1985 and included reconciliation instructions requiring House committees, no later than June 30, to submit measures to meet budget targets to the Budget Committee. Rejected 39-382: N(1-4-0), May 22, 1985.

114. H Con Res 152. First Budget Resolution, Fiscal 1986. Pursell, R-Mich., substitute to set budget targets for the fiscal year ending Sept. 30, 1986, as follows: budget authority, \$1,060 billion; outlays, \$970.8 billion; revenues, \$794.2 billion; deficit, \$176.6 billion. The amendment also revised budget levels for fiscal 1985. Rejected 87-335: N(2-3-0), May 22, 1985.

115. H Con Res 152. First Budget Resolution, Fiscal 1986. Leland, D-Texas, substitute to set budget targets for the fiscal year ending Sept. 30, 1986, as follows: budget authority, \$1,056.5 billion; outlays, \$989.4 billion; revenues, \$816.1 billion; deficit, \$173.3 billion. The amendment also revised budget

levels for fiscal 1985. Rejected 54-361: N(0-5-0), May 22, 1985.

117. H Con Res 152. First Budget Resolution, Fiscal 1986. Latta, R-Ohio, substitute to set budget targets for the fiscal year ending Sept. 30, 1986, as follows: budget authority, \$1,064.9 billion; outlays, \$996.1 billion; revenues, \$793.5 billion; deficit, authority, \$1,064.9 billion; outlays, \$996.1 billion; revenues, \$793.5 billion; deficit, \$172.6 billion. The amendment also revised budget totals for fiscal 1985 and included reconciliation instructions requiring House committees, no later than June 30, to submit measures to meet budget targets to the Budget Committee. Rejected 102-329: N(4-1-0), May 23, 1985.

118. H Con Res 152. First Budget Resolution, Fiscal 1986. Leach, D-Texas, amendment to reduce the deficit by \$75 billion in fiscal 1986, and by \$350 billion over fiscal 1986-88, by eliminating increases in cost-of-living adjustments for recipients of Social Security and other federal retirement programs and by raising \$12 billion in new taxes, in combination with spending cuts outlined in the concurrent resolution. Rejected 56-372: Y(3-2-0), May 23, 1985.

119. H Con Res 152. First Budget Resolution, Fiscal 1986. Oakar, D-Ohio, amendment to express the sense of the House that the Ways and Means Committee should report legislation imposing a minimum federal income tax, with new revenues to be used to reduce either tax rates or the federal budget deficit. Rejected 142-283: Y(1-4-0), May 23, 1985.

120. H Con Res 152. First Budget Resolution, Fiscal 1986. Adoption of the concurrent resolution to set budget targets for the fiscal year ending Sept. 30, 1986, as follows: budget authority, \$1,051.5 billion; outlays, \$959.1 billion; revenues, \$794.1 billion; deficit, \$165 billion. The concurrent resolution also revised budget levels for fiscal 1985 and included reconciliation instructions requiring House committees, within 30 days after final approval of the resolution, to submit measures to meet budget targets to the Budget committee. Adopted 258-170: Y(1-4-0), May 23, 1985.

122. H J Res 192. National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man. Ford, D-Mich., motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution to designate April 24, 1986, as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man," to memorialize all victims of genocide, especially the 1.5 million Armenians killed in Turkey from 1915-1923. Motion rejected 233-180: Y(1-4-0), June 4, 1985.

123. HR 1460. Anti-Apartheid Act. Zschau, R-Calif., amendment to ban the importation into the United States of South African gold coins, called Krugerrands, only if the prohibition is not inconsistent with U.S. obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Rejected 127-292: N(4-1-0), June 4, 1985. (The effect of the amendment was to allow the administration to kill the ban if it decided that the action constituted a violation of GATT.)

124. HR 1460. Anti-Apartheid Act. Burton, R-Ind., amendment to waive the provisions in the bill restricting new investment in South Africa if the secretary of state determined, based on poll of non-white South Africans, that a majority of non-white South Africans opposed the restrictions or the divestiture of U.S. investments in South Africa. Rejected 40-379: N(1-4-0), June 4, 1985.

125. HR 1460. Anti-Apartheid Act. Burton, R-Ind., amendment to waive the provisions

in the bill restricting new investment in South Africa if the secretary of state determined, based on an internationally supervised referendum of non-white South Africans, that a majority of non-white South Africans opposed the restrictions. Rejected 30-384: N(1-4-0), June 4, 1985.

126. HR 1460. Anti-Apartheid Act. Siljander, R-Mich., substitute to establish a commission to study apartheid in South Africa and to recommend, after three years, what sanctions the United States should impose on the South African government. The amendment would also require all U.S. companies doing business in South Africa to adhere to the fair-labor code known as the Sullivan principles. Rejected 108-310: N(2-3-0), June 5, 1985.

127. HR 1460. Anti-Apartheid Act. Gunderson, R-Wis., substitute to impose sanctions against South Africa if significant progress had not been made toward eliminating apartheid in two years. The amendment would also require all U.S. companies doing business in South Africa to adhere to the fair-labor code known as the Sullivan principles. Rejected 112-313: N(3-2-0), June 5, 1985.

128. HR 1460. Anti-Apartheid Act. Delums, D-Calif., substitute to require the immediate withdrawal of all U.S. investment from South Africa and to impose a total ban on U.S. exports to that country. Rejected 77-345: N(0-5-0), June 5, 1985.

129. HR 1460. Anti-Apartheid Act. Crane, R-Ill., motion to recommit the bill to the Foreign Affairs Committee with instructions to amend it to postpone for one year the imposition of any sanctions against South Africa and to permit the president to waive the sanctions if he determined that the African National Congress had not renounced the use of violence. Motion rejected 139-282: N(4-1-0), June 5, 1985.

130. HR 1460. Anti-Apartheid Act. Passage of the bill to impose sanctions immediately against South Africa, including a ban on bank loans to the South African government, and prohibitions against the sale of computer goods and nuclear power equipment and supplies to that country. Subject to review by the president and Congress, the bill also would bar new U.S. business investments in South Africa and prohibit the importation into the United States of the South African gold coins, called Krugerrands. Passed 295-127: Y(1-4-0), June 5, 1985.

132. HR 2577. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Adoption of the rule (H Res 186) to provide for House floor consideration of the bill to appropriate \$13.49 billion for fiscal 1985. Adopted 267-149: Y(2-3-0), June 6, 1985.

133. HR 2577. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Edgar, D-Pa., amendment to the Whitten, D-Miss., amendment, to reduce from \$150 million to \$51 million the funds added for water projects of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Adopted 203-202: N(0-5-0), June 6, 1985.

134. HR 2577. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Whitten, D-Miss., amendment as amended by the Edgar, D-Pa., amendment to add \$51 million for water projects of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Adopted 325-74: Y(5-0-0), June 6, 1985.

136. HR 2577. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Brown, R-Colo., amendment to cut \$500 million in economic aid for Egypt. Rejected 110-314: N(2-3-0), June 11, 1985.

137. HR 2577. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Walker, R-Pa., amendments to cut all supplemental appropriations for the House of Representatives and the Executive Branch. Rejected en bloc 202-217: N(4-1-0), June 11, 1985.

138. HR 2577. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Zschau, R-Calif., amendment to cut all supplemental appropriations for discretionary programs by five percent. Rejected 190-226: N(3-2-0), June 11, 1985.

140. HR 2577. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Boland, D-Mass., amendment to the McDade, R-Pa., amendment to continue indefinitely the prohibition of any funding by U.S. intelligence agencies that would support, directly or indirectly, military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua. Rejected 196-232: Y(1-4-0), June 12, 1985. A "nay" vote was supporting the President's position.

141. HR 2577. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Gephardt, D-Mo., amendment to the McDade, R-Pa., amendment to delay expenditure of "humanitarian" assistance to the Nicaraguan rebels until six months after enactment of the bill, to encourage negotiations under the auspices of the "Contadora" countries or through other diplomatic channels. After six months, the assistance would be made available if the president submitted a request to Congress and Congress passed a joint resolution approving his request. Rejected 172-259: Y(1-4-0), June 12, 1985. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

142. HR 2577. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. McDade, R-Pa., amendment to provide \$27 million in "humanitarian" assistance to the Nicaraguan rebels, to be allocated in three equal installments, coinciding with the president's submission of reports every 90 days until March 31, 1986, by a U.S. agency other than the CIA or the Department of Defense. The amendment also provided \$2 million for implementation of a Central America peace agreement reached under the auspices of the "Contadora" countries. Adopted 248-184: N(4-1-0), June 12, 1985. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

143. HR 2577. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Hamilton, D-Ind., amendment to authorize \$14 million for aid to Nicaraguan refugees outside Nicaragua, to authorize use of the Economic Support Fund to implement a Central America peace agreement reached under the auspices of the "Contadora" countries, and to extend indefinitely a prohibition on support by any U.S. intelligence agency for military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua. Rejected 174-254: Y(1-4-0), June 12, 1985. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

144. HR 2577. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Passage of the bill to provide \$13.4 billion in supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1985. Passed 271-156: Y(5-0-0), June 12, 1985.

145. HR 1452. Refugee Assistance Extension Act. Sensenbrenner, R-Wis., amendment to delete a \$50 million authorization for "targeted assistance" to areas with large refugee populations, such as California and Florida. Rejected 104-307: N(2-2-1), June 13, 1985. A "yea" vote was a vote supporting the President's position.

146. HR 1452. Refugee Assistance Extension Act. Pursell, R-Mich., amendment to freeze the authorization for refugee social services and medical screening programs at the fiscal 1985 appropriations level plus an adjustment for inflation. Adopted 278-112: Y(4-0-1), June 13, 1985.

147. HR 2369. Family Planning Assistance. Waxman, D-Calif., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to extend federal aid for family planning serving services through fiscal 1988, authorizing \$454 million over three years. Motion rejected 214-197: Y(2-3-0), June 18, 1985. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

148. HR 2417. Health Maintenance Organizations. Waxman, D-Calif., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to phase out federal grants and loans promoting the establishment of health maintenance organizations. Motion agreed to 411-2: Y(5-0-0), June 18, 1985.

149. HR 2290. Orphan Drug Amendments. Waxman, D-Calif., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to extend grants for the development of drugs to treat rare diseases, authorizing \$4 million each year in fiscal 1986-88. Motion agreed to 413-0: Y(5-0-0), June 18, 1985.

150. HR 1872. Department of Defense Authorization, Fiscal 1986. Aspin, D-Wis., amendment to reduce the amount authorized by the bill by \$10 billion, to the level set by the House-passed budget resolution. Adopted 301-115: Y(2-3-0), June 18, 1985.

DEDICATION CEREMONY HONORS A STATESMAN, GEORGE MAHON

HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I have the opportunity to rise today and report to my colleagues about a very special occasion that took place in my district recently. This event was held in Colorado City, TX, to honor one of the finest men to ever step into this Chamber, George Herman Mahon.

On January 10, 1986, more than 300 people gathered on the lawn of the Mitchell County Courthouse to join in the dedication of a bronze bust of Mr. Mahon, who served almost 45 years of this life as Congressman for the 19th District of Texas. In that time, he rose to the position of chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and he grew in stature and respect—a true statesman.

I am proud to say that his native Mitchell County is now a part of my district and it was my privilege to partake in this dedication. Joining me on this fine day were several Congressmen, past and present, from the great Lone Star State, who delighted the crowd with stories and anecdotes about our friend, who passed away November 19, 1985. In attendance at the dedication were the Honorable J.J. PICKLE, the Honorable Omar Bureson, the Honorable Jack Hightower, and the Honorable O.C. Fisher.

Mr. Mahon was the epitome of a Texas gentleman and statesman. He had a presence about him that was experienced by all who met and worked with him. He had the common sense and intellect that allowed him to chair one of the most powerful committees in this country at times when this Nation needed such a man.

Mr. Mahon was a compassionate being who knew how to set priorities. He could do so while sticking to a budget. Indeed, he was a

smart, financial businessman. At one time while he was in office, he observed that if we didn't stop spending money like we're spending it, pretty soon our Nation's debt is going to reach a "googol." That's a 1 followed by 100 zeros. Well we've got 88 zeros to go as of today because our Nation's debt has reached \$2 trillion. He was the kind of fiscal conservative we could use in the House once again today.

Too often those who serve in political office do not have very many good things said about them after they leave. That's because they have been "politicians." The testimonies that we heard about Mr. Mahon obviously dispelled that notion about him. He was a statesman, not a politician.

At this time, I would like to share with you some of the stories that were recalled and fine statements that were made at the ceremonies on that special, sunny day in Colorado City:

Texas State Senator Ray Farabee:

No one can fill the shoes of George Mahon. Through the example set by Mr. Mahon, all of us in public office will do a better job. He set an example of leadership and integrity.

Texas State Representative Dick Burnett:

We are here to honor the memory of this great servant. This bust, which will always face east, should serve as a reminder to our youth that there is a Nation out there awaiting their help, awaiting their services, needing their talents and sometimes even their blood and lives.

County Judge Bill Carter:

The citizens of Mitchell County cared enough back in 1934 to send the very best when they sent George Mahon to the U.S. Congress. Our only regret is that George is not able to be here with us.

Northern District of Texas Federal Judge Eldon Mahon, his nephew:

This is a great day for the Mahon family. We are indebted to the people of Mitchell County for making this occasion possible. He was a great legislator and a great Texan. He was a good man. The only two four-letter words heard frequently in the Mahon household were "work" and "love."

In addition to these statements are the very special remarks made by my good friend and dear colleague, the Honorable JAKE PICKLE:

IN MEMORY OF GEORGE MAHON, BY U.S. REP.
J.J. PICKLE, FEBRUARY 3, 1986

Mr. Speaker, last fall, our former colleague and friend, George Herman Mahon passed away. This was a great loss to those of us who knew The Chairman and a great loss to the country. George Mahon served in this House for over 40 years, and he will be remembered as one of the best to have walked these halls. We will not forget him. He was loved and admired by many. After he passed away, many of his friends took time to remember George Mahon. We all have our favorite Mahon story or saying. Appropriations Chairman Jamie Whitten, Ed Powers, Mike Gillette, and Liz Carpenter have contributed their recollections of Mahon stories and quotes, and I would like to include them in the Record.

"In 1934, when I was first elected, I thought I'd like to serve at least two terms so as not to be considered a political accident."

"President Truman's budget can, must, and will be cut."

When the Lyndon Johnson Committee questioned the moral value of "over elaborate recreational facilities," Mahon said: "Bowling is better than drinking and acquiring venereal diseases in dumps and dens. I consider money spent for recreation well worth while."

Re: Economic and military aid in Europe: "We are suffering from over administration."

"Although the future is clouded with threats of war, there are no substitutes for the old fashioned virtues of common honesty and decency, hard work, loyalty and devotion to family, God and country."

"The top brass should stick to its knitting and not go around in military planes to speak to chambers of commerce."

"If we are going to war, we are appropriating too little, if peace is to continue, we are spending too much," was Mahon's way of describing the delicate problem faced each year.

The Appropriations Committee demanded that all preliminary work on the Air Force Academy be halted until building plans are more firmly established. Members made it plain that they didn't like the ultra-modern steel, glass, and aluminum design. Mahon said: "The plans look more like a factory than a school. There is so much glass in the proposed buildings it might take all 30,000 soldiers at nearby Camp Carson to keep the windows washed."

Once, when Mrs. (Helen) Mahon returned from a trip from Texas, George dug out an exaggerated 10-gallon hat, with the wide brim turned up at the sides, and went to the railroad station to meet his wife. All eyes turned on his lanky form and floppish western hat as he strolled through the station with a big bouquet of gladiola. The Congressman ruefully reported that Mrs. didn't seem to appreciate the welcome he gave her.

George Mahon performed an heroic act, but so modest was he about this act that he wouldn't disclose or discuss what he did. From fragmentary accounts, it has been found that Mahon went to the rescue of a swimmer at Ocean City, Maryland, answering his calls for help and pulling him to safety. All the Congressman admitted was that he and Mrs. Mahon went to Ocean City. He suspected his wife quietly spread the word to a few close friends about what her husband had done.

Not only did Mahon not drink alcohol, but he rarely drank tea, coffee, or even cokes. What he really enjoyed was a good drink of water and sometimes milk or lemonade. However, one time President Carter invited Mahon down to the White House for a private lunch just between the two of them in honor of Mahon's birthday. It was a beautiful fall day and they sat out in the Rose Garden. Mrs. Carter brought out a birthday cake. When Mahon got back he sat down and wrote a general letter to his family, as he frequently did. In the letter he wrote, "It was such a pleasant occasion and I enjoyed it so much that before I knew it, I had had not only one glass of iced tea, but two. I felt practically intoxicated."

Along the same lines, H.R. Gross was always making a fuss over "entertainment" funds for the Department of State. Entertainment meant "serving of drinks." He entered into a colloquy with George about how much money was for entertainment (whiskey) in the bill being debated on the floor. This meant whiskey, rum, and vodka. It took about two hours that night to try to

correct the debate so that it would not look so bad in the Congressional Record.

When Mahon had his portrait presented to the Congress, President Ford was the main speaker and Congressman Whitten, as ranking Member of the Appropriations Committee, presided. Subsequently, George sent him a picture of the ceremony showing George with his eyes closed, with a notation that said, "Jamie, I had so much confidence in you that I had my eyes closed." Jamie wrote him back, saying, "Mr. Chairman, I am glad you explained it. I thought you were praying."

Mr. Speaker, these stories, recollections, and sayings give us a good sense of George Mahon, which we will always remember. As I said, he was loved by many, and we will not forget him. At this time, I would like to have included in the Record, my luncheon speech at the unveiling of a bust of George Mahon on the lawn of the Mitchell County Court House.

If I were asked to define the word "Statesman," it would be enough to simply say, George Mahon.

Rarely in our history have we ever seen another person of such humble and simple virtues carry so much power and responsibility so quietly and so graciously.

A great political columnist, William S. White once wrote: "It is the Mahons of Congress—the quiet, little-noticed, deeply responsible men who are content with the power and never mind the pomp and publicity—who are the best justification for Congress."

It is well known, almost legendary now, that George Mahon shunned the bright lights and glitter of Washington parties; that he did not seek publicity and attention; that he did not smoke or drink liquor, or even coffee.

I tell you, such a man is rare among the high circles of power in Washington.

He was a quiet, gentle man who lived a quiet life at a time when he was one of the most powerful leaders in our nation.

He was a man dedicated to doing his job and serving his nation and few have worked harder at it than George Mahon.

He could be seen nearly every day, eating a quick lunch, often all alone in the House Restaurant.

He once said: "I'd like to have lunch with my friends, but I just don't have time to sit and talk." He was not a man who wasted time.

To George Mahon, every minute of the day was an opportunity to get something done that needed to be done. If he found himself alone on an elevator in the Capitol, he would use the time to do physical exercises. When he was driving home from work in the evening, he would pull out a toothbrush and brush his teeth as he drove because he said it invigorated his gums. And when he wasn't brushing his teeth as he drove, he was usually singing one of his favorite songs at the top of his lungs. What a sight it must have been to see a car driven through the traffic in Washington by a tall, Stetson-hatted man, singing, "How Great Thou Art."

There are very few positions in our government more powerful than the chairmanship of the Appropriations Committee. It was a power that George Mahon never abused.

In the 39 years that he served on the Appropriations Committee, he was involved in deciding how trillions of dollars would be spent to fund the general government. Majority Leader Jim Wright noted recently

that George Mahon was a man who never forgot the value of a single dollar or knowingly tolerated its waste. George knew where every nickel went in the federal government and squeezed until there were tears in the Buffalo Nickel's eyes.

He felt personally responsible for every penny the government spent. He was a strong believer in pay-as-you-go government. In 1973, he said: "The day of accounting is upon us. Not even the richest country in the world can continue to spend beyond its means. No one likes to hear about it. They don't stay awake nights worrying about it. But I spend a lot of nights worrying about it."

This was an attitude that he developed early in his life. When George was in grade school in Loraine, he had heard somewhere that in order for a young man to really make something of himself in the world he needed to know shorthand or how to type.

George wanted to get ahead in life, decided to save up his money and finally got \$7.50 to make a downpayment on a typewriter. When the typewriter arrived at the house one day, his parents were very surprised to learn that George had taken on an obligation amounting to about \$40. His family was so concerned that he had bought something on credit that they finally prevailed upon him to return the typewriter. Said George: "I was terribly upset and disappointed and thought: I was doomed to the cotton patch."

Thus, it is little wonder that George stayed awake at nights worrying about federal deficits and government finance.

Yet, in spite of his quiet ways and gentle demeanor, George knew when to exercise the power of his position.

Once, when the Secretary of the Air Force was testifying before the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee about getting the run-around from Pentagon bureaucrats whenever he tried to get a question answered. After getting a long and eloquent roasting from George, the Secretary finally asked George: "Do you think I'm stupid?"

George shot back: "You're d—— right we think you're stupid. We know you're stupid. Now, let's get on to something controversial."

Although it was generally not his style, he knew how to play hardball when he had to.

A reporter once wrote of George Mahon: "It is said of him that he knows the byways of the Pentagon far better than any Secretary of Defense we ever had—because while secretaries come and go, Mahon has stayed on and on. Yet, if you met him, you might think him a reserved country school teacher or, possibly, a sedate rancher, in town to see the banker."

One day, during the time when George was at the height of his career in Washington, I was walking with him from the House Office Building over to the Capitol discussing some legislative business. And as we were walking along the sidewalk talking, George veered off from the sidewalk onto the lawn of the Capitol and began picking buckeyes off the ground that had fallen from a large buckeye tree.

George just kept right on talking business as he stuffed his pockets full of buckeyes until I finally stopped him and asked why he was picking up buckeyes. He said that buckeyes bring good luck and he liked to have them in his office to give them to folks who came up from Texas to visit Washington. He said it was a nice thing to give out to the people, a buckeye from the U.S. Capitol grounds.

I asked him how many buckeyes he gave away. And George said: "As of last week, 2,361."

I should have known that the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee would be good with numbers.

But that story also reminds us that he never lost that common touch even though he was a confidant of presidents.

He was the quiet giant in Congress. He held great power, but never allowed that power to change his view of himself or his job.

He once said: "I think of myself as the hired hand of about 4,000 West Texans who believe in me as their friend and who trust me in matters big and little to do my best for them."

He was a scholar. He was a statesman. He was as solid as the rough West Texas country from which he came and to which he returned.

Mr. Speaker, there is one story which I think sums up the grace, humor, and seriousness of George Mahon. It concerns former President Gerald Ford and former Vice President Nelson Rockefeller.

George and Gerry Ford were the closest of friends. Before Ford became Minority Leader in the House—the highest Republican leadership position in the House—he had served on the Appropriations Committee, and for 13 years worked with George on the Defense Subcommittee, 11 of those years while George was chairman of the subcommittee.

This meant that they sat next to each other during all the Defense hearings—a long, drawn out process.

When Congressman Ford was nominated for Vice President by President Nixon, Mr Mahon testified at his confirmation hearings in the Senate. The day after Congressman Ford was sworn in as Vice President, he called and asked if he could come up to see Mr. Mahon. Mahon, of course, agreed, thinking that some important matter was at hand.

This was also the time when the government decided that the Vice President needed a permanent home because it was getting too expensive fixing up every home where a Vice President lived, and in many cases adequate security could not be provided. So, the government had taken over the home of the Chief of Naval Operations to use as the Vice President's residence.

The Vice President arrived and they were sitting around that 20 foot long conference table in George's grand office in the Capitol. Here are the Vice President of the United States and the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee who presided over billions and billions of dollars. And the first thing that Vice President Ford said was: "George, do you think you could find money anywhere to buy dishes for the new Vice President's residence? We just can't afford it."

Mahon, of course, agreed.

But events moved very quickly and in a very short time, Nixon had resigned, Ford had become President, and Nelson Rockefeller, one of the wealthiest men in America, had become Vice President.

So the scene seemed to repeat itself. Rockefeller called and asked if he could see the Chairman. Here they were again around that big table—but this time the first thing that was said by the Vice President was, "Mr. Chairman, I'll be able to buy the dishes."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BENOIT SAMUELSON NAMED NATION'S TOP AMATEUR ATHLETE

HON. JOHN R. McKERNAN, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. McKERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues yet another milestone that has been achieved by marathoner Joan Benoit Samuelson, a resident of Maine's First District, which I represent.

Joan has been selected as the recipient of the Sullivan Award, distinguishing her as the Nation's top amateur athlete for 1985. Chosen by 2,400 voters comprising the U.S. Amateur Athletic Union, Joan becomes only the seventh woman to receive this award in its 56-year history. The accomplishment occurs in the year following her Olympic gold medal performance in the women's marathon.

Currently recovering from heel surgery, Joan continues to set the standard for dedication, skill, and sportsmanship, by which other athletes are measured. Upon receiving the Sullivan Award, Joan remarked that "I still have room for improvement," a testament to her unending pursuit of excellence.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Joan Benoit Samuelson on this extraordinary honor. She is an outstanding athlete and a fitting role model for the Nation and the State of Maine.

A SALUTE TO TERRY GILLES

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise before my fellow Members of Congress today in order to call their attention to a gentleman in my district, Terry Gilles. Terry has enlisted in the U.S. Army and will be joining their ranks very shortly for what he expects to be the full 20 years. You may wonder what is so unusual about such a move. I am here to explain just how unusually dedicated Terry is to both his country and his community.

To begin with, Terry is 36 years old and has already served on active duty with the U.S. Air Force. He served in the Air Force 13 years ago at a time when the armed services were not very popular with many young people of our country. For Terry, however, the experience was rewarding enough for him to reenlist for 2 more years of inactive Reserve time following his active duty. He realized the importance of military service in his youth and maintained interest as he grew older by his active involvement in the Civil Air Patrol. Patriotism, however, is not the only unique quality that Terry possesses.

In enlisting in the Army, Terry will be giving up a successful business as the operator of the Gilles True Value Hardware Store. As an operator of this store in this community for the past 12 years, he acquired a reputation as both a knowledgeable handyman and a skilled

February 27, 1986

businessman. These accomplishments, though, still do not tell his complete story.

Terry has also been actively involved with a wide variety of community groups and their events. In the local chapter of the Rotary Club, he has served as both vice president and treasurer. Additionally, he has participated with this group in everything from their international student exchange program to handing out Christmas baskets to the needy. Further, Terry found time to participate in the Commodore Barry Post No. 256 American Legion and the Berwyn Township Anti-Graffiti Program to give a few more examples. His concern for his community helps make Terry unique but this is not the quality that his friends and family will miss the most.

In talking to Terry's friends and neighbors it became clear to me that they will not only miss his community services, but also the good nature and enthusiasm he has brought to his actions. As one of his friends described it, his appetite for life and its challenges was revealed only by his appetite for dinner. Of course, his parents as well as his own child will miss his love and support most directly. They, more than anyone, realize how unique Terry is.

In my opinion, Terry Gilles is a model citizen for the combination of talents he possesses and his ability to use them to benefit himself, his family, his community, and his country. I'm sure my colleagues in Congress join me in applauding Terry Gilles' past accomplishments and wishing him luck in his future.

WE MUST STAND AGAINST TERRORISM

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, there have been 21,000 acts of terrorism in the last 10 years; 30 percent have been against Americans. The citizens of this country have grown weary of the grief that these senseless acts of violence have brought. Terrorism and its perpetrators are an affront to the fabric of the American society. We live in freedom, but in recent years this freedom has been consistently threatened by those who have no knowledge of liberty or justice. They know only of lawlessness and violence. We have been forced through our grief to know these criminals. We must strive to stop them.

We must first take action to protect ourselves from these ruthless killers. I have co-sponsored legislation to combat terrorism in a number of ways. First, the President must impose sanctions, including cutting off foreign assistance to any state which actively supports international terrorism. The Secretary of Transportation must assess security at foreign airports and revoke the operating authority of U.S. and foreign carriers which use inadequately secured facilities. All flights to and from a country where a hijacking has occurred should be suspended until action is taken to secure the airport. If no action is taken, all foreign airlines landing in that country should be prevented from flying to the

United States. And finally, armed sky marshals must be placed on all U.S. international flights. While these measures will help protect innocent Americans from falling victim to terrorist attack, they alone are not enough.

We also must reject the practice of some of our allies who capitulate to international terrorist demands and intimidation. We must establish a clear-cut, counterterrorist policy that begins with the treatment of terrorist acts as acts of war, then form a coordinated counterterrorist intelligence network with other free nations of the world. We should also plan toward establishing an international counterterrorist strike force, employing the most advanced techniques and equipment available to Western nations.

As we dedicate ourselves to fighting back against terrorism it would be wise to look to Israel. Americans cheered when the Israeli commandos overtook the terrorist kidnapers at Entebbe. We quietly applauded Israel's daring raid that destroyed the Iraqi nuclear reactor and atomic weapons program. Though America did not say so officially, the American people feel the justice in Israel's retaliation versus terrorism against her citizens by leveling the PLO headquarters in Tunis. These daring actions of Israel provided America and free world with the standard of courage and conviction to oppose terrorism that demands admiration.

President Reagan recently displayed this brand of courage when he ordered the interception of the Egyptian airliner attempting to whisk the *Achille Lauro* hijackers from justice. This type of affirmative defense against terrorists is to be applauded. The United States must not allow its citizens to be kidnapped, hijacked, or killed without swift and certain reprisal.

On December 27, terrorist attacks at the Rome and Vienna airports killed 19 people and injured 112. Five of the dead were Americans including an 11-year-old school girl. These five Americans, along with Leon Klinghoffer, and all the other American victims of terrorism gave their lives courageously. They will be remembered and in their memory we must focus our strongest efforts at eliminating the scourge of terrorism from the world.

NO AID TO THE CONTRAS

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, Peter Bell, of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, wrote a compelling article on aid to the Contras for the February 19 edition of the Los Angeles Times.

As the title of his essay clearly states, there is no good argument for giving aid to the Contras, particularly at a time when we are making such severe cuts on domestic programs.

I commend Peter Bell's thoughtful article to the RECORD for my colleagues' perusal:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 19, 1986]

WE CAN'T BUY PEACE FOR NICARAGUA NO ARGUMENT FOR GIVING CONTRAS \$100 MILLION IS SUPPORTABLE

(By Peter D. Bell)

Ineluctably, and tragically, the Reagan Administration is pushing Congress down the slippery slope leading to more direct U.S. military intervention in Nicaragua. Only a year ago, Congress was reluctant to lift its ban on financial support for the anti-Sandinista rebels. Eventually, it approved \$27 million in "humanitarian" aid, which the Reagan Administration broadened to include any "nonlethal" aid. Now, the Administration is brazenly seeking \$100 million, including outright military aid, for the *contras*.

The Administration has four arguments on behalf of additional aid, none of which really makes the case:

By keeping the Sandinistas occupied, the contras help to distract them from adventurism in El Salvador. President Jose Napoleon Duarte of El Salvador made this point when I met with him on a recent trip to Central America, but he did so without much conviction. When I pressed Duarte as to whether he favored U.S. support for the *contras*, he demurred, saying that this was an issue between the United States and Nicaragua. The argument today that the *contras* keep the Sandinistas from mischief-making in neighboring countries carries no more weight than the old argument that the *contras* interdicted Sandinista arms destined for the Salvadoran rebels. Everyone knows that the *contras* have other reasons for being.

The *contras* keep pressure on the Sandinistas for internal political changes. This argument presumes that the Reagan Administration would be satisfied with something less than the Sandinistas' ouster. As long as the Sandinistas believe otherwise—and the Administration keeps giving them every reason to do so—they have no incentive to consider internal political accommodations. In fact, the *contras*' association with the Somocista National Guard and U.S. interventionism has helped to consolidate and stiffen the Sandinista regime.

The *contras* will overthrow the Sandinistas. Outside of Washington, hardly anyone believes that the *contras*, as currently constituted, can win. The Sandinistas have used the *contra* threat to justify both the massive build-up of their armed forces and the resumption of emergency powers. Despite unhappiness with the way the revolution has gone, most Nicaraguans have closed ranks against outside intervention. If most of the *contras* had not repaired to Honduran sanctuary, they would have been defeated by now.

The Reagan Administration apparently believes that the *contras*' credibility as a fighting force depends not only on additional U.S. financial and material aid, but also on U.S. involvement in training the insurgents and in planning and directing the war. What the Administration will not say is how much U.S. involvement would be enough, or what the United States would do if the *contras* still were unable to do the job.

Support for the *contras* signifies U.S. resolve to stop Soviet expansionism in Central America. Much of Central America is embittered at the Leninist turn of the Nicaraguan revolution, anxious about Sandinista ties to the Soviet Union and Cuba, and concerned over alleged Sandinista support for other revolutionary movements. Yet even the most virulent opponents of the Sandinistas

are not much impressed by U.S. support for the *contras* as such. Still, it does nurture their belief that the United States is so determined to rout the Marxists that it ultimately will move directly against Nicaragua. This belief and pledges of more aid to the *contras* have reinforced passivity within the internal Nicaraguan opposition, who are content to wait for "Uncle Sam."

Sustaining the *contras* is widely viewed in Central America as a no-win proposition for the region. It only prolongs a low-intensity war, contributes to a regional arms race, draws Central America deeper into the East-West struggle, and hampers regional trade, private investment and tourism. Such a war could always flare into a regional conflagration, with deepening superpower involvement.

Upon starting his new jobs as national security adviser, Adm. John M. Poindexter traveled to Central America to assure the region that President Reagan will fight for more assistance to the *contras*. The countries of the region, and of Latin America in general, hardly seek such assurance. Overwhelmingly, what would reassure them is evidence of progress toward a regional peace, starting with cessation of aid to the *contras*—if such a move were part of a larger set of accommodations on security issues between the Reagan Administration and the Sandinistas.

The way might then be cleared for a full-scale, Contadora-sponsored regional settlement, and the United States could concentrate its political energies on more productive tasks, such as economic development and democratization in the countries neighboring Nicaragua. Progress in these areas, not stepped-up involvement with the *contras*, is the key to an effective policy of containing Soviet ambitions. The success of Costa Rica's recovery and the search for social justice and self-determination in El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala offer the best hope for keeping the Sandinista revolution within Nicaraguan bounds.

The alternative to support for the *contras* is not invasion or surrender, but negotiation. The basis for a deal would be U.S. acceptance of the regime in Nicaragua in return for the Sandinistas' satisfying our most immediate security concerns. These include attenuation of their ties to the Soviets and Cubans, renunciation of support for insurgencies in neighboring countries, and reduction of the size and sophistication of their army.

Ultimately, our choice is between a will-o'-the-wisp commitment to roll back the Sandinista revolution and a willingness to reach a realistic accommodation with it. "Roll back" may seem resolute and cheap in Washington, but it is viewed as ineffective and costly in Central America.

JACKSON'S ORPHANS AND THE CONTRAS

HON. DICK CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Norman Podhoretz is a good summary of the current situation in Nicaragua and does an excellent job of making the case for the importance of supporting President Reagan's request for assistance to the *Contras*.

[From the New York Post, Feb. 25, 1986]

JACKSON'S ORPHANS AND THE CONTRAS

(By Norman Podhoretz)

I keep hearing from some of my old friends in the Democratic Party, most of whom were politically orphaned by the death of Sen. Henry M. Jackson in 1983, that things have been getting better in the last year or two.

No longer, these Jackson orphans tell me, does the party reflexively "blame America first." No longer is it insensitive to the dangers of Soviet expansionism. No longer is it in the grip of the position inelegantly but by now inescapably known as anti-Communism.

I wish the Jackson orphans were right. But if they were, would the Democrats in Congress be struggling so hard at this very moment against the President's request for military aid to the Nicaraguan contras?

To appreciate just how disheartening that struggle must be to the Jackson orphans, it is necessary to go yet again over ground that ought to be as familiar as the local scenery, but that keeps getting obscured by the fogs and smokescreens of ideology and propaganda.

So it is that we have to remind ourselves one more time that thousands of Nicaraguans have risen up against a Communist tyranny in their country that is not only supported and armed by the Soviet Union and Cuba but has itself also supported and armed the Communists who are trying to topple a fledgling democratic government in neighboring El Salvador.

We have to remind ourselves one more time that what these Nicaraguans are fighting for is to reclaim the democratic revolution against the Somoza dictatorship that was stolen from them by the Communist Sandinistas.

We have to remind ourselves one more time that, in waging this war, the contras are also serving American interests by making it unnecessary for us to use our own troops to prevent the establishment of another Cuba on the continental American mainland.

And we have to remind ourselves one more time that all the contras ask of us is the weapons with which to carry on their fight.

The President of the United States wants to give them those weapons. And the Democrats? According to Tip O'Neill, their leader in the House, it "would be a disaster and a shame for this country" if Congress were to agree.

O'Neill's formulation is so outlandish that one is tempted to dismiss it as the partisan hyperbole of a colorful political figure. Yet what lies behind his rhetoric is precisely the thinking that the Jackson orphans have been saying no longer rules the Democratic perspective on foreign policy.

From that perspective, in a war between Communists and anti-Communists it is in general both morally wrong ("a shame") and damaging to American interests ("a disaster") to side with the anti-Communists.

The Communists—so the moral reasoning goes—may not be everything we would wish, but they are bound to be preferable to the anti-Communists, who are usually a collection of fascist thugs.

As for American interests, there is no need to fear that the Communists will automatically ally themselves with the Soviet Union. Indeed, when they do, it is only because our hostility "drives" them into the Soviet camp.

Never mind that as applied to Nicaragua (not to mention a dozen other countries) every one of these propositions is false.

Never mind that the real thugs in Nicaragua, are the Sandinistas, and that the contras are led by people who were among the leaders of the revolution against Somoza.

Never mind that the new regime in Nicaragua received more aid from the United States in its first 18 months than Somoza received in his last 20 years.

Never mind that even while this aid was pouring in the Sandinistas were openly declaring their commitment to Marxism-Leninism and their solidarity with the Soviet Union, while also providing help of various kinds to the Communist insurgents in El Salvador.

None of these things can shake Tip O'Neill or most of the other Democrats in the House, who are determined to stop President Reagan from sending military aid to the contras.

Charging their critics in the Reagan administration with McCarthyism, these Democrats refuse to believe, or will not understand, that cutting the contras off means turning Nicaragua irreversibly over to communism and the totalitarian horrors that have accompanied it wherever it has taken root.

Denouncing "military solutions," these Democrats refuse to believe, or will not understand, that as serious Marxist-Leninists, the Sandinistas will not more voluntarily agree to sharing power through negotiations, let alone giving it up through elections, than any other Communist regime ever has (including the ones in Yugoslavia and China even after breaking free of Soviet control.)

Calling for peaceful co-existence under the deluded Contadora proposals, these Democrats refuse to believe, or will not understand, that a consolidated Communist regime in Nicaragua would constitute a standing threat to every country in the region, and would also represent an extension of Soviet power and influence.

There are, of course, Democrats who do not suffer from this obdurate refusal to see and understand. Conversely there are Republicans who are as willfully blind to the realities of the Nicaraguan situation as the majority of Democrats. Thus in April 1985, the last time military aid to the contras was brought up in the House, 40 Republicans joined the Democratic majority in voting against it.

This Republican failing may offer a perverse species of cold comfort to my old friends in the Democratic Party. But it still leaves them as orphaned as they have been since the day Scoop Jackson died. And it leaves this country in a dangerously divided state.

RECOGNITION OF ST. MARY OF THE ASSUMPTION SCHOOL

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize St. Mary of the Assumption School in Butler County in my Fourth District of Pennsyl-

vania and do so in special recognition of Catholic School Week in the Diocese of Pittsburgh.

The theme of this week, from March 2 to 8, is Catholic Schools—A Rainbow of Excellence, and the week will be honored with an all-school mass at St. Mary of the Assumption, special activities, a display of students' work, an afternoon school visit by grandparents, special student minicourses in calligraphy, cookie making, cake decorating, ceramics, macrame, cooking, typing, and parental visits.

I commend St. Mary of the Assumption School for recognizing each child's potential and preparing these youths to become better citizens. Like the rainbow the week emulates, Catholic schools and this Catholic school, brighten the lives of millions of students and parents throughout the county and the country. Such schools bring beauty, hope and promise—the symbols of the rainbow—and mostly respect for all people.

Before the U.S. House of Representatives today, I recognize and honor St. Mary of the Assumption School and the noble work it does.

THE FLOOD DISASTER IN CALIFORNIA: URGENT LEGISLATION AND WELL-DESERVED COMMENDATIONS

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, northern California has been battered by a series of brutal storms over the past 2 weeks. In their aftermath is a disaster of immense proportions: at least 13 lives have been lost, tens of thousands of people have been left homeless and hundreds of millions of dollars worth of public and private property has been destroyed or damaged.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I introduced, along with a bipartisan group of my affected colleagues, an emergency supplemental appropriations bill of \$425 million to provide Federal assistance for the victims of this disaster.

I cannot emphasize enough the importance of taking up and approving this legislation as soon as we possibly can. As I am sure many of you are aware, hurricanes on the east coast, floods in West Virginia and mudslides in Puerto Rico have exhausted the financial resources of the Federal Emergency Management Agency. In fact, before the recent storms in California—where damage may exceed \$500 million—FEMA has requested \$250 million in supplemental appropriations for expenses already anticipated.

My bill would provide funding to meet FEMA's present and future shortfalls. It would also call for additional funding for relief efforts by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of Agriculture.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting and passing this vital piece of legislation with the greatest possible expedition.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express the great degree of appreciation and admiration I hold for the many people who shared their time and their skills to help make this crisis easier to bear for millions of northern Californians.

At the Federal level, the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation protected large areas of the State from being inundated by torrential flood waters that have swollen many rivers and streams to record-high levels. Where flooding occurred, the Corps was quick to mobilize efforts to stem levee breaks and protect populated areas. Air Force and National Guard personnel were also extremely helpful in evacuating and providing shelter for the homeless.

Over the next several months, the Small Business Administration, the Department of Transportation and the USDA will play an essential role in helping disaster victims to rebuild their homes and their livelihoods. The Federal Emergency Management Agency, which already has teams in the field to assess the damage, will have the massive responsibility of delivering disaster assistance from the aforementioned agencies to thousands of individuals in northern California.

A number of California State agencies contributed to relief efforts but several merit special commendation. From the start, the Office of Emergency Services coordinated an impressive network of relief teams throughout superior California and focused disaster assistance to those areas that needed it most. From its Flood Operations Center in Sacramento, the Department of Water Resources closely monitored California's many river systems and warned downstream communities of potential problems. The State Reclamation Board kept a steady watch along the hundreds of miles of levees and made repairs where needed. The California Department of Transportation [CalTrans] and California Highway Patrol worked diligently to keep roadways clear for emergency services and supplies. And, on the disaster's front lines, hundreds of hardworking young women and men from the California Conservation Corps endured miserable—and often dangerous—conditions to fight against rising flood waters with shovels and sandbags.

Of course, cities and counties were among the first to respond to the disaster through the efforts of sheriff and police departments, as well as street, utility, and other maintenance personnel.

Obviously, Government's response to the crisis has been exemplary, but I am particularly proud of the individuals who voluntarily gave of themselves to help others in so many different ways. As always, the American Red Cross was there first, aiding the cold, displaced and homeless with food and warm shelter. There are other heroes—many of them in every affected community—who also deserve acknowledgement but are too numerous to cite here. Thanks to all of them.

AQUINO AND THE PHILIPPINES: AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the assumption of the presidency of the Philippines by Corazon Aquino is not merely a personal victory for this courageous woman, but a great national victory for the people of the Philippines.

The inauguration of President Aquino is also a triumph for the principle of democracy itself. The insistence of the Philippine people for change, for reform, for an end to repressive and coercive government has defeated the intransigence and the tanks of Ferdinand Marcos.

Over 100 years ago, Victor Hugo foresaw this week's historic change in the Philippines. "An invasion of armies can be resisted," Hugo wrote, "but not an idea whose time has come." In Manila this week, Corazon Aquino's time, democracy's time, and the Philippine people's time has come.

There was a single dramatic turning point which I would like to note. It was not the election victory of Mrs. Aquino, which Mr. Marcos blunderingly sought to reverse. It was not the defection of key political and military leaders from the Marcos government. It was not the seizure of the television station.

The key moment, I believe, was when thousands of ordinary Philippine citizens, including many members of the clergy, sat down in front of advancing tanks manned by Marcos' soldiers. They sat, in the tradition of Gandhi and King, and they prayed.

And a miracle happened: The tanks, which had slowly advanced on the protestors, inched forward to the front line, and stopped. The soldiers, who in months past had shot those who challenged Marcos, decided they would no longer be parties to the shedding of more innocent blood in order to prop up a dying regime.

At that moment, the victory of the Philippine people was assured.

We also should note that the triumph of democracy, which is so welcome by the jubilant men and women in the Philippines and by this Congress and the American people, is shared by hundreds of thousands of Philippine-Americans who see a new birth of liberty for their native country. To those men and women, too, we send our congratulations and our commitment to continue to work with the Philippines to preserve the victory they have achieved this week.

HIGHER EDUCATION PROTECTION ACT

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that Congress' preoccupation with the budget

is obscuring some of the issues important to the future of our children. While the red ink of the deficit threatens our children's future, the lack of commitment to provide the opportunity for a college education is just as threatening to this country's future.

I have always felt that one of the most basic duties of the Federal Government is to guarantee free and equal access to higher education. In 1965, Congress enacted the Higher Education Act—landmark legislation conceived with the intent to provide lower and middle income students with grant and loan support to meet college costs. Both the Pell grant and guaranteed student loan programs have, over the years become the mainstays of access to higher education. Yet, the automatic cuts mandated by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 will cripple student assistance and eventually make a college education the privilege of the wealthy. With college costs continuing to increase disproportionately to the level of personal income, coupled with the fact that the majority of students receive one or more forms of financial assistance, there is no question in my mind that if funding for these programs is slashed, the number of low to middle income students attending college will greatly diminish.

The institutional aid program authorized under title III of the Higher Education Act is also crucial to providing quality education for those who can't afford it. It is the main source of support for institutions serving large numbers of rural area and disadvantage students. Over the years, this program has improved the academic quality and the financial stability of institutions, not only in my congressional district, but in a great number of others nationwide. Cutting this relatively inexpensive program will jeopardize the existence of these institutions and deprive many students of an education.

In the continuing effort to provide higher education to low income individuals, the TRIO Program has, since its creation, provided low-income, first generation, and physically handicapped students the supportive services they need to enroll in and graduate from college. Such services include counseling, basic skills and instruction, tutoring, and information about college admissions and financial aid. These programs provide low-income students a realistic opportunity to escape the cycle of poverty and dependence to achieve the upward mobility afforded by higher education. This program cannot afford to be cut.

In order to maintain the integrity and effectiveness of the financial assistance, TRIO, and institutional aid programs, I am today introducing a bill, the Higher Education Protection Act, to exempt these programs from sequestration under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act. As a majority of my colleagues did, I voted in favor of this bill as a last ditch effort to reduce and eventually eliminate the deficit. I believe in this legislation because it is a concrete method of eliminating the deficit, actually requiring Congress to overcome its partisan differences and take action. But, in our budget cutting fervor, we have to realize that student aid is an investment in economic development, employment, and

leadership which yields returns that are far greater than the financial cost. Let us not turn our backs on the future of this country—I urge my colleagues to support this effort and co-sponsor my bill.

THE C.B.I., 936, AND PUERTO RICO

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, on his visit to Grenada last week, President Reagan publicly endorsed Puerto Rican Gov. Hernandez Colon's proposal to use 936 tax funds in Puerto Rico's development bank for twin plant projects throughout the Caribbean Basin.

In essence, the Governor's proposal puts tax incentives—that is investment incentives—into a faltering CBI. By utilizing 936 earnings, the CBI will be able to expand and bring to life the CBI. Several major firms are ready to commit themselves to building twin plants in Puerto Rico and a CBI nation if 936 remains intact.

So far, so good—936 was preserved in the House tax bill. It is my hope that it will not be changed or eliminated in the Senate version of the bill. It is too good an idea to let it die. Gov. Hernandez Colon deserves a great deal of credit for developing and working for this proposal. I am happy to see that the President realizes the importance of the Governor's plan.

I am submitting as part of my statement a press release from the Governor's office on the President's endorsement, and an excerpt from the President's speech delivered in Grenada last week discussing the Governor's proposal.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE RAFAEL HERNANDEZ COLON, GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

In my inaugural address, I announced an initiative for preserving section 936 of the Internal Revenue Code as a permanent tool of economic development for Puerto Rico by sharing its blessings with our Caribbean neighbors. We have worked closely with the Reagan Administration in pursuing this objective. Today, President Reagan publicly embraced the approach we have fashioned together. It is fitting that he chose the occasion of his visit to Grenada—the first site we targeted for demonstrating the potential impact of our strategy—to add his personal strong endorsement to the bipartisan support our approach has earned in Congress. We appreciate the President's praise and shall continue to do everything possible to put more Puerto Ricans to work and to help ourselves by helping our neighbors.

TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE CITIZENS OF GRENADA

There's something else brewing that will be a big boost to the people of the Caribbean. Our Congress is considering a change in the tax code to permit funds in Puerto Rico's Development Bank to be used for investment loans elsewhere in the Caribbean. This proposal, worked out with Governor Hernandez Colon of Puerto Rico, has my endorsement and bipartisan support in Congress. The Governor has spearheaded a drive to persuade U.S. firms in Puerto Rico

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to invest in plants in other parts of the Caribbean. He is committed to the ambitious goal of \$100 million in new investment into Caribbean Basin countries each year. Three major U.S. firms have already announced plans to place projects here in Grenada, and other projects are moving forward elsewhere in the Caribbean. The tax provisions being considered by Congress are tied to the success of this investment program. We applaud Puerto Rico's contribution and urge congressional approval.

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE PETER CARUSO OF CLIFTON, NJ, 1986 "MAN OF THE YEAR," ITALIAN AMERICAN SOCCER LEAGUE OF NEW JERSEY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 28, the residents of the city of Clifton, my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join with the members of the Italian American Soccer League of New Jersey in testimony to an outstanding individual and good friend—the Honorable Peter Caruso of Clifton, NJ, whose standards of excellence in helping our young people build strength of character, fair play, and sportsmanship through participation in the historic international game of soccer has earned him the highly prestigious honor of being chosen as the Man of the Year—the highest award that the Italian American Soccer League of New Jersey can bestow upon any of its members. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our heartiest congratulations and best of wishes to Peter Caruso and share the pride of his good wife Victoria; sons: Dominic and Robert; daughters: Mary, Theresa, Elena and Lisa; and four grandchildren on this milestone of achievement in their family endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, the Italian American Soccer League of New Jersey was organized 26 years ago and for the past quarter of a century-plus has sponsored one of the most outstanding athletic youth programs of our Nation, providing a great public service to our young people in high school and college between the ages of 17 and 22 years. The league not only provides recreation that brings joy and refreshment of spirit to the participants and those who attend the soccer games but with the proceeds of its athletic endeavors awards scholarships to worthy students to aid them in their search for knowledge and higher educational pursuits.

Peter Caruso has by his example and dedication to these true American ideals personified exemplary leadership in his untiring efforts of national and international renown in the sports world of soccer. He is being feted by the Italian American Soccer League of New Jersey as vice president of intersport promotions and was selected Man of the Year by the league's membership because of his outstanding contributions in many years of service to our young people and dedicated concern for his fellow man.

February 27, 1986

Mr. Speaker, as a nation comprised of all people of all nationalities and regions throughout the world, each singularly, and rightfully so, proud of his or her individual heritage and united in common endeavor of freedom, justice, and a good life for all, we can most assuredly be proud of the exemplary achievements that the people of Italian heritage have contributed to America's greatness.

Our Man of the Year, Peter Caruso, was born in Ferruzzano, a small village on the Aegean coast of Calabria, Italy on April 4, 1927. He became a tailor's apprentice at age 9 in order to learn a trade. By the time he was 14, economic conditions deteriorated to the point that tailors were a luxury the local villages could not afford so Peter began to work for the regional pharmacist, traveling to Milan and transporting needed medical supplies. In 1945, he left this village to work in Genova as a custom tailor. At night he attended school to learn design patternmaking and fashion design and it is interesting to note that he received recognition in the garment industry here in America for the quality of his expertise and was named Designer of the Year in 1974.

In 1956 Peter Caruso brought his bride of 6 years and two children to the United States. They settled first in Jersey City, NJ where Peter worked as a pattern-maker. His dream of opening his own tailor shop could not wait so he held two full-time jobs to earn the necessary capital to establish his own business. His perseverance and industriousness prevailed and he opened his first tailor shop in September 1957, only 18 months after arriving in the United States. By the early seventies, his factory under the trade name of Mari-leather Fashions which is now headquartered in Passaic, NJ was employing 30 to 40 people with a prestigious clientele of many nationally recognized retailers in the garment industry.

There is much that can be said of Peter Caruso as a leading and active participant in the business community. He has truly attained the greatest respect and esteem of all of us for his compassion, dedication and untiring efforts in service to his fellow man.

Peter Caruso's deep interest in the game of soccer can be traced to his early youth in Italy when he played with an old wornout ball with his older brother and friends in the church square near his home in Ferruzzano, Italy. He became involved as a strong advocate of the highly popular international game of soccer on the professional level as a great supporter of the Cosmos and the Italian National Team based in Milan, Italy. He continues to support soccer in the area and is currently serving as president of Calabria Aurora, a soccer team based in New Brunswick, NJ.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed appropriate that we reflect on the deeds and achievements of our people who have contributed to the quality of life here in America. As we join today in saluting Peter Caruso, may I also take this opportunity to add the deep appreciation and gratitude of all Americans for the wealth of wisdom and cultural enrichment that the people of Italian heritage have contributed to the quality of our way of life here in America.

As we gather together on Friday, February 28 in tribute to Peter Caruso's leadership endeavors and personal commitment dedicated

to service to people, we do indeed salute the 1986 Man of the Year of the Italian American Soccer League of New Jersey—the Honorable Peter Caruso of Clifton, NJ.

ISRAEL HAS MADE AID WORK

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I recommend that my colleagues read the progress report on Israel's economic situation written by two noted United States economists, Stanley Fischer and Herbert Stein, which appeared in today's Wall Street Journal.

Although the Israeli Government will have to take further steps, the article indicates that, as of now, the combination of United States assistance and Israel's own efforts have brought about a significant improvement in the economy of a major United States friend and ally.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 26, 1986]

ISRAEL HAS MADE AID WORK

(By Stanley Fischer)

Israel is the largest single recipient of economic aid from the U.S. This is partly because the economic stability of Israel is uncertain and is important to U.S. national interests. Therefore a report on the progress of the Israeli economy is relevant to policy decisions to be made here.

A common view, supported by some experience, is that the availability of foreign aid prevents the recipient country from taking the steps required for its own economic health. The story of Israel suggests that there may be exceptions to this dismal lesson.

On July 1, 1985, Israel introduced a radical stabilization program designed to bring the inflation rate down from 1000% to 20% a year or less. Success was swift. Within two months inflation was down to less than 4% a month; in November and December 1985 it averaged only 1% a month. But there is still a long way to go before success is assured.

The Israeli inflation rate rose by stages from 2% per annum in 1967-70 to the 1000%-per-annum area at the end of 1984. The pattern was for an inflationary shock to kick the inflation rate up to a new plateau, at which it stabilized before the next shock.

Underlying the Israeli inflation were massive budget deficits averaging 15% of gross national product for more than a decade, fueling, and fueled by, a fast-growing national debt and a rapid monetary growth. At the heart of the government's budget problem is defense spending of 25% of GNP. Despite large-scale U.S. aid, the government found it increasingly difficult to borrow at home or abroad in 1984 and 1985, and was forced instead to print money. More than anything else, it was the difficulty of borrowing that forced the government to undertake the stabilization program.

THREE POLICY POSITIONS ARGUED

Widespread indexation of assets and of wages made living with inflation tolerable. As inflation persisted from 1979 to 1983 in the 100%-130% range, Israelis explained to foreigners that they had found a way of living with high but non-exploding inflation.

Three policy positions were argued during this period. A first group was willing to live with inflation. Another group wanted steady disinflation through gradual reductions in the budget deficit and money growth. A third, shock-treatment group argued that only a comprehensive program designed to move the economy immediately to a sustainable low inflation equilibrium could succeed.

The living-with-inflation group evaporated as inflation hit the 20%-a-month range in 1984.

Tough anti-inflationary policy was widely expected from whichever party won the July 1984 election. But it failed to materialize. The election led to a coalition government that took nearly three months to form.

The first stabilization program of the new government was a package deal with the Histadrut (national trade union organization) and employers whereby wages and prices would be frozen for three months. However, devaluation continued. The planned 1985/86 budget had sharply cut the deficit, but with the government spending increasing amounts to maintain the prices of subsidized goods, the deficit did not fall. Nor were other planned cuts in government spending implemented.

By April and May of 1985 the package deal had fallen apart and inflation was back to the 400%-per-annum area. The balance-of-payments deficit had been reduced from its 1983 level, but foreign-exchange reserves were falling rapidly as Israelis switched into dollars. The government budget deficit was at an unsustainable level and the need for action was clear.

By this stage the comprehensive approach was the only choice. The aim would be to move the government budget, monetary and exchange-rate policy, and wages and prices all at once to a new, sustainable level.

Israeli inflation 1985

[Percent per month]

January to May ¹	11.3
June	14.9
July	27.8
August	4.0
September	3.0
October	4.7
November	0.5
December	1.5

¹ Average.

The essential requirement for the stabilization was a sharp reduction in the budget deficit. Without that, no amount of wage and price controls, sophisticated exchange-rate management or clever monetary policy could do more than temporarily slow the inflation.

The program had three main ingredients:

A cut in the budget deficit from 17% to 8% of GNP. The cut came mainly through subsidy reductions.

A large devaluation to be followed by a stable (though not formally fixed) exchange rate against the dollar.

Introduction of wage and price controls and suspension of wage indexation and other elements of existing labor contracts by emergency decree.

In support of the program, monetary policy would control the growth of credit.

The devaluation and lifting of subsidies caused a 28% jump in the price level in July. Wage earners were not compensated for most of the July inflation, with the result that the real wage fell about 20%.

The government's main fear about the program had been that it would create mas-

sive unemployment. Economists argued that a reduction in the real wage and devaluation would prevent unemployment and allow a switch of production into exports. The knowledge that a requested supplementary U.S. aid package of \$1.5 billion over the next two years was likely to be granted within a few months encouraged the government to act decisively, in the belief that it would have a safety net of reserves and resources to use to increase employment if things went badly wrong.

Immediate results of the plan have been positive. The data show the inflation rate coming down fast. In January 1986 the consumer price index declined 1.5%. The budget is doing even better than expected as the reduced inflation increases real tax revenue (tax receipts previously lost much of their value by the time they were collected). The trade balance has maintained the improvement that began with the maxi-devaluation at the end of 1983. The black-market exchange rate, which had been at a premium of 25%, has fallen to 5%. Price controls have not yet produced serious shortages.

Although labor objected bitterly to the use of emergency decrees to suspend contract terms, a new voluntary wage agreement was reached after remarkably little strife. The agreement allowed the real wage reduction of July to go through, but maintained partial indexation and provided for nominal wage increases of 4% a month from December 1985 to February 1986.

Monetary policy during the first months of the stabilization was strongly contractionary. The nominal interest even in October was still 13% a month, implying an annual real interest rate of more than 100%. Several large firms are in financial difficulties. The nominal interest rate was brought down rapidly in November and is now 5% a month.

Contrary to fears, unemployment rose only briefly in July and August, and has started back down again.

So far, then, the plan is a total success. Public approval for the economic policy, despite the immediate hardships it has caused, is widespread.

PROSPECT OF INFLATION-RATE RISE

Nonetheless, serious difficulties remain. The first is that the government budget deficit is still too high. At 8% of GNP, it cannot be financed without increasing debt or printing money too rapidly. Yet the government finds it increasingly difficult to cut spending. Because government revenue in Israel is near 50% of GNP, the tax burden is too high and taxes should be cut. But without further spending cuts, taxes cannot be cut. Further spending cuts are thus a high priority.

The wage agreement will raise nominal wages at least 17% over the next three months. Unless the government finds a way of neutralizing that increase, the price level will rise as business costs increase. Price controls cannot contain such pressure, and in any event cannot be successfully maintained over long periods.

The prospect is that the inflation rate will rise back to the 3%-4%-a-month rate by the end of April, unless the government finds a way of dealing with the effects of the planned wage increases. There is no way of doing so without further budget-deficit reductions. From 3%-4% a month inflation, the trip to 10% a month is easy, especially for an economy that has been that way before.

Budget decisions of the next few weeks will show whether the coalition government can bring itself to the measures now needed to protect the gains achieved by its decisive action of last July.

**A TRIBUTE TO VICTOR J.
RUTKOSKI, SR.**

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a resident of my Fourth District of Pennsylvania who has selflessly given countless hours of his time to the Freeport community at large. Mr. Victor J. Rutkoski, Sr., has served the area as a member of the Freeport Volunteer Fire Company for more than 32 years. Since he first began working there on February 4, 1956, Mr. Rutkoski has performed 234 specific jobs within this volunteer organization. These activities mainly were in ambulance service but also included service on various committees, being a member of the company's fire police and serving as the organization's sergeant at arms.

Mr. Rutkoski already has received recognition from his fellow fire fighters in Freeport and across Armstrong County. The fire company presented him the Outstanding Fireman Ray Hibbs Award during its annual award banquet on March 16, 1985.

But aside from the humanitarian aspects of Mr. Rutkoski's accomplishments for the community, he is part of an organization that is literally saving the Freeport community hundreds of thousands of dollars. He and his fellow volunteers at the company are providing a service that otherwise would be publicly funded and cost the community more than \$850,000 in tax dollars each year.

So it gives me great pride and pleasure to present the accomplishments of Mr. Victor J. Rutkoski, Sr., before my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives. His 32 years of dedicated and life-saving services are thus noted here. But his works are ever more so duly appreciated by myself and the residents he so faithfully serves.

**SACRED HEART ACADEMY,
HEMPSTEAD, NY, SPONSORS
PEACE DAY PROGRAM**

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, students of Sacred Heart Academy in Hempstead, NY, are sponsoring a "peace day" program to join me in prayer and fellowship for world peace.

In the midst of budget battles over military spending and debate over action or restraint in foreign conflicts we can easily overlook the real goal we seek, which is a peaceful and more stable world. Many efforts throughout the world are also overlooked in spite of their effectiveness. If we look carefully, we would

see activities of dedicated individuals in troubled regions. In spite of tremendous risks posed by war, famine, disease, and other hardships, members of charitable and religious organizations work tirelessly to assist the poor, care for the sick and dying, and educate people to provide for themselves.

I believe we should do whatever we can to foster an attitude of greater concern for world peace. That concern must be based on thoughtful consideration of world problems and their underlying causes. Many ways exist for us to promote justice, human rights, freedom and other factors which permit peace to flourish. I hope that the peace day observance at Sacred Heart and similar events will encourage others to offer their thoughts, prayers, and efforts toward that end.

**NATIONAL ENERGY EDUCATION
DAY RESOLUTION**

HON. W.J. (BILLY) TAUZIN

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, a multitude of energy issues faces our Nation today, and will continue to come before us for years to come. One of the ways to ensure that we will be able to successfully meet the challenges of tomorrow is through educating the public on what our Nation will need in the future.

This task—educating the public—will take time. As our Nation's schools are well equipped to handle this task, and as many have included energy education in their curriculums over the past decade, our public school system is an ideal place to assist in our efforts to educate our citizens to our energy needs.

To further this effort, today I am introducing a resolution to declare March 21, 1986, as "National Energy Education Day." This year's NEED theme, "Exploring Energy Pathways to Tomorrow," will be the focus of energy education activities to call attention to the need to develop conventional and alternative energy sources. It is anticipated that between 8,000 to 10,000 schools will hold activities and programs.

Since the Congress launched NEED in 1980, a network of State, regional, and local NEED committees has evolved which provides energy educators with encouragement, information, and recognition. We are gradually becoming a more educated nation, but we cannot stop short of our goal.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in the promotion of a greater understanding of the role education will play in shaping America's energy future by cosponsoring this resolution.

**THE PANAMA CANAL
AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1986**

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I am today pleased to introduce, along with a number of my distinguished colleagues from the House

Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, a bill to exempt the Panama Canal Commission from the requirements of the Balance Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

This historic act, better known as the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law, will cause severe and adverse financial difficulties for the Panama Canal Commission without having any effect whatsoever on our Federal budget deficit.

The Panama Canal Commission, which was created with the enactment of the Panama Canal Act of 1979, operates as an appropriated fund Federal agency. Under the terms of the treaty, the Commission is charged with the responsibility of operating the canal until the year 2000.

It is a unique and self-sustaining agency which by law must operate on a break-even basis without any Federal assistance and at no cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

All tolls collected from ships transiting the canal and other fees received by the Commission are deposited in the Panama Canal Commission fund in the U.S. Treasury and all appropriations to the Commission are made from this fund.

These revenues must cover the cost of all canal operations including the administrative expenses of the Commission, capital expenditures, interest payments, depreciation, and certain annuity payments to the Republic of Panama.

In addition, the PCC may not accumulate any profit or carry over any funds from one fiscal year to the next.

In fact, if the PCC underestimates the amount of its projected total revenues for any fiscal year, then that profit of up to \$10 million per year, must be paid directly to the Republic of Panama in accordance with article XIII, paragraph 4(c) of the Panama Canal Treaty. Also, because of the cumulative requirement of that provision, beginning with fiscal year 1980, Panama will be entitled to any profit realized in fiscal year 1986 up to \$53 million.

While the PCC has done an outstanding job of accurately forecasting the amount of its anticipated vessel traffic, the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law completely abrogates this treaty required process.

For the current fiscal year, the Panama Canal Commission has had its appropriations reduced by \$18.3 million. Unlike any other Federal agency, however, this reduction will in no way contribute toward the Federal deficit reduction goal but must be paid directly to Panama.

While I supported the enactment of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act and fervently believe we must reduce our Federal deficits, it was never intended that this law would be used as a mechanism to divert funds from a Federal agency to a foreign government.

While other Federal entities face unforeseen difficulties because of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law, only the Panama Canal Commission finds itself in the position of having its budget significantly reduced without benefiting either our taxpayers or our Federal deficit reduction efforts.

While other agencies may in the future avoid significant reductions by increasing their revenues, this option is not available for the

PCC. In fact, by raising its revenues, through a toll increase or some other mechanism, the Panama Canal Commission would simply generate a larger profit payment for Panama.

In short, there is no way to effectively apply the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law to the operations of the PCC. By insisting on its application, the Congress will cripple this agency and will simply fill the coffers of the Panamanian Treasury with funds that will not be used to maintain or improve the operation of the Panama Canal.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we quickly enact this legislation and based on my preliminary discussions with Members of the other body and the administration, I am confident that broad support will be forthcoming for this proposal.

While no one in this Congress desires to penalize the Republic of Panama, which has been and will remain a close friend of the United States, it is absolutely clear that the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law was never intended to have this effect on any Federal agency including the Panama Canal Commission.

In essence what we are proposing is simply a correction or an exception to Public Law 99-177 for a unique Federal agency whose accounting and funding procedures are both little known and widely misunderstood.

Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize that this amendment will in no way violate either the letter or the spirit of article XIII of the Panama Canal Treaty.

In closing, I would like to acknowledge and express my appreciation to my distinguished colleagues who have joined with me in sponsoring this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with us in supporting the Panama Canal Amendments Act of 1986.

EMIGRATION OF SOVIET JEWRY

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, recently we witnessed the release of Anatoly Shcharansky from the Soviet Union, where he was detained in a prison and labor camps for 9 years.

At long last, Mr. Shcharansky can begin his life anew, living in freedom with his wife, Avital, from whom he was separated in 1978. We joyously welcome Anatoly Shcharansky into the free world and give thanks to those including Representative GILMAN and Representative LANTOS who worked so long and so hard to secure the release of this extraordinary man with the small frame, warm humor, and the fortitude never to abandon the fight for freedom.

While we express our joy and relief, we must also express our concern about the thousands of Soviets who are still in the U.S.S.R. waiting to emigrate. As a people whose very being is underscored by the right to individual freedom and freedom of worship, we must not neglect the pleas of those who are denied such rights.

The release of Anatoly Shcharansky does not imply that emigration restrictions for Soviet

Jews have been eased. In fact, only 79 Jews were allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union in January. It is our responsibility to continue to prod the Soviets into easing emigration restrictions.

This needn't be done through the use of harsh or strident invective. Continued use of sensible diplomacy, combined with a consistent commitment not only to Soviet Jewry, but also to our own freedom-loving principles, will make a difference in the future. The Soviet leadership will hear the cries of those who demand freedom. The plight of Soviet Jewry will not be forgotten.

BUTLER, PA, YMCA CELEBRATES 100 YEARS' SERVICE

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 1986, the Butler County Family YMCA, located in Butler, PA, will celebrate its 100th birthday. Like thousands of YMCA's across the Nation, the Butler Y is a family oriented facility that provides a wide variety of programs and activities for people of all ages and incomes.

Since it was organized on November 8, 1886, the Butler Y has promoted physical, mental, and spiritual well-being through physical education, aquatic instruction, vocational training, leadership development opportunities, club and group activities, parent-child programs, camping, and counseling. And for just as many years, the Butler Y has opened its doors to the public for community activities, always graciously lending its facilities, grounds, and personnel.

As the Butler Y prepares for its second century of community service, I am confident that it will continue its tradition of serving thousands of Butler residents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that our colleagues join me in wishing the directors and the dedicated employees and volunteers of the Butler YMCA a very special 100th anniversary.

INDEPENDENT VOICES, EAST AND WEST, SPEAK OUT AGAINST REAGAN'S NICARAGUA POLICY

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, as Congress considers the President's request for \$100 million in new aid to the Nicaraguan Contras, the tide of public opinion throughout the Western world is flowing strongly against this administration's Central American policy. More surprisingly, prominent dissidents and human rights activists in Eastern Europe have now called for a reversal of this policy.

On December 1 a statement, entitled "Independent Voices, East and West, Speak Out Against Reagan's Nicaragua Policy," was printed in the Sunday New York Times. This statement, circulated by the Campaign for

Peace and Democracy/East and West and Across Frontiers magazine, opposes the Reagan administration's policy on Nicaragua, and has been signed by leading peace, labor, social justice, religious, and cultural figures from the United States, Western Europe, and the Third World. For the first time they are joined in their opposition to U.S. interventionism by a large number of activists and writers from the Eastern bloc, many of whom have been persecuted in their own countries for work in independent peace and human rights movements.

Their statement and a list of signatories is reprinted below.

INDEPENDENT VOICES, EAST AND WEST, SPEAK OUT AGAINST REAGAN'S NICARAGUA POLICY

As opponents of the Cold War East and West we protest the Reagan Administration's escalating war on Nicaragua. The nature of the Nicaraguan regime is not the issue. We defend the democratic right of every nation of self-determination in complete freedom from superpower control, whether that domination is justified by the Brezhnev doctrine in Eastern Europe and Afghanistan, or by Reagan's claims of U.S. special interests in Central America and the Caribbean. The application of force against weaker nations blocks democratic social and political change, tightens the superpowers' grip on their respective blocs and spheres of influence, and fuels the arms race with catastrophic consequences for all of us.

To escape from the current global impasse we must find a Third Way in which democratic activists and movements from around the world make common cause to build an alternative to both blocs. We are raising our voices in unison against this ominous heightening of the Cold War, and demand an immediate end to the United States' growing intervention in Nicaragua. We challenge the U.S. to set an example of non-interventionism, and we ask the Soviet Union to do the same in Eastern Europe and Afghanistan.

UNITED STATES

Edward Asner, Richard Barnet, Institute for Policy Studies; Steven M. Becker, Co-Director, Campaign for Peace & Democracy East & West; Angie Berryman, Assoc. Coord., Hum. Rts./Global Justice Program, American Friends Service Committee; Bruce Birchard, Co-Coordinator, Disarmament Peace Conversion Program, AFSC; Rabbi Balfour Brickner, Stephen Wise Free Synagogue; Frank Brodhead, author; David R. Brower, Chair, Friends of the Earth; James Cannon, Noam Chomsky, Dr. Charlie Clements, Americans for Peace in the Americas.

Rev. John Collins, Darlene Cuccinello, Hum. Rts. Coordinator, Intercommunity Ctr. for Justice & Peace; Gail Daneker, Assoc. Dir., Campaign for Peace & Democracy East & West; Richard Deats, Dir., US-USSR Reconciliation, Fellowship of Reconciliation; Ronald V. Dellums, U.S. Congress; Tom DeLuca, N.Y. Mobilization for Survival; Adrian DeWind, Attorney; Daniel Ellsberg, Richard Falk, Mike Farrell, Actor; W.H. & Carol Ferry, Catherine Fitzpatrick, Allen Ginsberg, Poet; Todd Gitlin, John Glasel, Pres., Loc. 802, Amer. Fed. of Musicians.

Victor Gotbaum, Exec. Dir., D.C. 37, AFSCME; Stephen Jay Gould, Harvard University; Lee Grant, Actress and director; Mina Hamilton, Michael Harrington, Democratic Socialists of America; Thomas L. Har-

rierson, CPD/EW; Grace Hane Hedemann, Peace activist; Judy Hempfling, Peace Activists East & West Coord. Comm.; Henry Hiz, Univ. of Pa.; Adam Hochschild, Mother Jones; A. Winton Jackson, Across Frontiers; Julius & Phyllis Jacobson, New Politics; Randy Kehler, Fellow, Peace Development Fund.

Charles Knights, Modern Times; Charles Komanoff, Jeri Laber, Exec. Dir., Helsinki Watch; Joanne Landy, Co-Director, Campaign for Peace & Democracy/East & West; Penny Lernoux, Writer; Margaret Lloyd, David McReynolds, War Registers League; Sam Meyers, Pres., Local 259, UAW; Dr. Stefan Niewiarowski, Temple University; Grace Paley, Paul Robeson Jr., Peggy Scherer, N.Y. Catholic Worker; Pam Solo, Bunting Institute (Radcliffe).

George Soros, Cheryl Stevenson, Katharine S. Stokes, Rose Styron, Kurt Vonnegut, Jr., Jim Wallis, Sojourners; James Weinstein, In These Times; Chris Wing, Co-Coord Disarmament Peace Conv. Prog. AFSC; Rev. Dr. William Winfler, Hum. Rts. Office Nat'l Council of Churches; Max & Sylvia Wohl, Socialist Party, Cleveland; Anne Zill, Fund for Constitutional Government.

USSR AND EASTERN EUROPE Czechoslovakia

Jiri Dienstbier, Journalist, served prison term for civil rights activities; Jiri Hajek, Former foreign minister; Eva Kanturtova, Writer; Lubos Kohout, Former Prof. now works as laborer; Vaclav Maly, Cath priest banned by State from exercising pastoral duties; Milos Rejchrt, Protestant clergyman; Jaroslav Sabata, Former univ. lecturer formerly on Communist Party Central Comm imprisoned 8 years for civil rights work; Anna Sabstova, Activist, served 2½ years in prison; Zedna Tomla, Exiled novelist; Petr Uhl, Teacher, now a stoker; 9 years in prison.

East Germany

Barbel Bohley, Women for Peace; Werner Fischer, Independent peace activist; Ralf Hirsch, Independent peace activist; Roland Jahn, Independent peace activist forcibly expelled in 1982; Gerd Poppe, Independent peace activist; Ulrike Poppe, Women for Peace; Lutz Rathenow, Author and playwright, imprisoned for publishing a book abroad; Rudiger Rosenthal, Independent peace activists.

Hungary

Gabor Demszky, Founder "AB" samizdat publishers; Istvan Eorsi, Writer, poet and playwright; Gyorgy Konrad, Novelist and essayist; Gyorgy Petri, Poet; Laszlo Rajk, Samizdat publisher, son of L. Rajk, former Communist minister executed in show trial.

Poland

Jacek Czaputowicz, Polish independent peace movement "Wolnoci Pokoj" ("Freedom and Peace"); Jan Jozef Lipski, Solidarnose activist member of KOR (Workers Defense Committee) imprisoned under martial law.

U.S.S.R.

Sergei & Natasha Batovrin, Founding members, independent Soviet peace movement, now in NYC; Marya & Vladimir Fleishgaker, Founding members, independent Soviet peace movement, now in NYC; Lev Kopelev, Writer living in W. Germany.

Yugoslavia

Kosta Cavoski, Professor, Belgrade; Dobrica Cosik, Chair, Belgrade Comm. for Defense of Freedom of Thought & Public Ex-

pression; Mihailo Markovic, Professor; member, Belgrade Comm. for Def. of Freedom of Thought & Pub. Exp.; Ed., Praxis International; Milan Nikolic, Sociologist, tried for paper written at Brandeis U.

OTHER COUNTRIES

Isabel Allende, Chilean author; Father Ernesto Balducci, Testimonianze, Italy; Wim Bartels, Int'l Sec., Dutch Interchurch Peace Council (I.K.V.); Simone de Beauvoir, Ariel Dorfman, Chilean author; Mient-Jan Faber, Gen. Sec., Dutch I.K.V.; Carlos Fuentes, Mexican author; Dan Gallin, Gen. Sec. Int'l Union of Food & Allied Workers, Geneva; Gunter Grass, German writer; Mary Kaldor, E.N.D. Journal; Petra Kelly, Green Party, W. Germany; Rajni Kothari, Dir., Peace & Global Transform Prog., India; Sylvie Marrant, CODENE (Comite pour le Desarmement Nucleaire en Europe), France; E.P. & Dorothy Thompson, European Nuclear Disarmament (END).

OUR INDIAN RESERVATION SYSTEM HAS FAILED TO HELP THE INDIANS

HON. RON MARLENEE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, Ken Byerly, a sage publisher in Lewistown, MT, has written an editorial entitled "Our Indian Reservation System Has Failed To Help the Indians" that will make interesting reading to my colleagues in Congress.

Ken is not one to step away from controversy, and like any tough but fair editorial writer, he calls 'em like he sees 'em.

I suggest my colleagues read the following editorial, reprinted from the January 5, 1986 edition of the Lewistown News-Argus.

[From the Lewistown News-Argus, Jan. 5, 1986]

OUR INDIAN RESERVATION SYSTEM HAS FAILED TO HELP THE INDIANS

This editorial is not a criticism of Indians. It is a concern for them, and an urge that something sensible be done for them at long last to reverse the tragic downward trend that Indians have suffered through for many decades.

Here are some of the sad facts as revealed in a report released recently by the Department of Health and Human Services in Washington.

It reports that more than 35 percent of all Indian deaths are related directly to alcohol. This is more than one-third of all Indian deaths in the nation.

Pin-point the Aberdeen area of the Indian Health Service, for example, which includes North and south Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa and Minnesota. Alcohol-related deaths there among Indians is 9.2 times greater than for the nation's general population.

This is almost unbelievable, but true according to the report.

The alcohol-related deaths include accidents, alcoholism, cirrhosis of the liver, suicide and homicide.

Accidents are the leading cause of Indian deaths according to the report with about 75 percent of them alcohol related. A large number of them involve motor vehicles.

No figures seem to be readily available on this in Montana, but a study of the yearly reports of the Montana Highway Patrol

reveal clearly that the percent of motor vehicle accidents per capita in counties that include our Indian reservations are consistently higher than for the state as a whole—much higher in some cases.

Here are some other startling facts revealed by the report:

Cirrhosis of the liver (related to alcohol) accounts for 6 percent of Indian deaths. This is more than three times the national rate.

Alcoholism itself is directly responsible for 3.2 percent of Indian deaths, about four times the national rate.

Suicides account for 2.9 percent of Indian deaths, about twice the national rate. The Indian Health Service estimates that about 70 percent of Indian suicides involve alcohol.

Homicides account for an estimated two percent of Indian deaths, 70 percent higher than the national rate. The IHS found that 90 percent of Indian homicides involve alcohol.

There is more, but these statistics are enough to reveal the huge and tragic toll of alcohol use by Indians.

What to do about it?

The Bureau of Indian Affairs was created by the Congress more than 150 years ago to help Indians adjust to their changing position in the United States . . . to work itself out of a job by helping Indians to stand on their own feet.

However, the Bureau has grown steadily in size and cost through the decades, but the plight of most Indians has worsened.

It is obvious from this that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has been a tragic and ever-increasingly costly failure . . . that just appropriating more and more money isn't the answer.

But let's not just blame the Indian Service for this.

Congress must take the blame because it has refused to face the issue . . . to study means of correcting it, and then having the guts to take a stand to correct the system that has failed so badly.

Some Indian leaders too are at fault.

A third of a century ago, for example, when Eisenhower was elected president, many Indian leaders said to him in effect, "The nation's handling of Indian affairs is a failure. It is making bums out of many of our people who depend more and more on government handouts and less and less on getting jobs of their own."

"Turn us loose," some of these Indian leaders said, "Get us off the reservations and out into the world. It is our only hope."

Eisenhower listened. He named a director of Indian affairs with the longtime intent to help Indians do just this, and also eventually to bring an end to the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

But what happened then?

Many Indian leaders quickly reversed themselves and said in effect, "What are you trying to do to us?"

The result was an end to any new hope and a return instead to the same old dreary programs that have been such a tragic, long-time failure for the Indians as well as the nation.

If the system isn't changed. . . if strong action isn't taken to help Indians regain their self-reliance. . . if Congress doesn't quit drifting along on this as it has for more than a century and a half. . . things will continue to go down hill for Indians, and it will be increasingly difficult to help them get on their own feet.

The toll alcohol takes on Indians now as a result of the present system is just further proof of the great need for sensible, strong and far-sighted action.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY HONORS CORETTA SCOTT KING

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, this year the people of this country honored for the first time through a national holiday one of our heroes, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Heroism comes in many forms. Some risk their lives on the battlefield; others develop bold new techniques that contribute to human health or that improve dramatically our quality of life. Yet others, like Dr. King, are heroes because their actions cause a fundamental positive change in our national consciousness.

This weekend I was privileged to join my fellow citizens in Los Angeles County to honor another kind of heroine. Coretta Scott King was at her husband's side literally or spiritually during the whole of his adult life. She was with him through the marches. She spoke for him when jail house bars separated him from the public. She shared responsibility for the care and upbringing of the King children while Dr. King was alive. But like Eleanor Roosevelt, the greatness of Coretta Scott King became sharply apparent only after the death of her husband.

In many ways Coretta King is the prototypical woman of our time. She is the model of strength, vision, intelligence, and courage that defines for this generation of adults the most positive of responses to a world fraught with adversity, challenge, and possibility. She has lived her adult life in full view of the unblinking eye of the news camera. Under that constant pressure she has mourned the loss of her husband and gone on to raise, alone, four children who are easily the envy of parents everywhere. At the same time, she has kept before the eyes of all our citizens a vision of what America must become if it is to fulfill its promise of egalitarianism. Through the Center for Nonviolent Social Change, through her contributions to current political thinking, and through the astute commentary on world and national events which she provides through the Cable News Network, Coretta Scott King actively gives direction to our perception of the world.

At a time when the tide of thinking is exclusively toward preservation of self-interest Coretta King reminds us that private interest will ultimately perish if the common good is neglected. Through her own dedication to humanity, Coretta King has helped to preserve and to enrich the humanity of each of us. I can think of no more fitting way to celebrate Black History Month than to honor this woman whose vision partakes of black history yet is not a vision of the past but of the future. Through her insight she helps us to see what we citizens of these United States must become if our country is truly to be the land of liberty, justice, and equality for all its people.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

UAB's MEDICAL CENTER RATED TOPS

HON. BEN ERDREICH

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, the people of Jefferson County have long been aware of the fact that Birmingham's University of Alabama Medical Center is one of the top-ranked hospitals in this country. I am proud to say that a soon-to-be published book entitled "The Best in Medicine: Where to Get the Finest Health Care for You and Your Family" only reaffirms what we in Jefferson County and throughout Alabama have known and been proud of for many years.

The book, written by Dr. Herbert J. Dietrich, Jr., a former medical school faculty member at Harvard University and the University of Pennsylvania, and journalist Virginia Biddle, is based on 2½ years of research, including questionnaires answered by 300 doctors from across the country representing 27 different medical specialties. These doctors were asked to pick 10 hospitals where they would seek health care for themselves or their families, excluding hospitals in the locale where they practice medicine. The authors consulted with hospital administrators, professors of medicine and medical education literature. They also compared the quality of various hospitals' programs for training new doctors.

In writing about UAB's Medical Center, the authors noted:

This medical complex, with its many strong departments in medicine and surgery, has an annual budget of more than \$60 million for research. It is noted for its work in hand surgery, for its treatment of cancer and spinal cord injuries, and for having one of the first arthritis rehabilitation centers in the country.

Medical research, health care, and related services have assumed a leading role in Metropolitan Birmingham's makeup because of the outstanding reputation that UAB's Medical Center has earned. UAB, in fact, is Birmingham's largest employer with over 10,000 employees, and is a vital part of our local economy.

I would like to extend my congratulations to UAB president S. Richardson Hill, Jr., and the staff and employees of UAB's Medical Center on this outstanding recognition. I am proud to represent the third highest rated hospital in the country, second only to the Mayo Medical Center and Massachusetts General, and pleased that it has received this acclaim as a premier health care facility.

Following is an editorial that appeared in the February 19, 1986, edition of the Birmingham News, congratulating UAB's Medical Center on this latest achievement:

RECOGNITION FOR MEDICAL CENTER

The secret is out.

We have known for some time that we had a world-class medical center developing at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. Now, thanks to a new book called *The Best in Medicine: Where to Get the Finest Health Care for You and Your Family*, all the world knows it, too.

That book, written after two and one-half years of research, ranks the University of Alabama Medical Center third among the nation's top hospitals, behind only the Mayo Medical Center in Rochester, Minn., and Boston's Massachusetts General Hospital.

The ranking was done by doctors themselves. Some 300 doctors from around the country were asked where they would seek health care for themselves or their families.

While the UAB Medical Center was one of the newer centers on the list, it has obtained a good reputation nationwide for the care it provides, according to Dr. Herbert J. Dietrich Jr., one of the authors of the book.

The new study confirms that Birmingham has a top-notch research and care facility. We're proud to see it getting the recognition it deserves.

BARRIERS FACING AMERICAN INDUSTRY IN JAPAN ARE FAR REACHING

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, the President last December rightfully vetoed protectionist legislation passed by Congress to restrict the import of certain foreign goods. Now there is talk of reviving the legislation, H.R. 1562, later this year in an attempt to override the President's veto.

Such a policy is, in my opinion, hypocritical given our current efforts to encourage the Japanese to open their markets to American goods. What we are advocating is the creation of something similar to what we are trying so hard to get Japan to abolish.

The barriers facing American industry in Japan are far reaching. Without a doubt, Americans produce high-quality products, yet these products continually have difficulty entering Japanese markets. Although I find it difficult to understand the rationale for these market barriers, the fact that they exist is obvious.

For instance, the policies followed by the Japanese Government have the effect of reserving nearly 98 percent of the cigarette market for Japanese products. The excise tax in Japan for Japanese cigarettes is levied on the ex-factory price plus a markup for the Government-owned monopoly. At the same time, the excise tax for imported cigarettes is based on the landed price of the product—including insurance and freight—plus the import duty—an obvious case of discrimination.

Our agriculture and high-technology products face similar restrictions. Citrus imports are restricted by limiting the number of Japanese firms that can obtain import licenses for the quotas, and juice quotas are allotted to only four manufacturing groups which determine which Japanese trading companies can be involved in the actual transactions. Similarly, United States companies do not enjoy full access to the Japanese semiconductor market—approximately 10 to 12 percent—while the Japanese dump semiconductor products at will both here and in Europe.

Given the extent of Japanese barriers, I was truly stunned when the new Minister of International Trade in Japan only 6 months ago was quoted as saying that he saw nothing in the United States that anyone in Japan would want to buy. Quite frankly, I happen to believe that the Government of Japan is arbitrarily making that decision for the Japanese people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we in the House should do everything possible to maintain pressure on the Japanese to open their markets to American products. At the same time, however, I believe any attempt to enact protectionist trade legislation to protect our domestic markets will seriously undermine our credibility with our major trading partners, and thus hamper our efforts to break down market barriers in Japan and elsewhere. I urge my colleagues to think twice about the implications of overriding the President's veto of H.R. 1562, particularly on our efforts to end protectionism around the world.

EXTENSION OF GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, the General Revenue-Sharing Program is scheduled to expire at the end of the current fiscal year. Since the administration has not proposed reauthorization of the program, extension of the program by the Congress is uncertain.

I will make no bones about my philosophical opposition to general revenue sharing. When the Congress considered reauthorization in 1980, I said that the concept underlying revenue sharing was flawed—that being that the program separates the local governments from the responsibility of raising the revenue which they are given to spend. And while it is easy to refer negatively to the program as "deficit sharing," the truth is that the Federal Government has shown a deficit on its books in each year that general revenue sharing has been in effect.

I have served as a city councilman, a mayor, and a State legislator, and experienced the problems inherent in seeking approval of the taxpayers for the operation of local government, as well as the uncertainty of the nature and extent of assistance that might be available from the Federal Government. Therefore, I am sympathetic to the calls from representatives of local governments for extension of the General Revenue-Sharing Program for two reasons:

First, I do not think it is wise to force local governments to go "cold turkey" at the end of this fiscal year, when other budgetary shifts may present a variety of problems to be met and solved by local governments.

Second, since the General Revenue-Sharing Program allows local governments almost complete flexibility in the use of funds, there should be such resources available to bridge the gaps that may result from the Congress bringing the budget deficit under control.

I am introducing today a bill to extend the General Revenue-Sharing Program for 4 years

during which time the program would be phased out by equal steps.

In the coming fiscal year, 1987, my bill would authorize the current level of funding, \$4,185,000,000.

In the following fiscal year, 1988, local governments eligible for general revenue sharing would receive 75 percent of the current authorized level; the total amount authorized in that fiscal year would be \$3,138,750,000.

In the following fiscal year 1989, local governments eligible for general revenue sharing would receive 50 percent of the current authorized level; the total amount authorized for that fiscal year would be \$2,092,500,000.

And, in fiscal 1990, local governments eligible for general revenue sharing would receive 25 percent of the current authorized level; the total amount authorized would be \$1,046,250,000. The last payments would be sent in October 1990.

My bill makes no other changes in the currently authorized program. Specifically: There are no changes in the eligibility criteria; and the program would remain an entitlement, rather than subject to annual appropriations.

I know that some representatives of local governments would like to reauthorize the program at the current level for as many years as the Congress could be persuaded to reauthorize it, assuming, of course, that the President would sign such a bill into law. And then they will go through the process all over again at the end of the authorization period.

I think that the time is past due to plan for the end of general revenue sharing. My bill offers a reasonable means of continuing the program in a way that will allow local governments a period of transition until the program finally expires.

The Government Operations Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources yesterday ordered a bill reported to the full Committee on Government Operations which would extend the General Revenue-Sharing Program for 3 years at a level of \$4.6 billion annually, but subject to annual appropriations. Wearing my local government hat, I believe that provision, if enacted, would make continuation of the program even more uncertain than it is right now with the prospect of no reauthorization at all. My proposal provides certainty in two ways: That payments will continue in certain but declining amounts for the next 4 years and that the program will expire at the end of that 4-year period.

I hope that my colleagues will agree with me that this is a practical and fair way of dealing with the question of reauthorization of general revenue sharing and urge them to co-sponsor my bill.

A SALUTE TO NEW MEXICO'S DEAN OF NEWS REPORTING ON STATE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to share with my col-

leagues the outstanding contributions of one of New Mexico's finest journalists. This Sunday, March 2, at a banquet in Albuquerque the New Mexico Chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists—Sigma Delta Chi, will present the 1985 Dan Burrows Award for outstanding and continuing contributions to journalism in New Mexico to longtime Associated Press Santa Fe Correspondent Bill Feather.

Feather was nominated for the award as an example to all of the media of what a fair, honest, accurate reporter should be.

The Burrows Award was established by the New Mexico Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi in 1971 and is presented annually in honor of the late Dan Burrows, editor of the Albuquerque Tribune from 1944 to 1966.

A native of Artesia, NM, Feather began his journalist career as a reporter for the Las Cruces Citizen in 1948, while attending what is now New Mexico State University.

Since that time, Feather has covered more than 25 legislative sessions, more than a dozen elections and countless other State events.

After brief stints on some Texas newspapers, Feather joined AP in Albuquerque on July 15, 1956. He spent a year in Santa Fe in 1958, returned to Albuquerque, and was then named as AP's Santa Fe correspondent in 1961. He left AP in 1966 to become the editor of The New Mexican in Santa Fe, but returned back to AP in 1968.

Mr. Speaker, Feather's nomination points to his outstanding contributions to journalism in New Mexico. His nomination states: "His thorough understanding of State finance, elections and the judicial system made him a walking almanac for capitol reporters, AP staffers, student reporters covering the legislature, politicians and even longtime State employees." I hope my colleagues will join with me in saluting New Mexico's dean of news reporting on State government and politics, Bill Feather.

THE MATTER OF CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we are expected to consider a contempt resolution tomorrow against two lawyers who recently appeared before the House Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, I wish to enter into the RECORD a letter which I sent to the distinguished chairman of that subcommittee. During the subcommittee and full committee consideration of the matter of contempt, I voted against the contempt citation.

I have grave concern that in our desire to learn as much as possible about the property holdings of Mr. Marcos in the United States, we are bringing into question a privilege that is of extreme importance to the concept of legal representation in the United States. The two lawyers declined to answer some questions posed by subcommittee members because they believed their answers would violate the confidentiality that exists between a lawyer and a client. I am as anxious as any

member of the subcommittee to know what we need to know about former President Marcos. But I do not want to sacrifice a time-honored facet of legal representation in the United States in the process. I ask that my letter to Mr. SOLARZ be entered into the RECORD in order to inform my colleagues about the basis for my views in this matter.

FEBRUARY 19, 1986.

HON. STEPHEN SOLARZ,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, Longworth Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are writing to recommend that the Foreign Affairs Committee postpone until after February 27, 1986 introduction on the House floor of Report No. 99-462, and the resolutions of contempt set forth therein against Joseph Bernstein and Ralph Bernstein.

These resolutions of contempt resulted from the determination by these two gentlemen that they could not answer certain questions put to them under subpoena at hearings held by the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs on December 11 and 12, 1986. The basis for these determinations was that answering the questions might require disclosure of confidential attorney-client communications. Joseph Bernstein is a member of the law firm of Bernstein Carter and Deyo. Ralph Bernstein is a former employee of the law firm.

Bernstein Carter and Deyo has submitted to the Ethics Committee of the Bar Association of the City of New York a written request for advice on the ethical obligations of the two Bernsteins under the difficult circumstances in which they find themselves. The Bernsteins have committed themselves to abide by the advice that the Bar Committee renders. Hence, if the Bar accepts the request and advises that they may answer some or all of the Subcommittee's questions, there may be no reason to proceed with floor action on these resolutions of contempt.

We understand that the Bar Association Committee will meet on February 27 to determine what action to take with respect to the Bernstein Carter and Deyo request for a ruling. Nothing will be lost, as far as the Subcommittee or the Committee is concerned, if we await the outcome of this February 27 meeting. Fortunately, the Subcommittee's investigation has proven a major success. It is our understanding that we have obtained all the information we need to demonstrate that the Marcoses own the properties examined by the Subcommittee.

We are not suggesting a postponement of floor action because we believe that the House should necessarily consider its judgment as subordinate in any sense to that of the Bar Association on the merits of the questions of privilege raised by this case. Rather, it is clear that the Bar Association's advice, if it determines to offer advice, could put the matter in a completely different light from the standpoint of Joseph and Ralph Bernstein. In that event, a serious confrontation can be avoided between Congress's investigative power and the scope of protection for confidential communications between clients and attorneys (and, for that matter, between priests and penitents, doctors and patients, and others covered by common law privileges).

We should bear in mind that the posture taken by the Bernsteins at present is that they will answer all questions put to them by the Subcommittee—to the extent that the Bar Association determines that it is eth-

ical for them to do so. This is not the type of willful or unprincipled refusal to cooperate that normally underlies citation for contempt of Congress.

To turn this matter into a criminal prosecution at this point could create the perception that Congress is acting in a manner which denies these witnesses a chance they have sought to come forward and meet the Subcommittee's asserted information needs, in a manner consistent with their professional obligations.

Furthermore, a postponement of floor consideration of these resolutions will help to assure that the substantial civil liberties questions raised by this matter will not be overwhelmed by the strong feelings many of us understandably feel about the current political situation in the Philippines, following the contested Presidential election. Incursions on the privacy of attorney-client communications in this case will affect the security of all such relationships in our country, from this date forward. We should take steps that could lead to such a result only under calmer circumstances.

Sincerely,

MERVYN M. DYMALLY,
ROBERT TORRICELLI,
Members of Congress.

A TRIBUTE TO SANDY GREENBERG

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, this evening Sandy Greenberg, a dear friend, great humanitarian, and former resident of our Buffalo, NY community, was honored by Brandeis University as a distinguished fellow.

Our colleagues HOWARD METZENBAUM, JOHN HEINZ, STEVE SOLARZ, and I were speakers as Justice William J. Brennan delivered the main address. President Handler of Brandeis made the presentation and described the great work of Brandeis University and the good works of Sandy Greenberg.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the program of the evening that inspired more than 300 of Sandy's friends from all walks of life who were there to honor Sandy, his wife Sue, and their dear family.

UNITED STATES CONGRESS
WASHINGTON, DC

Seventy years ago the Senate confirmed Louis D. Brandeis as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. The debate over Justice Brandeis' confirmation had been stormy and long, reflecting the intense controversy surrounding the nomination. At the center of the controversy was Brandeis' lifelong commitment to individual freedom and each individual's right to a fair opportunity at American bounty. After World War II, when Jewish leaders sought to create a university to champion the intellectual spirit even a Holocaust could not extinguish, they turned for inspiration to the life and philosophy of this great American.

As members of the Congress and friends of the University that proudly bears Justice Brandeis' name, we are honored to announce the selection of Sanford D. Greenberg as a Fellow of Brandeis University. On behalf of the University, we welcome you to

Sandy's formal hooding by Brandeis President Evelyn Handler.

Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., of the United States Supreme Court, has kindly agreed to share with us his views on Justice Brandeis' legacy to the country.

We have known Sandy Greenberg for many years. Our families have shared many a long dinner together. We have come to recognize his unique blend of talents, the breadth of his interests and experience, the strength of his character and his courage. Whether as scholar, inventor, businessman or public servant, he has comported himself with the same commitment and dedication that distinguished Justice Brandeis' career. Sandy's life, like Brandeis', is a testament to the ability of brave and resourceful Americans to overcome both physical and financial obstacles to achieve success.

We are delighted, too, that Sandy's college roommate and long time friend, Art Garfunkel, of Simon and Garfunkel, will also join us in honoring Sandy by singing at the ceremony. He will be accompanied by composer Jimmy Webb.

We are pleased to share this important evening with you.

HOWARD M. METZENBAUM,
JOHN HEINZ,
JACK KEMP,
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ.

DIRKSEN SENATE, OFFICE BUILDING
UNITED STATES SENATE, WASHINGTON, DC
Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Induction of Sanford D. Greenberg as a fellow of Brandeis University

Processional.

"America the Beautiful": Art Garfunkel, Jimmy Webb.

Welcome: Senator Howard Metzenbaum, Representative Stephen J. Solarz.

Address: "The Legacy of Justice Louis Brandeis", Justice William J. Brennan, Jr.

"Bridge Over Troubled Water": Art Garfunkel, Jimmy Webb.

Introduction of Sanford D. Greenberg: Senator John Heinz, Representative Jack Kemp.

Induction ceremony: President Evelyn Handler, Rena Blumberg, Chair of Fellows. Acceptance: Sanford D. Greenberg.

"Old Friends": Art Garfunkel, Jimmy Webb.

Recessional.

Reception—Russell Senate Caucus Room.

A STEP TOWARD A COMPREHENSIVE STEEL INDUSTRY POLICY

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1986

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill designed to put into place a mechanism in the Federal Government for developing and implementing a comprehensive, coordinated steel industry policy.

The American steel industry has been battered about by several currents in recent years: a surge of imports lured into our ports by the high dollar; the drag of the recession and low demand; outdated and inefficient plants and equipment.

Production in 1984 had plummeted to 95 million tons, down from 150 million tons in

1973. Steel jobs have been more than halved, dropping from 609,000 in 1974 to 273,000 in 1984. In 1982-83, the basic steel industry experienced the worst steel recession in the postwar period. Imports have escalated from 10 percent in 1965 to 13 percent in 1975. In 1985 they reached a peak of 30 percent, averaging 25 percent for the whole year.

In my view, we will not be able to revive the steel industry without a comprehensive, long-term approach that considers all the ways in which Government affects the industry. Each Federal department and each congressional committee tends to approach the industry from its own particular perspective whether that be taxes, trade, technology, environment, labor, economics, or antitrust. There must be a mechanism in our Government for pulling all those considerations together.

There used to be one. In 1978, President Carter established the Steel Tripartite Committee which conducted a comprehensive review of the industry. When President Reagan came to office, the committee died and only after 3 years of prodding, President Reagan reestablished it. But it vanished once again in the fall of 1984, after issuing a report. Reports can be useful, but not without coordinated effort to implement them. An assessment of the industry is only the beginning of the formulation of policy. The tough part is implementing the policy. The bill I am introducing today would create an entity that can assess, report, develop, and implement a comprehensive policy.

STEEL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Under the bill, the President is directed to establish a Steel Advisory Council to provide recommendations to the President on the modernization problems of the industry, the effects these problems have on communities dependent on steel and on other international and domestic issues related to the industry. The Federal Government's members would be the Secretaries of Commerce, Energy, Labor, and Treasury, the Attorney General, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Trade Representative. In addition, the President would appoint seven industry representatives—mid- and upper-level managers—seven labor representatives, three individuals from steel communities, and three individuals with expertise in economics or technology affecting the industry.

EMPHASIS ON MODERNIZATION

The bill would give the committee a special emphasis on modernization of the industry. It is widely held that the American steel industry must modernize to survive. To modernize, the industry must have the capital to implement new technologies. Richard Pitler, vice president of Allegheny-Ludlum Steel stated it this way:

To maintain an efficient steel industry in the United States, we must recognize the changes in technology that have been occurring and will occur in the industry, driven by forces over which the industry itself has little or no control. It should be recognized that the development of these technologies may be a necessary, but very insufficient condition for the survival of the industry. It will do no good to have the technologies developed if the industry does not have the capital to install them . . . all the technological development in the world will not improve the competitiveness of the U.S.

steel industry nor keep it competitive unless capital is available to install new technologies.

Similarly, OTA in its 1980 report concluded:

The U.S. steel industry can be revitalized through increased investment in research and development and the adoption of new technology. For that to happen, however, steelmakers must increase their capital spending.

With good coordination at the top levels of Government we can bring together our best minds and develop technological processes that make our industry the best in the world. We already have in place a \$12 million combined Department of Energy and Bureau of Standards "leapfrog" steel R&D initiative to begin that process.

Foreign nations are outpacing us by using newer technology more broadly. Many of those foreign competitors, have done so with the help of Government subsidies. In this country, continuous casting—which has seen increased use since 1977—still is used in only 20 percent of our production compared with 70 percent in Japan. Our ability to survive in a world market will depend on our ability to develop superior technology.

The U.S. steel industry has been unnecessarily hurt by a long series of disjointed, contradictory, sporadic, Band-Aid policies. Failure to modernize can be traced substantially to Government pressure on prices and the lack of a firm import policy. We can do better, and hopefully, this bill is one step in the right direction.

PUBLIC HEARING ON TOXIC CHEMICALS AND WATER QUALITY IN THE ST. CLAIR RIVER

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as a result of chemical spills into the St. Clair River in the 12th District of Michigan, I held a public hearing on December 16, 1985. It was my intention to assess the water quality of the St. Clair River which provides drinking water for many of my constituents. My inquiries led to the conclusion that by and large the river is safe. However, these events teach us to care for our natural resources and be vigilant that all members of the community, both businesses and private citizens, respect the vulnerability of natural water system.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the results of my investigation by inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report I recently released on these events.

PUBLIC HEARING ON TOXIC CHEMICALS AND WATER QUALITY IN THE ST. CLAIR RIVER

Toxic contamination is a crisis that must be faced, and our nation has begun to respond. We have passed Superfund legislation to clean-up the landfills that are the result of past errors, and we have passed legislation to control, from cradle to grave, the handling of hazardous waste, hoping to prevent a repetition of those same past mistakes.

But there is more to be done, much more.

In 1984, the Congress strengthened the legislation controlling the handling of hazardous waste. Just last year, the House passed new legislation to expand the Superfund program almost tenfold, increasing it to respond to our expanding realization of the broad problem posed by toxic waste.

But legislation is only a beginning. The problem of toxic chemicals recognizes no international boundaries and will not be solved by words on a statute book alone. It requires our communities to come together in a forceful partnership of state and local government, the private and the public sectors, and the international community.

BACKGROUND EVENTS

The Dow Chemical Company has a plant at Sarnia, Ontario which is one of the several chemical plants across the St. Clair River from Port Huron, Michigan. In mid-August, a faulty valve at the Dow plant burst and released 3100 U.S. gallons of perchloroethylene into the St. Clair River. The mid-August spill was only one of many toxic accidents. There were eleven (11) or more spills at the Dow plant during 1985.

Perchloroethylene is a clear, organic chemical compound used mainly as a dry-cleaning fluid. It is heavier than water, sinks to the bottom of the river, and does not dissolve quickly, allowing the substance to be removed from the water. In November, a black tarry substance was discovered on the bottom of the river in the area of the perchloroethylene spill.

Disturbingly, the tarry substance was discovered by scientists nearly one year earlier and reported to the Canadian government, but the Canadian government failed to notify the United States. That was only one of many cases of failed notification. The United States was only notified of the mid-August spill some two weeks after the accident, and similar notification failures occurred in the other 10 known earlier accidents at the Dow facility.

The scientists who discovered the tarry substance submitted samples of the substance for analysis at a Toronto laboratory under contract to the Canadian government. When results of the analysis were delayed, the scientists had an independent analysis done which revealed the presence of dioxin, as well as close to 40 other chemicals, in the tarry substance.

The mid-August spill was not the last accident. There were additional spills, and communication problems between the Canadian government and the United States government continued. The Canadian government failed to report to the United States government a December 20, 1985 spill of 15,000 U.S. gallons of waste water containing two poisonous compounds, isobutylene dimer and tertiary butyl alcohol at the Polysar Ltd. plant in Sarnia.

DISTURBING QUESTIONS

These events raised two significant questions with respect to remedial actions to address past spills and the tarry substance:

What are the continuing health risks posed by the spills and the tarry substance?

What is the status of the efforts to clean-up the spills and the tarry substance?

In addition, the continuing pattern of toxic accidents raised questions for the future:

What corrective steps are being taken to reduce future spills and other leaks into the Great Lakes water system?

What steps are being taken to ensure better communication in the future between

the United States and Canadian governments?

THE HEARING

On December 16, 1985, a hearing was held in Port Huron by Congressman David E. Bonior and Thomas Martin of Governor Blanchard's Office of the Great Lakes. Testimony was heard from officials of the national government of the United States and Canada, as well as state, local and provincial governments, and affected citizens.

RISK POSED BY THE PERCHLOROETHYLENE SPILL

Doug McTavish, the Southwestern Regional Director of the Ministry of Environment of the Province of Ontario, testified that the Ministry ran a computer model which, based on available information, calculated that the levels of perchloroethylene would not exceed 10 parts per billion at Canadian water treatment plants down stream and that the compound would not move onto the American side of the river. An actual test at the Canadian Walpole Island showed levels of 7 parts per billion. A test at the Canadian Stag Island found no detectable levels.

After they were notified of the spill, the Michigan Department of Public Health monitored water intakes to test perchloroethylene levels. Michael Kovach and Elgar Brown of the Department testified that levels no greater than 1.0 part per billion were reported at any of the intakes.

The World Health Organization life-time daily exposure standard for perchloroethylene is 10 parts per billion, with an upward exposure limit of 2300 parts per billion for a 24 hour period, and 175 parts per billion for a ten day period.

THE INITIAL CLEANUP

Remedial action was required to clean-up the mid-August spill and the tarry material. The Ministry of the Environment of the Province of Ontario approved a plan which required:

*Vacuuming up the perchloroethylene and the tarry substance.

*Vacuuming up approximately six inches of the sediment in the entire 150 feet by 150 feet spill area in order to remove the sediment down to the hard clay bottom of the river.

The material vacuumed up was initially stored in an environmentally secure settling pond on the Dow plant site. Separation processes were undertaken to remove contaminants from the sediment.

Contaminants are to be destroyed by a high temperature incinerator on the Dow property which is approved by the Ministry of the Environment. The remaining sediment will be treated and sent to a nearby landfill.

The initial clean-up was completed on December 23, 1985.

THE TARRY SUBSTANCE

At the time of the hearing, an initial theory for the presence of the tarry substance was that the perchloroethylene spill had loosened contaminated sediment of the river bottom and the contamination coagulated to produce the black tarry masses.

There were several problems with this theory, however:

The theory did not explain the existence of the tarry material a full year before the perchloroethylene spill.

The theory did not explain why the tarry substance reappeared during inspections in January, 1986, after the Ministry of the Environment and Dow concluded the clean-up on December 23, 1985.

In addition, the chemical composition of the tarry substance changed over time. A January 28, 1986 report by the Canadian government stated that the tarry substance was 97 percent perchloroethylene in September, while the puddles in December were 65 percent perchloroethylene and 35 percent carbon tetrachloride.

In mid-January, Dow began on-site excavations at the perimeter of the sewer complex nearest to the August spill site, approximately 12 yards from the discharge point at the river. On January 22, 1986, Dow found a small seepage of the dark tarry material in the gravel bed underneath the approximately 35 inch sewer pipe leading to the river from the Dow plant. Two days later, divers discovered more tarry material in a drain pipe which runs along the sewer pipe.

The tarry substance discovered in January was cleaned up, however, there is a continuing seepage estimated at around one half gallon per day. While the exact source of this seepage has not yet been determined, the Canadian government suspects that the ultimate source of the toxic material is either waste stored on-site or an undetected leaky connection somewhere on the plant property.

CORRECTIVE ACTION

The presence of the toxic chemicals required more than a clean-up of the immediate spills. The extended pattern of spills required corrective action to reduce future accidents. Corrective action was also required to eliminate the continued seepage that appeared to be connected with the presence of the tarry substance.

In consultation with Canadian authorities, Dow took the following measures to curb the release of contaminants into the St. Clair River:

The area around the truck loading station where the faulty valve burst was isolated so that any future spills will be prevented from reaching the river.

Dow has accelerated their sewer separation program begun in 1977. This will separate the larger volume of clean cooling water from the contaminated process effluent and contaminated run-off.

Dow has also accelerated the completion of a program to install continuous analyzers to monitor the quality of water being discharged into the river.

Trenches parallel to the river are being extended in an effort to prevent the flow of toxic substances through the subsoil toward the St. Clair River.

LONG-TERM HEALTH CONSEQUENCES

The Ministry of the Environment of the Province of Ontario reported on January 28, 1986 that trace levels of dioxin were found in treated water samples taken from Ontario communities. The dioxins found were similar to those present in the tarry substance where some forth other chemicals were also found.

Peter Wise, Director of the Great Lakes National Program Office of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, testified that federal funds had been made available for the Michigan Department of Public Health to test water in Marysville and Algonac for dioxin. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency did not find detectable levels of dioxin in the water tested.

None of the tests found the most toxic form of the compound, TCDD, the contaminant present in Agency Orange. U.S. and Canadian officials reported that the levels of those dioxins found are well below what

is considered the maximum acceptable in drinking water, 150,000 parts per quadrillion. The Canadian tests from four Ontario communities ranged from seven to 22 parts per quadrillion.

Nevertheless, the chemicals identified present significant health risks and a serious threat to the Great Lakes ecology. Individuals testifying reported concerns about water quality. Mike Braidwood, Chairman of the Lake St. Clair Advisory Committee, for example, cited instances of salmon taken from the river which had a strong kerosene taste.

In addition, studies of leachate from Dow's Scott Road Landfill site in Sarnia discovered 2, 4, 5 trichlorophenol. Since the most dangerous form of dioxin (TCDD) occurs as a by-product in the manufacturer of 2, 4, 5 trichlorophenol, it is possible that TCDD may be present at the dump. Environmental safeguards isolate the dump, preventing run-off into the river.

The health risks posed by the chemicals that have appeared require longer term studies conducted independent of a specific spill. The need for these studies is reinforced by the pattern of spills as well as the past failure to identify the source of the tarry substance. Such studies can indicate the presence of a significant threat to water quality.

During the hearings, an official from the Michigan Department of Natural Resources announced that the Department would resume the testing of fish in the St. Clair River. The tests had been discontinued because of budget pressures. Also, the U.S.-Canadian Great Lakes Connecting Channel Study is an extensive multi-year effort designed to analyze water quality and identify sources of contamination in the Great Lakes region.

NOTIFICATION PROCEDURES

A 1978 treaty requires the Canadian and American governments to notify each other in the event of cross border spills. The respective Coast Guards are designated as the lead agencies responsible for providing and receiving official notification.

Despite this treaty obligation, American officials were notified eleven months after the tarry substance was identified and, in fact, learned about the substance from Canadian news reports. American officials were officially informed about the mid-August 1985 spill two weeks after it occurred. In 1985, Dow reported 10 other spills of varying quantities and toxicities into the St. Clair River. The U.S. Coast Guard Station at Detroit has no record of notification from the Canadians in these 10 cases.

Any failure to notify the U.S. in a timely manner of toxic spills creates two significant problems. First, it precludes appropriate U.S. emergency responses. Second, it leaves local communities wondering whether they are fully informed of the breadth and frequency of the problem.

To help address this problem, Governor Blanchard negotiated with the Province of Ontario a new notification agreement which was signed on December 6, 1985. Nevertheless, the Canadian government failed to provide notification of a new spill that occurred on December 20, 1985.

On January 17, 1986, Congressman Bonior wrote D.I. McMinn, the Regional Director General of the Canadian Coast Guard, alerting him to the Canadian failure to provide notice of the December 20th spill. In response to that letter, the Regional Director General wrote Congressman Bonior out-

lining three new steps to help ensure timely notification.

In some cases, notification apparently was not given because of the belief that the spill was not significant or would not cross the border into the United States:

The Canadian Coast Guard will notify the United States of spills even when the sequences of the spill are unclear or when it is unclear whether or not the spills will cross the border into the United States.

In at least one case, notification was not provided because the Canadian Coast Guard itself was not informed of the spill by other Canadian authorities:

A meeting will be held in February between Federal and Provincial officials and the Canadian Coast Guard to clarify the notification process, to identify any problems in the process, and to outline corrective action to be taken.

A test of the notification process will be made part of the exercises to be held between the U.S. and Canada in April 1986 in Sault Ste. Marie.

CONCLUSION

The threat to our health and the Great Lakes ecology posed by toxic chemicals requires us to come together as one community, committed to helping each other. The Canadian and U.S. governments have a key role to play in meeting this crisis. But governments cannot do everything. The answer will also have an important dimension of private responsibility that must be met by the corporations involved.

Government can mandate and help fund the studies that will seek to determine the extent of any health risk. Government can mandate and monitor the clean-up and other corrective measures to ensure that Canada and the United States work with each other so that the two countries act together to meet a common danger.

However, corporate discipline is the critical ingredient needed to stem the frequent pattern of releases, and the slow seeping of toxics into our water resources. The manufacturing companies must continue to seek out the cause of any problem and move aggressively to implement measures to respond to immediate problems and reduce future risks.

Public attention is focused on the responsible use of the environment. Canadian and American parties must forcefully respond to this attention and tackle this problem together. This problem is bigger than any one of the involved parties. But it is not bigger than all of us combined, acting together.

The Port Huron hearing was an unprecedented meeting of representatives from the private and public sectors, from Canada and the United States, and from the national, state, provincial, and local governments of each country. The challenge for the future is to maintain that level of joint effort in the face of a shared responsibility.

TEEN PREGNANCY A NATIONAL PROBLEM

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, recently, an article appeared in the Bozeman Chronicle

newspaper in Bozeman, MT, which I would like to share with my colleagues. Teen pregnancy is becoming a national problem. The information contained within this article demonstrates that the Adolescent Family Life Program does address the issue of teenage pregnancy at the family and local community level. The author of the guest editorial is Joye Kohl, director of the Parents and Adolescents Can Talk [PACT] project at Montana State University:

[From the Bozeman Daily Chronicle, Feb. 10, 1986]

TEEN PREGNANCY: ANSWERS AT HOME

(By Joye Kohl)

During the past few months The Chronicle, along with many other newspapers, has spotlighted the problems related to adolescent sexual activity. Much of the attention, however, has focused on national statistics and has linked teen-age pregnancy to minority and low-income groups.

Although many Montanans may not realize the extent of the problem of adolescent sexual activity in Montana, as a state we, too, are very much impacted by premature sexual behavior. One in every 20 15-17-year-old Montana girls becomes pregnant each year; still others become pregnant at ages younger than 15. And, like other sexually active population groups, teens risk infection from sexually transmitted diseases. The Alan Guttmacher Institute predicts, based on current trends, that two of every five 14-year-old girls today will become pregnant before they turn 20. The costs to all of us as citizens can be felt in economic, education and social terms. And, regardless whether a pregnancy or sexually transmitted disease occurs, involvement in intimate relationships gets in the way of many other growing up tasks of adolescents.

Adolescent sexual activity is a phenomenon of which we all need to be aware. No longer do the extended families bear the consequences alone; today we bear them as a society as we struggle with the resulting cycles of poverty, health problems and educational issues.

Although premature sexual activity has been around for a long time, kids today are impacted by mixed messages as they view videos and television, listen to the lyrics of rock music, and tune into ads that first and foremost sell sex. Young people must make decisions for which they are unprepared and do not and cannot understand the long range consequences of the choices before them.

Current research tells us that the media have become the most powerful influence reaching youth, but mass media impact attitudes not knowledge.

A congressional mandate in 1981, under Title XX legislation, created the potential to impact the growing epidemic of adolescent pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases. The program authorized by the legislation has two thrusts: 1. to prevent adolescent pregnancies by encouraging postponement of premature sexual activity before teens become sexually active and, 2. to prevent the various negative consequences associated with adolescent parenting. Involvement of the family is the central theme of the adolescent family life authorized in the legislation.

Public policy traditionally has reflected greater support for "after-the-fact" treatments or crisis intervention than for prevention. Attention certainly needs to be given to the delivery of support services to those vulnerable adolescents who are either pregnant or already parents, but the only real hope for getting a grip on the adolescent pregnancy problems is through a concerted community and family approach to prevention. Although both the general public and professionals agree that the home should be the focus of human sexuality education, it is obvious from the data the task requires more attention. Schools, churches and other community groups need to work hand-in-hand with parents in planning for, implementing and evaluating greater responsibility over their sexual behavior.

Research indicates a need for education programs aimed at young people prior to their becoming sexually active. Since the birth and abortion records demonstrate that sexual activity begins as early as 12 and 13, education should begin no later than the fifth or sixth grade. Due to the wide range of consequences and the interrelatedness of sexual behavior to other life dimensions, educational strategies need to be approached from a comprehensive family life systems perspective.

One such approach is the Parents and Adolescents Can Talk (PACT) project currently in place in Gallatin County. The program is one of 33 primary prevention projects currently funded through the Adolescent Family Life Programs. The family-oriented program design was conceived by a group of parents, clergy, health care, agency and education personnel and it continues to draw community input into its design and implementation through an advisory committee and liaison committees being formed in each community throughout Gallatin County.

The heart of the PACT project is a new education curricula for fifth through eighth grade pre-adolescents/adolescents and one or both of their parents. The training program, designed in two separate curricula—one for the fifth and sixth grade pre-adolescents and their parents, and one for the seventh and eighth grade adolescents and their parents—is divided into a series of lessons or modules focusing on self-esteem, parent-adolescent communication, assertiveness, decision making and knowledge, values and attitudes toward sexuality.

The primary emphasis of the project is to help parents reclaim their responsibility as the primary sex educators of their children and to facilitate improved family communication, enhanced self-esteem and the development of assertiveness skills among adolescents in order for them to resist peer and media pressures to become sexually active; thus, to encourage postponement of premature sexual activity.

Parents and other community members are invited to investigate the PACT project at a Bozeman Junior High School Parent Advisory Committee-sponsored public meeting tonight at 7:15 in the junior high cafeteria.

The time is critical for action to tackle the adolescent sexual activity problem at the grass roots level. Your commitment and support is needed.

WEST VIRGINIA'S SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS H.R. 495, THE FIREARMS OWNERS' PROTECTION ACT OF 1985

HON. ALAN B. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter I recently received from the West Virginia Sheriffs' Association in which they express their strong support for H.R. 495, the Firearms Owners' Protection Act of 1985.

I believe this letter, in support of H.R. 495, shows that the law enforcement community can benefit from this important piece of legislation, as well as the law-abiding citizen and sportsman.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that the House of Representatives be given the opportunity to consider this measure. I hope my colleagues will take a minute and review the comments of the West Virginia Sheriffs' Association.

FEBRUARY 11, 1986.

Congressman ALAN B. MOLLOHAN,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOLLOHAN: The West Virginia Sheriffs' Association held our annual meeting in Charleston, West Virginia, January 19th-21st, 1986. After committee researched the Volkmer Bill 495 and Senate Bill 49, the Association voted to endorse the bill for passage.

The West Virginia Sheriffs' Association would respectfully like to ask that you sign the discharge petition and secondly, we respectfully ask for your support and vote for this bill. The West Virginia Sheriffs' Association feel that passage of this bill would benefit law abiding citizens, sportsmen, and the law enforcement officers as well.

If the West Virginia Sheriffs' Association can be of any assistance to you in reference to the above, please feel free to contact us. Thank you.

Respectfully,

JAY BARNETTE,
Secretary,
West Virginia Sheriffs' Association.

NO RUSH TO JUDGMENT ON CONRAIL

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the major items of legislative business before the House this year is the proposed sale of Conrail—either to Norfolk Southern or to some other bidder. The Senate voted earlier this year to approve Norfolk Southern's \$1.2 billion offer and the House Energy and Commerce Committee will soon begin the process of determining whether the House should concur in the Senate's judgment, support one of the alternative offers or press for revisions of one or more of these proposals.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I have not yet decided which, if

any, of these proposals I will support. In my view, there are two key questions that must be answered to the satisfaction of the committee and the House before this matter moves forward. First, we must make sure that the present owners of Conrail—the American taxpayers—receive a fair price for selling a very valuable asset. Second, we must insist that any disposition of Conrail involving another railroad does not create an anticompetitive situation that hurts rail shippers and increases costs to consumers.

Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Commerce Committee will fully protect the interests of taxpayers, consumers and rail shippers in considering the future of Conrail and will not be inclined to move forward on this matter in any great haste. A recent editorial in the Journal of Commerce and a recent article in U.S. News & World Report both make this point rather well, and I request permission that these two items be printed in the RECORD at this time:

[From The Journal of Commerce, Feb. 10, 1986]

ON TO THE HOUSE

Senate approval of the Reagan administration's proposed sale of Conrail to Norfolk Southern Corp. is a victory for NS and for Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Hanford Dole. Whether or not it is a defeat for shippers and taxpayers depends on how the House handles the legislation.

The issues involved in the sale are clear cut: Is the price tag of \$1.2 billion that Mrs. Dole attached to Conrail high enough? And would a merger of Norfolk Southern and Conrail be anti-competitive? The answers to these two questions remain no and yes and as long as they do, the Conrail bill has little chance of making its way through the House in its present form.

Norfolk Southern's bid is lower than either the \$1.4 billion offer by Morgan Stanley or the \$1.6 billion offer from Allen & Co. Conrail's assets exceed \$6.5 billion. Its cash balance at the end of 1985 was \$910 million. Not only that, the railroad is making money—big money. Over the past three years Conrail has reported earnings of \$1.25 billion (including \$440 million in 1985). Proponents of the NS bid argue that Conrail had significant labor concessions during much of that time, which is true. Conrail, however, gave those up on July 1, 1984. The Philadelphia-based carrier also projects earnings of over \$420 million for 1986.

Yet in the face of this mountain of evidence to the contrary, Norfolk Southern and Mrs. Dole insist that Conrail will be bankrupt by the end of 1988. Mrs. Dole calls the sale of Conrail for \$1.2 billion "a victory for the taxpayer." Others call it the "steal of the century."

Under the terms of its covenants with the Department of Transportation, Norfolk Southern would gain a tax write-off of about \$150 million over five years and would receive tax credits of anywhere between \$174 million (Treasury Department estimate) and \$600 million (Morgan Stanley estimate). Some victory for the taxpayer.

The competitive aspects of the deal look even shakier. The Justice Department told Norfolk Southern it must divest itself of trackage before it would approve the deal. Twice NS proposals were rejected by Justice. A third divestiture bid, tentatively approved, would give Guilford Transportation Industries trackage access to Detroit through Toledo and would allow both Guil-

ford and Pittsburgh and Lake Erie Railroad access to Fort Wayne, Ind. These two railroads lost \$75 million between them from 1981 to 1984, and few serious rail industry experts give either a chance of competing against the giant that would be Conrail-Norfolk Southern.

Regretfully, the Senate didn't bother to wait for the full Justice report. Mrs. Dole and Norfolk Southern won't be so lucky in the House. The Commerce, Transportation and Tourism Subcommittee will not vote on the legislation until they see both the Justice report and the United States Railway Association report, and they won't be ready for at least two or three months.

Norfolk Southern Chairman, Robert Clayton has stated emphatically that his company will pay no more than the \$1.2 billion. If that's the case, NS is going to have a very tough time in the House. Already there are rumblings that Morgan Stanley will increase its offer, a move that would put further pressure on Norfolk Southern.

In addition, it seems unlikely that either Subcommittee Chairman James J. Florio or House Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman John Dingell will find the NS divestiture package to their liking. One more thing to keep in mind, Mrs. Dole, her husband, Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole and President Reagan may find their audience less receptive in the Democrat-controlled House than they did in the Senate.

The House might approve the Conrail bill—after all, most everyone wants Conrail out of the government. But if it does, the bill will have a decidedly different look from the slapdash legislation that passed the Senate, which should give rail shippers and taxpayers hope they won't be sold down the river.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 17, 1986]

IS WASHINGTON BEING RAILOADED ON CONRAIL?

Small wonder Norfolk Southern and Morgan Stanley slug it out to purchase government-owned Consolidated Rail. Who wouldn't jump to buy a prosperous company for just four times its earnings? That's the deal the Senate approved for Norfolk Southern on February 4. Now, the matter goes to the House, where skepticism abounds.

NS would pay the government \$1.2 billion, give Conrail employees \$375 million for their 15 percent share and forego Conrail's tax-loss carry-forwards and investment tax credits. For this it would get a railroad—a major competitor—that earned, after taxes, \$361 million in 1985 and \$472 million in 1984. NS also would get access to at least \$800 million from Conrail's treasury, plus \$300 million more in excess pension contributions. Net cost to Norfolk Southern: Less than a year's worth of Conrail profits. The 43-investor consortium put together by Morgan Stanley isn't much more generous; it offers Washington \$1.4 billion.

NS and Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Dole agreed on the price a year ago. In 1985, the market value of the nation's five largest publicly owned railroads rose by \$7.6 billion, or roughly 30 percent. Their stocks sell at an average of 11.5 times 1985 earnings—about three times the value assigned Conrail by NS and Morgan Stanley.

"There will be no stampede in the House, no rush to judgment," says John Dingell (D-Mich.), whose Commerce Committee will control the Conrail bill. Dingell and other

House Democrats will lean on would-be buyers to cough up more money. A third bid, by Allen & Company, is also on the table.

How much is Conrail really worth? Far from going broke, as DOT's Dole fears, the railroad keeps getting fatter; it spent \$572 million in 1985 just for capital improvements. Many analysts peg its value at a minimum \$2 billion. "It's worth twice the Norfolk offer," says Henry Livingston of Kidder Peabody. Washington may settle for less, but bidding is almost certain to reopen.

ANALYST URGES TREATY

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, within the next few weeks, we in Congress will again face a vote on providing aid to the "Contras." But this time, President Reagan is asking for military aid.

Before making up your mind, I recommend that our colleagues view the following article from the Moline Daily Dispatch which describes a recent presentation at Augustana College in Rock Island, IL. In speaking before a group of Augustana students, former CIA analyst and U.S. Marine Corps officer, David MacMichael, warned against military actions that could lead to a prolonged and indecisive war in Central America. Instead, he states that the best solution for the United States would be to support the Contadora Treaty. Speaking from his long experience in the region, MacMichael challenges the Reagan administration's ideological desire for military action. Rather, his realist assessment of the region calls for a more constructive approach.

I hope our colleagues will realize the gravity of the vote which looms before us and take to heart the comments of Mr. MacMichael.

ANALYST URGES TREATY

(By Tom Raithe)

The United States cannot unseat the Nicaraguan government without committing great numbers of U.S. troops to a regional war, a former Central Intelligence Agency analyst told a group of Augustana College students Thursday.

The U.S. would be better served if it signed a treaty with Nicaragua and other Latin American nations which would prevent armament buildup and encourage democracy in the region, he said.

Former CIA analyst David MacMichael, 57, Reston, Va., addressed a group of students in the College Center. He was a member of the CIA's elite National Intelligence Officers from March 1981 to April 1983. His area of expertise was Latin America, and he was responsible for advising the CIA director and other members of the intelligence community on Nicaragua.

A former Marine Corps officer and professor of Latin American history, he currently is a senior associate of the Council of Hemispheric Affairs—a research group that puts out a bi-monthly report on current affairs in the Caribbean and Latin America.

He has testified before the U.S. Congress against the Reagan administration's policies toward Nicaragua.

In an interview before his speech Thursday, MacMichael said the Reagan adminis-

tration's current efforts to unseat the Nicaraguan government, or the Sandinistas, are not based on any sound information, but on ideological fervor.

"When the administration came into office, one of its principal objectives was to overcome what it described as the Vietnam syndrome," MacMichael said. According to the administration, this syndrome is making the U.S. overly reluctant to engage in military activities abroad.

According to MacMichael, the administration has been seeking a foreign conflict to enter and achieve a quick victory in to end the Vietnam syndrome. It has been frustrated in many regions of the world, but not Central America, MacMichael said. These nations are relatively close and accessible to U.S. actions.

To justify U.S. actions in Nicaragua, the administration needs to demonstrate Nicaragua is assisting revolution in El Salvador and elsewhere, MacMichael said. The obstacle the administration faces, he said, is that there is no reliable evidence supporting Nicaraguan involvement in El Salvador in recent years.

MacMichael said he and other intelligence analysts sought evidence of this kind of connection between the Sandinistas and El Salvador, or between the Sandinistas and Cuba or the Soviet Union, for years, but turned up nothing.

The Reagan administration claim is so dubious, MacMichael said, that "I do not believe that their people genuinely believe this."

Without evidence of such activity, the U.S. cannot get international support for an invasion. But even if it could get that support, an invasion would be costly, MacMichael said.

"I can assure you that the U.S. invasion of Nicaragua will be no easy task. It would be a long and bloody process. You'd fill a lot of body bags," he said.

The administration has contented itself with supporting the contras—a group of Nicaraguan rebels intent on overthrowing the government, MacMichael said, but the contra effort is near collapse. "I can tell you that no matter how much money you give the contras, they are not going to do it."

The best solution for the U.S. would be to join several Latin American countries in supporting the Contadora treaty. This treaty would establish a system of international inspections to prohibit armament buildups or foreign troop maneuvers in the region. Such an agreement would appear to relieve U.S. fears that Nicaragua would be used as a base for pro-Soviet activities in this hemisphere.

The administration, in fact, supported such a treaty at one time, but only because it expected it to be rejected by Nicaragua. MacMichael charged. When the Sandinistas demonstrated their willingness to live by those terms, the administration backed down.

MacMichael said signing the treaty would still be the best course for the U.S. The contras are too weak to overthrow the Sandinistas; a U.S. invasion would lead to a long, costly and unpopular war.

"I do not wish to cry wolf and be an alarmist, but I believe the dangers are real," MacMichael. "These fears are shared by many competent authorities."

PRESIDENT CERESO OF GUATEMALA ABOLISHES SECRET POLICE

HON. MICHAEL BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, too little attention has been paid to the courageous move of Guatemala's new President, Vinicio Cerezo, in abolishing the notorious Department of Technical Investigations [DIT], Guatemala's secret police. This courageous action was the first major step in President Cerezo's attempt to improve the human rights performance of Guatemala's Government and to dismantle the structures of repression. There will be other such steps. I know we all applaud President Cerezo for this action and support him in any future actions that he may take.

I wish to include a brief UPI story on this matter that appeared in the Washington Post for February 8, and a February 7 Christian Science Monitor editorial on the subject:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 8, 1986]

GUATEMALAN POLICEMEN TO BE PROSECUTED

GUATEMALA CITY, Feb. 7.—At least 115 Guatemalan secret police officers, part of a much-feared squad abolished by President Vinicio Cerezo this week, will be charged with human rights abuses, the Interior Ministry announced today.

Interior Minister Juan Jose Rodil Peralta said a preliminary investigation into the conduct of the more than 600 agents of the Department of Technical Investigations turned up at least 115 officers with "bad records."

The agents will be fired and the attorney general will file charges against them, Rodil Peralta said. The unit has been accused of involvement in the disappearance of thousands of Guatemalans.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 7, 1986]

CERESO ACTS

Guatemala's newly inaugurated President Marco Vinicio Cerezo Arévalo, has taken his first promised step toward ending human rights abuses in his troubled nation: He has abolished the feared secret police and fingerprinted its 600 members. Those suspected of crimes are to be prosecuted.

President Cerezo in effect has put on notice the military and police forces, without confronting them directly. The military remains the most powerful element in Guatemala today, far stronger than the elected government: Too broad a challenge to military or police could likely result in the unseating of Mr. Cerezo, which is why his decision to move against only one police arm, the secret police, at this time was appropriate.

It was also the correct human rights move. During his election campaign Cerezo had promised to end his country's widespread human rights abuses, reported since the late 1970s by Guatemalan exiles and international organizations and blamed on sections of the military, the police, and paramilitary forces. The secret police received a good share of the condemnation, and it deserved to be the first force to be disbanded. Other police or military departments should take note: They could be next.

LATE-BLOOMING DADS

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the January 19, 1986, issue of the Daily Breeze.

Entitled "For These Kids, Dad Really Is the Old Man," this article highlights the growing phenomenon of middle-aged men who have young children. These "late-blooming dads," who either delayed having families or are embracing fatherhood for the second time around, have the capacity, according to some experts, to be among the best at fathering.

One of these "late-bloomers" is Ed McMahon, sidekick to Johnny Carson, who recently adopted a newborn at age 62. Another is a good friend of mine, Ron Cawdrey, a 49-year-old Redondo Beach City Council member, who is also dad to 5-year-old Crystal.

While having a child at any age is a tremendous adjustment, for these middle-aged fathers the advantage of their experience, maturity, and financial security has made the adjustment a little less traumatic.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to my colleagues:

[From the Daily Breeze, Jan. 19, 1986]

FOR THESE KIDS, DAD REALLY IS THE OLD MAN

(By Jim Brooks)

Dan Shannon recalls helping his wife, Deborah, and infant daughter, Sarah, board a plane last summer on their way to Minneapolis and Sarah's christening.

"I had to leave two days later because of my work," Shannon explains, "so I helped her onto the plane at LAX . . . got her seated and taken care of, and I walked off the plane."

The 51-year-old Redondo Beach father chuckles to himself.

"I found out later that all of the stewardesses came over and said, 'My, what a nice grandfather you have.' And my wife was saying, 'That's not her grandfather, that's her father.'"

Today, Shannon has a T-shirt for just such occasions—a Father's Day gift—that reads "I am not her grandfather."

Ed McMahon sports a similarly inscribed sweatshirt, which arrived last month after the 62-year-old sidekick to Johnny Carson adopted a newborn, Katherine Mary.

"I keep calling myself granddaddy," admits the, in fact, two-time grandfather. "I find myself correcting that. 'No, I'm the daddy. I'm not the granddaddy.'"

While juggling diapers and formulas, Shannon and McMahon also are balancing on the cutting edge of what some experts say is a growing phenomenon: late-blooming dads who can rightly be called "the old man" by their youngsters.

They're either parents for the first time—often members of "the yuppied-out group" who delayed having families—or dads embracing fatherhood for a second time with new, usually younger, wives.

Whatever their particular situation, these brave new poppas face a fatherhood distinctive from that of their younger counterparts.

"Well, your back hurts more," cracks Ken Miller, a 52-year-old San Pedro father who chases around after 2-year-old Andy.

Miller, a music teacher at Harbor College, is somewhat rare in that he straddles both categories. Andy is the product of a second marriage; but Miller also waited until he was 38 to start his first family of three, who now range from 10 to 15.

"I don't doubt at all that I'm not only less physically able to romp around, but I'm also less interested in doing those things," admits Miller of fatherhood after 50.

Then he adds: "I'm a roller with the kids on the floor. I wrestle with them, and probably will when I'm a grandfather, when I'm 80. . . . But it's harder for me. It's harder to get down on the floor when you're 50 than when you're 20—but I'll get down there. (I might have to say) 'Help me up.'"

The energy issue is a valid one, experts say, for those older men pondering late-night feedings again.

It's the toughest part of his new role, says Peter Kirby, 46-year-old father of 2-year-old Rachel. "I mean, I get tired," says the Santa Monica video producer and editor. Dads at 20 or 25 "get tired, but they recover quicker. At least that's what I remember. But the opposite side of that is I know how to pace myself better."

That kind of awareness is what can compensate for slower reflexes and even slower muscles and can make older fathers potentially the best dads.

It goes along with the philosophy that the gray around the ears is matched by a wisdom between the ears.

"It's an over-used phrase, but they 'know who they are,' as opposed to becoming a parent very young, (when) there are so many unfinished issues of childhood and adolescence that it makes it hard to deal with a child's demands," says Sharon Stone, a Rancho Palos Verdes clinical social worker. "So often young marriages have difficulty making it because the people are changing themselves, still forming themselves. So to become a parent when you've already had more chance to take care of those things for yourself could be a real benefit."

"I think it was good for me as a person to have had 20 years of adulthood to mature and try to get myself together before I tried to help other people get together," confirms Miller. ". . . Some of the problems I might have brought into a father-son or father-daughter relationship when I was younger, I've worked through to some extent."

Related to this personal acceptance is career acceptance: Older fathers are more likely to be less focused on work and finances, freeing them to lavish more attention on a child. "A lot of men when they first have their children are very much into building their own empire and getting established," says Fran Louise Hill, a marriage and family therapist with practices in Lomita and Rolling Hills.

" . . . Oftentimes they don't bond as closely with the child because (their work) is demanding a great deal of their attention; they're thinking in terms of another mother to feed and 'will I be able to do that.' . . . Later in life a man is very well established and in a better financial situation and therefore more emotionally available to the child."

Ron Cawdrey, a 49-year-old Redondo Beach councilman and dad to 5-year-old Crystal, agrees. "She's a dream, she's easy because I've gone through it all before," says Cawdrey of starting over with Crystal

after fathering three other children—30, 26 and 24—from a previous marriage. "And a lot of it has to do with stability, with your economic situation."

Shannon, dean of extended education at California State University, Dominguez Hills, echoes the sentiment.

"As an adult being a lot more mature, I think it's in a sense easier to relate to (Sarah)," says the father of three older children—25, 23, and 21—from a first marriage. "I'm not as pressed, at least in terms of career, as I was much earlier on. I feel more comfortable with myself than I did when I was younger. And as a consequence I think I can focus more on her than I did as a younger man with my older children."

The gray-haired grandfather finds himself frequently playing with his infant daughter, reading to her, rolling around on the floor with her, "integrating her a lot more" into his life.

"I feel a lot more laidback about fatherhood, a lot more comfortable with the idea of it than when I was younger," Shannon explains. "The whole process of birth is different now than it was the first time for me. In the early 60s, I'd drive my wife to the hospital, drop her at the door, go park the car and then find my way to the father's waiting room, and when the baby was born they'd call me and I'd go look through the glass. And then I wouldn't see the child really until four or five days later when the infant would return with his or her mother."

"This time I went through Lamaze, and I was there through the whole birth process and held Sarah before my wife did. The whole process—I guess they call it bonding—was a lot more real this time, and as a consequence I feel very, very close to her."

Dads like Shannon and Cawdrey—long on experience and shorter on career struggles—have the capacity to be among the best at fathering, says Jeff Marsh, a clinical psychologist who leads a fathers group Saturdays in the parenting center at the Stephens S. Wise Temple in West L.A.

"The most interesting dads . . . are the guys who are starting a second family, and are in their 40s and 50s, have teen-age children or older and now have a baby coming," Marsh says. "They tend to be the ideal dads. I mean, you can see the difference in the groups. They are just more comfortable. It's not that they know that much more about how to be a father. Their questions are just as naive or open in some ways as the other guys, but the way they go about the fathering is much easier. They're more comfortable with the child, holding the child and interacting with him."

If it's easier the second time around, it's because these dads "know the score," says Rick Porter, director of the Rainbow River School Age Centers in Manhattan Beach and a leader of father workshops himself.

"If it's their first time, there might be some surprises, some new twists they hadn't thought about," he adds.

Stone puts it even more succinctly: "At a later age we do become creatures of habit—and at any age having a kid is a tremendous adjustment."

The size of that adjustment for a first-time father at 40 may be daunting, especially for those at the upper end of the baby-boom me-generation used to having it their way—when a toddler wants it his way.

"That's the classic cliché of my generation, that we want everything . . . (that) we're used to having our own way," says Kirby, who is producing a videotape called "Creative Parenting."

It's late-blooming fathers such as himself, he believes, that may account for the growing number of older dads in general. "Part of it is that adolescence for a lot of people my age and younger seems to last till you're about 30, so you end up not even thinking about getting serious with relationships and family and that sort of thing until later in life."

Marsh labels them "the yupped-out group," those men who went to college, established careers, "finally got married, and now they're wanting to experience what it's like to be a father."

"In general, you're talking about someone who's really been into his career and not into a relationship with a child," says Santa Monica pediatrician Harvey Karp.

Making that new relationship work starts with realizing that there are sacrifices along with joys in fathering, that "you have less time for yourself and to devote to the things you're used to doing," says Stone.

Says Miller, "I look around at some of my peers whose kids are off at college or off married with their own kids, and these people are in a phase of life that most 50-year-olds are in, and I'll probably never have that phase. I'll never have that smug time when the kids are grown and gone and you can concentrate on (your own interests), or that time when middle-aged couples start traveling and such."

He laughs. "My travel is between soccer and piano lessons."

Another prospect that faces the older dad—either the experienced second-family man or the first-time-around novice—is that of dealing with an adolescent as they're coping with advanced middle-age and beyond.

"You're dealing with life-cycle kind of changes," says Mitch Golant, a Brentwood clinical psychologist. "As, for example, that 40-year-old man enters his 55th birthday his child is entering adolescence, so not only is that 55-year-old man dealing with the (approaching) death of his own parents, he's dealing with his son or daughter in adolescence."

Art Bohart, a psychology professor at CSUDH who at 43 is father to 7-year-old Maura, believes "that is when some difficulties might arise. Because as fathers get toward their 60s, they tend perhaps to lose touch. Whereas in your 40s you're still young enough to be in touch with what it's like to be a child or a teen-ager, by the time you get to be 60 you're perhaps getting a little less tolerant, a little less likely to be able to understand the headstrongness of youth, so to speak."

The best way to resolve the issue, Bohart says simply, is to just be aware of the potential problems.

"I know it's going to be a frustrating period, especially with all the pitfalls that are around today for young people, with the drugs and sex and whatnot," says McMahon, who's already guided four offspring from an earlier marriage through the terrible teens. ". . . But we're going to have a very open relationship with this child. I've had some experience. I've made all my mistakes—I hope. And I'll be able to sit down and talk with her and reason with her. Because you do come from a strong point of wisdom when you're in your 70s."

For Kirby, talking about his daughter's eventual adolescence sparks a stickier issue. "It may seem weird," he says, "but one of the things that I think about a lot is am I going to see any grandchildren. Or is she going to wait till she's 35 to have any kids?"

In a similar vein, Shannon reveals that "one very peculiar feeling I've had is a sense of mortality that I didn't have before (Sarah) was born; a sense of my age relative to life expectancy, and a concern about being around long enough to see her grown and mature and marry and have children."

He, Kirby and McMahon all talk of making financial plans so their children will be secure should father time run out on them. They also speak of a keener sense of taking care of their own selves.

"You become more aware of how fragile everything is," says Kirby. "I mean, I drive more carefully and look both ways more than once when I cross the street. You're just more aware of risks all the time . . . because, you know, I want to be here for her."

FOR A TAX AMNESTY TO CUT THE DEFICIT

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, we are faced this year with the difficult and unenviable task of finding approximately \$60 billion to cut from the Federal budget. This will bring us to the deficit level mandated by the "march of folly" that is known as Gramm-Rudman. I believe we are required to reach this deficit target regardless of the Supreme Court decision as to the constitutionality of the triggering mechanism with Gramm-Rudman.

The budget request submitted by President Reagan for fiscal year 1987 reveals his priorities and plans for reaching the target deficit. This President would subject many vital domestic programs to elimination or draconian cuts while adding over \$33 billion to the Defense budget. The President has said we must reduce the deficit but that he will veto any measures that raises revenues for the purpose of reducing that deficit.

That severely limits our options here in Congress. But, Mr. Speaker, the State of Massachusetts faced a budget deficit a few short years ago. They undertook a unique program of one time tax amnesty and tough enforcement that has yielded approximately \$564 million over the last 2 years. This Revenue Enhancement and Protection Program has been successful in Massachusetts and similar programs in other States have met with like success. There is no reason to believe that such a program on a national basis would not yield the Federal Government at least \$25 billion. This would be \$25 billion not in tax increases, not in program cuts, but in pure deficit reduction. I have cosponsored H.R. 2530, a bill introduced by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. DONNELLY. This bill would implement a Revenue Enhancement and Protection Program on a national level.

We must take innovative steps to deal with our budgetary woes. This type of program is just such a step. I urge my colleagues to read the insightful article written by Governor Dukakis of Massachusetts. His article points out the windfall to be realized by careful implementation of a Revenue Enhancement Program. Let us follow the lead of Governor Du-

kakis and Massachusetts and attack our budget problems with vigor.

FOR A TAX AMNESTY TO CUT THE DEFICIT

(By Michael S. Dukakis)

BOSTON.—At a time when the Federal Government is hacking away at important programs in order to balance its budget and reduce its deficit, the Reagan Administration and Congress should be looking first at the revenue side—not to raise taxes but to get serious about collecting what is already owed the Treasury. They should adopt what has worked for many states: tax amnesty combined with tougher enforcement.

Tax evasion and cheating have become serious problems. To fool around with the Internal Revenue Service was once to court serious fines, prison sentences and, at least, public humiliation. But as the I.R.S. now admits, those days are long gone.

According to I.R.S. figures, voluntary tax compliance has fallen to 81 percent, down from 94 percent 20 years ago. More starkly put, 19 percent of all taxes owed on legitimate earnings are not collected. Nor does that include other major sources of lost tax revenue, such as illegal drugs and organized crime. What it all adds up to is \$100 billion in Federal taxes that go uncollected every year. That's half the Federal deficit.

What to do? Once again the states have come up with a good idea. It is an idea that has taken hold in Massachusetts and has been picked up by 18 other states, including New York, which recovered \$334 million.

In January 1983, Massachusetts faced a multimillion dollar deficit. I was urged to do what President Reagan and Congress have been asked to do: raise taxes, cut programs or both. But we discovered that dodging the tax man had become almost as popular a sport as watching the Celtics play basketball. We inaugurated a program called Revenue Enforcement and Protection, which aimed to collect taxes owed to the state treasury.

First, we raised the stakes by getting tough on enforcement—adding tax auditors, introducing computers and launching an aggressive campaign to seek out and prosecute tax evaders. After we had demonstrated just how tough we could be, we offered the delinquents an amnesty, a 90-day grace period to make good on what they owed the state with interest but no civil or criminal penalties.

When the amnesty period ended, we got tough again. Restaurants were padlocked and seizure notices slapped on doors, luxury yachts registered out of state to evade taxes were seized and other tax-delinquent businesses were forced to pay up. The word quickly got out—Massachusetts was serious about tax collection.

We also decided it was time to treat honest taxpayers as valued customers—men and women whose business and tax payments we appreciated. We introduced a simplified tax form, expanded taxpayer assistance programs and guaranteed that those who file early could get their refund checks within three weeks.

Amnesty was only a part of the reason for Massachusetts' success. In two years, tougher enforcement under the Revenue Enforcement and Protection Program has accounted for tens of millions in new revenues from evaders and delinquents. There has been an even more dramatic increase in voluntary compliance—a total of \$564 million in new revenue in the last two years. Only \$85 million of it came from amnesty.

As a result, Massachusetts enjoyed its biggest tax cut in history last year. We have a healthy surplus in the state treasury and we have the resources we need to invest in economic growth, good schools, important social services and environmental protection.

Could this work at the I.R.S.? I believe it could. In the 18 states offering amnesty programs, almost 500,000 people have paid more than \$650 million in back taxes and interest.

A tough, fair, competently administered Federal revenue recovery program would yield \$20 billion to \$25 billion annually from amnesty, better enforcement and the increased voluntary compliance that comes with it. Getting our national tax compliance rate back to where it was 20 years ago would mean \$65 billion a year in new revenue without raising taxes.

That's a serious beginning toward erasing the deficit. State programs across the nation have demonstrated the potential for a fair tax system. The Federal Government could restore public confidence in the revenue system without carving the heart out of programs that provide health, housing and job opportunities, or blowing holes in the President's defense budget.

GIVE LAW A CHANCE

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, Winston Skinner of the Newnan Times-Herald recently wrote a column that I strongly urge all of my colleagues to read. In the column he says:

All the money (that the Federal Government borrows) has to be paid (back), and the longer you wait to pay it back, the more it costs you.

I think Winston has accurately portrayed the feelings of most Americans. It's time Congress stops this ridiculous overspending:

GIVE LAW A CHANCE

The Gramm-Rudman bill is not perfect, but it is a start.

The bill, which would require the budget be balanced in the next few years, commits the federal government to doing something about the deficit. We have heard about how the growth of the economy will eliminate the deficit without increasing taxes, but we've seen the deficit grow.

The deficit is truly frightening. Like many folks, I survive on credit. But I have learned a lesson about credit. All that money eventually has to be paid, and the longer you wait to pay it back, the more it costs you.

As my teacher wife explains to her students, interest is "rent" you pay for using the bank's money. You have to pay the money back, and you have to pay the rent, too. Someday, somehow, the government must not only learn to operate on a reasonable budget, but it must pay back the principal and interest from years of spending with abandon.

As President Reagan said recently, "We do not face large deficits because American families are undertaxed. We face those deficits because the federal government overspends."

The effects of the bill are already being felt. Some government employees are getting the word to send out resumes because

their paychecks will stop with the beginning of the next fiscal year this summer.

The bill requires that automatic, across-the-board, spending cuts take place if the president and congress cannot agree on a budget that meets certain criteria. For example, the fiscal year 1987 budget could have a deficit of no more than \$144 billion, which is to me a staggering amount of money. The allowable deficit would decrease yearly until 1991, when the government would have to operate within its means.

Gramm-Rudman is going to cost us. According to Associated Press, Georgia stands to lose \$278 million in federal funds next year because of the law.

While this sounds terrible, what it means is that there should be less control from Washington over what is done in the states. With the passage of Gramm-Rudman, if a big pile of dollar bills is to be spent on public education or social welfare or highways, it will be because someone in Georgia decided that was a need.

And while I realize state and local governments can have bureaucrats as well as Washington, I still think someone who lives in Georgia probably knows better how to deal with most of Georgia's problems than does someone from New York who went to school in New Jersey and now works in an office in Washington.

Local churches and charitable organizations will have to take a greater hand in helping the truly needy, and federal funds will have to be aimed at solving problems rather than programs which require perpetual funding.

The Reagan administration's agenda does not coincide with my view of the world. On a planet where the major powers already have the means to blow every smidgen of life away, spending ever-increasing amounts for weaponry seems futile. I have no argument with a strong defense but I think belt tightening can probably be done as "easily" in the Pentagon as it can at the local DFACS office.

In fact, it is not going to be easy anywhere, and it is going to require average citizens in places like Newnan to take a greater role in determining the kind of life to be found in their communities. The big packages filled with dollar bills from Washington are going to come less and less often.

Caring about the basic needs of people is important.

What we must do is provide for those needs as economically as possible, and there must be a constant, diligent effort to keep those who can and should work off the welfare roles.

At the same time, the federal government perhaps should tend more to its specific constitutional duties and avoid the temptation to govern every aspect of the affairs of the 50 states.

Less federal intervention would mean that state and local governments could run the schools—and many other programs—with greater efficiency. Perhaps there would be less money for some programs, but it would then come to the point where the states and counties, who generally try to live within their means, could decide if a particular program is really needed and is cost effective.

Much the same could be said for agriculture, aviation, higher education, small business development, and a host of other programs. Perhaps, after reducing its involvement in other areas, Washington can take a realistic look at defense spending and treat the Pentagon with a business-like approach, too.

Already, there is talk of suits questioning the constitutionality of Gramm-Rudman. A court challenge may render the whole bill invalid. But even if that comes to pass, the idea is still a start.

At least we have made an effort to cut federal spending so that our grandchildren will not have to worry about paying the deficit.

OHIO'S 19TH DISTRICT RESPONDS TO TAX SURVEY

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, last year as the House debated tax report legislation, I wrote to my constituents requesting their views on several of the options under discussion. I received a massive response, reflecting the great general interest in reform of our tax system as well as a real desire to participate in correcting the unfairness of our current tax structure. I especially appreciated the time taken by many thousands of respondents who wrote detailed letters with their ideas and suggestions. Because of the large number of my constituents who shared their opinion with me, I am still in the process of responding to many of them.

While the tax legislation approved by the House is not perfect, it does go a long way toward reforming our current Tax Code. Still, any final bill that comes before the House should include several key improvements. Tax reform must be fair to all sections of our country, including those hard pressed regions that have faced real economic dislocation during the past several years. At the same time, tax reform must be equitable—insuring that all Americans pay a proper share of the costs needed to run the essential services of Government.

Finally, tax reform must be seen in the context of Nation's real economic needs. Our Tax Codes should encourage the economic growth and future vitality that are required if we hope to meet the challenges of a fast-changing world economy. Particularly in the Great Lakes region, we must recognize that several aspects of our Tax Codes have a real impact on our ability to be competitive and create needed new jobs. I am happy that so many of the respondents to my questionnaire recognized this. In fact, fully 82 percent voiced strong opposition to repealing the deductibility of State and local taxes—taxes that go to pay for so many of the important educational programs and infrastructure repairs that our region needs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the results of the 19th district tax survey be printed in the RECORD so that other Members can review them. Our goal must continue to be a tax reform package that is both fair and equitable, and provides a sound basis for economic growth and increased jobs.

The tax survey follows:

1. President Reagan is proposing many changes in tax law. Of the changes listed below, check those you would oppose, even if they would help make possible an overall reduction in tax rates.

a. Repeal the ability of people to deduct state and local taxes—income taxes, property taxes, and sales taxes; 82%.

b. Repeal the marriage penalty deduction, 39%.

c. Limit deductions for interest, except business loans and home mortgages; 48%.

d. Repeal income averaging; 37%.

e. Repeal the additional exemption for the blind and the elderly; 67%.

f. Repeal credits for energy-saving home improvements; 34%.

g. Tax a portion of employer-paid health insurance; 62%.

h. Tax increases in the cash value of life insurance policies; 63%.

i. Tax all unemployment compensation and payments for work-related injuries; 49%.

j. Limit deductions for work-related expenses, such as union and professional dues, safety equipment, tools, uniforms, and travel; 43%.

2. Should Congress cut taxes if doing so would increase the deficit? Yes 15%; No 85%.

3. Should the oil and gas industry receive more favorable tax treatment than other industries in order to provide incentives for increased production? Yes 18%; No 82%.

4. Should capital gains (profits from the sale of stocks, bonds and other investments) be taxed at a lower rate than wages and salaries to encourage such investments, or should they be taxed at the same rate as wages and salaries? a. Lower rate 50%; b. Same rate 50%.

5. Under the present system, tax rates for people with large incomes are higher than rates for people with lower incomes. Should the system be changed so that there is less difference between tax rates for people with high incomes and rates for people with lower incomes? Yes 30%; No 70%.

6. Should the 50% top rate (for joint return income in excess of \$175,000) be—15% (a) Cut to 35%; 10% (b) Cut to 40%; 8% (c) Cut to 45%; 66% (d) Kept at 50%.

7. Should business be allowed to deduct the costs of entertainment, such as taking clients on hunting and fishing trips, to the theater, or to professional sports events? Yes 25%; No 75%.

8. How much should businessmen be allowed to deduct for meals at which business might be discussed? 22% (a) The full cost; 19% (b) \$25 per person; 19% (c) \$15 per person; 41% (d) Nothing.

9. The goals of simplification and fairness often work against one another because much of the complexity in the tax law is due to provisions designed to assure fair treatment for taxpayers with special circumstances. Given that fact, which goal is more important: 17% (a) Simplifying the tax law, even if that results in less fairness, or; 83% (b) Assuring that everyone pays a fair share of the tax burden, even if that means less simplification.

10. What should be the main goals of tax reform? Of the nine goals listed below, which are the three most important (rank 1, 2, 3) and which are the three least important (rank 7, 8, 9). 83/6% (a) Make sure everyone, both businesses and individuals, pays a fair share of the tax burden; 12/54% (b) Reduce tax rates so that there is less difference between rates for high-income and low-income people; 21/35% (c) Reduce tax rates, but keep the differences between rates for high-income and low-income people; 20/36% (d) Leave the rate structure alone, but cut taxes by raising the personal exemption and the standard deduction; 23/

42% (e) Make it easier for me to do my taxes; 63/19% (f) Eliminate complex tax breaks that give unfair advantage to those who can afford high-priced tax experts; 19/50% (g) Simplify the tax system by eliminating as many deductions and credits as possible, including those that are widely used by the average taxpayer.

DIGGER PHELPS—EDUCATOR AND COACH

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an article which appeared in the February issue of *Ozark Magazine* on Notre Dame basketball coach Richard "Digger" Phelps.

I would especially like to draw attention to Coach Phelps' remarks in regard to education and its relationship to intercollegiate athletics. I believe my colleagues will find his comments particularly enlightening in the wake of the court case involving the University of Georgia and the subject of academic integrity.

Coach Phelps and the basketball program at Notre Dame are perfect examples of all that is good about intercollegiate athletics. In his 14 years at Notre Dame, Coach Phelps has amassed an impressive record of 277-132. Of more importance, every one of Coach Phelps' players has earned a degree. It is this record of which he is most proud.

I was extremely gratified that Coach Phelps was one of the first and strongest supporters of my legislation, H.R. 2620, the "College Athlete Education and Protection Act." By lending me this most-welcomed support, he has shown that he does more than just give lip-service concerning the problems that confront athletic departments at our colleges and universities.

Again, I urge all of my colleagues to read the following article. I am sure you will agree with me that higher education could use more people like Digger Phelps.

COURTING SUCCESS—YOU HAVE TO BE MORE THAN JUST A GREAT BASKETBALL PLAYER TO PLAY FOR NOTRE DAME'S DIGGER PHELPS

(By Thomas Granger)

At 3:00 p.m., it's time for basketball practice, but the Notre Dame varsity must wait for seven players to arrive. Another coach at another school might throw those players off the squad, but Notre Dame's Richard (Digger) Phelps knows there are extenuating circumstances for the absences. He shrugs. "Four had papers to get in or were being tutored," says Phelps, a volatile man in his mid-forties who still boasts matinee-idol good looks. "Three were freshmen who had makeup test that they had to take."

Phelps, like Indiana's Bobby Knight and Georgia Tech's Bobby Cremins, is one of those rare old-fashioned head coaches who still expect their players to achieve their grades the old-fashioned way: by earning them. Moreover, not even Knight, the fabled Hoosier disciplinarian, can claim to match Digger's record of graduating players. In contrast to many basketball factories where barely one of five players leaves college with a sheepskin, Notre Dame's graduation rate of its basketball players is an

amazing 100 percent. That's right—since Digger Phelps first came to South Bend back in 1971, at the tender age of twenty-nine, every one of his players has earned a degree, a fact made even more impressive when you consider that Notre Dame offers no so-called "pudd" majors.

"That's the record I'm proudest of," says Phelps, interviewed in a spacious office whose paintings and tasteful furniture are more likely to be found on the pages of *Architectural Digest* than in a college basketball coach's environs. "That's even more important than what we've accomplished on the court. We stress that fact to high school players when we talk to them. They've got to realize that basketball isn't going to last the rest of their lives. How many people remember who won the national championship five years ago?"

What people do remember, with distaste, are the abundant scandals that have rocked the ranks of collegiate basketball in recent years. There is former head coach Bates Locke, who left Clemson in disgrace after admitting he knew that the Tigers' alumni regularly greased the palms of top players and recruits. There is deposed New Mexico head coach Norm Ellenberger, who played fast and loose with the transcripts of his players to keep them eligible. There is last year's point-shaving scandal at Tulane. There is the tragedy of such former players as Kevin Ross, who went back to grammar school at age twenty-seven in a belated attempt to learn to read, and there is the suicide of Bill Robinzine, whose farewell note said there was nothing left after basketball.

Digger Phelps can and frequently does recite a veritable litany of injustices he's witnessed over the past fifteen years. He insists that not even the high professional salaries paid such nongraduates as Larry Bird and Wayman Tisdale can justify the lack of a diploma.

"No matter how much money you have, there is still the question, 'What are you inside yourself?'" snaps Phelps, whose own days as a player were undistinguishably spent at New Jersey's Rider College. "The only promise I make to the families of recruits is that their sons are going to graduate on time. I've had two players leave school early to play professional ball, but they came back and finished in summer school. If a youngster fails to graduate, not only will I be slapped in the face, but so will his parents."

When Digger Phelps talks, his players listen. What he has to say makes sense, and he backs up his talk with indisputable action. In addition to earning a reputation as one of the game's most solid citizens, Phelps is also respected for the quality of the teams he puts on the court. He wins and wins big, despite the apparent disadvantage of being able to recruit only those athletes who can satisfy Notre Dame's demanding SAT and high school grade point requirements. Going into the current season, these are but a few of the man's accomplishments:

An overall record of 277-132 in fourteen seasons at Notre Dame.

An awesome 303-135 career record in fifteen seasons as a college head coach. (His only other stint was a 26-3 season at Fordham sixteen years ago, catching the eye of the Notre Dame brass then looking to replace coach Johnny Dee, who had resigned.)

A reputation for developing such talented National Basketball Association stars as Utah Jazz super scorer Adrian Dantley, Detroit Pistons hotshots Bill Laimbeer and

Kelly Tripucka, and the Denver Nuggets' hustling Bill Hanzlik.

Such credentials have made Digger Phelps as popular in basketball-mad northern Indiana as the pope himself is in the Vatican. But as recently deposed football coach Gerry Faust learned all too well, no other college anywhere puts pressure to win on its coaches the way that Notre Dame does. A favorite saying on campus is that elsewhere, hope springs eternal; at Notre Dame, demand springs eternal. However, since relatively few lines crease his forehead below his salt 'n' pepper hair, Phelps is asked the secret behind his mastery of stress. "I yell a lot," guffaws Phelps, an opinion that is spontaneously cosigned by his eavesdropping secretary, Dottie Van Paris, which cracks him up once again. "That's my personality. I never keep it in; I always let it out," he explains.

Indeed, Phelps's fiery rampages alongside his team bench are the equal of Knight's, although Digger is always too much in control to launch a chair at his Hoosier counterpart. The Fighting Irish coach has the instincts of a thespian for knowing when a tantrum is needed to motivate his team. Moreover, if his own derisive shouts at the opposition or the refs manage to deter enemy fans from distracting his more excitable players, Phelps is not opposed to such gamesmanship. "Hey, it's show business," he says with a shrug. "Let the people yell at me. I'd rather have them yelling at me than at my players. If they yell at me to sit down, I'll wait another twenty seconds before I sit down."

Without question, Richard Phelps's nickname of Digger is one of sport's most enduring handles, ranked right up there in fan recognition with the likes of the Birdman (Larry Bird), Doctor J (Julius Erving) and Tree (Wayne Rollins). Phelps earned that nickname as a boy in the Hudson valley town of Beacon, New York, by working after school for his father, a local undertaker. So devoted to the business was young Richard that he once seriously thought about going to embalming school to succeed his father. The job had several advantages, cracks Phelps, not the least of which was that he always had fresh flowers to bring his dates.

The other advantage, he notes in a serious moment, is that the job afforded him a means of putting his own joys and sorrows in their proper perspective. Seeing death and bereavement on an almost daily basis helped Phelps gain greater appreciation of life itself.

"I learned something from seeing people come home in a box," he reveals. "You enjoy what you have when you have it. You never know what's going to hit you, or when it's your turn to go."

"Growing up I saw so much of death. After all, it was the business. You sort of get a callous feeling about death as a reaction, but you also have to act with sensitivity and understand what people are going through."

Phelps's childhood makes it possible for him to accept occasional defeats with equanimity, although not even Terry, his wife of two decades, would go so far as to call him a good loser. "I saw it all as a kid," insists Phelps. "That experience has enabled me to say to young men, 'Hey! There's other things out there besides your sport.' That's a part of the education process that I've learned outside of the classroom that I'm trying to put into these young men's lives for their future."

No one, however, has accused the flamboyant Phelps of complacency toward his

sport. He works long, hard hours and is reputed to be one of the game's best salesmen come recruiting time. To relax, he forces himself to play racquetball or some other exerting game, occasionally just hours before a critical contest begins. He also collects stamps, a diversion carried over from his childhood, jogs frequently around the pretty twin lakes on his South Bend campus and haunts art galleries with his demure and attractive wife, a doctoral student in languages.

"You can't day-in and day-out eat, sleep and drink basketball," says Phelps. "During the season I've got to go to a movie, sit down and listen to a song, visit the Italian bakery in town. I just can't stay at it twenty-four hours a day. I have to take the time to get away from it. I just put an hour aside and get out of the office to clear my head. I think that's important in order to survive."

Digger Phelps is looking for much more than mere survival this season. After all, the Fighting Irish are returning all starters on a squad that won more games (21) than any other independent last year and impressed many observers in two NCAA playoff games. This year's Irishmen are intent on avenging last year's 60-58 loss to North Carolina, which cost them an opportunity to join the NCAA's Final Four.

Seniors Ken Barlow, at six-foot-ten, and six-foot-nine Tim Kempton offer more than adequate front court protection. Barlow is capable of scoring in double figures every game, and Kempton looks ready to assert himself on the boards now that he's beefed up by twenty pounds.

Barlow believes that the 1985-86 Notre Dame team is destiny's favorite. "We accomplished a little bit more each of my first three seasons," he observes. "We went from losing in the NIT when I was a freshman to the NIT championship game as a sophomore, then to the NCAA [playoffs] last year, and we know that we can do more as we grow together. We're ready to keep moving up."

Other scoring threats are Donald Royal, who looks agile enough to dunk a ball from midcourt, and six-foot-five freshman Mark Stevenson, son of former Harlem Globetrotters ace Jack Stevenson, who earned all-American on *Parade's* high school dream team. "Mark Stevenson will speak for himself," muses Phelps. "He knows the game and he's very good as an athlete playing the game intuitively. He's going to be a solid basketball player."

Completing the squad is the team's genuine superstar, point guard David Rivers, a sophomore who is a potential future national Player of the Year (college basketball's most coveted personal honor).

Rivers is an explosive player who can shoot, pass and force opposition turnovers. *Sports Illustrated* summed up his value to the team this way: "As goes David Rivers, so goes Notre Dame." His inspired play has enabled Phelps to transform Notre Dame's traditionally plodding ball control game into an exciting run-and-gun offense. "David Rivers is allowing me to be my type of coach for the first time since I've been at Notre Dame," says Phelps. "The whole court is David Rivers's environment. It's his living room; he's most comfortable there. David does things with a basketball that are hard to believe because of his quickness. He has added a dimension that we haven't had since I've been at Notre Dame because he's a point guard who can dominate a game."

Rivers, in turn, is Digger Phelps's biggest supporter, and claims that the coach's fiery

style keeps the Irish from feeling complacent on the court. "He's a super motivator," says Rivers, whose 15.8 shooting average led the squad last year. "He really knows what it takes. Sometimes he'll get on our case when we're ahead by 30 points because he thinks we should be ahead by 50."

Rivers, a hard worker who brings a notebook with him when he studies game films, fits well into Notre Dame's academic environment. "The schoolwork doesn't come as easy to David as it does to some of these other guys, but he hangs in there and studies hard," notes John Heisler, the Irish's assistant sports information director. Rivers claims he's goaded to achieve in school by the peer pressure of his fellow students and by a determination not to gain the dubious distinction of being the only Notre Dame hoopster who fails to graduate. "No one wants to be the one who fails to do that," says Rivers.

If Rivers stays healthy, his team has an opportunity to thrash all NCAA competition and win the coveted national championship for Coach Digger Phelps.

The highly superstitious Phelps refuses to comment on such an eventuality, calling all predictions "the kiss of death." However, he makes no secret of the fact that winning a national championship is his life's goal, insisting he will retire, most likely to go into television broadcasting, once he succeeds. Phelps worked as color commentator during the 1984 Olympic basketball trials, using his natural charm and dry wit to maximum advantage. He pooh-poohs the notion that someday he will enter the political arena, noting that a man in his position "can do more outside than inside the political system."

Although the team seldom talks publicly about it, says Heisler, "They are aware that two longshot teams [North Carolina State and Villanova] have won the past two years." Adds Rivers, "It would be nice for this team to take the national championship, but we are more concerned with winning on a week-by-week basis."

"It's the only thing I haven't done here, and it's the only thing that would stop me from coaching," says Phelps to close the subject. "Once I'd win it, I'd leave. A national championship in basketball has never been done here. That is a challenge."

But win or lose, when the all-important NCAA tournament winds down that last week in March, there is one prediction you can make. Digger Phelps's players can hold up their heads when they amble across campus to get to class. Above all, he's taught them that winning isn't everything, but that integrity is.

"You weren't born to go undefeated," says Phelps. "You were born to learn how to survive in everyday life. I used to be a basketball freak, but I realized there's more to life than basketball. I hate to say it, but basketball is still a game. After it's over, it's time to get back to the real world. No matter whether you win or lose, the sun is going to come up the next day. There's always tomorrow. I admire [Notre Dame president] Father Hesburgh because he has been involved in civil rights, solving world hunger, nuclear disarmament, and is still a university president."

With such a philosophy, is it any wonder that Digger has left everyone else in the dust?

HANFORD—THE FORGOTTEN
STEPCHILD OF DOE'S NUCLE-
AR DEFENSE PROGRAM

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Energy's Hanford nuclear facility has recently become the subject of intense discussion and debate in the Northwest and in Congress. As the Nation's oldest and largest federally owned nuclear production and radioactive waste complex, Hanford could also become the first permanent repository of U.S. commercial high-level radioactive wastes. Like others in the Northwest, I am concerned about the effects such a repository could have on the integrity of the Northwest's greatest treasure—the Columbia River.

The Columbia River, in its abundance, is a life source not only for the physical environment, but also for the economy of our region. A high-level nuclear waste repository containing vast amounts of radioactive and toxic substances which remain dangerous for hundreds of centuries placed so close to this vital watershed could destroy the balance between environmental protection and economic diversity. What would happen to the quality of life in the Northwest if this magnificent waterway was threatened?

It has recently become increasingly clear that the threat of contamination from the Hanford site is not hypothetical or contingent on the siting of a nuclear waste repository. In fact, for more than 45 years the Federal nuclear program has been using the Columbia River to dispose of radioactive and hazardous wastes. During the 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's, Columbia River water passed through as many as eight operating plutonium reactors at Hanford, carrying large amounts of radioactive back to the river. Although direct contamination from this type of reactor may not be as high now, severely contaminated ground water continues to steadily seep into the Columbia from the dumping of billions of gallons of radioactive and nonradioactive toxic wastes onto the grounds at Hanford. According to a 1985 report by the Rockwell Corp., which operates Hanford's waste activities, the total volume of low and intermediate liquid wastes dumped on the ground at Hanford since 1943 is in excess of 200 billion gallons—enough to cover Manhattan Island to a depth of 40 feet. Moreover, according to a September 1985 Hanford ground water report, liquid discharges directly into the environment at Hanford continue on a truly enormous scale. Since the restart of Hanford's PUREX chemical separations facility, cooling and processing waters dumped on Hanford soil exceeds 8 billion gallons per year.

To a large extent, Hanford is a microcosm of a national crisis growing around the radioactive and nonradioactive hazardous waste disposal practices of DOE's enormous nuclear industry. With an annual budget now in excess of \$8 billion, the DOE defense program owns, according to the General Accounting Office, some 280 nuclear facilities—and is in itself

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

perhaps one of the Nation's largest ultra-hazardous industries.

The Federal nuclear program has, for more than 45 years, generated vast amount of toxic and radioactive wastes, a significant amount of which is stored in unstable forms and intense concentrations. Unlike hazardous chemicals generated by private industry, defense radioactive wastes have the "midas touch" of making anything they come in contact with radioactive. Extremely dangerous penetrating radiation is emitted, creating severe handling problems and necessitating the use of heavy shielding and remote equipment.

The liquid wastes that have leaked into the environment either by accident or by design are readily incorporated and concentrated in the human food chain. When radioactive wastes are combined, as is many DOE operations, with hazardous chemicals like a mercury and organic solvents, the problem becomes even more complex. Engineering News Record—a respected publication of the engineering profession—recently called for a major effort to clean up DOE's radioactive and toxic legacy, describing the problem as "an environmental time bomb that is ticking in the soil around the Federal Government's weapon plants."

It is only recently that we have been able to penetrate the curtain of secrecy that has shrouded the Federal nuclear program for an entire generation. One of the most disturbing aspects is DOE's management and disposal of toxic and radioactive waste liquids at these facilities. DOE's basic practice is simple: Soils, surface, and ground water are used as disposal and transport medium. The physical environment of the various sites used by DOE around the country is converted into a giant "sponge" to soak up these wastes.

This practice has its origins in the early days of the nuclear weapons program, when a desire to mass produce nuclear weapons as cheaply and quickly as possible superseded all other considerations—including long-term protection of the human environment. While the Nuclear Regulatory Commission forbids the commercial nuclear industry from using such disposal practices, the DOE at Hanford is not only fading to deal with this dangerous legacy head on, it is, incredibly, spending more public funds to continue the dumping of these deadly liquids into the soils of eastern Washington.

I am very concerned that DOE will attempt to avoid dealing responsibly with this massive problem in its long-awaited draft environmental impact statement [DEIS] on Hanford's defense radioactive wastes, despite the current \$1.5 million public awareness campaign designed to convince the citizens of the Northwest that it is capable of cleaning up the nuclear waste mess at Hanford.

Through the DEIS process, DOE is attempting to convince the citizens of the Northwest that various options to deal with Hanford's defense wastes are under active and equal consideration and that no decisions on a final solution have been made. However, an analysis of DOE's atomic defense budgets for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, prepared for me by the Environmental Policy Institute, indicates that the Hanford defense waste DEIS may be just

window dressing—and that DOE really intends to pursue the cheapest and quickest course of action, regardless of the potential long-term consequences to the Columbia River, the environment, or the health and safety of the citizens of the Pacific Northwest.

If Federal spending is any indication of the commitment of DOE to protect the long-term environmental and economic interests of the Northwest, such a commitment appears to me to be largely illusory. The Hanford site is clearly at the bottom of DOE's list of priorities—even though the magnitude of the problem at Hanford probably dwarfs several other DOE sites.

In terms of anticipated spending for environmental protection, DOE has proposed to spend approximately \$11.7 million at Hanford, mainly for preliminary work on reducing chemical and radioactive liquid discharges. By comparison, at the Savannah River plant in South Carolina, DOE plans to spend over \$190 million for environmental protection—about 17 times the amount earmarked for Hanford. DOE's Lawrence Livermore Laboratory in California, where far lower levels of radioactive and toxic materials have been generated, is planning for about \$175 million. DOE's Oak Ridge facility will request \$83.4 million. The Fernald, OH, Feed Materials Production Center, which processes uranium fuel for Hanford's N reactor, is planning to spend more than \$200 million.

Not only is Hanford at the bottom of the list for environmental protection, DOE is actually increasing the number of soil dumping sites at Hanford. DOE recently asked for and received funds to dump radioactive liquids from the N reactor into two additional "liquid effluent disposal" trenches. In fiscal year 1987, DOE is asking for an additional \$1.6 million for two more disposal ponds at Hanford's high-level radioactive waste "tank farm."

Another disturbing aspect of DOE's handling of the waste problems at Hanford is the increased use of soil for the disposal of radioactive materials in Hanford's high-level waste tanks. DOE is spending over \$2 million this year to develop a "transportable grout" facility that will draw out radioactive liquids for Hanford's highlevel radioactive waste tanks, mix them with concrete and dispose of them in shallow burial pits. It is possible if not likely that the radioactivity will outlast the concrete and be released in significant quantities into the environment. Additionally, DOE also plans to dispose of about 530,000 gallons per year of neutralized and heavily contaminated acid wastes from Hanford's chemical separations facility [PUREX] in a similar manner.

Higher levels of spending by DOE at facilities other than Hanford are at least partially the result of adverse publicity, lawsuits filed by citizens and States, and congressional interest. In fact, DOE's fiscal year 1987 budget proposal acknowledges that "adverse publicity" prompted the kind of spending that is taking place at Oak Ridge and Fernald. I believe it is time to turn on the lights at Hanford, if that is what it takes to start cleaning up the serious safety, health and environmental problems at that facility and give the people of the Northwest the same level of protection citi-

zens in other regions have already begun to receive.

Without question, Hanford is the Nation's largest radioactive "graveyard" for inoperative and heavily contaminated facilities. Of the 226 defunct Government reactors, labs, processing plants and waste storage facilities, 123 are at Hanford. The number of these facilities requiring decontamination and decommissioning was even larger, until DOE removed several Hanford facilities from the list and transferred them to the interim waste program. Those facilities include several inactive soil dumping sites which are described as "cribs" and "ponds." DOE appears to have abandoned plans to decontaminate or decommission these severely radioactive and toxic sites, even though they will remain dangerous for centuries.

While DOE continues to use the Hanford site as a "sponge" for ever-increasing volumes of toxic and radioactive wastes, significant funds are being spent at other DOE sites to move away from this dangerous practice. The Savannah River plant is a very similar facility and therefore a legitimate point of comparison. The Savannah River plant has production reactors, laboratories, reprocessing plants and large volumes of liquid high-level radioactive wastes. Like Hanford, the Savannah River plant has used soil, surface and ground water as disposal media for toxic and radioactive wastes for more than 30 years. Unlike Hanford, however, DOE has now concluded that "discharging of mildly contaminated effluents to seepage basins is unacceptable" at Savannah River. According to DOE's budget proposal for fiscal year 1987 for the Savannah River plant, "environmental activities will include monitoring, evaluation and cleanup of ground water contamination. Engineering studies will be performed on the deactivation and decommissioning of separation area seepage basins." Yet, I am not aware of any proposal to spend a single penny to halt the use of soil as a disposal medium for the discharges from Hanford's PUREX plant.

In addition, DOE, as early as 1983, started spending considerable funds at the Savannah River plant to deal with nonradioactive hazardous wastes which, according to DOE, must "meet regulations" under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act [RCRA]. Congress amended RCRA in 1984 when it became clear that the Federal Government, through the Departments of Defense and Energy, is a major violator of Federal toxic waste laws. At Hanford, enormous amounts of hazardous chemicals such as nitrates, chromium, and trichlorethylene have been dumped on the ground. Unfortunately, it is not at all clear if DOE even knows what kinds of chemical and radioactive wastes from now defunct chemical separations plants that operated in the 1940's and 1950's have been dumped or mixed in the burial grounds at Hanford.

Earlier this month, the State of Washington and the Environmental Protection Agency issued claims against DOE for their failure to comply with RCRA regulations. I applaud this effort because it will help reverse the dangerous waste management practices at Hanford and help achieve compliance with RCRA through a more thorough accounting of Hanford's chemical dumping practices.

I am also quite concerned that DOE may have already made up its mind on what will be done with the old single-shell tanks containing high-level nuclear wastes that are now severely compromised by age and fatigue. It's no secret that the cheapest and quickest way to deal with these extremely radioactive underground tanks is to fill them with gravel, pour dirt over them and post a sign to warn human beings who may stumble on the site 1,000 years from now. A clear indication that DOE is inclined to leave these dangerous tanks permanently in the ground at Hanford can be seen in its fiscal 1987 budget request. Of the Programmatic funds being spent at Hanford relative to long-term waste disposal technologies, the only relevant project mentioned is for a "demonstration of technology required for the in-place stabilization and disposal for Hanford single-shell tanks."

The implications of DOE's nuclear and hazardous waste policies at Hanford are disturbing. Whether or not a high-level nuclear waste repository is ultimately located in the Northwest doesn't change the fact that DOE seems to be treating the Hanford site like the forgotten stepchild of the Federal nuclear program. DOE's 1986 and 1987 budgets indicate that it wants to manage and dispose of Hanford waste onsite in a way that may pose an even greater environmental burden on subsequent generations than would a permanent high-level repository. These budget proposals also lead me to suspect that Hanford may be asked to accept high-level defense wastes from other DOE sites around the country.

In terms of major construction projects to stabilize and dispose of DOE's high-level radioactive wastes, about \$950 million will be spent at Savannah River over the next several years, while the comparable figure at Hanford is \$148 million. Projects at Savannah River are geared toward site cleanup and conversion of high-level radioactive wastes into glass for offsite disposal. Construction spending at Hanford, however, seems to be geared toward keeping these wastes onsite and preparing to receive more. Contrary to DOE claims, these big differences in construction project funding cannot be justified strictly on the basis of geographic and demographic differences between the two sites. I refuse to accept any implication that the health and safety of people in the Southeast should somehow be a higher priority than the health and safety of the citizens of the Northwest—or that potential environmental damage in the vicinity of the Columbia River is a lower priority than similar concerns elsewhere.

I am very concerned that DOE is simply planning to write off Hanford because the problems there are perceived as too formidable and too expensive to solve. If DOE writes off Hanford, they would essentially be writing off the environmental protection of Columbia River and the long-term viability of the environment and economy of the entire Northwest. This to me would be totally unacceptable.

Before we plunge ahead with a decision to characterize the Hanford site as a potential repository site for the Nation's high-level radioactive waste, we must address the issue of how the Federal Government is planning to manage and dispose of the enormous quanti-

ties of nuclear and toxic wastes that continue to accumulate at Hanford. Otherwise, we are putting the cart before the horse.

I refuse to accept the notion that Hanford should become a national nuclear graveyard. To deal adequately with the immediate, existing waste management problem at Hanford will require a major change in congressional appropriations and the allocation of cleanup funds. Regardless of how much the DOE is spending on publicity and "citizen input" concerning possible solutions to the Hanford waste crisis, I fear that DOE's recent budget proposals are a much more accurate indicator of the agency's actual intentions. Statements of commitment to solve the enormous radioactive and toxic legacy of the Federal nuclear program at Hanford by top DOE officials have a hollow ring when budget priorities are examined closely. Past spending practices and current funding requests fail to address the existing environmental time bomb that is ticking at Hanford—and suggest a course of conduct that will increase the radioactive and toxic burden at the site. It's clearly time for a major reallocation of environmental protection and nuclear waste management resources at DOE. That is the only way Hanford will cease to be the poor stepchild of DOE's nuclear defense network. Members of Congress and the citizens of the Pacific Northwest should insist on nothing less.

Specifically, I believe that DOE spending practices at Hanford in the area of environment, health, and safety should be targeted toward: First, a thorough study of all major soil disposal sites so they can be characterized, stabilized, decontaminated, and decommissioned; second, full consideration of all alternative methods of disposal—other than the permanent entombment—of the contents of Hanford's single-shell waste disposal tanks; and third, adequate resources to enable DOE to come into compliance with RCRA at Hanford.

These are important and necessary first steps in protecting our region's environment. I hope all my colleagues from Oregon and Washington will join me in keeping a close eye on DOE activities and priorities at Hanford—and otherwise get more personally involved in this important effort. We are going to need all the help we can get if we are to responsibly come to grips with the stark legacy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki we find in our own backyard.

THE GENERAL REVENUE SHARING PROGRAM

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues comments that I made before the House Budget Committee:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I appreciate having the opportunity to appear before you and the other members of the Budget Committee to express my support for the continuation of the General Revenue Sharing Program.

Mr. Chairman, a multitude of pressing concerns confront our Nation's communities.

Poverty; hunger and homelessness; increasing immigrant and refugee populations; drug use and drug-related as well as organized crime; a growing, elderly population, often on fixed incomes; and, a disenfranchised youth population looking for skills, jobs and a future.

Add to that, plant closings and farm foreclosures have left permanent scars on our fellow Americans in many industrial, manufacturing and agricultural based jurisdictions.

Many community leaders have been successful in marshaling the resources to cope with these problems and others have faced severe difficulties. Some cities have benefited from the more than 280,000 new jobs that are being created in America every month now for the past 42 months. However, some have lagged behind.

It has been our Nation's mayors who have launched innovative, efficient, and cost-effective new programs to cope with the new realities of the eighties, showing Washington the way. However, some remain in the quagmire of the past.

Mr. Chairman, we have entered a new era, and we are witnessing the most dramatic changes ever in the Federal Government's relationship between our Nation's cities. Domestic programs launched under the "great society" of the 1960's and taken for granted in the seventies have now come under close scrutiny.

Local governments have always been forced to be more self-reliant and efficient in the delivery of services—forced to work harder and smarter, and do more with less.

They are now being called upon to take even more responsibility for the citizens they serve in addition to the fire protection, police protection, social services for the elderly, youth and poor; public transportation; health care; rescue services; and parks and recreation facilities and service, etc.

In the past, they had help, particularly from the most successful and innovative Federal aid program ever—general revenue sharing.

Conceived by a Democrat economist, Walter Heller, and launched by a Republican President, Richard Nixon, revenue sharing was the right program for 1972. It was based on a sensible premise: Washington can raise revenue better and more equitably, but governments closer to home know better how to use it wisely.

The new program was, as the President said at the bill signing ceremony in October of 1972 at Philadelphia's Constitution Hall "A demonstration of a principle that we have faith in people, we believe in people, and we believe that Government closest to the people should have the greatest support."

He envisioned a program that would restore balance between the various levels of Government. He said:

"After many years in which power has been flowing away from those levels of Government which are closest to the people, power will now begin to flow back to the people again—a development which can have an enormous impact on their daily existence.

"In many States and localities, it will mean lower property taxes or lower sales taxes or lower income taxes than would otherwise have been the case. Revenue sharing can provide desperately needed tax relief for millions of Americans.

"In other places, revenue sharing will mean better schools or better hospitals.

"In some communities, this money will be used to put more policemen on the beat or to start new drug control programs.

"In still other instances, it will be devoted to job training or to recreational facilities or to public transportation.

"But the most important point is this: in each case it will be local officials responding to local conditions and local constituencies who will decide what should happen and not some distant bureaucrat in Washington, D.C."

To a great extent, the dreams that many had for the revenue sharing program have been fulfilled. Indeed, revenue sharing has been a model Federal program. It has done what it was designed to do.

It has been the bedrock of an historic effort to reform the Federal system. It is the only program that goes to practically every local government in the country, including many of which receive no other form of Federal assistance.

Revenue sharing is the only source of Federal aid that remains virtually unencumbered by lengthy Federal restrictions and paperwork requirements. In fact, GRS funds are often used to pay for unfunded mandates imposed by other Federal programs.

Finally, GRS monies are distributed in a relatively targeted manner. Per capita revenue sharing payments range from almost \$30 per person in our poorest communities to less than \$5 per person in our Nation's wealthiest jurisdictions.

However, if we accept the need to control Federal spending—which I do—this may well be the wrong program to eliminate. In better budgetary circumstances, I would argue that this program be expanded, not eliminated. I have been a long-time supporter of general revenue sharing and a strong advocate of its confidence in local decision-making approach to federalism.

But today we are confronting a budgetary crisis. We must examine every program with the utmost scrutiny. We must develop new solutions to new problems. The Federal Government no longer can afford to share revenues it does not have with communities like Beverly Hills, California, Greenwich, Connecticut, or Scarsdale, New York. As the Federal Government reduces its overall role, however, it must assure that communities that face reduced Federal aid and growing servicing responsibilities have the fiscal capacity to meet their growing needs. We must assure that general revenue sharing fulfills its fundamental role as a mechanism that mitigates fiscal disparities, and does it in the most efficient manner possible. We must, in short, refashion GRS as a fiscal safety net for needy communities.

As many of you are aware, Senator David Durenberger and I have introduced legislation calling for reauthorization and revision of general revenue sharing to give it a stronger, more contemporary rationale.

Let me briefly summarize the major components of our proposal which we're calling "targeted fiscal assistance" or TFA.

This new program will serve as a safety net, albeit loose, for needy communities. This program will ensure that in our efforts to balance the budget, we do not ignore the very real and legitimate needs of our partners in the Federal system.

TFA will provide general purpose grants to local governments, enabling mayors and local officials to determine the best uses for the funds. An interstate formula will deter-

mine each State's allocation which, in turn, will be distributed to local governments through an intrastate formula. By utilizing appropriate measures of need and fiscal capacity, the program will target funds to those communities with the greatest public burden.

The program's authorization level will be \$2.3 billion per year. While this represents a 50-percent reduction from current revenue sharing, the targeted fiscal assistance program will have a greater effect in reducing the resource disparities that exist among communities.

INTERSTATE FORMULA CHANGES

Under the interstate formula, low income, low revenue capacity States will receive a greater proportion of funds than high income, high capacity States. A single formula based on population, tax effort, and revenue raising capacity will determine the total allocation for all communities within a State. The population of the State will be adjusted by heavily weighting that portion of a State's population under 150 percent of the poverty level, thereby reflecting need. A relative tax effort formula is included to reward those States that attempt to meet their own needs.

In the interstate formula, total taxable resources will be used automatically to receive funds. At the same time, the cap on grants to poor, high tax effort jurisdictions will be increased to 200 percent or twice the State's average grant. GRS presently sets a cap at 145 percent. Finally, the formula cuts off grants entirely to wealthy communities with personal income above 125 percent of the State average.

The effect of both the interstate and intrastate formulas will be to direct the greatest proportion of a State's allocation to poor rural and urban communities, particularly those that have above average tax effort relative to resources.

Can we afford this new program? I believe we have no choice.

All of us are well aware we face a challenging period. The decisions we face are not easy ones. This is true at all levels of Government. The safety net program we are proposing is the governmental counterpart to the social safety net. We all accept that the Federal Government has a responsibility to provide a level of income security to individuals who are unable to provide for themselves. But it is also true that people are not randomly spread across the country. They are often clustered in our poorest States and cities. Just as the Nation has a responsibility to establish a minimum floor of support below which our poorest citizens will not be allowed to fall, I believe it has a similar responsibility to assist those governments which are hardest-pressed to provide a minimal level of basic public services.

Even in these difficult times, I believe this must be a priority and purpose of the Federal Government.

Thirty years ago, President Dwight D. Eisenhower said, "communities are where the everlasting job of building a strong America must have its roots. America relies on the good sense and local knowledge of the community."

I say that our Nation must continue to rely on that "good sense" and provide at the minimum, the helping hand to our Nation's mayors and local leaders so that they may do the job with which they have been entrusted.

Thank you.

CHALLENGER

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit, for inclusion in the RECORD, a poem written by a fourth grader in my district, Ms. Erin Ferreira. I believe the poem reflects the feelings of bereavement of the Kessler School students and my fellow Montanans for the families of the *Challenger* astronauts.

CHALLENGER

(By Erin Ferreira)

The Challenger took off.

Yip, Yippy, Yeah.

I was so excited,

I couldn't stand another day.

Then they said, "throttle up."

Then suddenly it blew up.

My heart slowed down, I looked around,

smoke was coming to the ground.

I was so scared

because a teacher was aboard.

In the beginning I felt glory

But now I feel sorry.

GROWING URGENCY OF THE
SUPERFUND CONFERENCE

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, the conference committee on Superfund reauthorization issues has just begun the arduous process of reconciling the two versions of this crucial environmental legislation. Final passage of the legislation grows increasingly urgent because taxing authority for the program expired on October 1, 1985, and funding for the program has almost run out. Long-term cleanup at the Nation's priority sites has been at a standstill since last August.

Perhaps the most difficult issue that needs to be resolved by the conference is the nature of the funding mechanism that will support the reauthorized program. The two bodies have come up with fundamentally different approaches, and must work together to resolve their differences.

Unfortunately, a major roadblock to effective resolution of these issues has been thrown up by the administration, which has simultaneously threatened to veto both proposals and refused to come up with its own alternative.

The following editorial from the Wichita Eagle Beacon is typical of the views in newspapers across the country regarding the need to pass final Superfund legislation this year and I commend it to my colleagues' attention.

The editorial follows:

[From the Wichita-Beacon, Feb. 17, 1986]

SUPERFUND UP TO CONFEREES NOW

Among the more pressing unfinished business now facing Congress is reconciling the House and Senate versions of the Superfund renewal bill. The bill is five months overdue, and the U.S. Environmental Protection

Agency has run out of money for toxic waste cleanups. Congressional leaders have made no plans to convene the conference committees that will come up with a bill acceptable to both houses.

Why not? Most likely because Superfund renewal poses terrible political problems. The House bill would allocate more money to cleanup between now and 1990—\$10 billion versus the Senate's \$7.5 billion. The House also would require the EPA, whose Superfund record between 1980 and 1985 was dismal, to adopt strict cleanup schedules and cleanup standards. The Senate bill would do neither. In short, conferees have little leeway for agreement on a responsible bill: The House version holds all the cards.

The Senate bill is marred further by the unfair method by which it would raise money for the Superfund, an excise tax on all manufacturers. The House voted to keep and increase the Superfund tax on chemical/oil feedstocks: Those most directly responsible for the materials that become toxic wastes would continue to bear the cost of cleaning them up. This disparity between House and Senate approaches to raising Superfund money is the most vexing of the political problems connected with the Superfund—at least to members of Congress.

That's because the oil and chemical industries favor the Senate's excise tax, while manufacturers favor the House's feedstocks tax. Both groups traditionally contribute heavily to the campaigns of members sensitive to their interests. Doing nothing until the election is past therefore is bound to seem attractive to Superfund conferees—particularly GOP senators, for whom control of the Senate will be on the line next November. If Congress takes that tack, the hard-won provisions of the House bill, which deserve to become law, would be lost. The 100th Congress, when it convened in January 1987, would have to start the Superfund renewal process over again.

That mustn't happen. Sen Bob Dole, R-Kan., will sit on the conference committee studying Superfund taxation. As majority leader, he can influence the conferees slated to negotiate Superfund cleanup schedules and standards. He should do all he can to launch both conferences now. The nation shouldn't have to wait for vital legislation already long overdue.

CHIEF M. SGT. HILARY W.G. EDWARDS
RETIREES AFTER 30
YEARS

HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his retirement from the U.S. Air Force, I want to recognize Chief M. Sgt. Hilary W.G. Edwards, for his thirty (30) years of dedicated service to our country. In his most recent assignment as chief of the Correspondence Control Center, Congressional Inquiry Division, Office of Legislative Liaison, Chief Edwards provided invaluable service to every Member of Congress. Having demonstrated superior leadership, initiative, and strong management abilities, he was personally selected to manage the overall operation of the Correspondence Control Center which processes all Presidential, Vice Presidential and congressional correspondence for the Secretary of

the Air Force and the Chief of Staff, USAF. There he managed suspense controls for all Air Force-related congressional inquiries and as the Freedom of Information Act [FOIA] manager of legislative liaison, Chief Edwards planned and executed a FOIA program that is unsurpassed. His duties, as a congressional escort brought high praise from Members of Congress and congressional staff members of traveling delegations. Chief Edwards also was the Air Force legislative liaison directorate top secret control officer because of his expertise and mature judgment. A recent inspection report described his account as the best in the Secretariat and the Air staff. His contributions during this tour have been enormous and far beyond that expected. They culminate a long and distinguished career in the service of his country.

Born in Fort Mill, SC, Chief Edwards graduated from Fort Mill High School in 1956 and continued to pursue a higher education at the University of Virginia and the Community College of the Air Force. He also completed numerous military schools and courses including the Tactical Air Command NCO Prep School, where he received the Commandant's Award, and the Senior NCO Academy.

Chief Edwards began his military career in January 1956 as a member of the Army National Guard of South Carolina. Significant assignments have included overseas tours in Guam and Libya; tactical control support to Airborne Forces; 16 years with Air Force intelligence; 9 years with Hq USAF Prisoner of War Experience Analysis Program and his final assignment with legislative liaison. Chief Edwards also served one tour in Vietnam.

Chief Edwards' awards include: Meritorious Service Medal with one oakleaf cluster; AF Commendation Medal; AF Outstanding Unit Award w/1 OLC; AF Organizational Excellence Award; AF Good Conduct Medal w/1 Silver and 1 OLC; Good Conduct Medal w/3 bronze loops; National Defense Service Medal; Vietnam Service Medal w/3 Stars; AF Longevity Service Award Ribbon w/4 OLC; Air Reserve Forces Meritorious Service Award w/1 OLC; USAF NCO PME Graduate Ribbon; and others.

Chief Edwards is married to the former Shirley Hammond from Fort Mill, SC, and they have one son, Stephen, and one daughter, Leanne.

I want to join others in commending Chief Edwards on a full and productive service career and wish him every success in civilian life.

EMERGENCY FARM INCOME
AND CREDIT BILL OF 1986

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that the state of American agriculture at any given time both affects and reflects the state of the American economy. If depressions and recessions are not always "farm bred and farm led," surely farmers are

always among the first victims and among the last to benefit from economic recovery.

These are hard times on the farm, and hard times, too, for the small towns, small businesses, processing and manufacturing plants that are linked to the economic fortunes or misfortunes of the farm community. Yet, policies handed down by Congress and the administration have plunged the agricultural community into a state of crisis that shows no sign of easing. That is why I am cosponsoring the emergency farm income and credit bill of 1986.

It is senseless to help troubled agricultural lending institutions alone if that help does not permit them to continue to play an active role in their local communities. And farmers clearly need help to restructure their debts so that they are not forced off their land. Thus, this bill is an attempt to provide assistance and needed flexibility for both farmers and their lenders.

In terms of credit assistance, this bill would require the utilization of the FmHA's guaranteed operating loan program to encourage commercial lenders to restructure outstanding agricultural debt. A mandated 90 percent FmHA loan guarantee would be available to commercial lenders for the purpose of restructuring existing agricultural loans. Lenders would be required to write-off a minimal portion of the borrower's outstanding debt and accrued interest. The guarantee would be in effect during the duration of the interest reduction program and would apply to the remaining principal after loan restructuring by the lender.

Through the interest rate buy-down provision in the 1985 farm bill, the FmHA would participate in the reduction of the interest rate for the restructured loan package through a 1 percent buydown for each 10 percent reduction in principal by the lender.

In order to qualify for the FmHA loan guarantee, the interest rate on the restructured loan must be established at the cost of money to the lender. Notwithstanding the provisions of the interest rate buy-down program, the lender would be required to absorb this interest rate reduction for a period of 3 years.

With respect to a farm income safety net, this bill would mandate a minimum loan rate of \$5/bu for wheat and \$3.50/bu for corn. Establishing an increased loan rate would increase net farm income, while at the same time, reduce Government spending. I believe this approach makes good budget and policy sense.

This bill would also mandate a Voluntary Marketing Certificate Program. Farmers of wheat and feed grains who voluntarily participate in annual acreage reduction programs would be eligible for first, a nonrecourse loan on their crops, and second, marketing certificates equal to the program yield multiplied by the allowable planted acres—base—for their farm.

Grain accompanied by a marketing certificate, if not consumed domestically, would, if exported, be entitled to a subsidy equal to the difference between its domestic market value and the world price. The subsidy would be provided to the exporter as PIK from the CCC stocks or in cash; commodities provided as

PIK export subsidies would have to be exported.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, if enacted, will provide needed assistance for American family farmers who desperately need our help. It will also provide assistance for commercial banks, who through no fault of their own are being sent into the worst tailspin in 50 years.

This bill is certainly a compromise of the proposal I offered during consideration of the farm bill. However, I feel it is the best type of compromise which will still work effectively for farmers and bankers.

BALTIC FREEDOM

HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, this year the Baltic Nations of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia commemorate the 68th anniversary of their Declarations of Independence.

Although the Soviet Union's occupation of these nations continues today, Soviet human rights violations and attempts at "russification" of these nations have not doused the flame of freedom burning so brightly in the hearts and minds of the Baltic peoples.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that efforts must continue here in the free world to attempt to end this cruel Soviet domination and repression of the freedom loving Baltic spirit and democratic ideals, which were so openly espoused by the Baltic people during the years of true Baltic independence.

The United States has consistently refused to recognize the incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union, and the strong commitment of the U.S. Congress and the Reagan administration to this policy is encouraging as the struggle to regain Baltic independence and freedom continues.

I was glad to have joined my colleagues in the Congress in expressing this commitment to the struggle for Baltic freedom in past years; and with enthusiasm and conviction, I have once again cosponsored the resolution designating the official observance of Baltic Freedom Day. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this measure as well.

It is stated in the Joint Baltic American National Committee annual report that "one of the primary dangers facing the Baltic cause [is] a lack of awareness of the problems by the public and the individual officials who are not fully informed of long-standing policies and appropriate applications."

House Joint Resolution 500 helps to raise public awareness by serving as an important reminder of the Baltic struggle for independence over 46 years of domination.

During this year of the 68th anniversary of the Declarations of Independence for Lithuania (February 16, 1918), Estonia (February 24, 1918) and Latvia (November 18, 1918), I am reminded of the words of President Abraham Lincoln who, when describing our own Declaration of Independence, noted that it "gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world, for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time

the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all should have an equal chance."

As we commemorate these important anniversaries this year, the sentiment expressed in those words of Lincoln reminds us of the basis of our support for Baltic freedom, and reminds the Baltic Nations that they are not alone in their struggle.

MAYOR DAVID FORTIER

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express the profound sense of grief shared by the residents of Olmsted Falls and the entire Greater Cleveland area upon the tragic and untimely death of David Fortier, mayor of Olmsted Falls, who died in an automobile accident last week. He was only 38 years old. An energetic and far-seeing public servant, Mayor Fortier has left a permanent mark on the city of Olmsted Falls.

His mother, Una, describes him best—a man committed to his city of Olmsted Falls, whose greatest enjoyment was serving his fellow citizens. He began his public service in 1969 when he was elected to city council. He was just beginning his second term as mayor when he died so tragically. I had the privilege of administering the oath of office to him last December.

David was a long-time resident of our area. He graduated from Olmsted Falls High School, the College of Wooster in Ohio and received his secondary education certification from Baldwin-Wallace College in Berea, OH.

He taught chemistry at Brunswick High School, where he was highly respected and loved by his colleagues and his students. This year's science fair at Brunswick High School is dedicated to his memory.

Although he had deep and rich roots in Ohio, Mayor Fortier also had extensive experience with other cultures. In 1979, he taught Americans and other English-speaking children in Valencia, Venezuela. Because of his dedication to his own community, David returned home. He visited South America frequently, however, following up on his keen interest in the old legends of the Incan Empire in the Andes.

People closer to home remember David Fortier for more than his public service and dedication as a teacher. He was a bright, articulate and dedicated human being with a healthy streak of adventure. An avid bicyclist, he helped to organize a long bike ride each year called TASSLE [Tour Along the South Shore of Lake Erie].

He is sadly missed. I want to join his many friends and admirers in extending condolences to his mother, Una, and his sister, Barbara, who survive him. His legacy of goodness, dedication, and public service will be a lasting tribute.

CBO SAYS CONRAIL SALE LOSES MONEY

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Congressional Budget Office released a revised estimate of the return to the taxpayers from the administration's proposed sale of Conrail to the Norfolk Southern Corp. According to the CBO, the sale, under the terms agreed to by the administration, would cost the Government \$250 million between 1987 and 1991. While the Government would gain \$1.25 billion in revenue from the sale, the Government would lose \$1 billion in forgone interest and dividend payments from Conrail and \$500 million in lost tax revenues, for a net loss of \$250 million.

Norfolk Southern is an excellent, well-managed and financially healthy railroad. However, it is clear that the sale terms proposed by the Department of Transportation would add to the deficit, not reduce it. Norfolk Southern may well be the best candidate to buy Conrail, but the existing sales terms are unacceptable. Significant improvements will be necessary.

Following is the CBO's revised estimate, which appeared in its analysis of the President's fiscal year 1987 budget:

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGETARY PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

Conrail.—The President's budget assumes that Conrail will be sold to the Norfolk Southern Corporation in fiscal year 1986. CBO estimates that the government would receive \$1.25 billion at the time of such sale, but would lose, over the 1987-1991 period, approximately \$1.0 billion in interest and dividend payments from Conrail and about \$0.5 billion in tax revenues. (The dividend and interest losses would be reflected in budget function 400.)

A SALUTE TO NEW MEXICO'S DEAN OF NEWS REPORTING ON STATE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the outstanding contributions of one of New Mexico's finest journalists. This Sunday, March 2, at a banquet in Albuquerque, the New Mexico chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists—Sigma Delta Chi, will present the 1985 Dan Burrows Award for outstanding and continuing contributions to journalism in New Mexico to longtime Associated Press Santa Fe correspondent Bill Feather.

Feather was nominated for the award as, "an example to all of the media of what a fair, honest, accurate reporter should be."

The Burrows Award was established by the New Mexico chapter of Sigma Delta Chi in 1971, and is presented annually in honor of

the late Dan Burrows, editor of the Albuquerque Tribune from 1944 to 1966.

A native of Artesia, NM, Feather began his journalist career as a reporter for the Las Cruces Citizen in 1948, while attending what is now New Mexico State University.

Since that time, Feather has covered more than 25 legislative sessions, more than a dozen elections, and countless other State events.

After brief stints on some Texas newspapers, Feather joined AP in Albuquerque on July 15, 1956. He spent a year in Santa Fe in 1958, returned to Albuquerque, and was then named as AP's Santa Fe correspondent in 1961. He left AP in 1966 to become the editor of the New Mexican in Santa Fe, but returned back to AP in 1968.

Mr. Speaker, Feather's nomination points to his outstanding contributions to journalism in New Mexico. His nomination states:

His thorough understanding of State finance, elections, and the judicial system made him a walking almanac for capitol reporters, AP staffers, student reporters covering the legislature, politicians, and even longtime State employees.

I hope my colleagues will join with me in saluting New Mexico's dean of news reporting on State government and politics, Bill Feather.

FREE AND OPEN ELECTIONS IN HAITI

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the establishment of democratic government in Haiti which is accepted by all Haitians is of paramount importance to the United States. Now that Duvalier is gone, Haitians have expressed their concern about the present junta which has been viewed as "Duvalier without Duvalier." As we all know, the junta was named by Duvalier before his somewhat hasty departure. No matter what the individual sins or virtues of its members, its birth at the hands of Duvalier condemns it from its inception in the minds of many Haitians.

The resolution of the current situation in Haiti, which is growing more tense, can only lie in a civilian caretaker government which is committed to a fixed timetable for elections which are both open and free. Unfortunately, events in Haiti do not seem to suggest that this resolution will occur.

Last week a priest from my district was able to get a reentry permit to return to Haiti. He was held by the authorities for 3 hours of questioning upon arrival. He was then admitted as priests and nuns gathered in support of his release and entry into Haiti. Other constituents of mine have been refused reentry permits and have not been able to return to Haiti. Given that many of the most vigorously anti-Duvalier Haitians were forced to flee for fear of their lives, the interim government policy of denying reentry is a thinly veiled method of preventing anti-Duvalier Haitians from returning and participating in the formation of a new government in that troubled land. Opposition leaders such as Mr. Eugene, who agreed to

the Presidency for life of Jean Claude Duvalier and thereby legalized his political party, are now calling for the exclusion of Haitian exiles during the period of the interim government. In short, they do not want competition from exiled Haitians who vigorously opposed Duvalier and who are inclined to view Eugene's agreement to the Duvalier Presidency for life as an act of treason.

Looking at the Haitian situation from an American perspective, it is clear that the Haitians have not been welcomed without reservation here in the United States. It is in our best interests to support the right of return and to do all that we can to ensure maximum participation of Haitians in the electoral process. It is only through open and free elections that we can be sure that a government will be elected which is acceptable to Haitians. The crowning glory of our elections is that the losers can accept defeat with the knowledge that they have not been shut out of the process. Participation is the key to acceptance and the peaceful transition from one government to the next. It does not guarantee that everyone will be pleased, as we all well know, but it does support acceptance for the duration.

The history of elections in Haiti informs us that we must not intervene if we truly support an open process. The September 22, 1957, election in Haiti in which Duvalier was declared the official winner by a vote of 679,884 to 266,993 for Dejoie was based upon falsified tallies which should give us pause. The actual vote count gained through a Freedom of Information Act request, was Duvalier 212,409 to Dejoie 975,687. Given the recent tactics in Liberia and the Philippines, it is imperative that we maintain a neutral stance which does not encourage this sort of counting error.

My district has 50,000 Haitians. Some are citizens who wish to remain in their adopted land. Many more are not citizens and they do wish to return and commit themselves to the rebuilding and development of their homeland. I support their aspirations and the aspirations of Haitians who wish to see a democratic government in Haiti. It is for that reason that I have introduced House Resolution 379 with Congressman WEBER which supports the aspirations of the Haitian people and calls for free and open elections in 6 months. I urge all of my colleagues in supporting this proposal which puts us squarely on the side of democracy and decency for a land which has lacked both in its government.

NATIVE AMERICAN DIABETES PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT OF 1986

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation concerning one of the most serious health problems of American Indians and Alaskan Natives in this country.

The incidence of diabetes among Native Americans is significantly higher than in other population groups within the United States. In

fact, some Indian tribes report that more than 40 percent of their adult population have diabetes. This compares with statistics of approximately 3 percent of the overall U.S. adult population suffering from diabetes.

A similar bill has been introduced in the other body, S. 1988.

This legislation provides for immediate steps to be taken to prevent and control diabetes. Failure to prevent and control diabetes results in kidney failure, amputations and blindness. We need to take steps now to reduce the costs to the Federal Government as the costs of treatment for the long-term complications of diabetes are skyrocketing and the suffering to the individual is severe.

This legislation, which I am introducing today, will expand and coordinate Federal research programs aimed at diabetes and related complications among Native Americans. This legislation will strengthen the Indian Health Service efforts in the treatment, prevention and control of diabetes. Most important, this legislation will result in a reduction of diabetes among American Indians and Alaskan Natives.

A concentrated effort in dealing with this tragedy is long overdue. There has been, over the last several years, a marked improvement in the health of Native Americans, largely due to the passage of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act. However, we cannot overlook the fact that 1 in every 5 Indian person suffers from diabetes. This legislation is a beginning step in addressing this national tragedy.

I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in cosponsoring this important legislation.

The bill follows:

H.R. 4282

A bill to establish a program for the prevention and control of diabetes among Native Americans

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 "Native American Diabetes Prevention and Control Act of 1986".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the incidence of diabetes among Native Americans (which for purposes of this Act includes Indians and Native Alaskans) is significantly higher than in other population groups within the United States;

(2) in several Indian tribes over 40 percent of the adults have diabetes compared with approximately 3 percent of the overall United States adult population;

(3) diabetes has become the second leading reason for outpatient visits by Native Americans to Indian Health Service facilities nationwide;

(4) serious complications of diabetes, such as kidney failure, hypertension, amputation, and blindness, are increasing in frequency among Native Americans;

(5) health care costs for treatment of diabetes and related complications among Native Americans will increase significantly in the long term unless the Secretary of Health and Human Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary")—

(A) determines the cause of diabetes among Native Americans,

(B) develops early diagnosis, treatment, and prevention programs to reduce the inci-

dence of diabetes among Native Americans, and

(C) trains, or provides for the training of, Federal and Native American health care providers in the diagnosis, treatment, and control of diabetes and related complications;

(6) a Model Diabetes Control Program exists within the Indian Health Service, consisting of seven project sites which serve only 10 percent of the Indian Health Service patients; and

(7) outreach services and the conveyance of effective treatment strategies from the model project sites need to be implemented.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to broaden the research programs within the Department of Health and Human Services relating to diabetes and related complications among Native Americans;

(2) to strengthen the efforts of the Indian Health Service for the treatment of diabetes through the implementation of a program for the prevention and control of diabetes and related complications on each Indian Reservation and for each Alaskan Native Village; and

(3) to achieve a reduction in the incidence of diabetes among Native American populations to a rate comparable to that of the general United States population.

SEC. 3. STUDY ON DIABETES AMONG NATIVE AMERICANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall determine—

(1) the incidence of diabetes among Native Americans;

(2) activities the Indian Health Service should take—

(A) to reduce the incidence of diabetes among Native Americans,

(B) to provide Native Americans with guidance in the prevention, treatment, and control of diabetes,

(C) to provide early diagnosis of diabetes among Native Americans, and

(D) to ensure that proper continuing health care is provided to Native Americans who are diagnosed as diabetic; and

(3) the fiscal impact to the Federal Government of treating the long-term complications of diabetes based upon the existing prevalence and incidence of diabetes among Native Americans.

(b) INVENTORY.—The Secretary shall prepare an inventory of all health care programs and resources (public and private) within the United States that are available for the treatment, prevention, or control of diabetes among Native Americans.

(c) REPORT.—Within 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and transmit to the President and the Congress a report describing the determinations made under subsection (a), containing the inventory prepared under subsection (b), and describing the research activities conducted under section 6.

SEC. 4. DIABETES CARE PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM.—Within 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall implement a program designed—

(1) to strengthen and expand the diabetes control program of the Indian Health Service;

(2) to enable all service units of the Indian Health Service to treat effectively—

(A) newly diagnosed diabetics in order to reduce future complications from diabetes,

(B) individuals who have a high risk of becoming diabetic in order to reduce the incidence of diabetes, and

(C) short-term and long-term complications of diabetes;

(3) to conduct, for Federal, tribal, and other Native American health care providers (including community health representatives), training programs concerning current methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of diabetes and related complications among Native Americans;

(4) to determine the appropriate delivery to Native Americans of health care services relating to diabetes;

(5) to develop and present health education information to Native American communities and schools concerning the prevention, treatment, and control of diabetes; and

(6) to ensure that proper continuing health care is provided to Native Americans who are diagnosed as diabetic.

(b) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall—

(1) promote coordination and cooperation between all health care providers in the delivery of diabetes related services; and

(2) encourage and fund joint projects between Federal and tribal health care facilities and Native American communities for the prevention and treatment of diabetes.

(c) CLINICS.—(1) The Secretary shall continue to maintain each of the following model diabetes clinics which are in existence on the date of enactment of this Act:

(A) Claremore Indian Hospital in Oklahoma.

(B) Fort Totten Health Center in North Dakota.

(C) Sacaton Indian Hospital in Arizona.

(D) Winnebago Indian Hospital in Nebraska.

(E) Albuquerque Indian Hospital in New Mexico.

(F) Terry, Princeton, and Old Town Health Centers in Maine.

(G) Bellingham Health Center in Washington.

(2) Within 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish and maintain model diabetes clinics in additional locations.

(3) The Secretary shall develop and implement an outreach program to ensure that the achievements and benefits derived from the activities of the model diabetes clinics maintained under this section are used by all service units of the Indian Health Service in the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of diabetes among Native Americans.

(d) PERSONNEL.—The Secretary shall maintain appropriate personnel within the Indian Health Service to develop and implement this section and to manage and coordinate the diabetes care program of the Indian Health Service.

(e) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the Congress an annual report outlining the activities, achievements, needs, and future goals of the diabetes care program of the Indian Health Service.

SEC. 5. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS.

The Secretary shall develop and maintain a comprehensive standardized system within the Indian Health Service to collect, analyze, and report data regarding diabetes and related complications among Native Americans. Such system shall be designed to facilitate dissemination of the best available information on diabetes to Native American communities and health care professionals. Such system shall be operational within 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. RESEARCH.

The Secretary shall require each agency and unit of the Department of Health and Human Services which conducts research relating to diabetes—

(1) to give special attention to research concerning the causes, diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of diabetes and related complications among Native Americans; and

(2) to coordinate such research with all other agencies and units of the Department which conduct research relating to diabetes and related complications.

SEC. 7. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE VICARIATE OF SOLIDARITY IN CHILE

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my congratulations to the Vicariate of Solidarity of Chile for its receipt of the Freedom Prize by the Prince of Asturias Foundation.

The Vicariate of Solidarity, which was created by the Archbishop of Santiago, was chosen as the recipient for its work in the struggle for freedom and democracy in Chile. It is one of the principal organizations opposing the regime of General Augusto Pinochet, and its work has often put at risk the lives of its members.

The Prince of Asturias Foundation's Freedom Prize was instituted this year for the first time on the occasion of the 13th anniversary of Prince Phillip of Bourbon as heir to the Crown of Spain. The prize will be officially awarded to the vicariate in October.

The selection panel, which was headed by former West German Chancellor Walter Scheel, also included former Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kriesky, former Secretary General of the United Nations Kurt Waldheim, former British Prime Minister Edward Heath, and Secretary General of the Council of Europe Marcelo Oreja.

In announcing the award of the freedom prize to the vicariate, Secretary General Oreja aptly described the vicariate as "an organization that is fighting unselfishly and effectively on behalf of the coordination of very diverse social forces in Chile and those defending human rights, at the same time that it promotes a political impulse for the peaceful transition to a system of freedoms."

Among the candidates for the prize were Polish Solidarity leader Lech Walesa; former President of Italy Sandro Pertini; the leaders of the South African opposition, Nelson and Winnie Mandela; and Soviet dissident Andrei Sakharov. Although I consider all of these individuals worthy candidates for the prize, I am particularly pleased that the foundation chose the vicariate because, unlike the other candidates, it receives so little international attention for the invaluable work it does.

I have personally met with representatives of the vicariate, both in the United States and

in Chile, and I have found them all to be inspiring and dedicated individuals, who are willing to risk their lives to protect the rights of their fellow countrymen, and to help restore the rich tradition of democracy to Chile. I applaud their efforts and wish them continued success in their struggles.

THE GRAND DEAN OF DENVER TV

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, the commentaries of veteran Colorado newsman Carl Akers have inspired, challenged, angered, delighted, frustrated, enchanted, and impressed countless viewers of Denver's channel 9 news since 1975. His views have compelled all of us to think about our lives, environment, and Government.

I would like to share with my colleagues a superb article from the Boulder Sunday Camera magazine, February 23, 1986, the article, reprinted below, captures this grand newsman of Denver TV:

THE GRAND OLD MAN OF DENVER TV

(By Julie Hutchinson)

Its quitting time for Carl Akers this Wednesday afternoon at Denver's KUSA Channel 9. At the stroke of 4:55, he stubs out a Winston 100 cigarette, rises from behind his big, comfortably cluttered wooden desk, slips into his dark-green down parka and takes the stairs up to the front lobby. As he heads past the reception desk, Akers is spotted by a tall, handsome man with well-cut hair who approaches eagerly, hand poised to shake.

"You old curmudgeon you, how are you?" says the man with the well-cut hair, grasping Akers' hand affectionately. Akers' big, plain face crinkles into a wide grin in return.

The man with the well-cut hair is U.S. Rep. Tim Wirth, Colorado's 2nd District Democratic congressman and recently announced U.S. Senate hopeful. In his gruffly tender greeting, Wirth has paid impromptu homage to one of Denver's most-durable television faces.

The familiar, next-door-neighbor type face of Carl Akers has launched a thousand ratings wars since 1953, raised holy hell on subjects ranging from seat belts to South Africa and endured an onslaught of media consultants who in their heyday pushed prettier faces to the forefront of TV news.

But of those whose familiarity with Akers rests only in seeing him as a commentator—a role he came to late in his career—many wonder: Who is this guy, and how does he get away with being such a cornball?

Carl Akers hasn't always been a cornball. With only a year-and-a-half absence in the late 1960s, Akers has been a staple in Denver television news since he anchored the first-ever newscast for fledgling KLZ-TV Channel 7 (now KMGH-TV) the day it debuted on the air on Nov. 1, 1953. During Akers' tenure as lead anchor for Channel 7, he was the undisputed, top-of-the-ratings king of current events. During his years as Channel 9's news director, from 1968 to 1975, he put into place the formula and the faces that boosted Channel 9 to a decade of

undisputed dominance in the ratings. Since 1975 he has served as Channel 9's crusty—and controversial—commentator. In his career he has nurtured the careers of dozens of radio and TV journalists who have gone on to be household names and faces in the Rocky Mountain region, and who now look to him as one of the grand old guys.

Carl Akers remains a regular odd salty-dog kind of a guy in a medium that places great value on slick-as-a-whistle sophistication and drop-dead good looks. He's the guy with whom the gray-hair group identifies strongly, an old-fashioned, Colorado kind of guy, a reminder of those days when a one-way trip on the Denver-Boulder Turnpike cost a quarter and Stapleton was not an international airport.

"Few people are bland in their attitude toward Carl, either they like him or strongly dislike him," says Sheldon Peterson, who as KLZ Radio news director in 1948 hired a young, eager Carl Akers as writer and announcer. "Nonetheless, he's respected for his views," says Peterson, who retired as public affairs director at Channel 7 in 1976.

Since 1948, when Akers came to KLZ Radio fresh out of the University of Missouri journalism school, he's shared center stage with Denver TV and radio legends including Bob Palmer, Starr Yelland, Gene Amole, Stormy Rottman, John Rayburn and Warren Chandler, watching and being watched as the Denver television news market evolved from cow-town camp to big-city bluster.

In his thrice-daily, minute-and-15-second commentaries on Channel 9, Akers sticks out like a sore thumb. Television news has gone glamorous, beauty is bucks and cool translates into cash. Alongside Mike Landess' dreamboat good looks and the machine-gun fire intensity of darkly handsome Ed Sardella, Akers is a time-warp reminder of the days when the news was the news, and television sets were living room furniture.

For the first year or so on the air at Channel 7, newscasts ran 15 minutes and Akers read and wrote news, weather and sports—and drew his own maps. News was no-frills, it was no-nonsense and there were no bones about it. It was black and white, and it was live. Report it, roll in the cameras, read it and go home. Another day's work down and done.

But don't, don't tell Akers that you remember him when. Happens to him all the time and he hates it. "I hired a kid here some years ago, and he came in to my office one day and said, 'Carl, one of my earliest memories in life was of you on television.' He was a head taller than I was, he was around 30 I guess, and I said, 'I never want to hear that again. You just made me feel a hundred years old.'" He pulls hard on his cigarette as he tells the story, exhales and chuckles until his shoulders shake.

IN THE FLESH

He is different in person than on TV. Younger, thinner, softer. The crustiness is there, but there's a hesitation that doesn't come across on the air waves. It's almost as if he'd like to be more agreeable, but he's thought about it, thought about it long and hard, and he just can't be. He is considerate of his listeners, lights ladies' cigarettes with gusto and waves through the window of his office at Channel 9 staffers passing in the hall.

The minute-long impression he casts on the air is clipped, cantankerous, and devil-may-care. But one minute with him in the

flesh and that video visage gives way to a man who is kind, who cares about Colorado, who wants people to like him.

Akers has aged before our very eyes. He is a little heavier, jowlier and the hair that he grows long to comb over his bald spot is almost white. But there is a sense of bridled energy in his stout, powerful build. Akers turns 65 on Sept. 14, ripe for retirement, but he's not talking about what happens on that bellweather birthday. He might travel, might write a book or a newspaper column, might want to renew his contract with Channel 9.

Every time he completes a commentary, signing off with the words "This' Carl Akers," countless numbers of his 400,000 viewers react as if he just scraped his fingernails across a blackboard, wondering why he can't say "This is Carl Akers."

But Akers knows there are people who think he's a cornball. He doesn't care much, and for a good reason—he's still a valuable commodity in an industry that plays it by the numbers.

The Denver television market, which includes most of Colorado and parts of Nebraska, Wyoming and South Dakota, is the 19th-largest in the country. Big money is made in advertising revenues collected from evening newscasts, and Channel 9 has long been the undisputed fat cat in the ratings war.

Until two years ago, that is, when upstart KCNC Channel 4 began to nip at Channel 9's heels to the point that Channel 4 now leads in the 5 o'clock ratings and is neck-and-neck with Channel 9 at 10 o'clock. Last-place Channel 7's recent gains also threaten to erode Channel 9's portion of the first-place pie.

But Akers stands away from all the infighting, the incestuous gossip and the backstabbing competition in the Denver television news market for one simple reason: His appeal is proven.

ENTER THE CONSULTANTS

As the technology of television brought us living color, live-from-the scene reports and a dizzying display of graphics, local news programming became Big Business, capable of generating big ad bucks.

Denver TV stations relied heavily on advice from out-of-town consultants who converted newscasts from Maine to Montana into carbon copies of one another with identical, rousing theme music, exact eyewitness reports, blindingly bright graphics and monotonously slick anchor personalities.

But times have changed.

"The days of glitter and glitz are passing into oblivion," says Pete Hoffman, chairman of McHugh & Hoffman Inc., which acted as Channel 9's media consultant during part of Akers' tenure as news director, and today counts Denver's KMGH-TV Channel 7 among its 40 clients in the United States and Canada. "Substance is where it is at this point." Hoffman says viewers want perspective, and they want it delivered from someone "with a greater degree of knowledge than just a pretty microphone holder. Akers says Hoffman, has "historically had a great deal of longevity in the marketplace. He's been there, part of the mix. He's a fixture. There are other markets like Denver who've had guys who used to be anchors and transcended into senior statesman," which, translated in viewers' minds, is that undefinable quality called credibility.

"I am flat opposed to consultants," says Akers. "I have gotten my tail in a wringer, but I don't believe that anybody can sit in

some other city and tell us out here about our audience and what our audience wants. . . . I've been around here so long, I'm so hard-headed and bull-headed that they leave me pretty much alone. When I was newscasting, we hired some consultants to tell us what we were doing wrong, and I thought they were wrong."

But Akers hung on, defiantly and deliberately, through those topsy-turvy times. Even as KCNC Channel 4's Bob Palmer, the only other Denver TV veteran who begins to approach the venerability of Akers, updated his hairdo and spiffed up his wardrobe, Akers flew in the face of formula and did not alter his balding pate, his nasal, cranky voice or his do-or-die opinions.

Michael Wirth, chairman of the University of Denver department of mass communications, says "I think Carl's there to reassure that things haven't changed that much. . . . By the fact that Channel 9 continues to keep him on the air, I assume their research tells them a significant portion of their audience likes what he's doing."

AN INDEPENDENT STREAK

From the beginning, when Channel 7 went on the air in Denver from the old "pink palace" at Sixth Avenue and Speer Boulevard on Nov. 1, 1953, Akers has been calling—and getting—his own shots.

The oldest of three sons, Akers was born in the country near Denison, Texas. His mother was a school teacher who corrected his grammar and read Aesop's Fables and Mother Goose to her boys at bedtime. His father ran a little grocery store in town.

After overseas duty in an Army finance unit in World War II, Akers streaked through the University of Missouri school of journalism in two-and-a-half years and then fell in love with Colorado. Sheldon Peterson remembers Carl Akers, the 1948 job applicant.

"Carl came to Denver newly married, full of ambition," says Peterson, who lives in Denver. "Yes, his voice was excellent, and of course it still is. I've had to judge voices all my life. It's hard to say what makes a good one, but you instinctively know it. One of the qualities is that he has a lot of deep timbre. He seemed to blend Texas with Colorado in a very pleasing combination."

But Clayton Brace, then Akers' boss and now vice president and general manager of KGTV Channel 10 in San Diego, felt differently about Akers' accent.

"He failed on television," says Brace, of Akers' first days as Channel 7 anchor in 1953. Akers had some crazy notion about doing the news from a set that showed the working newsroom behind him—and he wanted to look the way he looked when he was really working, with rolled-up shirt sleeves, loosened tie, no makeup.

Management wanted something else: "We were still watching John Cameron Swayze, wearing a very fine business suit, in front of a potted palm," says Brace. "I was determined to do something new," says Akers, who remembers the details of those days with arresting clarity. "None of us knew anything about television; we were all out of radio." But management gave Akers his way and the news was broadcast from a tiny office with a double-pane glass window looking into the newsroom. Though even Dan Rather broadcasts today from a working-newsroom set, Akers' idea in 1953 was revolutionary.

Despite the determination to do something new, Akers had second thoughts about his innovation when, "I think the second day on the air, our janitor, bless his

heart, came into the newsroom and they tell me that he stuck his nose right against the glass right over my right shoulder and stared at the camera, while I was on the air." That very day, says Akers, a map went up over the window. "That danged set," however, stayed around 10 years.

And Akers didn't last too long either. After three days as Channel 7's first anchorman, Brace sent Akers back to radio.

Akers was terribly disappointed: "Oh, Lordy, was I. It was the roughest time of my life. I had been looking toward television for two or three or four years, because we knew it was coming, and I wanted to try my hand at it."

But Akers lost his Texas tones "very quickly," says Brace, though Akers claims he lost his accent in the Army out of self-protection.

But after a couple of months, "It wasn't long until we decided he brought more to TV than a Texas accent," says Brace. Back he came to TV news, "extremely effective on the air, as well as a very effective reporter," says Brace. "He exuded authority. . . . He was a fast study, he learned the market very quickly."

"We didn't know what we were doing" says Akers, shaking his head at the memory of those early days when TV was uncharted territory. Yet, says Brace, his popularity was "like a skyrocket. He built a following never surpassed by anybody in Denver. Carl was getting huge shares of audience."

During Akers' days of dominance at Channel 7 from 1953 to 1966, Brace says the Akers name was well-known around the country. "A lot of stations sent people out to study our news," says Brace. And many of those seeking the Akers secret were "aghast," says Brace, when they saw Channel 7's working-newsroom set "because there was no potted palm or sexy backdrop."

By 1955, Carl Akers had grown comfortable in his role as Channel 7's news anchor, and Denver was growing accustomed to the miracle of television. Then, on the night of Nov. 1, Akers realized how very different this business of television was from radio—more than just a picture to go with sound, but a medium that would bring people face-to-face with breaking news almost instantaneously, in the comfort of their very own living rooms.

A United Air Lines DC-6B bound for Portland, Ore., blew up near Longmont shortly after 7 p.m. that night, 18 minutes after taking off from Stapleton. All 44 people aboard died instantly. Denver resident John Gilbert Graham, who had purchased a life-insurance policy on his mother, a passenger on the plane, would later die in the gas chamber at Canon City after being convicted of planting a bomb on the plane.

"I remember putting that film on th air," says Akers of that night. Cameraman Jim Bennett, who doubled as Channel 7's weatherman, "jumped in his car and went up there and got the film and brought it back and the film was still wet. We didn't even have time to dry it. Didn't have time to look at it or edit it or anything." Akers and Bennett "ad-libbed" the 10 o'clock newscast.

Somehow you just get the feeling that because Akers remembers those good old days, because it's with him all the time, that's why the old fogies and the grey hairs seem to be so crazy about him. They've lived through those stories with him, and Akers is that same familiar face, amid all these greenhorn strangers.

IN THE STUDIO

Akers tapes his commentaries Monday through Friday immediately after the noon news team shuts down—and that day's taped commentary isn't shown until the following day, says Akers, so he has 24 hours to get out of town if somebody gets mad.

Once in a while, such as two weeks ago when Lee Iacocca was fired from his fund-raising job on the Statute of Liberty renovation, Akers responds to breaking news and does a hurry-up commentary.

Besides the noon news, Akers' commentaries also air during the 4:30 and 10 o'clock newscasts—the times when the ratings wars heat up and the upstart Channel 4 gets eye-to-eye with Channel 9.

Managing a mouthful of commentary in a minute or so is a rare skill which, says John Rayburn, who coanchored the Channel 7 news with Akers in the mid-'60s, Akers had down to a tee. "Carl is one of the best editors I've known in broadcasting."

Akers "retired" from Channel 7 in 1966 but was wooed by Channel 9 in 1968 by then-General Manager Al Flanagan. There he worked as both anchor and news director until 1975, when he and Flanagan "came to a mutual agreement that it was time for me to come off the air. I was just trying to do too much. And Flanagan asked me to do commentaries."

"I said, 'I don't know anything about commentaries.' I said, 'I've never done a commentary in my life.'"

"He says 'B.S. You editorialize straight through newscasts . . . I've watched you do it for years—raising an eyebrow; shaking your head or scratching an ear or something like that.'"

So he took the job.

"I've had people get furious about some of the stuff I say. Nobody screens my calls. I've told them . . . don't screen my calls, don't even ask them who's calling, and if they sound mad, so much the better."

Akers chooses his subject matter independently—and only Channel 9 President and General Manager Charles Leasure has override power on those editorials.

"I don't always agree," says Leasure, "but the purpose of the commentaries is to get people thinking about subjects and Carl has the ability to generate thought. While he speaks for himself and not for the station, I can imagine in all these years only two times where I have asked him not to run a comment."

One of those times, says Akers, occurred six or seven years ago when he took a hard shot at the Denver Broncos "when he thought they were playing lousy ball or something, god only knows." Leasure asked Akers to can the commentary because Channel 9 was in negotiations with the Broncos for pre-season game broadcasts.

AT HOME

Akers begins his day in his sprawling, yellow-brick ranch home in Lakewood with a big cup of coffee with cream and sugar.

"First thing I do is turn on the radio, then light a cigarette, then the third thing every morning is, *What am I going to talk about today?*" He scours the Rocky Mountain News page by page. And there are days when he's afraid there won't be anything to talk about: "I just keep throwing things in the wastebasket. . . ."

Aker's wife of 14 years, Mary Lou, knows to leave her husband alone during those early-morning brainstorming sessions. Divorced from Marge, his wife of 23 years, Akers met Mary Lou Dekker, who was the

Channel 9 newsroom secretary at the time, in 1970.

Mary Lou, who Akers affectionately calls "M Lou" is 54, with a Barbie-doll figure. She takes obvious pleasure in making the Akers home peaceful and comforting and it is decorated in earth tones, with skylights, plants, books and built-ins.

They have learned to operate independently in their 14 years together, with Mary Lou taking art classes at Red Rocks Community College while Carl plies his television trade downtown. They sleep in separate bedrooms, says Akers, because he snores, smokes and wakes up in the middle of the night sometimes and listens to talk radio.

What Mary Lou loves about Akers most, she says thoughtfully, is "his honesty, intelligence. He has the greatest laugh in the world, the best smile, and the patience of Job with me."

"He is the biggest chauvinist I think I have ever known in my entire life," she adds, laughing as Carl grimaces. She says during their early married days, "I thought my name was *While You're Up*. . . ."

Mary Lou has a 31-year-old son from a previous marriage, but Akers has no children of his own, which Akers says was a matter of choice, not circumstance.

"I have never regretted it," he says. "I've been accused of being selfish and I am. And I'm being 100 percent honest when I say that I never thought I would make a good father. I'm short-tempered, and I don't think I would have been a good parent."

After Akers reads the papers and gets down an idea for that day's commentary, he heads out for the station, about a 15-minute drive down the Sixth Avenue freeway from home. Once he's in his basement office at Channel 9, he skims *The Wall Street Journal*, *USA Today*, and *The Denver Post*.

Further verification of the value Channel 9 places on Akers is his large, comfortable office with wall-to-wall carpet and plenty of seating for visitors. Though Akers won't say what the station pays him as commentator he will say "It's probably quite a bit less than Ed (Sardella) and Mike (Landess), but they have more important jobs than I do and that's just the way it is." Akers says he thinks Sardella and Landess each receive in excess of \$100,000 annually, and that his salary is reflective of his experience.

THE PERILS OF FAME

He says he really likes only three or four or five of his commentaries a year, when the magic combination of the right words and the right humor are there.

"I've been accused of being too dour, or too straight-faced. When I try satire, or irony, some people take me very seriously, and that phone will start ringing . . . and you can't explain humor to anybody. And maybe I ought to smile once in a while, give 'em a tip-off that what I'm saying is not as serious as they might think," says Akers.

During the 1973 Arab oil crisis, Akers took the side of the Arabs, a position that some people interpreted as anti-Semitic, a suspicion that has shadowed him since, and of which Akers says he is clearly aware.

"I don't register that kind of a pulse at all," says Saul Rosenthal, regional director of the Mountain States Anti-Defamation League. "That may be Carl's perception, but I can't really confirm that myself. I think he's short-crediting himself if he thinks that. The Jewish community is no more, no less skeptical of Carl Akers than anybody

else who publicly speaks to Middle East or domestic issues."

Of the perception that he is anti-Semitic, Akers says "that's one of the things that really upsets me. I try to look at our own government and even foreign governments without any prejudice whatsoever."

STILL ENTHUSIASTIC AFTER ALL THESE YEARS

Carl Akers seems to love his business for its intrinsic, hard-working qualities—not its star-making potential.

"You can get to believe that you're something special. We're not. We just do our jobs like everybody else and, really, it's not that big a deal. . . . When I was news director I used to say 'I'm gonna put you on the air' to a certain individual, and I said, 'The day that you become, in your own mind, a celebrity or a star, then you're not worth a damn to me as a reporter or an anchor.'"

By their very nature, says Akers, television news personalities become celebrities. "But I think it's the way an individual thinks about himself or herself. I have seen television ruin a lot of good people."

"But I do love it. One reason I thoroughly enjoy it is because it's a wide-open door to meeting so many people. I can go out and sit down, out in eastern Colorado, which I've done on many occasions, lean up against a barn, and talk to a farmer about his problems, and enjoy it. Or I can call (former Denver Mayor) Bill Nichols, which I have done, and sit down and talk with Bill about his days as mayor."

During his years as news director, Akers hired a swarm of young people wanting to make a name for themselves in the news. One of those young people was Frank Currier, who made the big time and is now a Midwest correspondent for CBS News, based in Chicago.

"I've never been able to define why one person makes it on television and somebody else doesn't. I think it goes right back to the core . . . how they feel about themselves. You can't lie to a TV camera. That's the most heartless invention ever put together by mankind. If you feel a little proud of yourself, a TV camera amplifies that to where you look like you think you're sitting just at the right hand of God, or something. If you're nervous, conversely, it'll magnify your nervousness to where you look like a raving idiot."

Despite his success in the business Akers says he never wanted to make it to the networks like his protegee, Frank Currier. "In my self-appraisal, I am a realist. I don't think I could ever possibly make a go of it anywhere, maybe, except here. I don't think I have the talent, or the drive. But I will be honest with you, and I don't know whether I ought to say this or not, if I walked into a television station today and they didn't know me from Adam, they would laugh me right out of the place. Number one, because of my age; number two, had I not had the opportunity, that rare, rare opportunity to help put a station on the air, and be kind of hardheaded . . . I don't think I would have ever made it in television."

Akers has seen plenty of people come and go—including Starr Yelland, who worked as sports anchor with Akers as part of the successful Channel 7 team. Yelland was unceremoniously dumped from the Channel 7 lineup in those mid-'70s days when consultants were scrambling to provide all the answers.

"I think it was a mistake," says Akers. "It was during that change when all television was going to younger people . . . and I can understand that. I don't care what job a person has, the old process of evolution comes in. It always does. Anybody in any job eventually is going to have that job taken by a younger, more energetic individual, man or woman. It's a hell of a shock. . . . I've seen people older than I am who were really devastated when they had to retire."

But there will come a time when Akers is absent from the airwaves. "I've thought about that, and I'm not even concerned about leaving anything. I'm not worried about tomorrow, or leaving my name. The day I leave the air it will take less than a year for the majority not to remember. If one out of 10 remember, it would surprise me. Once it's off the air, it's gone. There's nothing quite as fleeting as TV."

CONGRESS SHIRKS ITS RESPONSIBILITY

HON. DAN SCHAEFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, when attempting to explain the sequestration process of Gramm-Rudman, many in this body have compared its automatic cuts to a gun at the head of Congress, forcing its Members to make the difficult decisions necessary to reach the deficit targets called for by the law. Borrowing this analogy, as the March 1 deadline approaches, it is evident that Congress has chosen to shirk its responsibility and pull the trigger. Unfortunately, the gun is aimed at middle-class America.

Given the entire month of February to replace the sequestration order with responsible budget cuts, the House chose instead to meet only 11 of the 27 days this month. If my district is any indication, the people of this country would have much preferred us taking this time to amend the sequestration order rather than traveling across America condemning Gramm-Rudman for our own irresponsibility. Now, as usual, when forced to accept the consequences of our inaction, we tell our constituents that sequestration was inevitable.

As one of the Members who cosponsored Congressman BOUTER's resolution to replace the fiscal year 1986 sequestration with prioritized spending reductions, I want my constituents to know that it was not Gramm-Rudman, but Congress that is responsible for pulling the automatic trigger. And, contrary to what we in this body want our districts to believe, our fingerprints are all over the gun.

Mr. Speaker, Gramm-Rudman was designed to force us to do our jobs, not to do our jobs for us. As we begin consideration of the fiscal year 1987 budget, let's work to put together a package of responsible and prioritized spending reductions and make the smoking gun a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

thing of the past. The sooner we treat sequestration as an unacceptable option, the sooner we can put together a budget we'll want our fingerprints all over.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

OHIO'S LINCOLN—FRANK J. LAUSCHE

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1985, there was a birthday celebration on Capitol Hill honoring Frank J. Lausche, former mayor of Cleveland, Governor of Ohio, and Senator from Ohio. Nine decades haven't lessened the vitality or vigor of this statesman from the great State of Ohio.

Frank J. Lausche is a true statesman. His values and convictions remained unwavering from the very beginning of his political career in 1932 in Cleveland, OH, when he became a municipal judge. As a judge, he cracked down on organized crime, gambling, and drove the loan sharks out of town. In 1941, he was elected mayor of Cleveland and was reelected in 1943. He became known as the "miracle man," providing Cleveland with clean government and inspirational leadership during the difficult times of World War II. In 1945, Frank Lausche became the first Catholic and first Slavic Governor of Ohio. There was universal agreement during his tenure that Gov. Frank J. Lausche continued the honest and effective stewardship he demonstrated while mayor of Cleveland for 4 years. In 1954, Frank Lausche was elected to his fifth term as Governor and by then had become a legend in Ohio politics. In 1956, Frank became the first Democrat to be elected to the U.S. Senate from Ohio in 22 years, serving until 1968.

I would like to direct my colleagues' attention to a recently published book "Ohio's Lincoln: Frank J. Lausche," a tribute and a festschrift for his 90th birthday. The book, edited by Edward Gobetz, and available through the Slovenian Research Center located at 29227 Eddy Road in Willoughby, OH, traces the life of Ohio's Lincoln from his early days as a gas street lamplighter to the present day where he continues to be vigorous and active. This beautifully crafted book contains over 350 pages of historic information, humorous anecdotes, political memorabilia, and fascinating pictures. I was honored to be a contributor to this book along with many of my colleagues and friends, and I recommend it to everyone. "Ohio's Lincoln: Frank J. Lausche" is a fitting tribute to a distinguished American. He is truly a source of pride for all Ohioans and an enduring example for all Americans active in public life. It is an honor for me to be able to pay tribute to Senator Lausche and I encourage my colleagues and their constituents to refer to "Ohio's Lincoln: Frank J. Lausche."

February 27, 1986

WORLD'S LARGEST SUPERCONDUCTING MAGNETIC FUSION FACILITY IS COMPLETED AT LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL LAB

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, last Friday full performance tests of superconducting magnets in the Mirror Fusion Test Facility at LLNL marked the completion of the \$350 million project.

A lot of hard work and money has been invested in the world's largest superconducting, tandem mirror fusion experiment. For 8 years, some of the finest scientists and engineers in America have dedicated their time and energy to the project.

The MFTF-B is a magnificent technological achievement. Housed in a 190-foot-long vacuum vessel and weighing nearly 3 million pounds, the 24 magnets in this set store more magnetic energy than any other magnet set ever built. To operate them, they were cooled to a temperature of -452° F, with one of the largest liquid-helium refrigerator systems in existence.

The magnet tests were the focus of a series of tests that began last November, other major systems were also operated successfully. These include intense particle beams that will be used for heating the fusion fuel, high-power microwave-heating systems, a complex high-speed vacuum-pumping system, and a large nitrogen-liquefaction plant to augment the computer control, using sophisticated state-of-the-art technology. Collectively, these integrated tests demonstrated the operational readiness of the facility and achieved some of the technology goals set when the project was proposed. Primary among these goals was the construction and operation of the magnets; a goal now met with the conclusion of the tests last week.

I would like to extend my sincere congratulations to the many people involved in the project. The completion of the facility marks a significant advancement toward the harnessing of fusion energy: I believe a goal well sought.

Unfortunately all is not well with the MFTF-B. Under the President's budget for fiscal year 1987, funding has not been provided for the operation of the facility. In fact, the budget proposes to pick up savings by mothballing the project. I would hope that we in the House could strike a compromise with the administration on this budget issue.

I am told by staff at LLNL that \$20 million more in their budget would allow the operation of MFTF-B at a reduced level. It is not the optimum solution, but facing the deficit that we do, it is a compromise solution.

MFTF-B is truly an incredible accomplishment. I sincerely hope that the facility might be used for the experiments it was meant, and again I commend those who made it possible.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to commemorate Black History Month. This is a time for all Americans to recognize the countless contributions that blacks have made to this country.

My district observed Black History Month through a wide variety of activities. I was honored to be the guest speaker at the Sixth Annual Black Achievement Awards Ceremony. This event was sponsored by the New Haven chapter of the Coalition of Concerned Citizens and was held at the United House of Prayer. Awards were given to over 30 members of the community.

The Afro-American Cultural Center at Yale opened the month with an art exhibit entitled "Samani Za Kale" (Once Upon A Time), the art of Njee and Kariuki Muturi. The Muturi brothers, raised in Nairobi, Kenya, used pen and ink to create large abstract symbolic pieces that evoke rich Agikuyu tradition. There were lectures on "Africa and Her New World Children: Exploring the Diaspora," "Liberation Theology: Future of the Black Church," and "Fighting the Klan." The Center's Heritage Theater Ensemble featured William Hanley's hit from the 1960's, "Slow Dance on the Killing Ground." The Yale Rep performed "Othello," and the Alliance Theater performed Alice Childress' "Wine in the Wilderness."

The Dixwell Community House sponsored a Black History Program including poetry, drama, dance, and gospel. The program entitled, "Black History '86, an Expression of Hope," featured Hattie Turner as the keynote speaker, poetess Gayle P.H. Hall, and the debut of the Pal Hall Dance Co.

The New Haven Preservation Trust published a list of 21 buildings associated with the history of Afro-Americans in New Haven. The buildings dating back from 1818 to 1950, include the Goffe Street Special School, Trowbridge Square, Bethel A.M.E. Church, Dixwell Avenue Church of Christ, Immanuel Baptist Church, St. Luke's Episcopal Church, St. Paul's Union A.M.E. Church, and Varick A.M.E. Zion Church. The Goffe Street School was built in 1864 for blacks. Trowbridge square was developed in the 1830's; many black families lived there in the mid-1800's.

The Stetson Library scheduled several Black History Month activities including a movie on blacks' escape from slavery via the underground railroad; Jesse Lewis hosted the Newhallville Senior Gospel Choir, the Tony Burroughs Singers, and the Dixwell Senior Line Dancers; and Sosivu Caldwell conducted a workshop on "African Mask Making: A Look Into the Past."

As this month comes to an end, I am pleased to be able to reflect on the contributions black Americans have made to this country as well as celebrate their rich history. Black History Month is not only a celebration of the past but an inspiration for the future.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO ASSISTANT
SHERIFF LARRY KALSBECK

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring the attention of this body the accomplishments of Assistant Sheriff Larry Kalsbeck.

Assistant Sheriff Kalsbeck joined the department on August 26, 1966, and was promoted to sergeant in 1969. His duties and responsibilities during that period included patrol supervisor, juvenile detective supervisor, homicide, and intelligence unit investigator. He also authored a grant for funding of a Sheriff—Probation Department's Law Enforcement Explorer Post.

In April 1974, Larry Kalsbeck was promoted to lieutenant and put in charge of East Valley detectives. Grants and responsibilities for the new Crimes Specific Task Force as well as County Regional Criminal Justice Planning Board and chairing the County Juvenile Justice Task Force claimed his time during this period.

In August 1975, Lieutenant Kalsbeck transferred to the personnel bureau with responsibility for recruitment, internal affairs, and administration of the Police and Sheriff's Regional Training Academy. He was also responsible for the department's affirmative action plan and initiated a career development program for sheriff's department personnel.

In April 1977, Lieutenant Kalsbeck was transferred to the city of Camarillo as new station commander and in August 1978, was promoted to commander and transferred to East Valley as new station commander and chief of police for the city of Thousand Oaks. He was responsible for a staff of 140 and a budget exceeding \$6 million.

In August 1982, Commander Kalsbeck was promoted to assistant sheriff. His duties included administration of the department's court services, special services, and support services divisions. He was also charged with responsibility for preparation and management of a budget of about \$38 million. Security planning for the 1983 International Regatta and the 1984 Olympic Games at Lake Casitas was the responsibility of Assistant Sheriff Kalsbeck.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in expressing our thanks to Larry Kalsbeck for a career of public service and accomplishment. May he and his family enjoy a long and fulfilling retirement.

A TRIBUTE TO SOCIAL
SECURITY

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 14, 1985, our Nation celebrated the 50th anniversary of the day the Social Security Act was signed into law. Historians already view this

legislation as one of the most significant statutes ever enacted in the United States. Created by Congress, at the request of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Social Security has done more to help keep Americans out of poverty than any other Government initiative.

This program was born during a time of great crisis in America's history. Millions of people were suffering the effects of the Great Depression. One-third of all Americans were ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-fed. Unemployment was rampant. Our financial institutions were failing, wiping out the life savings of millions of Americans, leaving them no money to rely on during these hard times. Because our country could not allow its citizens to suffer like this, a national program was established to provide for unemployment and old-age insurance, and for public assistance. It was hoped that this would lessen the pain of another severe economic crisis.

Social Security has undergone many positive changes in the last half century. In 1939, it became a family program, with dependents and survivors of the insured eligible for benefits. In 1950, legislation provided additional coverage for employees of State and local governments, farm and domestic workers, and most self-employed Americans. Social Security has continued to evolve to meet the needs of the working and the elderly: The program has been expanded to include disability insurance, and, in 1965, Medicare was created. Controversial amendments in 1983 moderated benefits for future recipients, but at the same time helped assure the financial security of the program for generations to come, well into the 21st century.

For many elderly citizens today, Social Security is all that stands between them and the depths of poverty. Without this safety net, over half of our senior citizens would be thrust into poverty. We must remain committed to the ideals outlined by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and ensure that Social Security is around for another 50 years, and another 50 after that.

We all realize the importance of Social Security and its valued role in our society. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Congress of the United States to maintain and upgrade all the components of the Social Security system, to fulfill the commitment first made 50 years ago: That America will never abandon its elderly and disabled.

A TRIBUTE TO DISNEYLAND'S
MARY BONINO JONES

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to pay tribute to Mrs. Mary Bonino Jones for 24 years of outstanding service to Disneyland in my district of Anaheim, CA. Mary joined the Disneyland Public Relations Division in 1962 and, as manager of the community affairs department, has been responsible for Disneyland's extensive community relations, governmental and interna-

tional relations and corporate social responsibility operations.

Since it opened in 1955 the nationally and internationally acclaimed amusement park has entertained nearly 250 million guests from every nation in the world. It has greatly influenced the growth of Anaheim and Orange County. Mary has been an important player in that outstanding development and has been a first rate representative for Disneyland.

Recognizing that business plays a vital role in maintaining a health community, Disneyland embraces the tradition of helping to build a better community. This responsibility is not taken lightly. Disneyland has spent millions of dollars on community programs. For example, every year since 1957 Disneyland has demonstrated its responsibility to Orange County through the Disneyland Community Service Awards Program. This special program, which alone has presented nearly \$2 million in 900 awards, provides incentives for organizations which foster the spirit of voluntarism characteristic of Orange County and recognizes organizations dedicated to community betterment and citizen involvement. It is a program of which Mary and her outstanding community affairs staff are justifiably very proud.

Disneyland employees also donate their time and talents to fellow citizens and organizations. And Mary has set a fine personal example for the staff and community. She served on the boards of St. Boniface Elementary School and Marywood High School and taught in the Released Time Religion Education Program. Mary also established the office of protocol for the county of Orange, CA. Her family is active in the community, as well. Mary and her husband, Wesley, have two daughters. Maria is a teacher at Cypress High School and Gloria is a Dominican Nun.

Mary's last day at Disneyland is February 28 and I want to take this opportunity to personally thank her for her many years of hard work and loyalty to Disneyland and the Orange County community. She has contributed many hours of invaluable and devoted service to Disneyland. I commend her on this special day and wish all the best in her new role as chief of protocol for the county of Orange.

THE GREAT PEACE MARCH BEGINS

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the news of a very special event in our Nation's history which will begin March 1, 1986, from Los Angeles CA, when an estimated 1,500 people will leave their jobs, families, and friends to embark on a 9-month march across the country to show their commitment for peace. It is called the "Great Peace March" and was organized by People Reaching Out for Peace or PRO-Peace. The group describes itself as "an international citizens movement with a single goal: bilateral nuclear disarmament." PRO-Peace was born from the idea that each individual can make a difference and the great ideas put forth by honest people can alter history.

Leaving from the Los Angeles Coliseum, the group will head across the Mojave Desert to Las Vegas, then march through Utah and Colorado, and up to the 12,000-foot Loveland Pass. The marchers will continue to climb over the Rocky Mountains and into Denver and then through Nebraska, past missile silos and across the Great Plains. In Iowa it is hoped that thousands of farmers will join the march through the Corn Belt. The march will continue to Chicago, and through the industrial heartland of America, past Three Mile Island near Harrisburg, on across New Jersey, over the George Washington Bridge and down through Manhattan. The march will continue down the east coast to Independence Hall in Philadelphia and then on to Baltimore and the Washington Beltway.

The night before the marchers enter Washington DC, hundreds of thousands of citizens from across the country will be asked to join the march in an all-night candlelight vigil for peace. The next morning, when the march enters the Nation's Capital to petition our Government and the Soviet Union to take the weapons down, thousands more are expected to join the march to fill the streets of Washington to walk in dignity for peace.

THE MACHINE TOOL INDUSTRY

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, February 28, makes the second anniversary to the day the machine tool industry's national security case reached the White House for review.

By any standard, that is a long time for a national security matter to sit gathering dust. Members of both parties and more than one Cabinet member agree—2 years is simply too long.

The machine tool industry is in trouble. In 3 years, imports have risen from 27 percent of the U.S. market to an astonishing 47 percent. Employment in the industry has dropped by 40 percent and is continuing to shrink.

Section 232, under which the machine tool industry filed its petition, is designed to deal with trade cases with national security implications. But section 232 does not set a deadline for decisionmaking—even though it is clearly in our interest to prevent such cases from languishing for months, even years, once they reach the White House. That is why I have introduced legislation to set a deadline for section 232 cases.

Meanwhile, the machine tool case drags on. Without some kind of relief, the future of the industry is in doubt. But at the very least, the industry is owed a decision. I urge my colleagues to join me in pressing for action on machine tools.

EMERGENCY FARM INCOME AND CREDIT ACT OF 1986

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues, BERKLEY BEDELL, and 13 of our fellow House Members in introducing the emergency farm income and credit bill of 1986. We come to the floor of this House a mere 2 months after passage of the 1985 farm bill with a single objective—we will not abandon the battle of improved farm income, no matter how formidable the opposition. Through reintroduction of this emergency legislation, we intend to refocus the attention of this body, and the Nation, on the seriousness of the farm crisis.

The legislation we are introducing today contains two very important components. Perhaps most importantly, this emergency bill offers farmers the chance to achieve their primary, and most critical, objective. It permits producers the opportunity to earn a fair price for the commodities they produce. Also, recognizing the serious credit crisis facing our family farmers and ranchers, this legislation provides the framework for debt restructuring and lower interest rates through the FmHA Guaranteed Loan Program.

The crisis statistics foreign to many not involved in family agriculture are, unfortunately, all too familiar to farmers and ranchers themselves.

Nearly 45 percent of all commercial farmers are experiencing some degree of financial stress, with the majority of these farmers and ranchers facing debt-to-asset ratios in excess of 50 percent. Most of these producers have been denied a fair price for their commodities, the single best medicine available for an ailing agricultural economy.

Statistical data to document the cause of this financial stress is abundant. The availability of operating capital is critical to nearly every family farmer and rancher. The value of the producer's farm, ranch, and other assets are the collateral used to secure these loan funds. At the same time farm income has been eroding, the value of farm land throughout the Midwest has tumbled by 42 percent since 1981, causing producers with debt-to-asset ratios that were acceptable 3 years ago to suddenly find themselves facing financial insolvency. This is occurring with no basic change in the farming operation.

All of these problems—declining farm income, eroding asset bases, and increasing debt-to-asset ratios—have resulted in a not too surprising Census Bureau statistic: nearly 25 percent of all farm families are in poverty. More farmers and ranchers have left the family farm in 1985 than in any year since 1976.

Many members of this body may have heard President Reagan's comments on agriculture and think that all is well in the agricultural sector. He was asked whether "we've turned the corner on the farm economy and are headed for better times" A good many

family farmers and ranchers would challenge the President's response: "I think we are."

My colleagues and I are introducing this legislation today because we know that is not the case. Farm income will decline by an estimated \$5 billion as a result of the current farm program. Carryover stocks, dramatically increasing in recent years, are expected to exceed those levels which caused the administration to implement the costly 1983 PIK Program. Increased exports, have been held out as a "carrot" for the financial salvation of farmers and ranchers, despite the fact that exports have fallen by 25 percent since 1981.

Some of my urban colleagues might ask "why should we care?" "What difference does it make to us if the agricultural sector is facing a crisis?" The answer is clear—a depression in the agricultural economy has far-reaching ramifications, into the congressional districts of nearly every Member of this body.

It has been estimated that possible unpaid Farm Credit System farm loans alone could total as much as \$25 billion by 1987—equivalent to a \$100 tax on every person in the Nation. General interest rates would increase, jobs would be lost, and the Federal debt would increase.

For many industries, the effect of the farm crisis has already been felt. Farm equipment production plunged 41 percent in 1985. Sales have fallen by more than 50 percent from the 1979 sales peak. Fertilizer use has decreased by more than 22 percent from a year ago. In some rural sectors, financial experts have placed a 25-percent reduction on the number of small businesses in many rural communities.

Mr. Speaker, time is of the essence. Financial decisions being considered by many family farmers and ranchers will be directly related to their future in farming and ranching. We urge our colleagues to join us in this effort to reverse the disastrous trends in the farm crisis and provide farmers with the best possible medicine—a fair price.

I ask unanimous consent to have a summary of this legislation placed in the RECORD at this point.

SUMMARY OF THE EMERGENCY FARM INCOME AND CREDIT BILL OF 1986

TITLE ONE—IMPROVED FARM INCOME THROUGH THE VOLUNTARY MARKETING PROGRAM

Marketing certificates and minimum loan rates

Under the Voluntary Marketing Certificate Program, producers of wheat and feed grains who voluntarily participate in annual acreage reduction programs would be eligible for (1) a nonrecourse loan on their crops and (2) marketing certificates equal to the program yield multiplied by the allowable planted acres for their farm.

The minimum loan rate would be \$5.00 per bushel of wheat and \$3.50 per bushel of corn for each of the 1986 through 1990 crops.

All wheat and feed grains sold for domestic consumption must be accompanied by a marketing certificate. Although producers who do not participate in annual acreage reduction programs may plant their entire wheat or feed grain acreage base, these producers could not receive a marketing certificate for their crop and, thus, would be required either to consume their production on their own farm (e.g. feed the grain to

livestock) or sell the grain only for export at world prices.

Grain produced by a program participant in excess of the marketing certificates assigned to that farm may be consumed on that farm, sold for export, or carried over to the next year and marketed with certificates (if applicable) in subsequent years.

Marketing certificates themselves would not be transferable except that the certificates must accompany grain that is bought and sold.

Export subsidies

Grain accompanied by a marketing certificate, if not consumed domestically, would, if exported, be entitled to subsidy equal to the difference between its domestic market value and the world price. The subsidy would be provided to the exporter as an in-kind payment from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks or in cash; commodities provided as in-kind export subsidies must be exported.

The Secretary would be required to announce the value of the export subsidies daily, based on the difference between domestic and world prices for each commodity. The export subsidy would assure that our exports are sold at prevailing world market prices.

Farmers would enjoy the benefit of this export subsidy since their grain (accompanied by the certificate) would be worth more than non-certificate grain that is exported.

Acreage reduction reductions

The Secretary must announce the acreage reduction requirements for each commodity as required by the provisions of the Food Security Act of 1985, taking into account likely program participation, estimated supply and demand. As already announced by USDA, the total acreage reduction required for 1986 would be 25 percent of a producer's wheat base and 20 percent of a producer's corn base.

In crop years 1987 through 1990, the individual acreage reduction requirement may not be more than 35 percent of a producer's wheat base nor more than 20 percent of a producer's feed grain base.

TITLE TWO—EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL CREDIT

Objective

To utilize the Farmers Home Administration's Guaranteed Operating Loan Program to encourage commercial lenders to restructure outstanding agricultural debt.

Operation of the program

A mandated 90 percent FmHA loan guarantee would be available to commercial lenders for the purpose of restructuring existing agricultural loans. Lenders would be required to "write-off" a minimal portion of the borrower's outstanding debt and accrued interest. The guarantee would be in effect during the duration of the interest reduction program and would apply to the remaining principal after loan restructuring by the lender.

Debt write off

In order to qualify for the loan guarantee, lenders would be required to write-off a minimum of ten percent of outstanding debt and interest accrued to the borrower. The interest rate buydown provisions of the legislation will encourage lenders to write-off additional unproductive debt in addition to the required initial ten percent.

Lower interest rates

In order to qualify for the FmHA loan guarantee, the interest rate on the restructured

loan must be established at the cost of money to the lender. Notwithstanding the provisions of the interest rate buydown program, the lender would be required to absorb this interest rate reduction.

Interest rate buydown

Through the interest rate buydown provision in the 1985 Farm Bill, the FmHA will participate in the reduction of the interest rate for the restructured loan package through a 1-percent buydown for each 10 percent reduction in principal by the lender.

TITLE THREE—AGRICULTURAL LENDER DEBT RESTRUCTURING

Amortization of debt write-off

Once a commercial lender has agreed to restructure and refinance a borrower's outstanding debt by writing-off a portion of the borrower's outstanding debt, the lender would be permitted to amortize this debt loss over a period of 10 years. The proposed legislation would change banking regulations which currently require the entire loss to be written-off by the lender in the year in which it is incurred.

ST. NICHOLAS ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, JERSEY CITY, CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY YEAR

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading parishes of the Roman Catholic Church, in the district I represent, is celebrating its 100th anniversary this year, and its accomplishments are so outstanding that I would like to share this information for the edification of all concerned.

St. Nicholas Roman Catholic parish, located on Central Avenue and Ferry Street, Jersey City, known as the Hudson City section, was officially constituted 100 years ago yesterday, specifically February 26, 1886.

Msr. Joseph C. Manz is pastor of St. Nicholas Church and is serving as its third pastor, succeeding Father Alois Auth, since July 1, 1967.

On that date, 100 years ago, 25 German-speaking families formed a nucleus of this new parish, which was fortunate to have as a builder of its foundation, Rev. Joseph N. Grieff, who was pastor of Holy Family parish in today's Union City, NJ. What became quickly apparent was the strong love for God, family, and country of these 25 families, who were led with tremendous pastoral zeal by Father Grieff.

Within 6 months, a church-school building, on the corner of Central Avenue and Ferry Street, was ready for service. Rev. John A. Weyland was appointed the first resident pastor of St. Nicholas parish on September 15, 1887. Within a few months, the parish plant was completed with the erection of the rectory and of the convent for the Sisters of Christian Charity, who were engaged to teach in the school.

The continued influx of German immigrants naturally fostered the growth of the St. Nicholas community so much that both the church

and the school proved to be too small. Since the burden of building both edifices could not be shouldered simultaneously, it was decided in the interests of Catholic education for the youth, to proceed first with the construction of the new school. This 12-classroom school was ready for occupancy in September 1895.

By this time, other immediate needs made themselves felt and demanded attention. The original church-school building was transformed in a fitting convent to accommodate the larger number of teaching nuns; a new parish house was built for the priests' residence and to provide space for parish offices; the spacious school hall became the temporary chapel.

It was not until the summer of 1905 that the cornerstone of the new church was finally set in place and blessed. After 3 years, including a prolonged suspension of operation due to a lack of funds, the majestic House of God was completed and dedicated on March 22, 1908.

The succeeding years witnessed the continued growth of the city and the simultaneous growth of the St. Nicholas community. The parish flourished under the direction of its pastor, Father Weyland. After almost 39 years of devoted service to the community of St. Nicholas, Father Weyland was called to his eternal reward on May 5, 1926, at the age of 73. A month later, on June 8, Rev. Alois Auth was assigned as the second pastor of St. Nicholas parish.

Since Father Weyland had completed the physical plant of his parish, Father Auth was able to concentrate his energies on the development of the school, which soon became his main charge. This personal interest in the school combined with untiring zeal and devotion produced results: St. Nicholas School achieved the distinction of being one of the outstanding schools in the city. This academic distinction was no less due to the self-sacrificing efforts of the Sisters of Christian Charity. Concrete proof of this excellence in achievement was this fact that, for a full quarter of a century, the graduates of St. Nicholas School, both the boys and the girls, were capturing the majority of the scholarships offered by the various Catholic high schools in the vicinity.

The formation of the school band, which matured into a senior band, helped St. Nicholas to extend itself beyond its parochial limits, for within a few years, it earned the reputation of being one of the finest in the State of New Jersey. The band took part in many church and civic events; it was even invited to participate in Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade and in the St. Patrick's Day Parade, both in New York City. After 24 years of existence, the band disintegrated in 1950.

Other major projects that occupied the pastor of St. Nicholas parish in the early 1940's was the improvement of the Sister's convent and the complete renovation of the church. Besides redecorating the church, the entire sanctuary was refurbished: Beautiful marble altars replaced the former wooden ones. Eventually, a new and larger organ was installed and likewise a public address system was set up. The continued growth of the parish created a need for more priests, which in turn necessitated the enlargement of the rectory to accommodate the additional priests.

In late October 1951, due to the constantly increasing enrollment and pressing need for more classrooms, the pastor, though past 70 years of age, embarked on a new building program. The cornerstone for the new 12-room school annex was set in place in 1952. The call for more teaching Sisters occasioned the simultaneous erection of a 3-story convent annex. Both these buildings were ready for occupation and use in September 1952. The school enrollment reached its peak—1,357 pupils—during the school year of 1963-64.

Having served St. Nicholas parish as its pastor for 41 years, Father Auth, now 88 years of age, decided to retire from active duty on June 30, 1967. Father Auth spent almost 2 years in quiet retirement; he died on May 30, 1969, at the age of 90.

Three of Father Auth's assistant priests deserve mention because of the length of their services in St. Nicholas parish, namely: Father Peter T. Werne, Father George Belger, and Father Albert Stegle. All these three zealous priests have long since departed from this world.

On July 1, 1967, the day after Father Auth's resignation as pastor, Monsignor Manz was assigned as pastor and he is still functioning in this capacity. Very well prepared and rich in experiences, gained in his previous 27 years of service, mostly as an administrator, Monsignor Manz was the right choice to head the St. Nicholas community. He immediately set about making extensive repairs and improvements mainly in the old school as well as on the exterior of the church. Probably the most significant item in this area was covering all the stained glass windows, including the magnificent 18-foot rose window of St. Nicholas over the choir loft, with protective weather glass.

As all things human and material undergo changes, so the parish of St. Nicholas showed changed with the passage of time. The outward appearance reflected a drastic change, ethnically speaking. Founded officially as a German parish, its membership was no longer German, since most of the German-speaking parishioners either died or moved to other parts of the city or to the suburbs. Due to the influx of a large number of Italian-speaking families into the area, a Sunday mass for the Italians was introduced in 1971. A like arrangement was made in 1979 to accommodate a similar wave of Spanish-speaking peoples from the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and Central and South America.

In preparation for the centennial celebration of St. Nicholas parish in 1986, the interior of the church was repainted, the main altar, as well as the pews were replaced, the sanctuary proper was enlarged with a corresponding reduction in the size of the body of the church, thus diminishing the seating capacity from 850 to 750 seats; the entire floor space, except that occupied by the pews, is now carpeted. All this work was duly completed in time for the actual celebration of the hundredth year, 1985-86.

The official celebration was begun on Sunday, March 3, 1985, with a mass concelebrated by Archbishop Peter L. Gerety, and a goodly number of fellow-priests. The calendar of additional centennial events will feature the following items:

October 12, 1985: Mass followed by a reception and dinner for all the Sisters who had taught at St. Nicholas School and also for the young ladies of this parish who had entered the Religious Life;

October 20, 1985: Mass for all present and former parishioners, followed by a reception;

February 7, 1986: The school children's contribution to the centennial celebration in the form of a play;

February 26, 1986: The actual centennial day of the founding of the parish: Mass by Monsignor Manz, the pastor, followed by a reception.

April 26, 1986: Dinner-dance at Meadowlands-Hilton in Secaucus, NJ.

St. Nicholas parish has been singularly fortunate and blessed in having had only three pastors in the span of 100 years. The parish plant in its entirety is a credit and a monument to the faith and loyalty of all the parishioners of St. Nicholas, as well as to all the priests who served them so devotedly. The parish is well founded and its stability augurs well for the next hundred years and more. May the benevolence of God continue to reign over this portion of His Kingdom.

During his visit in America, at Battery Park on October 3, 1979, His Holiness Pope John Paul II said:

It greatly honors your country and its citizens that on this foundation of liberty you have built a nation where the dignity of every human person is to be respected, where a religious sense and a strong family structure are fostered, where duty and honest work are held in high esteem, where generosity and hospitality are no idle words, and where the right to religious liberty is deeply rooted in your history.

These words indeed echo the history of St. Nicholas parish and pay tribute to its glorious 100 years of service to God and man. I am certain that my colleagues share my pride and best wishes to all the parishioners, nuns, and priests of this great parish.

OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I had the honor of introducing a resolution with 100 of my colleagues as original cosponsors calling on President Reagan to declare May of this year as "Older Americans Month."

This resolution expresses our gratitude and appreciation to all of the senior Americans who have given so much to make our country great. Older Americans are our country's most vital reservoir of knowledge and experience. None of us has to look very far to see how much our senior citizens have done for our country—and continue to do. They have developed a strong working relationship with the Federal Government as well as an interest in the issues that affect their neighbors and themselves. Through their active involvement in the political process Congress is able to better understand the special concerns of

older Americans and pinpoint the best ways to meet them.

This measure calls on the President to make the official designation and asks citizens to plan special activities to commemorate the month-long observance. It is a great honor to be part of this observance which means so much to our Nation's older Americans.

AMERICAN HEART MONTH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the importance of proper nutrition to safeguard the health of Americans has never received as much attention as it has recently. Even as February 1986 is proclaimed American Heart Month by the President and Congress, the Nation is being characterized as a kind of nutritional battlefield with old dogmas and new theories competing. Sometimes scientists themselves are deadlocked. For example, just last year the National Academy of Sciences, which is charged with periodically reviewing national diet guidelines, reportedly failed to issue recommended dietary allowances for vitamins and nutrients. The reason for this first ever precedent in over 40 years of reporting: "Scientific differences of opinion."

There are solid rocks around which these eddies flow. For example, U.S. News & World Report, in its January 20, 1986, issue, declared that the key controversy surrounding heart disease, the Nation's No. 1 killer and a subject of great interest to us this month, centers on the role of fat and cholesterol in foods. "Leading the attack on high-fat foods," said the magazine, "is the American Heart Association, which recommends that people dramatically cut back their consumption of fat from the current 40 percent of total calories to 30 percent. It also advises no more than two eggs a week. In 1984, a consensus panel of experts at the National Institutes of Health endorsed these dietary guidelines."

It is true that many scientists are examining these guidelines against genetic variability. This does not undermine the guidelines, according to U.S. News & World Report:

But to many health leaders, the Heart Association's guidelines remain good for everybody * * *. Over the past 15 years, heart-disease rates declined 28 percent. The key, say doctors, is for people to understand their own risks. While heredity plays a role, tests can help determine a person's susceptibility to the ill effects of salt, cholesterol and fats.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, the question is how are susceptible members of the public going to be able to make market decisions in their own interest? Dr. Virgil Brown of Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York City and the chairman of AHA's Nutrition Committee gave this advice when he testified on S. 1669 before the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources last October:

Labeling of foods is strongly advocated so that the public can more easily choose food of the desired composition. Many people desire to alter their eating habits but have insufficient knowledge of the composition

of the food to help them accomplish the change.

Dr. Brown said such labeling should include—

The specific common or usual name of each fat or oil, the total fat, type of fat (saturated, monounsaturated and polyunsaturated), cholesterol and caloric content in relation to a well-defined serving measurement.

However guidelines may change, members of the public will need this information to protect themselves against the ravages of heart disease.

I urge my colleagues to support nutrition labeling legislation, H.R. 3751, which I have introduced. When passed, this legislation will allow consumers to make informed decisions on food purchases through accurate and specific labeling.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET AND FEDERALLY EMPLOYED WOMEN

HON. SALA BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the following item to the attention of my colleagues. It outlines the potential effects of the President's budget on female Federal employees.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 27, 1986]

CUTS UNFAIR TO WOMEN?

(By Mike Causey)

Women, who make up 41 percent of the federal government's work force, would be hit especially hard by President Reagan's proposed budget, the organization Federally Employed Women contends.

Because women are concentrated in the government's eight lowest pay grades, FEW President Marie Argana said, they would suffer the most from White House proposals to limit federal pay raises to 3 percent during each of the next three years.

In addition, Argana said, the plan to reduce future cost-of-living adjustments for federal retirees would place many women who are on federal pensions below the poverty level. Argana said the average federal pension for women is \$8,000 a year, compared with more than \$12,000 a year for male retirees.

The president is proposing to skip the 1987 raise that is due retirees (just as the 1986 increase was frozen by the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings amendment to the Deficit Reduction Act), and to limit future retiree raises to 2 percentage points below the actual rise in inflation.

The FEW president said the budget, which calls for job cuts in most nondefense agencies, could mean layoffs for many women. Argana said women who have recently been promoted to middle- and upper-level jobs are "vulnerable to being rified [fired or demoted] first. Furthermore, many of the job categories where women predominate are functions that the government is contracting out to the private sector."

DISPUTES BETWEEN THE HOPI AND NAVAJO TRIBES

HON. JOHN McCAIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, today, Chairman MORRIS UDALL and I introduced a proposal in an effort to stimulate discussions and facilitate negotiations designed to resolve, in a comprehensive manner, many of the disputes between the Hopi, and Navajo Tribes.

In the 1880's, the Federal Government made decisions which had an impact on both tribes, without fully consulting them, nor anticipating the long-term results. Similar decisions were made in the 1930's. As a result, the Hopi tribal reservation became totally surrounded by the Navajo Reservation, and hundreds of thousands of acres became disputed lands as to ownership and control. This area came to be known as the Joint Use Area [JUA].

The tribes have struggled on the land, in the courts, and in the Congress to resolve the disputes. Congress attempted to solve the problem through the Navajo and Hopi Resettlement Act of 1974. The basis of this act was the empowering of a Federal commission to relocate those families, through monetary and housing inducements, that were on the wrong side of a court-partitioned boundary in the JUA, forming the Hopi partitioned lands [HPL] and the Navajo partitioned lands [NPL]. For many reasons, the efforts at relocation have not been successful, and it is apparent that hundreds of Navajo families will not be relocated by this July, the legislated completion date.

Chairman UDALL and I are proposing a comprehensive exchange of lands and minerals receipts, along with the dismissal of outstanding lawsuits between the tribes to settle the longstanding dispute. I believe Congress and the tribes should take a look at this proposal and determine if the current relocation policy can or should be changed.

I have joined Chairman UDALL in this proposal in the hope that discussion and negotiations will ensue, resulting in a just settlement that will alleviate the human suffering existent on both sides. It is my fervent hope that both tribes, and all parties concerned, will examine this legislation in that light.

NATIONAL PARKINSON'S DISEASE AWARENESS MONTH

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a disease about which little is known but is crippling an estimated 1.5 million elderly Americans. One out of every 100 Americans over the age of 60 suffer from Parkinson's disease, a devastating neurological disorder that affects the center of the brain which controls movement.

Unfortunately, Parkinson's is a relatively unknown and often misunderstood affliction. To this end, I am introducing legislation, along with my good friend and colleague, Mr. PEPPER, to designate April 1, 1986, as "National Parkinson's Disease Awareness Month." It is my hope that national recognition of this disease, and the efforts of all those engaged in the fight to understand both the causes and treatments of Parkinson's, will increase public awareness and understanding of this disease and ensure that the needs of Parkinson's victims and their families are effectively addressed.

Parkinson's disease can render its victims virtually helpless. In advanced stages, Parkinson's disease may cause the patient to encounter serious difficulties doing the most basic of chores such as eating. These difficulties pose a tremendous challenge to those who must manage, treat, and assist victims of Parkinson's disease. Perhaps the greatest tragedy of Parkinson's is in the way it affects the family. The presence of a Parkinson's victim in a family can be overwhelming; and the need for strong family support services is vital to both victims and their families.

At this time, I wish to recognize the many all-volunteer Parkinson's support groups across America. They have been instrumental in working for the amelioration of Parkinsonism, and have been devoted to assisting Parkinson's patients and their families cope with this illness. It is through their efforts and support that hope continues to burn brightly for the millions of families affected by Parkinson's disease.

It is altogether fitting that such a commemoration take place and that it receives the full support of all Members of Congress. For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting the full text of the resolution in the RECORD.

THE BAY OF PIGS AND VIETNAM ALL OVER AGAIN?

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to consider President Reagan's request for \$100 million for aid to the Nicaraguan Contras, we are forced to consider some very difficult questions. While examining these questions, we must take a hard look at history, and we must take a hard look at the present.

In looking at the recent past, there exist two obvious examples of disaster brought about by a parochial foreign policy. To some, the Cuban experience, and the Vietnam war are old arguments against the Reagan administration's requests for military aid for the Contras. These arguments may be old, but they have lost none of their validity.

In looking at the present, what exactly is our understanding of the inclinations of the citizens of Nicaragua? Mr. Speaker, I assert that the desire of Nicaraguans to preserve their independence, sovereignty, and freedom of choice, through their own process, is a fact that has not been grasped by the Reagan administration.

Aggravating this situation is the failure of the United States to support the Contadora peace effort. While seemingly doing everything in its power to undermine the work of the four Latin American countries which comprise the Contadora Group, and the four democracies which make up the Support Group, the United States has consistently opposed renewal of direct negotiations with Nicaragua.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the failure of the United States to fully comprehend the nationalism of the Nicaraguan people, I would like to share with my colleagues, a well written and hard hitting essay that examines precisely this inadequacy.

The essay, which is titled, "The Bay of Pigs and Vietnam All Over Again?" was written by Michael Robins. In this piece Mr. Robins recounts the experiences of Nicaraguan citizens, with whom he met in Nicaragua.

The text follows:

THE BAY OF PIGS AND VIETNAM ALL OVER AGAIN?

(By Michael Robins)

Twenty-five years ago President John F. Kennedy's underestimation of popular support for the Cuban Revolution led directly to the fiasco known as the "Bay of Pigs." His miscalculations on Vietnam were even more costly. Today, President Reagan's escalating war in Nicaragua threatens to replay those ignominious chapters of American history.

During a recent two-week visit to Nicaragua, I found that all of the citizens I spoke with—in Managua, Esteli, Condega, and Masachapa—viewed the FDN, the main contra group, as a mercenary invading force made up of former Somoza National Guard. Even those who oppose the Sandinistas viewed the contras as the instrument of U.S. imperialism. Having spent six months in Nicaragua over the last two years, it is clear to me that the vast majority of Nicaraguans recall that the United States supported 46 years of the Somoza dynasty, and therefore they are reluctant to believe that the "gringos" could today have the Nicaraguan people's best interests at heart.

"Look," one shop owner told me, "I don't like the Sandinistas. They are lousy administrators and want too much control of importing and exporting. But I will never support the contras. Look at their methods: killing innocent people, burning crops and buildings, stealing like a bunch of bandits."

A middle-aged woman, once an active supporter of the Sandinista party, today criticizes the government for too much bureaucracy, abuse of privileges, and poor economic planning. Yet what if the contra forces show up in the foothills near her small town? "I will pick up my gun like every other patriotic Nicaraguan and protect our sovereignty—to the end. This is our process."

Given such sentiment and the fact that 63 percent of the population voted for the Sandinistas in the November 1984 election, the majority of Nicaraguans appear quite disposed to protect their independence from outside aggression. This sense of nationalism—which is obvious to most of the 40,000 U.S. citizens who have visited Nicaragua since the 1979 revolution—is a fact that seems to have escaped administration policymakers.

How is it possible—in the 1960s in Cuba and the most, and now in Nicaragua—that the most sophisticated and experienced in-

telligence gathering agencies, military analysts, and foreign policy bureaucracy cannot accurately determine the political climate of a revolutionary country? Are US policymakers blinded by their own preconceptions and values? Why cannot they accurately gauge the subjective view of people in other cultures? Has anti-communism and its by-product, crisis mentality so skewed the policy apparatus that it cannot evaluate hard data?

Policymakers have assumed that, because the Sandinista regime looks to them Marxist-Leninist, the Nicaraguan people must be anxiously waiting to throw off their Sandinista oppressors. Never mind that, to many Nicaraguans, the mixed economy, the preponderance of private property, the participation of priests in the government, and the existence of diverse political parties do not add up to the Marxist-Leninist picture Administration officials paint.

A number of vital facts get overlooked in this mode of reasoning. The Nicaraguan peasant who received land, health care, literacy training, greater access to credit, and technical assistance under the Sandinista regime is not likely to want to return to the past. The Nicaraguan worker whose barrio today has electricity and running water, whose wages increase with inflation, who is involved in a labor union for the first time, and whose children have access to education at every level is likely to defend the Nicaraguan revolution. While such persons do not make up all of Nicaragua's population, they do form the vast majority.

The inability to take off the blinders of virulent anti-communism and reckon with the participants' view resulted in misreading the Cuban people in 1961. In Vietnam, it resulted in the useless death of more than 50,000 young North American men and as many as two million Vietnamese. Policymakers appear once again unable to accept the reality of popular support for the forces of change and revolution.

Elliot Abrams, the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, said on December 31 that if Congress does not authorize greater support to the contra forces, only two other policy options will remain: "You can use American military force . . . or you can surrender."

Is this simply political blackmail aimed at whipping up congressional support for the contras? Or is it in fact true that the only other option being considered, outside of supporting an unpopular gang of contra hoodlums, is a direct invasion that is doomed to fail precisely because it will confront the overwhelming opposition of the Nicaraguan people?

Perhaps more to the point: What does "surrender" really mean? Does it mean normalizing relations with the Sandinistas before they are irretrievably dependent on Cuban and Soviet support? Does it mean allowing an independent, sovereign nation to exist in this hemisphere? Does "surrender" mean permitting the Nicaraguan people to be the masters of their own destiny?

Mr. Abrams and his colleagues should forge a sane policy toward Nicaragua, based on an accurate picture of the Nicaraguan reality, not on the wish-fulfillment of strong anti-communism. And they should forge this policy now, before we commit ourselves to the Nicaraguan "Bay of Pigs."

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in these, the closing days of Black History Month, I think it is important to recall the fact that the history of blacks in the United States of America is the history of the United States of America.

From the beginning, the experience of this country and its black sons and daughters have been coterminous. I would hope, in the final hours of our official celebration of a common heritage, that it has fostered a greater appreciation of the contributions of talented and committed Americans, from the country's inception to the present day.

In Groton, CT, there is a memorial plaque to the bravery of Jordon Freeman, a Revolutionary War patriot who died while fighting for the new Nation's freedom—and his own—as he was a slave. He was killed after he lanced a British officer, Maj. William Montgomery, at the battle of Groton Heights.

I mention Jordon Freeman, because I know that his story and that of his contemporaries, the 5,000 black Revolutionary War patriots, is not well known. There are no national monuments to the service of blacks in the Continental Army and State militias. There is but one monument to a black in the entire city of Washington: To Mary McLeod Bethune in Lincoln Park. While all of us recognize the patriotism of individuals such as Jordan Freeman during Black History Month, we have yet to include his story in regular school curricula.

Blacks are part of the American mainstream. Their story is as dynamic and as integral as that of the Pilgrims, the immigrants who passed through Ellis Island, native Americans—the amalgam of cultures that make up American society. I am proud to join my colleagues in commemoration of Black History Month, and I look forward to the time when the goals of this month of special recognition will be maintained throughout the year.

UNDERSTANDING THE
OPPOSITION

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the 27th Party Congress began in the Soviet Union. I have come upon three good articles on Mr. Gorbachev and the future of the Soviet Union this past week.

One appeared in last Sunday's Washington Post, it was by Dimitri Simes, a Russian emigre and scholar. Another appeared in the March 3 edition of U.S. News & World Report. It was by Seweryn Bialer, a distinguished Russian scholar teaching at Columbia University. The third was in today's New York Times. It was by journalist and foreign affairs expert, Flora Lewis.

I believe that the more we know about the Soviet Union, the better we will be able to

deal with them. I hope my colleagues find these three analyses useful.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 23, 1986]

WHAT'S SO GREAT ABOUT GORBACHEV?
NOTHING—YET

(By Dimitri K. Simes)

The applause for Mikhail Gorbachev this week will be so loud that observers may overlook the fact that the new Soviet leader's performance, thus far, has been quite modest.

At the 27th Communist Party congress that opens in Moscow on Tuesday, Gorbachev will declare that, despite serious difficulties at home and abroad, things are getting better. He will make innovative-sounding proposals on domestic and foreign policy. The party faithful will voice resounding approval for his leadership.

Gorbachev watchers in the West probably will be only slightly less restrained in their praise for the new Soviet leader. Commentators will credit Gorbachev for his bold policies, compare his reformist ideas to those of the late Nikita Khrushchev and warn that the Soviet party chief poses a vigorous new challenge to the United States, both as a partner and a rival.

But Gorbachev's performance doesn't yet merit this chorus of congratulation. For there is less to the general secretary's international momentum than meets the eye.

Gorbachev's successes thus far mostly have been in two limited areas: personnel and public relations. He has proved adept at both, placing his supporters in key positions and presenting a fresh young face to the Soviet and Western publics. But these are largely procedural accomplishments, triumphs of style and political cunning rather than substantive policy.

Beneath the public-relations veneer, Gorbachev faces the same problems that troubled his predecessors: a feeble economy, a fraying empire, a restless population. These problems haven't improved since Gorbachev's accession to power, and in some cases they have gotten worse. More important, Gorbachev hasn't shown any willingness to consider the fundamental changes that might improve the Soviet position.

Consider Gorbachev's paltry record:

The Soviet economy, rather than improving under Gorbachev's supposedly dynamic leadership, remained sluggish last year and in some important areas actually declined. National income rose 3.1 percent, a slight gain over 1984 but less than the average annual increase of 3.2 percent over the last five years under Brezhnev, Andropov and Chernenko.

Soviet foreign policy under Gorbachev has produced much noise but little benefit for Moscow. U.S.-Soviet dialogue, resumed by his predecessor Konstantin Chernenko, hasn't borne any fruit other than a get-acquainted summit. President Reagan's commitment to the Strategic Defense Initiative appears unshakable. Attempts to build separate bridges to the West Europeans at the expense of NATO cohesion haven't gone very far. The Chinese and the Japanese remain suspicious of Soviet overtures. The situation in Eastern Europe is under control for the moment, but the potential for turmoil is as great as ever. And in the Third World, the Soviets are confronted by U.S.-backed counterinsurgencies against some of their clients, which raise the costs of Soviet empire.

Gorbachev, the supposed innovator, in fact appears to suffer from the same insecur-

ities, anxieties and rigidities that have hindered Soviet foreign and domestic policy for decades. At a time when the Soviet economy cries out for basic reforms, he appears wary of tampering with the system of state socialism created by Stalin. Abroad, he continues to depend on the same motley array of clients: Angola, Ethiopia, South Yemen, Vietnam, Cuba, Nicaragua.

The weakness of Gorbachev's performance is masked by his public-relations skill. The general secretary is now routinely described as a great communicator. British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher said that she could conduct business with him. And after the Geneva summit, President Ronald Reagan publicly vouches for "the sincerity" of the Soviet leader and later expressed thanks for his arms-control package, which one administration official described as "breathtaking."

But spectacular imagery is not a substitute for cutting through the web of foreign and domestic problems in which Moscow has become increasingly entangled during the last ten years. And with the exception of nuclear arms control, Gorbachev hasn't given a hint of any intent to reform the familiar Soviet world outlook.

Because Gorbachev made so few changes in Soviet policy, outside the arms-control arena, during his first year in power, one must look to his team of advisers for clues about his intentions. For if the new general secretary is quietly masterminding a shift in Soviet international conduct, he should already be putting in place a cadre of like-minded associates.

But the Gorbachev team is far from innovative. His appointees are younger and more public-relations oriented, but they have shown little desire to break with the established pattern of Soviet international behavior.

Gorbachev's chief political deputy is the tough provincial secretary from Tomsk, Yegor P. Ligachev, 65. A protege of the late Mikhail Suslov, for decades the protector of Communist orthodoxy, Ligachev has already impressed the foreign communists who have encountered him as a hard-nosed ideologue, suspicious of change.

Addressing the Cuban Communist Party congress several weeks ago, Ligachev emphasized the continuity in Soviet policy under Gorbachev: "I would like to stress that all our plans, perspectives and tasks are based on the accomplishments of our society during all the years of the Soviet authority." That doesn't signal enthusiasm for major domestic reforms.

As his new foreign minister, Gorbachev picked Eduard A. Shevardnadze, 57. Like Ligachev, he lacked any international background when he took office. A former police chief and party functionary from the southern republic of Georgia, Shevardnadze appeared to be a risk-taker and relatively open to new ideas, by the standards of the Soviet bureaucracy. But his inexperience, his background as a problem-solver rather than a conceptualizer and his well-documented tendency to defer to Politburo heavyweights may prove to be a problem.

Lower-level appointments confirm this pattern of new faces but old policies. For example, Anatoly Chernyaev has replaced Andrei Aleksandrov, who has served as foreign-policy assistant to every general secretary from Brezhnev on. This change was touted as a breath of fresh air, since Chernyaev, trained as a European historian, had been popular among Moscow's liberal intel-

lectuals, who found him unusually broad-minded and easygoing for a party official.

But old friends have noticed that as Chernenyaev rose through the hierarchy, his views gradually became more orthodox. They say that he would enthusiastically praise the human qualities and intellectual faculties of the stolid Leonid Brezhnev, for whom he sometimes wrote speeches.

Another aide who has Gorbachev's ear on international matters is the chief of the Central Committee's propaganda department, Aleksandr N. Yakovlev. Since he served as ambassador to Canada and is described as an Andropov protege, Yakovlev is regarded by some analysts as an innovator who understands the West. But several of Yakovlev's former subordinates at the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, where he worked before moving to the propaganda job, describe Yakovlev as an ideologue who—despite his stint in Ottawa—has a simplistic, dogmatic view of democratic societies.

Gorbachev's own public-relations savvy also has some striking limitations. U.S. officials who dealt with him in Moscow and Geneva complained about the rigidity and nearly arrogant self-confidence with which the Soviet leader would lecture Americans about their own country.

In an October interview with French television, Gorbachev asked rhetorically what would happen if workers were allowed for even half a year into Western parliaments. The question was particularly inappropriate in France, where the Socialists are in power and where dozens of Communist deputies sit in the National Assembly.

In that interview, Gorbachev claimed that nowhere else do Jews enjoy the same rights as in the Soviet Union. And in an interview early this month with the French newspaper "L'Humanite," the general secretary declared that Soviet-style censorship "exists in one form or another, in every country." He also explained that "Stalinism is a concept thought up by the enemies of Communism and widely used to discredit the Soviet Union and socialism as a whole."

This assertive parochialism is coupled with a burning desire to enhance his country's superpower status. At the April 1985 Central Committee Plenum, Gorbachev implied that one urgent reason for improving the Soviet economy was the danger of losing ground in the international competition. Fedor Burlatsky, a distinguished Soviet political commentator and a former Central Committee aide with links to Gorbachev, made the point particularly bluntly: "We have to think about the future. . . . Either we will be able to ride on it, to rule it, or other peoples and states will begin to pass us and to push us around. . . ."

Gorbachev obviously suffers from his inexperience. He made a costly gaffe at a joint press conference with French president Francois Mitterand during his autumn visit to France, when he left his host no alternative but to repudiate the Soviet proposal regarding separate talks with Paris and London on intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe.

At the same event, the general secretary also managed to offend the Dutch, who were about to make a crucial decision on deploying American cruise missiles. He answered a Dutch correspondent's question regarding the number of SS-20 missiles with a patronizing: "Your government has been informed of our proposals. That is enough for the Netherlands."

Gorbachev's offer to separate the issue of intermediate-range nuclear systems from

progress on the Strategic Defense Initiative was also clumsily presented. Moscow claimed that an agreement would require Britain and France to forego the planned modernization of their obsolete nuclear arsenals. Since Paris will surely refuse this demand, European arms-control advocates will have to blame the likely deadlock on France rather than the United States. No wonder some Reagan administration officials were openly relieved.

These incidents remind us that an excessive self-confidence may be dangerous. As one Soviet official with access to Gorbachev observed: "The general secretary is a very smart man. You start a sentence in his presence and he finishes it up for you. The only problem is that sometimes he finishes it up wrong. And few would dare to correct him."

Gorbachev's openness toward the United States may also have backfired, since it has eased the pressure on the Reagan administration to offer real concessions to the Soviets. The very fact of the Geneva summit—with its images of Reagan and Gorbachev smiling at each other—inevitably created an impression in the United States that Reagan's hard-line policy toward Moscow had worked and forced the Soviets back into serious arms negotiations.

In Western Europe, the opportunities for Soviet public diplomacy are greater. Unfortunately for Gorbachev, he came to power three years too late. If the Soviets had displayed half of his flexibility on intermediate-range nuclear weapons before the first American missiles were deployed, European public opinion would be rallying massively behind his initiatives.

But the missiles are being installed without much trouble. Reagan has become more sensitive to allied perspectives on East-West diplomacy and there is no sense of urgency in Europe to cut a deal with Gorbachev. Moscow's continuing heavy-handed treatment of West Germany mars the Soviet image in Western Europe as well.

The Kremlin hasn't been much more successful in the Far East. Shevardnadze's January trip to Tokyo revived Soviet-Japanese dialogue, but accomplished little else. The Chinese, despite sweet approaches from the Soviets, have refused to consider a non-aggression pact as long as Moscow continues its intervention in Afghanistan, supports the Vietnamese occupation of Kampuchea and remains unwilling to reduce its forces on the Sino-Soviet border.

In Eastern Europe, where Gorbachev's appointment was received with hope, he has also encountered difficulties. Moscow is trying to put the East Europeans on a shorter political leash. But it also wants to stop subsidizing them. Indeed the Soviets want the East Europeans to contribute to Soviet economic development. To stay afloat, however, the East Europeans need a combination of domestic economic reforms and cooperation with the West—precisely what the Kremlin finds undesirable.

These foreign problems are all compounded by the weakness of the Soviet economy, which advertises the failings of the Soviet system and forces painful political decisions about how to allocate scarce resources.

The economic crisis may even be getting worse. Economist Jan Vanous explains in the latest issue of his newsletter PlanEcon Report: "Contrary to the general impression conveyed throughout 1985 in the Soviet economic press and emphasized by Western media, Soviet economic growth did not accelerate in response to the more dynamic leadership of Gorbachev and his program of improved economic discipline."

Vanous adds that according to his own estimates of Soviet production during 1985, it's possible that "Gorbachev presided over the second-slowest growth in post World War II Soviet economic history."

Because the Soviet model of development has lost nearly all its worldwide appeal, Gorbachev's foreign policy will continue to be based on bayonets. Smiling at the same time won't provide a long-term solution.

That Gorbachev cannot walk on water is no reason for complacency in Washington. Even under his inept predecessors, the Soviet superpower had a major impact on the world. But the Reagan administration until recently could be confident that Washington's diplomatic blunders would be more than matched by Moscow. The free ride is over. Gorbachev demonstrated his skill at public diplomacy most recently by accepting the principle of on-site inspection—removing at a stroke the Reagan administration's most convenient excuse for avoiding arms control agreements.

The general secretary has the potential to grow on the job. Gorbachev still may not be sure how far, how fast and in which direction he will take the Soviet Union. At this early stage, dismissing the Soviet leader is as foolish as portraying him larger than life.

But Gorbachev will have to make tough decisions and major policy shifts before the current Soviet decline is reversed. The delegates at this week's Party congress in Moscow shouldn't hold their breath.

[From U.S. News & World Report, March 3, 1986]

ODDS WEIGH HEAVILY AGAINST REAL SUCCESS (By Serveryn Bialer)

The Soviet Union is at one of the major crossroads of its history. On the eve of his party congress, Mikhail Gorbachev stands determined to reverse a long period of Soviet decline. It is a formidable mission.

Gorbachev has left no doubt of his resolve. In one of his definitive speeches, he put his task in these ambitious terms: "What is at stake today is the ability of the Soviet Union to enter the new millennium in a manner worthy of a great and prosperous power. . . . Without the hard work and complete dedication of each and every one, it is not even possible to preserve what has been achieved."

This 27th Soviet Communist Party Congress is a milestone. In some ways it will earn the label "historic" as the leadership suggests. Gorbachev will attempt to invigorate Russia, overcome domestic stagnation, reinstate Soviet status as a global power and regain the international initiative. Stacked with Gorbachev loyalists, the congress will predictably ratify his every initiative, creating in the process the image of a Soviet Union that is now on the move.

But the image may be, in large part, an illusion. Gorbachev's experience during his first year in office suggests that the odds weigh heavily against any real success. Confronted with the reality of a moribund and unyielding Soviet system, Gorbachev was, and will be stymied at virtually every turn.

His struggle against socioeconomic stagnation—which, in turn, jeopardizes international and security goals—is weighed down by the full burden of Russian and Soviet tradition. The new General Secretary is himself a product of traditions that dictate the glaring limitations of his program. And, in his quest for revitalizing the country, the barriers tossed up by these traditions loom as his most powerful opponents.

Of the many problems facing Gorbachev the most intractable may be the insular views, deeply ingrained habits and lack of initiative of not only the peasant but also the worker, the manager, the bureaucrat, the high-level leader.

Brutalized and ostracized by Stalin, fragmented and isolated during the post-Stalin period, the peasantry is interested today only in its own survival—not in the grand scheme of Soviet society and destiny. A peasant's small private plot—and not the collective farm—is his world. If the successful Chinese experiment of reprivatization of the land were introduced in the U.S.S.R., it probably would fail for lack of peasant interest. The young and the bold leave the farms for the cities. The demographic structure of the village is weighted heavily in favor of old men, middle-age women and the very young.

The same lack of motivation afflicts the Soviet industrial working class. A society that venerates the worker has, ironically, unlearned how to work. It lacks work ethics—that essential and basic combination of duty and pride in work. There is reason to doubt that even greater material incentives would induce harder work.

A joke currently making the rounds in Moscow goes to the heart of the matter: A Japanese and a Soviet worker meet. The Japanese says: "Two hours of my working day I work for myself, 2 hours I work for my boss and 4 hours I work for the good of greater Japan." The Soviet answers: "I, too, work 2 hours for myself. But I have no boss, and why should I work for greater Japan?"

The habits of the Soviet managers will be very difficult to change. They were brought up and educated within the traditional—that is, centralized and Stalinist—Soviet economic system. They know how to cope with it, and they know how to exploit it. Most are rational men who have adjusted to a nonrational system where quality and economy are not top priorities and new technology is regarded as highly suspect. But unless this system drastically changes, the Soviet managerial pattern of behavior is not going to change. Increased worker productivity—so essential to reviving the Soviet economy—is going to remain the casualty.

The nature of the country's leadership is another obstacle to Gorbachev-style progress. While there has been a massive influx of new party and government leaders on all levels, there are not bold men bent on new adventures; the new leaders are, by and large, deputies of the old order. They are quick now to criticize the leaders they have succeeded. Yet if the system within which they, too, must work cannot be changed to fulfill their plans and ambitions, they inevitably will end up participating in the evils they now so roundly condemn: Rigged statistics, bribery, attempts to lower planned targets, rampant favoritism.

Gorbachev has moved faster and more decisively in consolidating his power than any previous leader in Soviet history. The challenge to his rule—or, rather, its effectiveness—comes not from the top leadership groups, where his voice is decisive, but from the inertia at the bottom and the swamp within the middle and lower leadership. The key slogans of the 27th party congress—that can be defined as "Throw the rascals out" and "Change the style of leadership"—will produce only short-term improvements.

Despite its domestic and international trouble, the Soviet Union remains an immensely powerful global force, although one whose strength is expressed primarily, if not

exclusively, in military terms. Yet the Soviet Union is just as obviously on the defensive now.

Without dynamic and consistent growth on the home front, the Gorbachev team faces near certain failure in its efforts to assure Soviet dominance in the international arena. Barring any fundamental change in the Soviet system—even if the will to reform of the Gorbachev team persists—the country is unlikely to bridge the gap between itself and its adversaries in technology and economic-military potential.

Gorbachev will, in all probability, improve Soviet performance. But what he can do at most is set into motion the forces of change in a land that for decades has viewed change as the enemy.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 27, 1986]

GORBACHEV'S NEW OLD DIRECTION

Moscow.—There is a curious point-counterpoint both to Mikhail Gorbachev's urgent demand for an overhaul of the Soviet economy and to the way his Communist Party is reacting.

Without any doubt, he really does seem to want to shake things up, move the country along, climb out of the doldrums. He talks about doubling practically everything by the year 2000, a year he can confidently expect to celebrate in power since he will have his 55th birthday on Sunday.

But his complaint about the stultified Brezhnev era rings true about his own regime so far. He told the 27th congress of the Soviet Communist Party yesterday that his predecessors had "a peculiar psychology, how to improve things without changing anything." That is the atmosphere of Moscow now.

Mr. Gorbachev followed the tradition of delivering a soporific all-day speech, divided in four parts. Two parts, about the economy and the party, sounded innovative, resounding with the new but not-yet-explained code words about "acceleration of socioeconomic development" and "scientific-technological progress." The other two parts, about the evils of capitalism and foreign policy, were full of all the old clichés.

Then the deputy chief of Gosplan, the state central planning agency, was sent to explain the economic ideas to foreign correspondents, and he sounded as completely wooden as ever. His idea of reform evidently went no further than replacing the manager of an enterprise that has failed, and then carrying on as before.

The fashionable official phase of the moment is "turning point." There is an energetic, rather new effort to convince everybody that this is really a historic moment, a watershed, a change in direction. And then the direction is described as doing more and better just what has been going on all the time until now.

Mr. Gorbachev is moving officials around, threatening sluggish workers with loss of their usually automatic bonuses, talking up a storm, but there is still no evidence of any readiness to change the way things are done, to give people any real incentive to show initiative, work hard, solve problems instead of finding someone else to blame.

The German Communist playwright Bertolt Brecht made a biting comment on the system he believed in during the workers' uprising in East Berlin in 1953. He said that "the Government has lost the confidence of the people, so it has to elect a new people." Somehow the same undertones echo in Moscow just now.

There is a tangible desire to modernize, to admit how many of the inevitable old boasts were empty and how few of the promises have been delivered on, but an equally tangible reluctance to say why or to do much about it. Seweryn Bialer, an astute American Sovietologist, has pointed out that the West should not confuse Mr. Gorbachev's ideas of reform with liberalization, and he is clearly right. Mr. Gorbachev wants to make the Soviet system work more efficiently, he doesn't want to improve it, because he evidently believes that it is fine as it is. If it doesn't work, it's the fault of the people who have been trying to work it, not the system itself, in his view.

There are some changes, vast compared with the Stalin era but noticeable even in comparison with a year or two ago. Moscow looks well and festive, dressed up for the party congress with sparkling snow, lots of red banners, bright and tastefully designed ornamental street lighting, and far fewer of the trite ideological banners and iconographic portraits than on past occasions. And the pictures are only of dead men, mostly Lenin, some Marx and Engels, but none of the current leaders.

People are much better dressed than they used to be. The long queues in the street are almost all in front of liquor stores now, since Mr. Gorbachev put harsh restrictions on sales and banished the usual vodka and cognac from official functions.

But these things aren't going to "accelerate the socioeconomic development" he talks about. He seems to have in mind a vibrant, productive society, but with its hands still tied and its mouth still gagged, with individuals there to serve the state and to accept what it chooses to give them, making no demands.

There is a sense of crossroads here, but it is just being approached, tentatively, cautiously. The decisive steps haven't been taken, don't even seem to be contemplated. So there is not the exhilaration of a real "turning point," just new faces, new words, same old habits.

PORTNOY HUMANITARIAN
AWARD TO UNION'S JOHN J.
DAVIS

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, the Phil Portnoy Association will honor an outstanding business and community leader, John J. Davis, president and chief executive officer of the Union Center National Bank, with its annual Humanitarian Award on March 8.

Jack Davis is not only an astute banker and businessman, but his compassion and involvement in community fund raising activities has been an inspiration to others. Whether it is the Cancer Society Crusade, the Kiwanis Club, the United Way, or the Wheelchair Gallery project, Jack Davis has done more than his share to stimulate community interest and support.

Jack Davis attended the New York University School of Finance and since 1961 has served in various capacities in the banking business. He is a member of the American Bankers Association, the New Jersey Bankers

Association and the Community Bankers Association of New Jersey.

He is the chairman of the Business and Industry Committee for the Union County Unit of the American Cancer Society. In Union Township he serves as business fund raising chairman of the Wheelchair Gallery, Inc. and the capitol campaign chairman for the Boys and Girls Club. He is past president of the Union Township Kiwanis Club and the finance chairman of St. Margaret's Church in Morristown, NJ. Mr. Davis has previously served on the United Way of Eastern Union County, and on the board of directors of the Visiting Nurse Association of Morris County. He also has been active in numerous other charities and certainly is a most deserving recipient of this year's humanitarian award.

MEDICARE DISCHARGE APPEALS OPPORTUNITY ACT

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to enable hospitalized Medicare beneficiaries to appeal discharge notices without placing themselves at financial risk. At present, peer review organizations have 3 working days to respond to even an expedited review request, but Medicare patients have only a 2-day grace period after receiving a notice of noncoverage.

Therefore, in order to get a review, patients must be able to assume financial responsibility for their hospital bill if they lose. Those who cannot afford to take that risk, are forced to leave the hospital and forfeit their right to a prompt review. The bill I am introducing today rectifies this inequity by requiring the PRO's to complete their review within the 2-day grace period.

The prospective payment system was designed to put pressure on hospitals to operate more efficiently, but evidence is mounting that some have responded by discharging Medicare patients prematurely. Not long ago, I heard of such a case from one of my constituents. Sitting in my office, she described her shock when a nurse walked into her hospital room last May, pulled the IV out of her arm and announced "You Don't Really Need To Be Here."

Hospitals are supposed to absorb the loss from those patients who are hospitalized longer than the average for their DRG, but the lack of a meaningful review opportunity makes it far too easy to shift those costs to the elderly ill. I urge my colleagues to support this vital Medicare reform.

ARTS CAUCUS WELCOMES PETER, PAUL, AND MARY

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week the members of the Congressional

Arts Caucus were honored to have as their guests the talented folk-singers Peter, Paul, and Mary, who were celebrating their 25th anniversary.

Since their debut as a group at New York's Bitter End Club in 1961, Peter Yarrow, Noel ("Paul") Stookey, and Mary Travers have continued to articulate the major concerns of our time. Their first hit single, "If I Had a Hammer," reached the top 10, and brought folk music and social consciousness to the popular music mainstream. Well-remembered for their other hits—"Blowin' in the Wind," "Puff the Magic Dragon," and "Leavin' on a Jet Plane"—Peter, Paul, and Mary received three Grammy Awards, and although they have pursued solo careers since 1970, they often reunite to perform at benefits.

At the caucus general membership luncheon on February 25, each of the folk-singers commented on their music and its relationship to the concerns of our Nation. "It is the responsibility of the artist," stated Mary, "to articulate the questions of our time." Adding to her remarks, Paul stressed how important the imagination and visions are to society and noted that there is "no funding for the imagination—artists must discover it." "It is our common responsibility as artists to share in the American dream, to keep our Nation on course," concluded Peter. The group reminded the members of Woodie Guthrie's comment that civilization should always be funded by the arts. Their performance of "This Land Is Your Land" perfectly summarized these sentiments as well as their unparalleled 25-year career as a conscience for society.

"BILL OF HOPE" FOR AMERICA'S FARMERS

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the desperate economic conditions plaguing our Nation's farm belt have not subsided. They have gathered increasing speed, leaving in their wake bankruptcies of both farms and banks, shattered lives and, with alarming frequency, reports of suicides on our farms.

The farm bill signed into law by the President will in no way help to reverse this situation. Prices will continue to fall, along with the livelihood of a great number of Americans. Cuts mandated by Gramm-Rudman are crippling many of the programs and services that our farmers depend on. And what Gramm-Rudman won't do, the administration budget for fiscal year 1987 aspires to.

We cannot sit by and watch the most valuable sector of our country's economy wither away. That is why I have joined in introducing the "Bill of Hope" for our farmers. This measure will accomplish two very important things. It will give our farmers a fair price for their goods, so that these individuals may start to climb from under their mountains of debt. This income will also trigger renewed spending in our rural communities.

The "Bill of Hope" also meets the demands of the second-round cuts of Gramm-Rudman

required of agriculture by saving our taxpayers and Federal Government approximately \$1 billion. I urge you to do our farmers and our Federal budget a favor, and support this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO HAL BARKER UNIT 79 OF AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, an example of volunteers providing a community service occurred in Cando, ND. The members of the Hal Barker Unit 79 of the American Legion Auxiliary purchased two telephone emergency units to be placed in the homes of sick people who may need emergency help and would otherwise have no phone.

The Towner County Memorial Hospital will determine who will receive the telephone lines based on need. The aim is to provide emergency medical help if necessary, but encouraging sick or elderly patients to continue to live at home as long as possible.

I would like to commend the members of the Hal Barker Unit 79 of the American Legion Auxiliary for this progressive step in making medical help more readily available.

M.B. OGLESBY, THANKS

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, let me take this occasion to express my personal thanks and gratitude to M.R. Oglesby, an Illinois native, who is leaving the White House staff to take up work in private enterprise.

"B" Oglesby has been more than conscientious in carrying out his duties as Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs. No issue was too big for "B." No concern too small for his prompt and courteous response.

"B" is well schooled in the ways and wiles of Washington. His experience with the State of Illinois Washington office taught him the importance of what many regard as the minutiae of government, all the tiny jots and titles that go together in a successful piece of legislation.

His service on Capitol Hill moved him up close to the legislative process where he promptly distinguished himself in the political pushing and tugging needed to move a bill through the congressional traps.

At the White House, "B" moved to the very pinnacle of legislative strategy when he replaced the legendary Max Friedersdorf last August and became the top legislative advisor to the President of the United States.

M.B. Oglesby, thanks—we wish you the best in the future.

HONORING M.B. OGLESBY

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform my colleagues of the fact that a man who has been a very good friend to many of us in this Chamber has decided to take his leave of government service. I refer to my friend of over 20 years, M.B. Oglesby.

"B," as he is affectionately known to us, and I have worked together in government service since January 1967, both in Illinois and here in Washington. "B" came to government service from private industry at the urging of the speaker of the Illinois House of Representatives. Serving first as the speaker's administrative assistant, he later became the administrative assistant of then Governor Ogilvie, and in 1973, came to Washington to be the administrative assistant in my office. He later served on the staff of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, as a special assistant to President Ford, and is serving now in the White House with President Reagan.

In nearly 20 years of association with this man, I have never received anything from him but straight talk, and I know from conversations with other Members of the House that they have had that same experience.

The time comes in every public servant's life when he must think about leaving government service in order to proceed with other challenges. Many persons leave government service, and some are missed. "B" Oglesby will be among those who are missed by all of us. But I know that every Member of this Chamber joins me in expressing our hope that his new career will provide him with sufficient challenges and rewards equal to his many abilities.

REMEMBERING FATHER
HARTKE

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the passing of a very special man in the Washington theater community, Rev. Gilbert V. Hartke.

For almost 50 years, Father Hartke was a guiding force behind the expansion of Washington theater. Father Hartke's influence in the world of the performing arts will remain with us for generations to come. As founder of the department of speech and drama at Catholic University, the Dominican priest built the school's drama program into one of the foremost community and regional theaters in the country. The National Players, a professional touring group of drama graduates created by Hartke in 1949, continues to entertain thousands of fans each year throughout the United States and abroad. The Hartke Theatre, Catholic University's 590-seat theater completed in 1970, represents another spectacular addition to the acting community due to Father Hartke's hard work and dedication.

As a mentor to almost 2,500 students, Father Hartke's everlasting contributions will never be forgotten. He never stopped encouraging aspiring actors to remain committed to the achievement of their goals. "Believe in your own creativity" were the words he preached to his drama students.

Father Hartke was a pioneer in the world of theatrics, who will be truly missed by all lovers of the performing arts. However, we must not forget that his enthusiastic love for drama will be carried on in the careers of those he taught and in the programs he established.

IMMEDIATE INCOME AND
CREDIT RELIEF TO FARMERS

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today joined by my colleagues, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. PENNY, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SIKORSKY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. KASTENMEIER in introducing legislation designed to provide immediate income and credit relief to farmers.

The need to reduce Federal budget deficits—whether under Gramm-Rudman or some other formula—almost certainly will mean a further chipping away at the already illusory price support levels approved in the 1985 farm bill. The bill we are introducing today is meant to stand as a ready alternative to this anticipated erosion in farm support levels while recognizing the constraints on Government spending.

Our "bill of hope" proposes to restore profitability to agriculture, and offer needed debt rescheduling to deserving farmers, by increasing the loan rate on wheat and feed grains, assuring that wheat and feed grains are exported at competitive prices, allowing rural banks to amortize their losses over a 10-year period, and guaranteeing reduced-interest loans made by banks that agree to reduce a farmer's indebtedness.

We believe that this package can reverse agriculture's current plight while reducing Federal farm outlays for wheat and feed grains by nearly \$1 billion from current levels.

Mr. Speaker, we urge all those who are interested in arresting the crisis in rural America to lend their support to this urgently needed and yet budget-conscious measure.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH ROOS

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I pay tribute today to a man who is not only a friend, but an inspiration to people and the community he has served with distinction. His name is Joseph "Joe" Roos.

It was during his Chicago days in the 1940's, that Joe first distinguished himself. He edited the National Free Press, a newspaper which he described as "an educational campaign of enlightenment on the subject of Hitlerism." He didn't hesitate to "take on" the German-American Bund, the Nazis, the Silver Shirts, Father Coughlin, and the Ku Klux Klan. It was during his tenure that he uncovered the first attempt by the Nazis to engage in espionage in America. He was loaned by the paper to Army Intelligence to conduct the first official investigation of the Nazis in the United States.

He left Chicago and moved to Los Angeles, where he tracked the Nazis at the German House, the headquarters for the German-American Bund. In 1954, he began writing for the Heritage newspaper. For 35 years, Joe served as executive director of the Community Relations Committee in Los Angeles. In 1979, Joe's many achievements were recognized by his colleagues and he received the U.S.C. Distinguished Achievement Award, putting him in the same league as previous recipients like Walter Cronkite, Ralph McGill, Theodore White, Norman Cousins, and Dan Rafter.

This year is a very special one for Joe and his wife Alvina. This year, Joe and Alvina will be celebrating their golden wedding anniversary. They are a very special couple with a very special relationship.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to know this man, and I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to him.

MACHINE TOOL PETITION FINDINGS
2 YEARS OLD TOMORROW

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 28, marks a special anniversary for a hard working group of Americans on which the future of U.S. security relies.

It is not a happy occasion for these people, who are not in the military but make their contribution in industry. Rather, it is an embarrassing anniversary for this administration which has ignored a cabinet-level recommendation for 2 years.

The issue? Is our defense industrial base capable of meeting the wartime, or even peacetime, requirements of our military and economy? In the case of machine tools, the answer from the Commerce Department, backed by the Pentagon, has been an emphatic no.

But Cabinet debate of Commerce's detailed analysis of our foreign dependence on state-of-the-art cutting and shaping tools, a prime ingredient in building and maintaining our weapons systems and supplying our troops, and its proposed remedies has been unconscionably delayed, sidetracked, and bottled up by senior staff at key agencies.

While these hidden agenda bureaucrats have stymied top-level consideration of our Nation's ability to defend itself in the decades ahead, our dependence on machine tool im-

ports have doubled and reached as high as 80 percent in the most critical technologies.

Two years tomorrow, and nothing to show for it. What is Congress to think of such bald-faced obstructionism and neglect?

THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

HON. TOMMY ROBINSON

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, last evening, this House voted to approve House Joint Resolution 3, calling on the President to propose negotiations on a comprehensive test ban on nuclear weapons to the Soviet Union.

Unfortunately, I had an important meeting away from Capitol Hill which prevented me from recording my vote. If I had been present, I would have voted in favor of the rule; against the Hyde-Byron substitute; and in favor of final passage.

Passage of this legislation is the first step on the long road to arms control. I realize that I have a reputation as a "hawk," and I have voted for weapons such as the MX missile. I did so because this weapon fills a gap in our strategic forces that must be addressed in the short term. I support the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty because it will prevent a third generation of sophisticated, and dangerously accurate nuclear weapons from being developed and deployed. We must draw the line here.

I am proud that this body has gone on record supporting this important arms control measure.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE LONG-TERM CARE PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 3, 1985, I announced my intention to introduce legislation to ensure protection of the rights of residents in long-term care facilities. Today I am introducing that bill, H.R. 4279, which requires development of a State plan to outline and enforce the rights of long-term care residents as a condition of receipt of Federal Medicaid funds.

It is well-documented that the institutionalized population in long-term care facilities is particularly vulnerable to many forms of abuse, ranging from direct physical and mental harm to unauthorized biochemical experimentation. Some regulations purport to protect institutionalized persons, but there is no existing statute that specifically guarantees the civil rights of long-term care residents. In the absence of a clear statement of congressional intent, it is uncertain whether Medicaid residents, who make up the bulk of the nursing home population, have the right to sue the facility in which they live for violation of their rights. This bill would give them that right, and would also prohibit discrimination against patients who are Medicaid recipients.

Each State would have the necessary flexibility to fashion its own plan for enumerating and enforcing the rights of long-term residents within the guidelines of this bill. Among the rights to be protected are:

The right of a resident to be informed about his or her medical condition and treatment;

The right to refuse to participate in drug experimentation;

The right to privacy during medical treatment and in personal visits;

February 27, 1986

The right to confidentiality of residents' records and personal communications;

The right to associate with persons and groups of their choice;

The right to freedom from physical and mental abuse, and from unreasonable restraint;

The right to personally manage the resident's financial affairs.

This legislation will protect persons who reside in long-term care facilities by affirming that their rights can neither be denied nor abridged because of their institutionalization. This legislation will ensure that residents of long-term care facilities have the same rights as the rest of us and that they will not surrender those rights to which they are entitled.

PLEASE HELP FIND LIVER FOR TERALYNN LANDIS

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1986

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make a plea to my colleagues to assist in the effort to find a suitable liver for a young girl in my district who is in very dire need of a liver transplant.

Her name is Teralynn Landis and she is from Youngstown, OH. Teralynn is 3½ months old and weighs only 11 lbs. Teralynn has tyrosinemia, a disease which gradually poisons the liver. Pittsburgh University Hospital has agreed to perform the operation when a suitable donor can be arranged.

Teralynn is currently being treated at the Rainbow Babies and Children's Unit at University Hospital in Cleveland, OH. I am urging my colleagues to assist in finding a liver for Teralynn. Any information on a possible donor should be given to Beth Eden of University Hospital at 216/844-1500.