EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF CORRUGATED STEEL PIPE

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the National Corrugated Steel Pipe Association [NCSPA], on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the patent for corrugated steel pipe.

Under a submission prepared by James H. Watson, corrugated steel pipe was granted patent No. 559,642 on May 5, 1896. Today, corrugated steel pipe is extensively used in private and public drainage structures throughout the country and the world. Though its effectiveness was widely doubted in 1896, corrugated steel pipe has proven itself able to withstand the stress of dead loads, heavy traffic, unstable foundations, cantilever extensions, hillside installations, and sewer freezing and thawing conditions. This sturdy, durable product has earned its place as a mainstay within the construction industry, properly gained by its effectiveness, durability, and cost efficiency.

I congratulate NCSPA and the corrugated steel pipe industry on this milestone and I thank my colleagues for joining me in recognizing this important occasion.

EAST TIMOR ABUSES CANNOT BE IGNORED

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, over a decade ago, Indonesia invaded and annexed East Timor. While this issue is usually only discussed in this body during the anniversary of the annexation or invasion, I would like to take this opportunity to point out recent reports which uncover the nature of Indonesian rule over East Timor in recent years.

Since the invasion, it is estimated that over 200,000 people have died out of a population of 700,000. To maintain order in the territory, Indonesia stations 5,000 troops in East Timor. These troops have been used to intimidate the local population into an illegal occupation, one which the United Nations has refused to recognize.

The Indonesian Government has consistently been cited by human rights groups such as Asia Watch and Amnesty International for their abuses in East Timor. In their annual report last year, Amnesty International pointed to the fact that at least 350 political prisoners, many of them prisoners of conscience, were held, including some 40 sentenced during the year. Hundreds of people were arrested and held without charge or trial. Torture of political detainees and criminal suspects was common, in some cases resulting in death. Several people were extrajudicially executed, and scores of criminal suspects were shot and killed by police in suspicious circumstances. The fate of possible hundreds of Achnese and East Timorese who ''disappeared'' in previous years remained unknown.

The political dynamics in East Timor seem to be shifting with a younger generation emerging, many of whom were born after the invasion and annexation, and social and economic strains taking their toll. Media reports indicate that the nature of their dispute with Indonesia has become more emotional and protests have become more spontaneous. In a recent news report from the Sydney Morning Herald, rioting last fall has taken East Timor into a new phase. Local people and diplomats said previous unrest in East Timor had been largely politically organized, but recent disorder has been more widespread and spontaneous, reflecting the anger of Timorese buckling under economic and social strains.

Mr. Speaker, while this issue has faded from the headlines and is not a hot topic in Congress, I believe we should be mindful of the abuses in East Timor and the changing political environment.

TRIBUTE TO DEWITT BUSSEY

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday I had the privilege of participating in the memorial services for Mr. DeWitt Bussey II at Solomon Temple Baptist Church in Pittsburg, CA.

DeWitt Bussey was a remarkable man. He gave his entire life to his country and to his community, first in the Armed Forces of this Nation and then later as a community activist and volunteer. Mr. Bussey gave his time to his family and to the children of our community where he counseled and inspired them to achieve high levels of performance as individuals in their daily lives.

Mr. Speaker, DeWitt Bussey was a warrior against the evils of racism and bigotry. He fought them wherever these evils raised their ugly heads in our community or in our State. DeWitt Bussey was there to fight back as a founder of the NAACP Racial Intolerance Task Force.

DeWitt Bussey II was born on January 22, 1934, in Columbus, GA, the youngest of three children born to DeWitt T. Bussey, Sr., and Narcissus Burke Threatt. In 1948, at the age of 15, he enlisted in the U.S. Army shortly before the military became integrated. For the next 22 years, Mr. Bussey served in the Army with distinction, graduating from the military intelligence branch of Officer's Candidate School and attending the Defense Language Institute in Monterey, CA, where he became fluent in Russian. He also fought in the Korean war and the Vietnam conflict. In 1970, Mr. Bussey retired from the military at the rank of captain. Shortly thereafter, he moved to Pittsburg, CA, with his wife and children in 1971.

Mr. Bussey graduated from Laney College in Oakland, CA, and earned a bachelor's degree in public administration from Golden Gate University in San Francisco, CA. He also completed several courses at Los Medanos College in Pittsburg. Mr. Bussey worked in a number of occupations following his military retirement, including salesman, circulation manager at the Pittsburg Post Dispatch, director of the First Baptist Church Head Start Program and part-time instructor at Los Medanos College. In addition, he worked for the Federal Government in the General Services Administration and the Youth Authority Conservation Corps. For the past 10 years, Mr. Bussey was self-employed as a consultant.

Active in State and local politics, Mr. Bussey was a member of the Rainbow Coalition and the East County Democratic Club and twice ran for a seat on the Pittsburg City Council. A passionate advocate for civil rights and a unwavering voice against injustice and racial intolerance, Mr. Bussey was a life member of the NAACP, a member of the Racial Intolerance Task Force, the African-American Resource Center, the Los Medanos Community Hospital Affirmative Action Committee and the Pittsburg Unified School District Affirmative Action Committee. From his arrival in Pittsburg until recently, Mr. Bussey actively participated in a number of community and educational organizations, including the Pittsburg Unified School District Student Attendance Review Board, the Pittsburg Model City Program, the Economic Opportunity Council, the First Neighborhood Council, the Pittsburg Area Council, and the Youth Connection. He also helped to establish the El Pueblo Track Club. At the time of his death, Mr. Bussey was serving as the district advisory chairperson for the Pittsburg Unified School District.

In 1990, Mr. Bussey joined Stewart Memorial C.M.E. Church in Pittsburg under the leadership of the late Reverend Willie Mays. He served on the board of trustees, taught Sunday School and served as an instructor for Project Spirit, an after-school program established by the church.

Mr. Bussey is survived by his beloved wife of 40 years, Edna, of Pittsburg; sons, DeWitt III and Jaimie of Pittsburg; daughters Carol and Deja of Pittsburg and Donna of Atlanta, GA; granddaughter Danielle; sisters, Lenora Bussey Tubbs and Verna Kay Bussey Miles of Pittsburg; brother, Robert Threatt of Pittsburg and numerous relatives and friends.

Mr. Speaker, our community lost a champion with the passing of DeWitt Bussey, but we are fortunate that he left us such a wonderful family with his values to carry on his work with our children to teach them excellence.

My family and our entire community extend our prayers to the Bussey family.

TRIBUTE TO DETECTIVE NICHOLAS SALERNO, BERWYN, IL POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a law enforcement officer who had been recognized for his community invovlement—Detective Nicholas Salerno of the Berwyn, Illinois Police Department.

Detective Salerno, an 18-year veteran of the force, was honored with the Cook County Sheriff's Award for Merit in recognition of his involvement with his community. A member of the Department's Juvenile Unit, Detective Salerno has been active with the Drug Abuse Resistance Education [DARE] program in the city.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Detective Salerno and all the other law enforcement officers who go above and beyond the call of duty to help the young people of their communities.

HONORING DR. LINDA MILLER

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of Fairfax County's finest teachers. Dr. Linda Miller is being honored by the Organization of American Historians as cowinner of the 1996 Mary K. Bonsteel Tachau Pre-Collegiate Teaching Award. This award recognizes the contributions made by pre-collegiate teachers to improve history education and is given for activities which enhance the intellectual development of other history teachers and/or students. The award named for the late Mary K. Bonsteel Tachau of the University of Louisville, memorializes her career, especially her pathbreaking efforts to build bridges between university and pre-collegiate history teachers.

Dr. Miller has been teaching in the Fairfax County Public School System since 1972. She started as a substitute teacher at various schools throughout the County. In 1973 she was a reading aide at Lake Braddock Secondary School. From 1974 to 1978 she taught social studies—civics—at Mark Twain Intermediate and Herndon Intermediate School served on summer curriculum committees developing map skills.

From 1978 to the present Dr. Miller has been teaching at Fairfax High School where her classes include American Government, Political Science, gifted and talented world cultures, gifted and talented American Government, Advanced Placement European history, and world cultures.

Dr. Miller's love of teaching is reflected not only by her receiving this award, but by instilling in her students an enthusiasm for government. At a time when public opinion of government and politics is low, Dr. Miller's dedication and success in educating her students and making American Government come alive, is a welcome addition.

Dr. Miller's education is extensive she holds a Bachelor of Science in Education and Social Studies from the University of Kansas. She received a Master of Arts in Education in 1978. She received a Doctorate in Education from the University of Virginia in 1991.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in congratulating Dr. Miller for her honor and thanking her for her many years of dedicated service teaching in Fairfax County. We wish her much success in the future.

TRIBUTE TO REV. JOSE DA SILVA FERREIRA

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding individual, Rev. Jose da Silva Ferreira on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood.

Father Ferreira was ordained on February 25, 1956, in the Vila Real Cathedral and began his religious life as an assistant pastor. His leadership qualities became apparent when he was appointed pastor Vilela do Támega, Chaves 1 year later. After 16 years as pastor, he emigrated to the United States. During his tenure as administrator of St. Anthony's Church in Cambridge, MA, Father Ferreira played a critical role in the planning and construction of a new rectory and parish center. After serving as pastor in both Lawrence and Lowell, MA, he was appointed pastor of St. Anthony's Church on August 10, 1995.

Throughout his lifetime of service to his church and community, Father Ferreira has displayed outstanding compassion and dedication to others. As pastor, Father Ferreira has gained the admiration of his parishioners by providing spiritual leadership for his neighbors and community. He is a man of humility, dedication, and hard work. I am pleased to have this opportunity to honor the outstanding life and career of such an inspirational individual.

PRESERVE ONE NATION, INDIVISIBLE

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, on occasions too numerous to count during my first year in Congress I have heard Members of Congress suggest that many of the activities of the Federal Government should be eliminated or pushed back to the States. As a Californian, I have listened with some incredulity to the opinion that our 50 Governors now seem to be viewed by some as the repository of governmental wisdom. This astonishing view seems to be that State bureaucracies are somehow preferable to Federal ones.

Aside from this viewpoint, however, there are fundamental questions posed by the helter-skelter rush to defederalize. I would like to share the view of Dr. John Collins, as printed in the Bakersfield Californian. Dr. Collins, a combat veteran of World War II and the retired chancellor of the Kern County Community College points out that while it is popular to bash government, we are the premier country in the world and that is not an accident, but the product of doing something right.

Dr. Collins is not only a respected member of his community, he is my father-in-law. I know him as someone not only who is a loved family member, but the kind of American who those of us in Congress should listen to. Like the rest of his generation, he suffered the poverty of America in the Depression; he helped save our country and the world from totalitarianism during World War II; he achieved professional success through education and then dedicated his life not only to raising a good family, but to helping his community have educational opportunities. His wisdom is gained through experience and we should listed carefully to his admonition that we are the United States, not these United States.

The remarks of Dr. John Collins follow, as they appeared in the Community Voices section of the January 22, 1996 edition of the Bakersfield Californian:

PRESERVE ''ONE NATION, INDIVISIBLE''

The history of the United States has its roots in the British colonies, which though of themselves as semi-autonomous little nations. When these colonies became states with the adoption of the Constitution in 1789, they continued to view themselves as part of a loose union of separate entities. This view was held in spite of the disastrous experience with the Articles of Confederation, which provided for no strong central government.

For 200 years we have been torn between those who want the states to be ascendant and those who see the need for a dominant central government. Before the Civil War, the term ''these United States'' was in common usage. When in 1861 Robert E. Lee, a colonel in the United States Army, was offered the position of general-in-chief of the Union armies, he said he could not turn his back on his country. By that he meant Virginia, not the United States.

Prior to the Civil War, there had been a serious governmental crisis over nullification wherein one state, South Carolina, took the position that a state could nullify a federal law (tariff in this instance). Andrew Jackson stood firm and the central government prevailed.

Also, in the early days of our history as a nation there were a number of Supreme Court rulings which gave precedence to the central government. However, the issue of ''states' rights'' seemed never to get settled.

When Lincoln was elected as the first Republican president, his election precipitated the secession of 11 Southern states from the Union. This formation of the Confederate States of America was the extreme position with regard to ''state rights.''

The South argued that states had the right to authority of what they viewed as a hostile central government.

A great civil war ensued that lasted four years, with more than 1 million causalities. Lincoln steadfastly and successfully conducted the Civil War to save the Union—to preserve the country as one nation, indivisible. His enormous and enduring contribution was and is that we have one country, not two, or four, or even 50.

However, in time the old dispute over ''state rights'' surfaced again, and again, and again, right up to 1996. We see now the spectacle of people who represent their states or districts serving in the United States Congress preaching ''states' rights.''

They want to turn over to the states responsibilities that have resided with the central government for many years. This

isn't a new argument, but it is startling coming at this late date, when we can see the terrible effects of parochialism and tribalism around the world.

Lincoln saved us from Balkanization. He made sure that it is ''the United States,'' not ''these United States.'' Our debt to Lincoln is huge, and we should not be persuaded easily that it is better to have 50 different policies on the environment, civil rights, Social Security, health services and many other central government functions.

It is popular now to bash the government. But over the long haul of history the government has served us well. It isn't an accident that we are the premier country in the world, the only superpower. We achieved that status because we have a good system of government. Democracy isn't an easy system. There are all kinds of tugging and pulling as we continue to give everyone a voice.

Let's not kill the goose that laid the golden egg. Let's not turn the future of this country over to 50 state legislatures. Let's keep one nation, indivisible.

TRIBUTE TO RALPH MRAZ, FORMER BERWYN, IL, ALDERMAN

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. LINPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated former public servant from my district who recently passed away—Mr. Ralph Mraz.

Mr. Mraz served as an alderman in Berwyn, IL, as well as a market auditor for the U.S. Department of Agriculture for 35 years before his retirement. He also was co-founder of the Life and Savings and Loan Association of America.

However, he was best known for obtaining Mraz Park in Berwyn, which was named in honor of his father, Fred.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my condolences to Mr. Mraz's widow, Lucille, his children, grandchildren, and all his friends.

HONORING DANIEL J. O'CONNOR

HON. BILL BAKER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, when I was growing up in Oakland, CA, crime was something I only read about in the papers. Yet in our day, the grim realities of lawbreaking are all too commonplace in each of our communities.

That is why I am especially pleased to recognize the contributions of one of California's finest to making the bay area's streets and neighborhoods safer. Sergeant Daniel J. O'Connor began his law enforcement career in 1962 when he joined the Concord, CA police department. He was appointed to the Bay Area Rapid Transit [BART] Police Department in 1973, and achieved the rank of sergeant in 1976. His 34 years of service have been a testimony to his devotion to duty and his commitment to the people of California.

As he prepares to retire in March, it is my hope that he will be encouraged by many good memories of his years of faithful service. His friends on the force will miss him, and his example of fidelity and dedication will continue to remind those who have worked with him of the vital importance of service in the public interest.

I wish Sergeant O'Connor the very best for many years of productive and enjoyable retirement, and am pleased to recognize this fine public servant in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

COMMENDING THE VETERANS OF UNDERAGE MILITARY SERVICE INC.

HON. OWEN B. PICKETT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an often unacknowledged group of veterans that deserves recognition. Each of the members of this group joined the military and fought to defend this country before they were of legal age to do so. These brave and courageous young men have been represented in every war in which the United States has been involved. Most of the current members fought in World War II.

These veterans have established an organization of their own, entitled ''Veterans of Underage Military Service, Inc.'' which is recognized as a nonprofit organization by the IRS and U.S. Postal Service. They have recently honored Adm. J.M. ''Mike'' Boorda, USN, the highest ranking underage enlistee on active duty, who joined the Navy when he was 16 years old.

The Second District of Virginia which I represent, is fortunate to be the home of one of the officers of the Virginia chapter of the Veterans of Underage Military Service, Inc., Mr. Thomas C. Hise. Tom Hise's work on behalf of this organization has contributed to the recognition it has received by obtaining laudatory proclamations from Virginia municipal and State governments.

Mr. Speaker, I request permission to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the House joint resolution adopted by the Virginia General Assembly commending members of the Veterans of Underage Military Service, Inc.

All Americans applaud the determination and patriotism shown by these underage enlistees and express gratitude and appreciation for their honorable service to our country.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY; HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 327

Whereas, throughout history, nations have called upon their youth to fight their wars, and it is inevitable that some young men and women under the age of 17, usually driven by strong patriotism, have enlisted in the armed forces; and

Whereas, in some instances, these youths were discovered and separated from the service, sometimes after they had already seen action and performed heroically; and

Whereas, the Veterans of Underage Military Service, Inc., was formed in 1990 to help such individuals who were frequently discharged from the service and stripped of their awards and their military benefits; and

Whereas, the primary goals of the organization are to contact all veterans who served in any branch of the United States armed forces when they were under 17 years of age and to advise and assist them in obtaining a proper discharge and their veteran's benefits; and

Whereas, a secondary goal is to establish a historical record of underage veterans by publishing their names, their deeds, and their stories; and

Whereas, the organization currently consists of over 600 veterans who served in the armed forces before they were 17; and

Whereas, three Medal of Honor winners who enlisted before they were 17 have been identified; and

Whereas, the officers of the Virginia chapter of the Veterans of Underage Military Service, Inc., Bobby Lee Pettit and Thomas C. Hise, both served in the armed forces before they were old enough to enlist, legally; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the General Assembly commend the Veterans of Underage Military Service, Inc., for their attempts to locate and assist all underage veterans of America's armed forces; and, be it

Resolved further, That the Clerk of the House of Delegates prepare a copy of this resolution for presentation to Bobby Lee Pettit, Commander of the Virginia chapter of the Veterans of Underage Military Service, Inc., as an expression of the support of the General Assembly for the worthy goals of this organization.

BRODER REBUTS EXCESSIVE CYNICISM

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have long felt that the most damaging form of naivete is excessive cynicism. No where is that better illustrated than in the current grossly distorted discussion of the influence of campaign contributions on public policy. The view that campaign contributions dominate most policy outcomes is a dangerously mistaken one. It is a complete lack of sophistication about the political process masquerading as the ultimate tough mindedness. And it is not only gravely wrong to argue that campaign contributions are the major factor in most policy outcomes, it is self-defeating. To the extent that citizens do believe that elected officials care little about votes and public opinion, not to mention the merits of the issues, and instead are driven largely by campaign contributions in making decisions, those citizens will be discouraged from voicing the opinions which are in fact the single greatest influence in our public policy deliberations.

In his column in the Washington Post for Wednesday, January 31, David Broder very effectively makes this point with a trenchant and cogent analysis of the recent PBS ''Frontline'' program on campaign financing.

That program, entitled ''So You Want To Buy A President'' seems to have perpetuated the mythic view that campaign finance is all important in deciding public policy debates. David Broder who knows better, demonstrates the fallacy of this reasoning in his column. Because it is important that citizens not be encouraged to fall into the trap of believing that their efforts will have no influence in the face of campaign contributions, I ask that David Broder's very important article be printed here.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 31, 1996]

''FRONTLINE'S'' EXERCISE IN EXAGGERATION

(By David S. Broder)

As if the cynicism about politics were not deep enough already, PBS's ''Frontline'' last

night presented a documentary called ''So You Want To Buy A President?''whose thesis seems to be that campaigns are a charade, policy debates are a deceit and only money talks.

The narrow point, made by Sen. Arlen Specter (R–Pa.), an early dropout from the 1996 presidential race, about millionaire publisher Malcolm S. (Steve) Forbes Jr., is that ''somebody is trying to buy the White House, and apparently it is for sale.''

The broader indictment, made by correspondent/narrator Robert Krulwich, is that Washington is gripped by a ''barter culture'' in which politicians are for sale and public policy is purchased by campaign contributions.

The program rested heavily on a newly published paperback, ''The Buying of the President.'' Author Charles Lewis, the head of the modestly titled Center for Public Integrity, was a principal witness, and Kevin Phillips, the conservative populist author who wrote the book's introduction, was also a major figure in the documentary.

It dramatized the view asserted by Lewis in the conclusion of his book: ''Simply stated, the wealthiest interests bankroll and, in effect, help to preselect the specific major candidates months and months before a single vote is cast anywhere. . . .

We the people have become a mere afterthought of those we put in office, a prop in our own play.''

Viewers saw a number of corporate executives—no labor leaders, no religious leaders, no activists of any kind, for some reason—who have raised and contributed money for presidents and presidential candidates and thereafter been given access at dinners, private meetings or overseas trade missions.

It is implied—but never shown—that policies changed because of these connections. As Krulwich said in the transcript of a media interview distributed, along with an advance tape, with the publicity kit for the broadcast, ''We don't really know whether these are bad guys or good guys. . . . I'm not really sure we've been able to prove, in too many cases, that a dollar spent bought a particular favor. All we've been able to show is that over and over again, people who do give a lot of money to politicians get a chance to talk to those politicians face to face, at parties, on planes, on missions, in private lunches, and you and I don't.''

If that is the substance of the charge, the innuendo is much heavier. At one point, Krulwich asked Lewis, in his most disingenuous manner, ''Do you come out convinced that elections are in huge part favors for sale, or in tiny part?''

And Lewis replied that while ''there are a lot of wealthy people that do want to express broad philosophical issues,'' the ''vested interests that have very narrow agendas that they want pursued see these candidates as their handmaidens or their puppets. The presidential campaign is not a horse race or a beauty contest. It's a giant auction.''

That is an oversimplified distortion that can do nothing but further alienate a cynical electorate. Of course, money is an important ingredient in our elections and its use deserves scrutiny. But ideas are important too, and grass-roots activism even more so. The Democratic Leadership Council's Al From and the Heritage Foundation's Robert Rector have had more influence in the last decade than any fund-raisers or contributors, because candidates have turned to them for policy advice.

John Rother of the American Association of Retired Persons and Ralph Reed of the Christian Coalition work for organizations that are nominally nonpartisan and make no campaign contributions at all. But their membership votes—so they have power.

The American political system is much more complex—and more open to influence by any who choose to engage in it—than the proponents of the ''auction'' theory of democracy understand, or choose to admit.

By exaggerating the influence of money, they send a clear message to citizens that the game is rigged, so there's no point in playing. That is deceitful, and it's dangerously wrong to feel that cynicism.

Especially when they have nothing to suggest when it comes to changing the rules for the money game.

At one point, Phillips said that the post-Watergate reforms succeeded only in having ''forced them [the contributors and politicians] to be more devious.'' That is untrue. Those reforms, which mandated the disclosure of all the financial connections on which the program was based, also created publicity which, even Krulwich and Co. admitted, foiled the ''plots'' of some contributors.

And Krulwich, for his part, suggested very helpfully that ''every high-profile politician agrees that some things have got to change. Change the limits. Change the rules. Change the primaries. Change the ads. Change enforcement. You gotta change something.''

How about changing the kind of journalism that tells people that politicians are bought-and-paid-for puppets and you're a sucker if you think there's a damn thing you can do to make your voice heard?

A TRIBUTE TO MR. AND MRS. JAMES ADAMS ON THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to two constituents who are an inspiration to all those who say ''I do''—James and Helen Adams.

Mr. and Mrs. Adams of Riverside, IL recently celebrated their 50th anniversary with a large party with dozens of their friends and family members.

However, the real celebration should be for a young sailor and his 20 year old fiance from Brookfield, IL who would not let even a world war from keeping them apart. With conflict still raging in the Pacific in June 1945, Jim Adams had planned to take advantage of a short leave to marry his sweetheart, Helen Jean Bennett. But, as is often the case in wartime, his leave was canceled and he was not able to get back home until December of that year, a few days before Christmas. Not only were there no churches available during the holidays for a wedding ceremony, there were no priests or preachers either. Finally, on New Year's Eve, a clergyman was found and the wedding took place in the bride's house.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. and Mrs. Adams on not only their 50th anniversary, but also their perseverance and devotion 50 years ago that prevented even a world war from keeping them apart.

TRIBUTE TO AUTHUR R. NASH, JR.

HON. VERNON J. EHLERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great delight that I take this opportunity to honor Art Nash for his many contributions to the State of Michigan through his work with the Department of State Police and the Department of Natural Resources. Art is retiring after 26 years of dedicated and loyal service to the Great Lakes State. His professionalism and exceptional work ethic will be sorely missed by those who have had the pleasure of working with him.

Art grew up in Dearborn, MI, and graduated from Fordson High School. He went on to Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, MI, where he obtained a bachelor of science degree in psychology and sociology in 1970. In addition to his academic pursuits, Art also participated on the varsity swim team and served as an officer of the Pi Kappa Alpha fraternity. He would later return to his alma mater to earn a master's degree in public administration in 1980.

Art's professional career began in 1970 when he took the oath as a trooper with the Michigan State Police. He served until 1977 in the department's uniform and criminal investigation division enforcing traffic laws, investigating criminal and civil complaints, and serving as an undercover officer for drug traffic investigations.

In 1977, Art's career path took him to another division within the Michigan State Police. For the next 17 years, Art was an integral member of the department's fire marshal division, playing an important role in the division's growth. As a member of the fire marshal division, Art rose through the ranks from detective sergeant in the First District Office to first lieutenant commander of the hazardous materials section. As first lieutenant commander, Art was responsible for administering the division's Hazardous Materials Enforcement Program. This also included the task of developing and implementing division policies and procedures.

In May 1994, Art said goodbye to the Michigan State Police and took his talents to the Department of Natural Resources where he served as chief of the Department's underground storage tank division. Though his work with the DNR was less than 2 years, his accomplishments were monumental. I am extremely appreciative of his efforts in the development of the underground storage tank regulatory program and his role in the creation of the risk-based corrective action plan for leaking underground storage tank sites. Michigan residents are fortunate to have had the expertise and knowledge that Art has to offer.

Art's commitments also extend beyond the workplace. He is a member of the St. Luke Lutheran Church in Haslett where he once served as president of the church council. In addition to support from his church Art has also been blessed with the love and support of his wife, Jennifer, and son, Kirk.

Mr. Speaker, there are some people you meet in life that you feel very privileged to know. Art Nash is one of those people. I am extremely thankful that I had the opportunity to work with this man of great character while I

served in the Michigan Legislature. It is with great delight that I offer this tribute to salute Art Nash, an outstanding and dedicated employee and citizen of the State of Michigan.

DR. RICHARD HOVANNISSIAN, ARMENIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEEMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1996, the central California chapter of the Armenian National Committee of America will be honoring Dr. Richard Hovanissian as Man of the Year.

Dr. Hovanissian is a professor of Armenian and Near Eastern History, and Associate Director of the G.E. von Gruenebaum Center for Near Eastern Studies at the University of California at Los Angeles [UCLA]. As a member of the UCLA faculty since 1962, Dr. Hovanissian has played a major role in international forums relating to the study of genocide and Armenian history. As a Guggenheim Fellow, he has published more than 40 scholarly articles. Dr. Hovanissian has given more than 1,500 speeches and lectures to university, community, television, and radio audiences on a variety of topics. He has been a guest lecturer in more than 25 countries. In 1990, Dr. Hovanissian was elected to the Armenian Academy of Social Sciences, becoming the first social scientist living abroad to be so honored.

Recently, at the invitation of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, he took part in a lecture series on ''Genocide and Mass Murder in the Twentieth Century.'' His presentation, ''The Armenian Genocide: An Eighty-year Perspective,'' reflected on the meaning of the Armenian experience today and its similarities and differences with other mass killings of this century.

I wish to add my personal congratulations to Dr. Hovanissian on being selected as the Armenian National Committee's, Man of the Year. Dr. Hovanissian's accomplishments and work for the Armenian community deserve special commendation. I wish him my best for continued success.

IN HONOR OF CARROLL BROWN

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Carroll Brown on the 10th anniversary of her founding of the West Haven Black Coalition.

For the past decade, the West Haven Black Coalition has improved the lives of African-Americans and strengthened the West Haven community. By joining forces, African-Americans in West Haven have made their voices heard and have assumed leading roles in all walks of life. The West Haven Black Coalition has spurred efforts to register voters, improve parks, and educate our future leaders through its scholarship program.

The West Haven Black Coalition's mission to encourage African-Americans to get involved in their community is a reflection of the organization's founder and president, Carroll Brown. Carroll's selfless devotion to helping others has improved Connecticut at both the State and local levels. She helped working people across Connecticut when she served as a labor committee staff member at the Statehouse in Hartford.

It is in her own community, however, that Carroll has truly set herself apart and shown others not only the way, but their responsibility to better their neighborhoods and surroundings. Her dedication can be seen in many ways, including her pioneering service as the first African-American woman on the West Haven Board of Education. She has fostered this community spirit in her husband and three sons.

Carroll realized the potential for greater community participation by African-Americans in West Haven and had the vision to create the West Haven Black Coalition. In the 10 years since, the coalition has unified West Haven's black community and given rise to true grass roots community involvement. Her oft-repeated words capture her commitment to a cohesive community: ''In unity there is strength. Together we stand, divided we fall.''

I have had the pleasure of working with Carroll Brown for many years and am pleased to take this opportunity to thank her and congratulate her on the 10th anniversary of the West Haven Black Coalition she has founded and nurtured over the years.

TRIBUTE TO RUTHANN VIHON

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding community servant in my Congressional District, Ms. Ruthann Vihon, of Western Springs, IL, on the occasion of her being honored with the Hinsdale/Gateway Rotary Club's Paul Harris Fellow Award on March 2, 1996.

The award recognizes her commitment to community service and volunteerism and will provide a $1,000 donation in her name to the Rotary Foundation. This truly tireless activist sits on the elected Lyons Township High School Board of Education. In addition, Ms. Vihon is a volunteer with the Community Support Service, Respite House, and the Hindsdale/Gateway Rotary Club Special Needs Scholarship Advisory Board, which assists special education students pursue higher education.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Ms. Vihon on this honor, and extend to her my best wishes on continued success in her service to her community.

HONORING THE LIFE AND WORK OF MORTON GOULD

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, on February 21st, this country lost a truly outstanding individual when composer and conductor Morton Gould died at the age of 82.

Born in Richmond Hill, NY, Morton Gould's creativity was recognized just last year, when he won the Pulitzer Prize for Stringmusic. He composed for Broadway and for the ballet; his music was commissioned by symphony orchestras throughout the United States. His style integrated jazz, blues, gospel, country-and-western, and folk elements into compositions that were instantly recognizable as American, and which led to his receiving three commissions for the U.S. Bicentennial.

As a conductor, Morton Gould led many of the major American orchestras as well as those of Canada, Mexico, Europe, Japan, and Australia.

But as accomplished as he was as composer and conductor, Morton Gould's true genius was that he became what he called a ''musical citizen'': composer, conductor, arranger, educator, mentor. He loved and appreciated all kinds of music and did much to advance the protection of songwriters, including serving as president of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers [ASCAP].

Morton Gould received a 1994 Kennedy Center Honor in recognition of his lifetime contribution to American Culture.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that this man, who contributed so much of lasting value to America, should be remembered and honored.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HENRY J. MELLO

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to one of California's great leaders and legislators, State Senator Henry J. Mello. The Senator retires this year after more than three decades of continuous service to the people of California's Central Coast, located in my district. As he closes this chapter of his public life, I want to take this time to salute a man who epitomizes the best in public service.

A native of Watsonville, CA, Senator Mello has spent most of his adult life working tirelessly on behalf of his constituents. Rising through the ranks of local government, the Senator served first as a Santa Cruz County supervisor for 8 years, then was elected to serve as assemblyman for both Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties in 1976. In 1980, Senator Mello was elected to the State senate and, in a tribute to his talent, he was quickly named that body's majority whip. Senator Mello was subsequently elected majority leader in 1992 and successfully chaired the Subcommittee on Aging, the Subcommittee on Economic Problems Facing Agriculture, the Senate Select Committee on Bilingual Education, the Joint Committees on the Arts, the 1992 Quincentenial, and served as vice chair of the Senate Select Committee on California's Wine Industry and Water Resources.

I have had the honor of working with Senator Mello on many occasions and I have always been touched by both his skill and his concern for the community. You just won't find a better citizen's advocate for education, the environment, or especially, the elderly. Senator Mello authored legislation to enact the

first programs focusing on Alzheimers-Respite Care, Adult Day Health care and the Multipurpose Senior Services Programs. He founded the Senior Legislature and passed legislation to combat elder abuse. In the 20 years that Senator Mello has served in the legislature, he has authored more than 120 bills on aging and long-term care that have become law of the land in California.

Senator Mello's commitment to our senior citizens, and indeed to all citizens, was particularly impressive when their need was greatest, after the Loma Prieta earthquake of 1989. Senator Mello's work was key in maintaining vital lines of communication and in ensuring that our area received millions of dollars to aid in the region's rebuilding. I am certain that had it not been for Senator Mello's initiative and hard work our area's recovery would have been far less easy. Helping the area recuperate from the earthquake was just one of many highlights in his distinguished legislative career.

For many years to come, tangible evidence of Senator Mello's labors will be obvious to all California residents, especially his interest in education and the arts. During his tenure as chairman of the Fort Ord Task Force, Senator Mello helped establish the California State University at Monterey Bay, the University of California, Santa Cruz research center at Fort Ord and authored the legislation creating the Fort Ord Reuse Authority. Senator Mello also acquired essential funding for Santa Cruz County libraries preventing their closure and, in perhaps the greatest tribute to his work, was honored in 1994 with the naming of the Henry J. Mello Center for Performing Arts in Watsonville. One could literally fill books with Senator Mello's many other wonderful accomplishments.

As he retires this year because of State term-limits, one thing is positively certain: Senator Mello will be sorely missed. For my part, I will miss working with a member of the Democratic team who has so successfully governed the Central Coast for more than a generation. As for the people of his district, they will no doubt miss something much more profound. In the Senator, they will miss a man who has lived his life to serve, who has led with levels of compassion and commitment not normally found in our public servants these days. But then again, Senator Mello has been no ordinary public servant.

TRIBUTE TO AMATO L. BERARDI

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of my close personal friend Amato L. Berardi, who will have the title ''Cavaliere dell'Ordine al merito della Republica Italiana'' bestowed upon him on March 17, 1996.

Amato L. Berardi was born on October 14, 1958 in Longano, a province of Isbernia, Italy. His parents, Carmine Berardi and Carmela Ditri, were married in Italy where they had four sons. In 1970 they emigrated to the United States.

Upon arriving in Philadelphia, Amato attended Mater Dolorosa grade school, followed by North East Catholic High School. In 1975, while still in high school, he and his brothers owned and operated a restaurant in Philadelphia. Amato graduated from high school in 1978, and then went on to attend Philadelphia College of Textiles and Business for 2 years. During Amato's 2-year tenure, he majored in business management.

On January 4, 1983, Amato joined New York Life where he became the No. 1 agent in his class in 1983. He became the Executive Council agent in 1986, achieved Presidents Council status in 1987, and Chairman's Council in 1993. Mr. Berardi gained membership in the Million Dollar Round Table, and has received the National Quality and National Sales Achievement awards.

Amato has also been recognized for his service to his community. He has received the Italian-American Knights Legion's Knight of Goodness Award, and has been honored with a Humanitarian Citation from the City Council of Philadelphia and the State Senate of Pennsylvania. Amato is also president of the National Italian American Political Action Committee and the Federation of Italian American Businesses. He is also actively involved in numerous social organizations, including the Overbrook Italo-American Democratic Club, the Sons of Italy, the Columbus Association of America, and the American Heart Association.

Today, Amato resides in Huntington Valley with his wife of 13 years, Maddalena Caranci, and their two children Carmelina and Carmine.

Mr. Speaker, I join Amato Berardi's family and friends in congratulating him for a lifetime of hard work and devotion to the Italian-American community and congregation.

TRIBUTE TO MELVIN EGGERT

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sympathy to the family and many friends of Melvin Eggert, the former mayor of Countryside, IL, a community in my district.

Mr. Eggert was a true pioneer in the community, which was incorporated in 1959. From 1960 to 1963, he served on the city council and then was Countryside's mayor from 1963 to 1967. He helped guide the city through its infancy, providing the foundation for its growth into one of the most prosperous suburbs in the Chicago area. He was also a successful restaurant owner in the area.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my condolences to Mr. Eggert's wife, Martha, and his entire family and his many friends on his passing.

THE PATIENT RIGHT TO KNOW ACT OF 1996

HON. GREG GANSKE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Massachusetts, [Mr. MARKEY] and numerous original cosponsors in introducing legislation to ensure that doctors remain free to provide critical health care information to patients.

There is nothing more central to the doctor-patient relationship than trust. Patients and their families rely on doctors to fully inform them about the course of a disease and the various ways it can be treated. They deserve to know the risks and benefits, the costs, and the chances of success of the treatments that will be inflicted on their own bodies or their loved ones. And they don't want information withheld because of an insurance company restriction.

Unfortunately, that essential doctor-patient trust is being undermined by some health plans that attempt to limit the content of discussions between patients and providers. Physicians are increasingly being offered contracts by insurance companies that contain restrictive clauses preventing the physician from using sound medical judgment and undermine the essential notion of informed consent.

Sometimes, these contracts explicitly seek to limit the information a doctor can provide to a patient, preventing doctors from discussing proposed treatments until the plan has agreed to pay for it. How can we expect patients to make informed decisions about their own health if doctors can only inform them of options that the plan is willing to pay for?

Other plans achieve the same result more subtly. Some place a general disparagement clause in their contracts, forbidding providers from saying anything that might undermine patient confidence in the plan. The danger of this clause is very real. Patients rely on their physician to tell them which doctors or hospitals are better than others. But in plans with general disparagement clauses, a doctor could not tell a patient that 7 of the last 11 patients he referred to the plan's heart surgeon have died. That is precisely the sort of information doctors should give to patients and is precisely the kind of communication that general disparagement clauses prevent.

Sometimes, contracts contain no explicit restrictions on communications between doctors and patients, but physicians can still find the content of their medical advice restricted. A former neurologist from a large HMO indicated that ''I was told it was a mistake to tell the patient about a procedure before checking to see whether it was covered.'' Whether explicit in a contract or communicated to doctors orally, such restrictions on communication deny patients access to critical information and make a farce out of the notion of informed consent.

Today, because of market concentration, for a physician to buck a ''gag clause'' and be terminated from one of two dominant HMO's in a community, may mean whether that physician stays in practice. There is genuine fear among providers that if they act too often or too vigorously as a patient advocate, their contract won't be renewed. Under these circumstances, it takes a hero to be a patient advocate. And as we know far too well, heroes are rare.

This legislation is a balanced approach to a growing problem. While I understand the importance of the free market, Congress must protect patients who are unaware that some doctors are no longer able to communicate their best judgment. These restrictions are unethical. They violate the Hippocratic Oath. They undermine the quality of care. And, as far as I'm concerned, they have no place in the health care market.

I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will see the importance of this issue

and help us enact the Patient Right to Know Act.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PATIENT RIGHT TO KNOW ACT OF 1996

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join Dr. GANSKE today in introducing the Patient Right to Know Act of 1996.

When I was a boy, my mother told me, ''if you don't have anything nice to say, don't say anything at all.'' Now when my mother said that, she was not talking about protecting the feelings of health plans. She was talking about people, who sometimes, unfortunately, become patients. So she would be quite surprised to see this dangerous twist on her advice in some of the contracts between doctors and health plans we see today. Today, to protect the feelings of health plans, doctors are being asked to restrict what they say to their patients. This is wrong, just plain wrong. No doctor can practice good medicine in a muzzle.

The fact is, when you're a patient, what you don't know can hurt you. That's why Congressman GANSKE and I are introducing the Patient Right to Know Act. The Patient Right to Know Act will prohibit health plans from restricting communications between doctors and their patients about treatment options, their benefits and risks, and other issues related to quality of care. It will ensure that doctors are allowed to tell their patients why a plan decides to pay for, or deny, a treatment. Finally, it will bar plans from restricting doctors from talking to their patients about financial arrangements they have with the plans which might affect those patients' access to care.

The impetus for our bill was the increasingly frequent reports of health plans trying to keep doctors from talking freely to their patients about their health care needs, or forcing doctors to sign contracts that include clauses restricting doctor-patient communications. I was deeply disturbed by these reports, because I am a great believer in the principle of informed consent and restrictions on communications between doctors and their patients make informed consent impossible. Attacks on informed consent—which is the most basic patient protection—simply cannot be tolerated in our society.

I have worked on consumer protection issues for a lot of years now, and I look at it this way: Patients are really just consumers of health care. Like any other kind of consumer, patients need complete and accurate information about the products or services available if they're going to make good decisions about the health care they consume. The only difference is, we are not talking about toasters or washing machines here, we are talking about people's health and lives.

Now Dr. GANSKE here has an advantage, because while I was at law school, learning about the rule against perpetuities, he was in med school, learning how to make sick people well. So when Dr. GANSKE is feeling a little under the weather, and he goes to see his family doctor, he's on a pretty level playing field. He knows what questions to ask. He's probably already read about the latest treatment for whatever is it that ails him.

But the ordinary Joe is at a disadvantage. He does not get the New England Journal of Medicine at home. He places enormous trust in his doctor, and depends on his doctor to tell it to him straight. When a health plan tries to control or censor communications between its doctors and their patients, that critical bond of trust is broken.

Silence isn't always golden. Although he who has the gold sometimes tries to demand silence—the fact is, in today's world, knowledge and information are the coins of the realm. Nowhere is this truer than in the realm of health care.

Hippocrates said ''Health is the greatest of human blessings.'' Surely, it is the most precious although many of us do not realize this until we ourselves or someone we love becomes seriously ill. Then, we would give away anything we have—all of our worldly treasures—to make them well again. At that moment, our greatest ally is our doctor, and our most valuable asset is the information he can give us. That is why passing the Patient Right to Know Act is so important.

IN HONOR OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN WOMEN

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, in honor of this year's theme of African-American women, I wish to recognize the passing of former Congresswomen Barbara Jordan, one of Texas' greatest political figures. She died at the age of 59 from pneumonia, one of the many illnesses which she suffered from in the last years of her life. But the life that she led was extraordinary, and she left a mark that few will ever match, and that none will ever forget.

Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman Jordan distinguished herself from an early age. With her family's encouragement she worked hard to rise above the poverty of her childhood in Houston. She graduated magna cum laude from Texas Southern University. It was there that she first displayed her powerful oratorical skills as a member of the debate team. In 1959 she received her law degree from Boston University.

Mr. Speaker, Barbara Jordan made history by setting a number of firsts. She was the first black State Senator in Texas history, elected in 1966. In 1972 she was accorded the high honor of being elected president pro tempore of the Texas Senate, another first for an African-American. Eight years later she recorded another first, becoming the first black from Texas to be elected to Congress. Although she only served for 6 years in the House of Representatives, her impact was monumental.

It was as a freshman Congresswoman, Mr. Speaker, that the Nation first came to know Barbara Jordan. As a member of the House Judiciary Committee she made one of the defining speeches of the Richard Nixon impeachment hearings. Rising above the political rhetoric, she told the world, ''My faith in the Constitution is whole, it is complete, it is total, and I am not going to sit here and be an idle spectator to the diminution, the subversion, the destruction of the Constitution.'' Indeed, her statements reminded America of what was truly great about this country.

On a more personal note, Mr. Speaker, Barbara Jordan served as one of my earliest political role models. I had a chance to see Congresswoman Jordan speak at the 1976 Democratic National Convention. Like everyone else that heard her speech I was moved not only by her eloquence, but by her definition of public service. ''More is required of public officials than slogans and handshakes and press releases,'' she said. ''We must hold ourselves strictly accountable. We must provide the people with a vision of the future.'' These words continue to guide and inspire me 20 years later.

I wish in the coming days that all Texans would join me in reflecting upon the legacy of Barbara Jordan. She stood for honesty, integrity, and an unswerving commitment to the principles on which this country was founded. Her legacy will endure as we continue to honor these ideals.

PHILADELPHIA GAY NEWS CELEBRATES 20 YEARS OF SERVICE TO COMMUNITY

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 20 year anniversary of publishing for the Philadelphia Gay News, one of the oldest newspapers serving the gay and lesbian community in America.

I met a young activist named Mark Segal when I was a Republican member of the Philadelphia City Council many years ago. When Mark started the newspaper in 1975, he was a pioneer. In 1975, very few communities had any means for gays and lesbians to know about what was going on in terms of politics, government, health or social events. They had to depend on leaflets and word of mouth. Through the energy of people like Mark Segal throughout the country, that has changed. Lesbian and gay journalism helped that community become more cohesive, politically aware and active. Indeed, trailblazers like Mark Segal helped put the community in the gay and lesbian community. Now, Mark is respected as an elder statesman in gay and lesbian independent journalism in America, though he is anything but an elder. Nationally, Mark was deeply involved in the establishment of gay and lesbian journalists' and publishers' organizations, as well as putting some of their newspapers onto the internet.

Through credible and independent journalism, the Philadelphia Gay News promoted pride in gay and lesbian self identity and educated the community about violence and HIV, AIDS, and other health concerns. The paper helped promote empowerment by giving an advertising avenue for burgeoning gay and lesbian business interests. It gave force to gays and lesbians in Philadelphia government and politics.

I congratulate Mark Segal, his partner Tony Lombardo, who acts as the paper's business manager, and the paper's editor Al Patrick for their commitment to adding to the vitality and diversity of the Greater Philadelphia community.

TRIBUTE TO LAKELAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Lakeland Elementary School in Norwalk, CA. Lakeland has been selected for the 1996 Program of Excellence Award by the California Council for the Social Studies. Only one school or district is selected each year throughout California to receive this prestigious award.

With the leadership and support of principal Tom Noesen, the creative and imaginative staff at Lakeland have used social studies as the core of an exciting resource-based instructional program, which has attracted the attention of an increasing number of educators. Lakeland School has also developed a remarkable relationship with its students, families, and with its primarily minority community. The staff at Lakeland Elementary are to be commended for achieving such positive educational results and for boosting its role within the community.

In this era of dwindling resources and support for public education, it is encouraging to see enthusiastic and caring teachers that are committed to providing our children the high quality education to which they are entitled. Lakeland School is a prime example of a team effort. Because of the cooperation that exists on the part of the administration to the students, Lakeland School has proved itself to be a pioneer in the effort to prepare our young people for success in the challenging world of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, it is with tremendous pride and appreciation that I ask my colleagues to join me in acknowledging the positive contribution that Lakeland School is making toward the future of America.

TRIBUTE TO WEST SUBURBAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 1996 AWARDS HONOREES

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to five outstanding individuals and three organizations in my district who were recently honored for public service and volunteerism by the West Suburban Chamber of Commerce (WSCC).

Mr. Lawrence Kinports of LaGrange, IL, was named as the WSCC's Citizen of the Year. Mr. Kinports, a retired business executive and current LaGrange trustee, is renowned in the community for his volunteer work. He serves as an active member of the boards of numerous organizations, including the Southwest Suburban Center of Aging and the Community Extension Project, which serves the youth of his community. In addition, Mr. Kinports has been previously recognized by this Member with my Senior Citizen of the Year Award.

WSCC Man of the Year Ronald Henrickson of LaGrange is another individual who can't say no when it comes to giving of his time and talents. He is a member of LaGrange's Economic Development/Redevelopment Commission, sits of the board of directors of the Richport YMCA, and volunteers with Mainstreet LaGrange, a redevelopment group in the community.

Ms. Linda Johnson of Western Springs, IL, the Chamber's Woman of the Year, is a successful small-business owner who also finds time for her community. She has been especially active in expanding opportunities for girls and young women, serving as board member of the Whispering Oaks Girl Scout Council and is a past president of the LaGrange Business and Professional Women's Organization. Ms. Johnson also sits on the Western Springs Economic Development Commission and the WSCC Board of Directors, and is the immediate past president of the Western Springs Business Association.

Mayor Carl LeGant of Countryside, IL, the WSCC's Public Servant of the Year, represents all that is good about government service. Mayor LeGant is a true pioneer in his community. He was active in Countryside's incorporation in 1959 and has served in city government since 1963. His honesty and devotion to his community are unquestioned, and after scandal rocked Countryside's government nearly 20 years ago, Carl LeGant was elected Mayor and helped restore the people's faith in their municipal leaders.

Mr. James Durkan of Indian Head Park, IL was recognized with the Outstanding Community Service by an Individual Award. Mr. Durkan serves as president of the Community Memorial Fund, which distributes funds for health and wellness projects throughout the community. He is also active in the LaGrange Kiwanis Club and received the LaGrange Community Nurse Service Association's Outstanding Service Award in 1993 and currently serves on the Chamber's board of directors.

Other WSCC award winners include the Rich Port YMCA as the Outstanding Community Service Organization. The Y, a true landmark in LaGrange, recently celebrated its 50th anniversary of serving 15 area communities. More than 200,000 people utilize the Rich Port YMCA each year.

Winners of the Chamber's Beautification Award include Burcor Properties of LaGrange and Courtright's Restaurant of Willow Springs, IL. Burcor and its owner, Jerry Burjan, a former WSCC Man of the Year, have done much to improve downtown LaGrange, including renovating a number of commercial buildings. William and Rebecca Courtright, owners of Courtright's, painstakingly preserved the surrounding natural beauty of a sweeping, wooded hill when they constructed their restaurant in Willow Springs.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the West Suburban Chamber of Commerce honorees on their contributions to the community and wish them and the WSCC much success in the future.

AGRICULTURE REGULATORY RELIEF AND TRADE ACT

HON. PAT ROBERTS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, today we are introducing what some have called Farm Bill II. More accurately we are calling it the Agriculture Regulatory Relief and Trade Act of 1996. This is a small step toward providing American farmers with the regulatory relief that will enable them to compete in a very competitive global environment.

Many of my colleagues have seen the Agriculture Policy Ledger. The Agriculture Committee has told farmers that there will be less money in the future but in return we have also promised less Government involvement in their lives. The Contract With America contained many of those promises. The Clean Water Act adopted by this House and awaiting action in the Senate would go a long way in addressing a wetlands regulatory nightmare.

I am firmly committed that we should consider many of the policy issues impacting farmers in a calm and careful manner. This bill will lay the cornerstone for the Agriculture Committee's effort to provide some regulatory relief to producers in the agricultural policy area. This bill reflects our commitment to a two-track approach. The first track, the Agricultural Market Transition Act, contains the major spending items in the agriculture budget. The second track, the one that we are embarking on today, deals with many of the policy issues under the House Agriculture Committee's jurisdiction.

I firmly believe rolling all of the budget and policy issues into one huge farm bill is a mistake. The Senate chose to pursue this approach and in that process ended up spending at least $800 million above the December CBO baseline. In fact, when you compare the Agriculture Market Transition Act to the Senate bill, we save over $5.4 billion more than they do.

REGULATORY RELIEF AND REAUTHORIZING THE CRP

The conservation title of the Agriculture Regulatory Relief and Trade Act fulfills a promise we made to our producers during the 1994 elections and the budget debate—in return for reduced Government support, we reduce the Government's involvement in their lives. The 1985 farm bill established a partnership between the Federal Government and the farmers. That agreement in essence said we will provide income support payments in return for compliance with government regulations.

However, since that time we have reduced payments by nearly two-thirds. At the same time Government regulations have increased exponentially. This is the first step towards stopping increased Government regulation on producers and making the regulations that remain meet the common sense tests that all regulations should have to meet—technical and economic feasibility and a focus on results, not on process.

The bill that I am introducing today with my subcommittee chairmen meets these tests. It protects the environment and allows producers to use their own innovation to meet environmental goals instead of forcing them to use the innovations of Government bureaucrats. This legislation will also halt several instances of regulatory overkill that have plagued producers since these laws were passed. This legislation goes a long way toward ending this overkill and putting producers back in charge of their land.

Specifically, this legislation will expedite procedures that producers must go through when requesting variances from conservation compliance due to circumstances beyond their control. Conservation systems and plans are

clearly defined so that they are technically and economically achievable, are based on local resource conditions and can be met in a cost effective manner. Penalties will remain in place for producers who violate compliance, but will be tempered when producers unknowingly violate compliance. This legislation also encourages producers to request technical assistance from NRCS without fear of being found out of compliance and then penalized.

We also move forward in reducing the paperwork burden on producers by consolidating cost-share programs that producers use to meet environmental goals. Through consolidation we allow producers to fill out one set of paperwork to access cost share programs, instead of the current system that requires producers to identify their needs then identify which government program they can access and then filling out duplicative government forms. This is common sense and should expedite the process. Finally, this legislation authorizes a new program for livestock produces to improve water quality. This is a mandatory program that is fully paid for and should help livestock operations improve the quality of rural areas.

In addition, this bill provides for the reauthorization of the Conservation Reserve Program up to 36.4 million acres. This program has been a very valuable program that has been enormously popular with farmers, environmentalists, sportsmen and conservationists. Our provision is a simple reauthorization of the program, without modifications to the criteria for enrollment in the CRP.

Mr. Speaker, this is common sense reform that both sides of the aisle should be able to support.

GOVERNMENT CREDIT REFORM

Farmers and ranchers learned the hard way in the late 1970's and 1980's that they could not borrow their way to prosperity. All of us here in Washington concerned with Federal farm policy know that American taxpayers are increasingly unwilling to pay for a continuation of status quo farm policy. USDA farm credit programs that have resulted in billions and billions of dollars going uncollected are high on that list of benefits we can no longer afford.

The bill introduced today seeks to realign Federal lending policies that have been patched together during the last two decades in response to the farm problems in the 1970's and 1980's. Statutory prescriptions that read like regulations are eliminated or streamlined by this bill. USDA farm loans should be used for income generating purposes to enhance our farmers survivability, not support environmental policies that are contained in regulatory activities under other laws. In that regard, the local Farm Service Agency credit office should not be a procurement agency for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The bill strikes this law.

We all have heard the stories about the farm and home borrower who got his debt written down one day and bought a new pickup the next. Or, farmers, who are always the last to plant in the spring and leave their crops in the fields all winter, are first in line at the county office when it comes time to get their debt forgiven. Of course, a lot of this is coffee shop talk but, on the other hand, the General Accounting Office [GAO] has spent a number of years examining USDA lending practices and has found USDA to be lax or deliberately permissive in response to congressional wishes. There have been nearly a dozen of these GAO reports over the years.

As a 1992 report says, ''Lenient loan-making policies, some congressionally directed, have further increased the government's exposure to direct loan losses.'' The GAO says the old FmHA provided $38 million in new loans to some 700 borrowers who had already defaulted on loans resulting in losses of $108 million. Half of these borrowers became deliquent on their second round of loans. This is nothing but throwing good money after bad, and I might add it has done nothing for the farmers but delay the inevitable. This kind of policy cannot continue.

GAO looks at one borrower who ''* * * received a $132,000 direct farm operating loan from the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) even though, just 2 months earlier, he had received about $428,000 in debt relief. By March 1991, he was $28,000 past due on payments.'' This may be a single instance but is not likely to be unrepresentative when you consider the aggregate losses of billions.

Unfortunately, the disposition of inventory property, including provisions that make otherwise viable farming units into easements for environmental purposes—all at taxpayers' expense—has been just as irresponsible. This legislation is designed to change those policies as well.

TRADE

Farmers know that there will be less money to spend on production agriculture in the future. The money we do spend must be spent wisely. Farmers must be prepared to respond to agriculture trade in a post NAFTA and GATT world. GATT and NAFTA opened up the world markets. We still must be competitive and fight for market share. That is the goal of this trade title, to give farmers and ranchers the tools necessary to respond to the exploding world demand we see in the Pacific Rim countries, China, and Latin America.

In the 70's exports were largely bulk grains. Today we are seeing more grain than ever move overseas, but it is in the form of processed products, beef, pork, and poultry. Red meat exports are three times the 1986 level. Poultry exports are six times the 1986 level.

The bill we are introducing today continues and fully funds the Market Promotion Program. While the MPP program has come under attack, I remind my colleagues that farmers and ranchers produce a commodity. By the very definition a commodity is just that—nondifferentiated. One bushel of wheat pretty much looks like another bushel of wheat.

Any economist will tell you that the way to move more of a commodity is turn it into a value added product. Differentiate the product and you will add value. Convince the overseas consumer that U.S. poultry or beef is better and you have sewn up market share. That is the goal of the MPP program and we need to retain the MPP program. Exports are moving toward value added products and MPP will facilitate that movement.

Specifically, the trade title allows credit guarantees for high value and value-added products with at least 90 percent U.S. content by weight.

Next, it provides protection to producers of any agriculture commodity who suffers a loss due to an embargo imposed for reasons of national security, foreign policy, or limited domestic supply.

The Secretary is given the flexibility to use the funds of the various export programs in ways that better accomplish the programs' objectives and to ultimately increase U.S. agriculture exports.

The Secretary is given the responsibility to monitor compliance with the agriculture provisions and sanitary and phytosanitary measures of the Uruguay Round Agreement. The Secretary will report any country failing to meet its commitments under the Uruguay Round Agreement to the U.S. Trade Representative for appropriate action.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The committee considered three important objectives when developing the rural development title: flexibility, local planning and decisionmaking, and sustainability. The rural development reforms included in this package meet all three.

In regards to flexibility, GAO issued a number of reports concerning the cumbersome and counterproductive regulations associated with present rural development programs. The programs are small and narrowly focused and each is equipped with its own rules and regulations. Many communities do not bother applying for funding due to the time and money involved in completing an application. And, since every rural development dollar is designated for a particular use, applicants often apply for available, instead of needed, funding. The Senate bill makes some improvements in terms of how rural development money can be spent. However, all the regulations, limitations, and restrictions would still apply. Our bill provides maximum flexibility by consolidating all rural development funding and including precious few regulations. The regulations are essentially two-fold. First, the money must be used for rural development activities currently eligible for funding. And, second, the money must be used to the benefit of small towns, particularly those with 10,000 people or less. That's it. This kind of flexibility cuts costs and confusion, saves time and energy, and allows rural America to get down to the business of rural development rather than bogged down in the business of bureaucracy.

A theme that dominated one GAO report is the need for local leadership and long-range planning in rural development. According to the report, ''each area has unique qualities that require customized, rather than off-the-shelf, solutions to its economic problems.''

The report continues, ''While the effectiveness of Federal programs may be uncertain, their inefficiency in delivering benefits is self-evident.'' Finally, the report concludes by recommending ''* * * exploring alternatives to the current set of Federal rural development programs, not merely better ways to coordinate them.'' While the Senate bill does throw a bone or two at State and local government, it jealously holds control of rural development programs in Washington—settling for off-the-shelf solutions to local problems. Our reform bill promotes local solutions to local problems by distributing consolidated rural development funds to the States. In turn, each State may administer its own rural development programs in close consultation with local government and the private sector. It is worth noting that State and regional governments already administer 4 out of the 5 major sources of Federal funding for water and waste projects. The States will gain one more if Senators CHAFEE and KEMPTHORNE's safe drinking water amendments become law. It just makes sense to turn these rural development programs—which include water and waste—over

the States to maximize coordination and get the job done.

Finally, in regard to sustainability, we all know that Federal funding for rural development is shrinking, In a single year—from fiscal year 1995 to fiscal year 1996—funding for rural development will be cut anywhere from 25 to 43 percent, depending on how USDA arranges its portfolio—ratio of grants to loans and loan guarantees. With the possibility of even deeper cuts coming in order to balance the budget and to provide increased funding for some programs that usually see annual increases, rural development programs may be sacrificed. What will rural towns, hospitals, and water districts do when the money runs out?

The Senate bill would wait and see. Our reform bill preempts the problem. It transfers administration of rural development to the States and requires each State to establish a revolving fund to be used for rural development. By capitalizing State revolving loan funds, which grown in size and operate in perpetuity, States can continue to provide rural development financing long after Federal funding comes to an end. In addition to sustainability, there's also efficiency in the State revolving fund. Even EPA Administrator Browner agrees that States—through State revolving funds—can actually provide more money at lower interest rates than traditional Federal programs—and do it all faster.

One final point in regard to rural development. I asked the administration and many Democrats on the committee who had concerns about this title to work with me to achieve flexibility, State, and local planning and decisionmaking, and sustainability. But, all I ever heard was the status quo. In light of GAO's criticism of current programs, I think we owe rural America better than that.

RESEARCH

The bill provides for a simple 2-year reauthorization of the research, education, and extension functions of USDA. Research should be the cornerstone of our farmers ability to compete in world market places. A simple extension of authorities will allow the committee to finish the work we have begun on an extensive review of the Federal research programs.

The Agriculture Committee has embarked on an extensive review of the Federal research effort. Last summer, I along with Representatives ALLARD, DE LA GARZA, and JOHNSON sent out a comprehensive questionnaire. We asked researchers and research users what can be done better and how can we spend the $1.7 billion annual commitment to agricultural research and extension to make sure producers and consumers will have a competitive and safe food supply in the 21st century.

In addition to the survey which I just discussed, the House Agriculture Committee has had the General Accounting Office conduct the first accounting of our Federal agricultural research investment since 1981. This report will be delivered to the committee by the end of next month.

Finally, we have scheduled a series of hearings this March and plan on producing a comprehensive rewrite of our Federal Research Program. Unfortunately, the other body has chosen to simply clean around the edges leaving in place research policies that fail to meet the needs of the agricultural sector as we transition into the free market. That is unacceptable and I urge my colleagues to support the Agriculture Committee in our effort to modernize USDA's research program.

This is a board overview of the Agriculture Regulatory Relief and Trade Act. Taken together, it's a strong package that will relieve the regulatory burden in rural America, reduce redtape and provide a consistent and dependable export policy.

RUSSIA AND THE NEW INDEPENDENT STATES [NIS]: PROMOTING U.S. INTERESTS

HON. CHRISTOPHER COX

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1996

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, at a recent executive session of the House Republican Policy Committee, which I chair, the Salvatori Fellow in Russian and Eurasian Studies at the Heritage Foundation, Dr. Ariel Cohen, made a presentation on the state of affairs in Russia and implications for American foreign policy. He offered an analysis of the December 1995 legislative elections and the presidential elections scheduled for next June, focusing on the growing influence of Communists and ultranationalists. His observations about Russia's stalled economic liberalization, military onslaught against the citizens of Chechnya, and sale of nuclear reactors to Iran force one to reconsider American economic assistance programs for Russia. His briefing report follows.

RUSSIA AND THE NEW INDEPENDENT STATES [NIS]: PROMOTING U.S. INTERESTS

Briefing to the House Republican Policy Committee, Hon. Christopher Cox, (R–CA), Chairman

THE ISSUES

The Future of U.S.-Russian Relations Remains Uncertain. The future of U.S.-Russian relations is uncertain. Much depends upon the outcome of the presidential elections in Russia, currently scheduled for the summer of 1996. In December 1995, elections communists, nationalists and their allies captured over 50 per cent of the popular vote to the Duma (the lower house of the Russian parliament). Currently, President Yeltsin is trailing the pack of presidential candidates, with his popular support in single digits. The most popular candidate is Vladimir Zhirinovsky, an anti-American ultra-nationalist. Another dangerous contender is Gennady Zyuganov, leader of the unreformed communist party. He, too, could win the presidency of the second largest nuclear power on earth. Victory for either Zhirinovsky or Zyuganov would gravely endanger Russia's young democracy and market reforms. A communist or a nationalist at Russia's helm could eventually place that country, with its considerable military power, on a collision course with the United States in Central Europe or the Middle East.

Yeltsin's Presidency Faltering. President Yeltsin's own prospects look grim. He has all but announced that he is about to run for the presidency, but his health is failing, and Russia's internal economic and political crisis continues unabated. The war in the breakaway republic of Chechnya, and economic difficulties are eroding the popularity of Yeltsin's administration.

No one knows who will rule in Moscow by the end of 1996, but the period of romantic partnership with the U.S. and the West is over. Russia is striking out on its own, taking a path that has already led toward confrontation with the West. In fact, Russia is in the midst of a political turbulence fraught with dangers for the West. The chances are good that the next American president will have to deal with a new set of players in Moscow, different from the current team. The U.S. cannot afford to appear partisan. Washington should be firm in expressing American support for democracy, elections, free markets and the support of individual rights in Russia. But the continuous and unquestionable support that the Clinton administration is providing Boris Yeltsin makes less and less sense. Questions about how closely and for how much longer Yeltsin should be embraced need to be addressed.

From Sphere of Influence to Empire? Anti-Western, anti-American, and xenophobic sentiments are growing in Russia. Moscow is attempting to re-establish its influence in neighboring regions that were once a part of the Soviet Union. The Kremlin is employing combination of economic, diplomatic and military means to achieve a sphere of economic and military influence in what Moscow calls its ''near abroad.'' Yeltsin's newly appointed foreign minister, Yevguenii Primakov, and other influential policy makers insist that the West scale down relations with former Soviet states, including Ukraine, and conduct these ties via Moscow. But in fact, preventing the emergence of a Russian empire in the lands of the former Soviet Union should be a top Western priority. Nothing less than Russian democracy and a future threat to vital Western interests are at stake. Moreover, an anti-Western policy may lead Russia to forge alliances with anti-Western forces in Iran, Iraq, China and Lybia.

The War in Chechnya. One of the main goals of the Russian attack on the quasi-independent republic of Chechnya in December of 1994 was to ensure control of a vital oil pipeline and stem illegal activities, such as drug-trafficking and smuggling, that were being conducted or condoned by the former administration in the Chechen capital of Grozny led by President Jokhar Dudayev. Russia launched massive but covert military actions to support Dudayev's opponents. In 1994, Dudayev turned to radical Islamic elements in the Middle East and Central Asia for support. This exacerbated the religious aspect of the conflict between the Muslim Chechens and Christian Orthodox Russians. Overt Russian military action began on December 12, 1994, when the army marched on Grozny. The city was destroyed by a brutal aerial, tank and artillery assault. Since the start of the campaign, over 30,000 people have been killed, and more than 300,000 became refugees. Hostilities continue, with hostage taking crises having erupted in July of 1995 and January of 1996. The southern border region of the Russian Federation increasingly resembles Lebanon or Yugoslavia, replete with hostages, refugees and vendettas.

The sale of nuclear reactors to Iran. The Islamic regime in Teheran has launched a bid to acquire nuclear weapons. It is buying two Russian-made nuclear reactors that will produce radioactive plutonium which can be enriched to become weapons-grade raw material for the manufacture of atomic bombs. The Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs itself does not support this sale, which could endanger both Russian and Western security. Iran, with its formidable oil and gas resources, does not need nuclear power. If Teheran wants an additional source of electricity, Russia could sell electrical power from its own ample resources. In addition, to compensate Russia for the lost reactor sales, the U.S. could increase its Russian uranium quota, or cooperate in building safer nuclear reactors on Russian soil.

Aid to Russia. The Bush and the Clinton administrations have provided over $4 billion dollars in aid to Russia since 1992. Over $20 billion has been provided by the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, Western governments and multilateral organizations, such as the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Combined aid monies and loans to the USSR and Russia for the period 1985–1995 amounted to over $100 billion. The results of these aid programs have been mixed. The primary agency which implements aid is the U.S. Agency for International Development (US AID), which often disregards Russia's real needs and pushes its own ''development'' agenda, utilizing personnel with expertise gained in Third World countries. The AID approach is hardly appropriate for Russia.

Technical assistance in the transition to free markets and democracy is vital. It should be administered by an independent board of U.S. policy makers, Russian area experts, and U.S. business representatives, and with guidance from the U.S. Department of State. The Russians need training in Western-style finance, accounting, management, law, and many other issues. They also need support in the development of the democratic institutions of an emerging civil society, as well as student and scientist exchanges.

ARMS CONTROL TREATIES WITH RUSSIA

Four treaties were signed by the USSR and the Russian Federation that require improvement, revision, rethinking. These are:

Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START II). This treaty, limiting the number of strategic nuclear weapons on both sides, was signed between President George Bush and the last leader of the USSR, Mikhail Gorbachev, in 1990, and has not yet been ratified by the U.S. Senate or the Russian Duma. In the U.S., START II is facing a challenge in the Senate. The senators understand that START II makes sense in Washington only if the treaty is compatible with a sound and rational policy that includes missile defense. But the main obstacles to START II ratification are not in Washington. They are in Moscow, where a majority of deputies in the newly elected Duma will probably refuse to ratify. While raising objections based on American intentions to build a missile defense, the real reason for the Russian intransigence lies elsewhere. The Russian military establishment wants to keep large, land-based multiple warhead missiles, such as the SS–18, SS–19 and especially the mobile SS–24. The reason for that is twofold. First and foremost, the Russian elite mistakenly thinks that these are the attributes of a superpower, and that with these tools of destruction Russia will retain the place of its predecessor, the USSR. Secondly, the Ministry of Defense wants to retain the level of investments that were made during the Soviet era. Such old thinking indicates that the lessons of the past have not been learned. Russia cannot become a superpower through such a muscle-bound strategy. Only a democratic Russia with freedom, prosperity and opportunity for all can build wealth and strength commensurate with superpower status.

Ballistic Missile Defense/Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. In an era of nuclear proliferation, the American mainland needs to be defended from accidental or terrorist missile launches. This is especially pertinent with Russia selling nuclear reactors and China selling ballistic missiles and technology to the extremist regime in Teheran. The efforts of Saddam Houssein to develop a nuclear ballistic missile capability are also well documented.

Ballistic Missile Defense is a limited and achievable goal for the U.S. It should not be thwarted by the obsolete 1972 ABM Treaty signed with the USSR, a country that no longer exists. Russia today claims to be heir to the now-defunct Soviet Union, and is demanding that the U.S. abide by the 1972 treaty.

Senators James Inhofe (R-OK) and Robert Smith (R-NH) have informed Majority Leader Robert Dole that they will ''object to any unanimous consent agreement that would call up START II for final Senate action'' if either the treaty or the Clinton administration prevent the U.S. from deploying a ballistic missile defense system.

Despite what critics in Moscow and Washington say, a BMD will not cause a new upward spiraling arms race. The deployment of a defense system will lessen reliance on offensive missiles and will allow the U.S. to achieve lower levels of strategic arms as delineated in START I and II. The limited National Missile Defense will not be aimed against Russia. It is a purely defensive system, and, as President Reagan envisaged, America can cooperate with Russia and its Western allies on developing and deploying such a system.

Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). Russia joined the CWC and expects the U.S. to do the same. America should support the creation of an arms control regime in the area of chemical weapons. However, such a regime needs to be enforceable and verifiable. Unfortunately, this is not the case with the current CWC, and therefore, the Congress should oppose it and refuse to ratify. The CWC is not verifiable because of the nature of chemical weapons. The ease of secret production, low tech equipment—all make verification extremely difficult. Secondly, the convention is unenforceable, as it places this authority in the hands of the U.N. Security Council, which would be hampered from doing an effective job as all of its permanent members have veto power. It is easy to foresee this body becoming deadlocked precisely when incidents of serious violation arise. Instead, the U.S. should propose a different regime, similar to the NPT, which will divide countries (including the permanent members of the Security Council) into weapon states and non-weapon states. Such a regime would circumvent the issue to veto power in the Security Council.

Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE). This treaty places limits on the numbers of conventional weapons, such as tanks and cannon, permitted in the European theaters of operation. It was signed with the now-defunct USSR in 1990, after more than two decades of negotiations. In the fall of 1995, the U.S. agreed to Russia's unilateral revision upwards of the limits imposed by the CFE on the northern and southern flanks of Russia. However, the threat to Russia used to justify these revisions is far from obvious. Beefing up the numbers of tanks and cannon on the borders of Russia's neighbors, be it the Baltics or in the Caucasus, raises questions about Moscow's intentions. This is especially relevant with all the rhetoric currently circulating in Moscow about reconstituting the Soviet Union and denunciations of the accords which led to the dissolution of the USSR. Moreover, Russia is far behind on meeting the weapons system destruction targets stipulated by the CFE.

OTHER ISSUES ON THE U.S.-RUSSIAN AGENDA

Peacekeeping in Bosnia. Many conservatives have misgivings about sending American troops to enforce peace in Bosnia. But if the U.S. has to do it, it is better to keep Russia in than out. The Russian military will gain experience interacting with NATO in Bosnia. This is a positive development. Peace in the region is in the interests of both the U.S. and Russia. However, this peacekeeping mission has to have clearly defined goals and objectives. It must neither exacerbate differences on the ground between NATO and Russian commanders nor magnify them into a political confrontation. It is important to guarantee that the command and control system in Bosnia ensure a close interaction between NATO and Russia. Such a structure should be able to withstand the stresses and strains of a ''worst case scenario,'' and keep tactical disagreements in check.

The Partnership for Peace (PFP). This is a gateway for NATO-Russian cooperation. Through the PFP, Russia and NATO can learn to work together, and learn about each other. It goes without saying that after the end of the Cold War the security architecture in Europe is going to be redesigned, and that a democratic and peaceful Russia should have a place of honor at the European table. NATO will feel more comfortable with a Russia that is not entangled in a bloody war in Chechnya, with a more democratic military without the hazing of recruits, and with a strong professional component.

U.S.-Russian security cooperation and NATO Enlargement. The issue of NATO enlargement to include Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic has become a bone of contention in U.S.-Russian relations. NATO expansion does not threaten Russia and is not a move toward encirclement. It is not a new cordon sanitaire. Simply stated, Central and Eastern Europe is that area of the European continent where bitter confrontations between the Slavs and the Germans have taken place over the last several hundred years. Two world wars have started there. If NATO is not expanded, Russia and Germany will find themselves locked in a new race aimed at dominating this key area. In this century the West abandoned the Poles, the Czechs and the Hungarians, first, to Hitler's aggression, and next, to Stalin's tyranny. This should not and must not happen again. These sovereign countries have the right to apply for membership in NATO, and NATO members should decide when and how new members will be accepted. Moscow cannot have veto power over this decision. The Republican Party has decided to include NATO expansion in its Contract with America, which was enthusiastically endorsed by the American people in the elections of 1994. There will be support in the U.S. Congress for NATO enlargement. And in the future, when the time is right, Russia, too, can explore the possibility of full membership in NATO.

The alleged promise that the Clinton administration gave to Russia not to expand NATO in order to secure Russian military cooperation in Bosnia is a mistake. If a hardliner comes to power in Russia or the Bosnian operation concludes, the U.S. should work to accept the three Central European states into NATO and keep the doors open for others if and when they are ready.

Crime and Corruption. Russia and other New Independent States (NIS) have become leading ''exporters of crime,'' together with Columbia, Southeast Asia, Afghanistan, Iran, and others. Law and order in Russia has collapsed; organized crime is merging with ''legal'' government structures, and it is difficult to say where the mafiosi end the government begins.

The main export items are weapons, drugs, and illegally obtained raw materials, such as oil, gasoline, timber and lumber, and precious metals. Today, organized crime syndicates are taking over whole manufacturing companies with tens of millions of dollars in sales. The total criminal exports from the NIS is in the billions of dollars.

Many Russian and Eurasian criminal organizations operate internationally, including

in the United States and Western Europe. Russian organized criminals and corrupt officials have access to weapons and technology of mass destruction, including uranium, chemical and biological weapons and the raw materials and components for their manufacture, as well as scientists with specific weapons-related expertise.

FACTS

On August 17, 1991, hardline elements of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Russian army, and the KGB attempted a coup against Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. The coup was repelled by the Russian people under the leadership of Boris Yeltsin, President of the Russian Federation, who had been elected only two months earlier. The coup leaders were put on trial and jailed—but were released in 1993. Yeltsin emerged as the strongest political leader in the USSR.

The Soviet Union dissolved on December 25, 1991. Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and other Newly Independent States (NIS) appeared on the map instead of the USSR.

On September 21, 1993, Boris Yeltsin disbanded the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation (the Soviet-era parliament). The recalcitrant Supreme Soviet became the site of intense opposition to Yeltsin and his market reforms. After a week-long standoff, Yeltsin ordered the Russian to shoot at the parliament building (the ''White House''). At least 130 people were killed. The new parliament (the Duma) was elected on December 12, 1993.

Today, Boris Yeltsin's health is failing. He has had two heart attacks in four months. His behavior is sometimes erratic; and intelligence services report that he has a heavy drinking problem.

Presidential elections are scheduled for June, 1996, but it is not certain whether they will take place. Hard-line nationalist and communist forces are on the rise, and the democratic reformers are retreating. The main contenders include President Boris Yeltsin; ultra-nationalist leader Vladimir Zhirinovsky; economist Grigory Yavlinsky (a moderate reformer); retired General Alexander Lebed (an authoritarian and charismatic nationalist); and Gennady Ziuganov (leader of the communist party).

During the Bush and Clinton administrations, Russia received over $4 billion in direct US aid, over $20 billion total in Western aid, and over $50 billion in loans from the G–7 countries and multilateral financial organizations, such as the IMF, the World Bank and EBRD. Together with the Soviet debt, Russia owes just under $130 billion.

In 1994, Russia started a war in the breakaway republic of Chechnya, that has to date killed over 30,000 people, made over 300,000 others refugees, and cost over $6 billion.

In the spring of 1995, Russia joined the Partnership for Peace (PFP), a ''halfway house for some to join NATO.'' However, today there is little likelihood that Russia will join in any time soon. Russia's reaction to NATO expansion East has been shrill and hostile. Most Russian politicians are erroneously claiming that NATO has aggressive designs against Russia and are using the NATO expansion issue to build up nationalism and anti-Western sentiments at home.

Russia agreed to cooperate with NATO in a peacekeeping mission in Bosnia, allegedly in exchange for a Clinton administration promise not to expand NATO, acquiescence to an increase in the number of conventional weapons in place on Russia's northern and southern flanks in violation of the CFE treaty, and freedom of action in the former Soviet area. Russia has over 2,000 peacekeepers in Bosnia.

Russia's unilateral violation of the CFE treaty, signed in 1990, threatens other former Soviet states, such as Ukraine, the Baltic countries, Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia. The build-up also jeopardizes the oil resources of the Caspian Sea.

Russia has signed agreements to supply at least two nuclear power reactors to the militant Islamic regime in Iran, which is implementing a nuclear weapons program.

Trafficking in radioactive materials and chemical weapons by corrupt Russian officials is well documented. Germany alone has made over 100 arrests related to nuclear material components exported from the NIS. General Anatoly Kuntsevich, head of the Russian Presidency's Chemical Weapons Department, illegally sold over 1600 pounds of chemical weapons components to a Middle Eastern country. Kuntsevich was subsequently fired and is currently under investigation.

One of the top Russian mafiosi, nicknamed ''Yaponets,'' is in U.S. custody on racketeering charges.

Russian organized crime in the U.S. netted over $1,000,000 in medical insurance fraud and hundreds of millions in gasoline tax fraud from 1992–1995. A large portion of these illegal proceeds is invested in Western and offshore banks and real estate in California, Florida, and other locations.

The Russian mob is successfully building ties to the Chinese ''triad'' gangs, Japan's Yakuza, the Sicilian La Cosa Nostra and Central Asian mafias. The strategic airlift capabilities of the former Soviet army are often used for illicit transactions, such as drug smuggling and stolen car transportation.

THE RECORD

President Clinton has made relations with Boris Yeltsin too personal. As Yeltsin's popularity plummeted, Clinton fed the flames of Russian resentment toward the U.S. with his unequivocal support of the Russian president, especially after the dramatic shooting at the Parliament building in October of 1993 and the beginning of the Chechen war. As a result, the U.S. is now perceived by many in the Russian political elite as partisan and uncritically supportive of Yeltsin's faltering policies, such as the Chechen war. The Clinton policy has endangered the ability of the U.S. to maintain relationship with segments of the Russian society that oppose President Yeltsin.

The Clinton administration has also been too slow to recognize the importance of countries other than Russia. For example, without Ukraine, the Russian empire cannot be recreated and will have only limited access to the heart of Europe. Azerbaijan controls vital oil and gas reserves, while Georgia is situated in a strategically crucial location in the Caucasus. Nevertheless, the Clinton administration has often neglected these countries, promoting a ''Russia-first'' policy.

The Clinton administration failed to prevent the sale of nuclear reactors to Iran, despite America's share in the massive financial aid provided to Moscow by the International Monetary Fund, The World Bank, and other multilateral financial institutions. The reactors are a vital component in the Iranian bid to acquire ''Islamic'' nuclear weapons.

U.S. assistance to the reform efforts in Russia and other former Soviet states has been poorly executed. Much of the $4.1 billion dollars in U.S. assistance allocated to date has been wasted. The Bush and Clinton administrations made an error in choosing the U.S. Agency for International Development as the main implementing agency for assistance. AID has its expertise in the developing world, not in post-communist transitional economies.

The organized crime from the former Soviet Union is becoming a global threat. In FY 1995, Congress funded and the FBI established a law enforcement academy in Budapest, Hungary where law enforcement officials from the region will train. There is now a small FBI liaison office in Moscow. The FBI is allocating more resources towards countering the Russian *mafia* than previously.

WHAT TO DO IN 1997

To promote democracy and the interests of the United States in Russia, The U.S. should:

Develop a Russian policy based on the support ideas and interests, not on the fate of individual politicians. The U.S. should support democracy and free markets, as well as political forces advocating these ideas, not controversial individual politicians such as Boris Yeltsin. Yeltsin is the elected president of Russia and was a key figure in bringing about the collapse of the Soviet communism. However, today some of his policies and his personal style are controversial, and his popularity is plummeting. Moreover, there are other reform-oriented politicians in Russia with whom a dialogue should be maintained.

Advocate broad-based cooperation with Russia and other NIS members to ensure their integration into global markets and the democratic community of nations. The U.S. should continue selective and targeted technical assistance programs and provide support to prodemocracy forces and nascent market institutions in the NIS. The U.S. must design and implement trade, investment and assistance programs for Russia and the NIS that reduce inflation, lower market barriers and stimulate growth. Congress should support these programs. Thriving Russian and Eurasian markets would create jobs and export opportunities for American businesses. U.S. assistance programs should be taken away from AID and given to an independent board of policy makers, area specialists and business representatives. Such a board can be jointly appointed by the president and Congress.

Condemn Russia's interference in the affairs of its neighbors. The survival, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all NIS countries are important to future peace and prosperity in Eurasia. The U.S. should support the independence of Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Georgia, and the Central Asian states, many of which are being drawn into the Russian orbit against their will. Washington should intensify its ties with Ukraine, the Baltic states, and countries in the Caucasus and Central Asia. The West should provide them with support in developing foreign and domestic policy decision making bodies and mechanisms, training their bureaucracies, and increasing security cooperation. Technical assistance in privatization of industry and agriculture should also be provided.

Make clear to Moscow that the use of brutal force against states or areas of the former Soviet Union, based on the model of Chechnya, is unacceptable and will trigger Western retaliation against Russian economic and political interests. While the U.S. should support the territorial integrity of the Russian Federation, the West should oppose the brutal methods of the Russian military in handling internal dissent, such as in Chechnya. The Clinton administration should cease issuing declarations of support for Russia's actions in Chechnya and boost OSCE efforts to resolve the Chechen crisis peacefully. A high profile OSCE mission to Chechnya and Russia, followed by a mediation effort, is in order.

Maintain Dialog with Moscow over NATO Expansion. The U.S. should maintain a constant dialog with Russia on this topic, pointing out possibilities for Russian-NATO cooperation and stressing that NATO is not a

threat to Russian security. While NATO enlargement will occur, Russian participation in the Partnership for Peace and the dialogue with Brussels should be expanded simultaneously. A secure Western border is in the interests of Russia, Belorus and other Eastern European countries.

Oppose Russian moves, such as sale of nuclear reactors to Iran, that threaten international security and the interests of U.S. allies in Eurasia. The U.S. should take all the steps at its disposal to prevent Iran, Iraq and other rogue states from gaining nuclear and chemical weapons capabilities. For example, voluntary export controls, similar to the COCOM regime during the Cold War, on technology sales to these countries should be put in place. Pressure should be applied against the governments arming rogue states, up to and including the imposition of selective economic sanctions. At the same time, other options, such as an increase in Russian uranium sales and civilian space launches, should be explored with Moscow, that may bring about a voluntary cancellation of the reactor deal. The U.S. should also cooperate with pro-Western circles in Turkey and Azerbaijan to promote democracy and oppose radical Islam in Eurasia.

Assist Russia and other NIS countries in fighting against organized crime and corruption. This can include help with writing comprehensive criminal and criminal procedure codes. Some of the old Soviet legislation lacks important legal concepts, such as conspiracy to commit a crime. In addition, U.S. law enforcement agencies should cooperate, to the degree possible, with trustworthy and reliable law enforcement personnel in the East. In particular, they can assist in developing a witness relocation program. They should strive to track and penetrate Russian and NIS criminal rings dealing in weapons of mass destruction and narcotics. American law enforcement agencies should monitor East-West financial transactions more closely. Deposits that originate in the NIS should be carefully screened and the legitimacy of earnings established.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Why should we provide aid to Russia?

The window of opportunity for the West in Russia may be closing. While there is still time, we should provide aid that strengthens free markets and free minds. Communism destroyed both of these for seventy years. Many Russians still want to learn about democracy and capitalism, and we should provide them with a fighting chance before it is too late.

What if hard-liners take Yeltsin's place?

We should act now to strengthen relations with all countries in the region, which will be under even more threat than the West if hardliners come to power in Moscow. We should expand NATO to include Poland, the Czech republic and Hungary, and prevent any U.S. or international assistance to an aggressive, anti-American or anti-Western government in Moscow, should one emerge. We should still maintain a dialogue with Moscow, explaining what we will see as unacceptable policies and clarifying what price Russia may pay if ''red lines'' are crossed. Eventually, if the need arises, we may need to plan for military contingencies.

Doesn't NATO expansion endanger Russia?

No, it does not. NATO enlargement is aimed at creating a zone of stability and security in Eastern and Central Europe, and to hasten the integration of the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary into the West. NATO expansion is also aimed at preventing competition between Germany and Russia in the area which triggered the two world wars. NATO is a defensive alliance, and its posture in Central Europe should remain defensive.

Why shouldn't we be more cooperative with Russia? After all, the cold war is over; Russia is a democracy and a great power, too. Why shouldn't we allow Moscow a greater role in policing unstable regions, such as the Caucasus or Central Asia?

We can cooperate with those in Russia who are interested in building a market economy and democratic polity. Democracy is still struggling for survival in Russia. More time needs to pass before we are sure that it is there to stay. As for Russia's role in the region, it will always be considerable due to Russia's sheer size and economic, political and cultural weight. However, there are forces in Russia that dream of re-establishing the Soviet Union or the Russian Empire. These circles are anti-Western and anti-American. They cannot be ignored. We should oppose Russia's heavy-handed interference into the affairs of its neighbors and attempts to violate their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

In view of Chechnya, what should the U.S. do to prevent Russia from invading its neighbors?

We should boost our relations with Ukraine, the Baltic States, and countries in the Caucasus and Central Asia. There are as many people there as there are in Russia. We should draw ''lines in the sand'' and stick to them. For example, we should tell Moscow that we will block all IMF and World Bank assistance if an NIS country is invaded. We should clarify to Russia that the U.S. will lead the international diplomatic campaign to restore the independence of a violated country. If Russia crosses these lines, we should consider imposing restrictions on exchanges and economic and trade sanctions against Russia. We should also demand from Moscow that the war in Chechnya stop.

What about organized crime in Russia?

There is wide-spread crime and corruption in Russia. Crime undermines reforms. People mistakenly think that the cause of crime is free market capitalism, but this is, of course, not true. Crime is rampant because there is no rule of law in Russia. Moreover, real democracy barely exists there, and the country still has a long way to go before a free market system is fully established.

Is Russian organized crime a threat to U.S. and Western security?

Yes, it is, because Russian criminals are very sophisticated, well-educated, and well-connected world-wide. They often boast advanced college degrees, KGB and special forces training. There is great potential danger in the merger of former communist, KGB and criminal elements in that part of the world. In particular, access of organized criminals to weapons of mass destruction and technology to produce those makes this threat particularly acute.

How can we stop the Russian ''mafia?''

The Russian government will have to deal with its own criminal organizations one day, but many in the current Russian government, including law enforcement officials, are themselves corrupt. Until such time as NIS governments are able to effectively combat criminal organizations, the West has to apprehend and prosecute criminals from Russia and the NIS affecting its interests.

Are all people from the former Soviet Union criminals?

No, because many of them travel for legitimate business, education and tourism purposes.

STAND BY THE AMERICAN FLAG

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, last year this Congress came so close to restoring the American flag to its rightful position of honor and glory. You might remember that an overwhelming majority of my colleagues in the House agreed with the overwhelming majority of the American people and voted in favor of my proposed constitutional amendment allowing States and the Federal Government to prohibit the despicable destruction of Old Glory. Unfortunately, just three Senators couldn't find it in their heart to stand up for the Stars and Stripes and provide the constitutional protection that is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, this fight isn't over yet and it won't be over until we win. Just to demonstrate the support behind that statement, allow me to submit the following piece from the American Legion's National Commander Daniel Ludwig for the RECORD as evidence of that organization's resolve to correct this gross injustice. It was the American Legion and the Citizens Flag Alliance who carried the flag and the flag amendment to within three votes of this ultimate protection. Well, Mr. Speaker, just like you might expect out of a crew of old warriors, they're not going to surrender.

WE WILL CONTINUE TO STAND BY OUR FLAG

(By Daniel A. Ludwig)

By the time you read this, the postmortems on the Senate vote on the flag amendment will largely have subsided. The media may finally have stopped smirking their smirks of (supposed) intellectual superiority. The constitutional scholars who were thrust into an unaccustomed limelight will have gone back to their universities to continue the debate in quieter fashion. The public-interest groups who took sides against us—and, we always believed, against the public interest—will have turned their attention to other cherished aspects of traditional American life that need to be ''modernized,'' which is to say, cheapened or twisted or gutted altogether.

Observers have suggested that we, too, should give up the fight. Enough is enough, they say. ''You gave it your best, now it's time to pack it in.'' Those people don't understand what the past six years, since the 1989 Supreme Court decision, have really been about.

From the beginning of our efforts, debate centered on the issue of free speech and whether the proposed amendment infringes on it. But whether flag desecration is free speech, or an abuse of free speech, as Orrin Hatch suggests (and we agree), there is a larger point here that explains why we can't—shouldn't—just fold up our tents and go quietly.

Our adversaries have long argued that opposition to the amendment is not the same as opposition to the flag itself, that it's possible to love the flag and yet vote against protecting it. Perhaps in the best of all possible worlds we could accept such muddled thinking.

Sadly, we do not live in the best of all possible worlds.

In the best of all possible worlds it would not be necessary to install metal detectors in public schools, or have drunk-driving checkpoints on our highways, or give mandatory drug tests to prospective airline employees. Indeed, in the best of all possible

worlds, the Pope would not have to make his rounds in a bulletproof vehicle. In all of these cases, we have willingly made certain sacrifices in freedom because we recognize that there are larger interests at stake. In the case of the metal detectors, for example, the safety of our children, and our teachers, and the establishment of a stable climate for instruction to take place, is paramount.

If the flag amendment is about anything, it's about holding the line on respect, on the values that you and I risked our lives to preserve. We live in a society that respects little and honors still less. Most, if not all, of today's ills can be traced to a breakdown in respect—for laws, for traditions, for people, for the things held sacred by the great bulk of us.

Just as the godless are succeeding at removing God from everyday life, growing numbers of people have come to feel they're not answerable to anything larger than themselves. The message seems to be that nothing takes priority over the needs and desires and ''rights'' of the individual. Nothing is forbidden. Everything is permissible, from the shockingly vulgar music that urges kids to go out and shoot cops, to ''art'' that depicts Christ plunging into a vat of urine—to the desecration of a cherished symbol like the U.S. Flag.

Are these really the freedoms our forefathers envisioned when they drafted the Bill of Rights? Thomas Jefferson himself did not regard liberty as a no-strings proposition. His concept of democracy presupposed a nation of honorable citizens. Remove the honorable motives from a free society and what you have left is not democracy, but anarchy. What you have left, eventually, is ''Lord of the Flies.''

Amid all this, the flag stands for something. If respect for the flag were institutionalized, and children were brought up to understand the unique collection of principles it represents, there would be inevitable benefits to society, benefits that would help turn the tide of today's chaos and disrespect. For no one who takes such principles to heart—no one who sees the flag as an untouchable symbol of democracy, of decency—could possibly do the things that some people do, these days, in the name of freedom.

The flag stands for something miraculous that took life upon these shores more than two centuries ago and, if we only let it, will live on for centuries more. It stands for a glorious idea that has survived every challenge, that has persevered in the face of external forces who promised to ''bury'' us and internal forces which promised to tear us apart. Let us never forget this.

And let us not forget that 63 out of 99 senators voted with us, or that we won over 375 legislators in total. Our efforts were no more wasted than were the efforts to take remote outposts in the Pacific a half-century ago. Those efforts, too, failed at first, but eventually we prevailed.

We undertook a noble fight in trying to save our flag, and the fact that we have suffered a temporary setback does not diminish the nobility of what we fought for. This is not over by a long shot. They will hear from us again.

TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH DOUPHNER

HON. ANTHONY BEILENSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of Topanga, California's most dedicated and admired citizens, Elizabeth Douphner, who passed away recently.

Betty Douphner served as executive officer-clerk of the Board of Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains, formerly of Topanga-Las Virgenes Resource Conservation District, which carries out environmental education and restoration projects. During the 34 years Betty was employed by the district, she watched it grow from an operation with one employee, herself, to the 50-employee agency it is today.

In her position with the district, Betty worked tirelessly for our community. She helped secure conservation services for landowners in the area, wrote the district's quarterly newsletter, coordinated the annual plant sale, hired personnel, maintained all the district's records, and helped establish and maintain the district's Vance Hoyt Memorial Library. She became an expert on the law governing the operation of resource conservation districts in order to properly advise the district board.

Betty was also responsible for writing and obtaining the first grants that expanded the district's education program. The large number of awards to the district for conservation and education are a testimony to the effectiveness of her work, for which she was twice honored with a distinguished service award by the Employee Association of the California Association of Resource Conservation Districts.

Betty contributed much to the community in other ways as well. For her volunteer work with schools, the Women's Club, and the Strawberry Festival, the Topanga Chamber of Commerce recognized her as the 1979 ''Citizen of the Year.'' She was also a volunteer with Share International, where she helped publish its monthly magazine.

Betty Douphner's warmth, enthusiasm, and dedication are greatly missed by all of her colleagues at the district, and by everyone else who knew her. The entire Topanga community joins me in expressing our deep sorrow to her family and friends, and our heartfelt appreciation for her many years of outstanding public service.

IN RECOGNITION OF LAWRENCE G. REUTER, METRO GENERAL MANAGER

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take this opportunity to recognize the many accomplishments of the general manager of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit System [WMATA], Mr. Lawrence G. Reuter. It is indeed the Washington area's loss that Mr. Reuter has chosen to accept the position of president of New York City's transit system.

Mr. Reuter, as general manager of WMATA for the past 2 years, has consistently proven that he knows how to run a railroad. His administrative skills have been evident as he has kept the fast-track program, designed to complete the planned 103-mile metrorail system in an accelerated time period, on schedule and within budget. Under his stewardship, WMATA now has the remaining four rail segments under construction. Completion will finally provide a complete network linking all of the suburban communities to all of the District of Columbia.

Perhaps the most difficult issues Mr. Reuter has addressed during his tenure at Metro are the fiscal challenges faced by all jurisdictions throughout this region. He has had to be resourceful in order to preserve quality Metro service at a time when State and local response to these budgets are lean, and Federal transit assistance has been diminishing.

Mr. Reuter has provided the kind of leadership necessary to run a public service organization in these tight fiscal times. He has consistently encouraged private sector partnerships in order to fully capitalize on the public investment in Metro. He was instrumental in the negotiation of an agreement with the RF&P Corp. to construct, entirely with private funds, a Metrorail station at Potomac Yard in Alexandria, VA. This is the first agreement of this type ever executed in the United States. His commitment to public-private partnerships has enabled Metro to streamline its joint development program making it easier for the private sector to invest in properties near Metrorail stations. His efforts to bring private sector investment to locations in proximity to Metro reflects his firm view that this region must fully utilize our investment in Metrorail. Mr. Reuter recognizes that the Metro system provides economic opportunity to all of the communities along its lines as well as environmental benefits to the entire region.

Larry Reuter has demonstrated his extraordinary ability to lead during one of the most challenging times for the transit authority. This region owes Mr. Reuter our gratitude for preserving our investment in the Metro system and for continuing to provide quality public transit service to the entire National Capital region.

TRIBUTE TO JONATHAN NEWTON

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, the volunteer fire service community and the entire State of Delaware suffered a tragic loss recently with the death of Jonathan Newton. Mr. Newton, at the young age of 31, was the consummate volunteer firefighter. At the time of the accident, he was en route to a fire safety program at a local middle school. It was not uncommon for Mr. Newton to volunteer his time and energy to programs that heightened public awareness about fire safety. In fact, his community education work earned him recognition as Firefighter of the Year for the Hockessin Fire Company.

When a firefighter in Delaware suffers a tragedy, it is felt by the entire fire service community. They are like a family, a unique group of individuals who take great pride in their heritage of volunteer service. Friends and family members alike spoke of Mr. Newton's altruism, and fondness toward children, as he devoted so much of his time to educating them about fire safety.

What is most tragic about Mr. Newton's death is that he leaves behind a family. He has a wife who is 7 months pregnant and two children—all of whom will always have a special place in the Delaware volunteer fire service family.

Mr. Newton's legacy of commitment and dedication as a volunteer firefighter will find a permanent place in the Delaware volunteer fire service mantra, reminding future volunteer firefighters of the importance of their mission. On behalf of the citizens of Delaware, I offer my condolences to Sharon Newton and the entire family on the untimely and tragic death of a true American hero, Mr. Jonathan Newton.

HONORING MICHAEL EAKIN

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to J. Michael Eakin who was recently elected as Pennsylvania Superior Court Judge and is ending his tenure as Cumberland Country District Attorney. For over 20 years he has served the citizens of Pennsylvania's 19th Congressional District by dedicating his career to protecting those who live in Cumberland County and ensuring the laws of the Commonwealth are upheld.

Mr. Eakin's accomplishments in both enforcement and prevention are numerous. He is responsible for establishing the first multicounty drug task force in Pennsylvania's history. He has also dedicated much of his time to working with at-risk youth through programs such as drug abuse resistance education. In addition, Mr. Eakin has led efforts to reduce Cumberland County's alcohol-related fatalities by developing innovative programs which work to expeditiously apprehend and process drunk drivers. Several community service groups including Mother's Against Drunk Drivers and the Cumberland-Perry Drug and Alcohol Council have recognized Mr. Eakin for these achievements.

Mr. Eakin has contributed a great deal to the professional development of attorneys and law enforcement personnel. Currently recognized by the Pennsylvania District Attorney's Association and Pennsylvania Bar Association as an authority on law enforcement, he has developed and led training sessions for new district attorneys throughout the State.

Mr. Speaker, by working hand in hand with the community, Michael Eakin has exemplified the true definition of public service. On behalf of the people of Pennsylvania's 19th Congressional District, I thank him for his years of dedication and wish him continued success as superior court judge.

SRI LANKA'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 4, 1996, marked the 48th anniversary of the independence of Sri Lanka. I know my colleagues will want to join me in saluting our good friends in Sri Lanka on this momentous occasion.

Sri Lanka and the United States have much in common. Both are committed to political pluralism, and both believe in the efficacy of free markets and private enterprise. In addition, Sri Lanka has been a good friend to the United States for many years. We work together on regional issues and in the United Nations. We collaborate on a range of critical transnational issues such as population, food security, and the environment. The United States is Sri Lanka's largest trading partner. Sri Lanka has long hosted an important Voice of America facility on its territory.

Sadly, what should have been a day of celebration for our friends in Sri Lanka was instead a time of mourning. Several days before National Day, Colombo, the Sri Lankan capital, was rocked by a terrorist explosion that claimed nearly 100 lives; 1,400 other men, women, and children were injured in the blast.

Sri Lankan officials have blamed the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam [LTTE] for this despicable act of terrorism, which, if true, would make the Colombo attack merely the latest in a long line of cowardly terrorist acts the LTTE has taken. The world community should be forthright in its denunciations of this group. let there be no doubt on this score: Genuine freedom fighters do not wantonly take the lives of the very people they claim to be liberating.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude by reiterating my congratulations to the brave people of Sri Lanka on the occasion of their National Day, as well as my deepest condolences for this horrid act of terrorism that struck down so many innocent people.

CONGRESS MISSES THE MAGIC SHOW

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in passing a Defense authorization bill which includes a cruel and wholly unjustified provision requiring the discharge of all service members who are HIV-positive, Congress served itself and the Nation very badly. Our former colleague, who is now the junior Senator from California [Ms. BOXER] recently illustrated how unwise and unfair this new policy is with an article in the Los Angeles Times for February 6. Because we still have a chance to redeem ourselves by repealing this provision before it goes into effect, it is very important that all Members reflect on the truth of what our former colleague has written and so I ask that the article entitled "Congress Misses the Magic Show" by BARBARA BOXER, in the February 6, Los Angeles Times be reprinted here.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 6, 1996]

CONGRESS MISSES THE 'MAGIC' SHOW

(By Barbara Boxer)

Americans cheered last week as Earvin "Magic" Johnson triumphantly returned to the Los Angeles Lakers. In just 27 minutes, he scored 19 points and dispelled any remaining doubt about his ability to compete at the highest level.

To their credit, Magic's fans, coaches, teammates and even his NBA opponents welcomed him back with open arms. Imagine how absurd it would be if Congress, just as Magic demonstrated his Hall of Fame talent, passed a law requiring the NBA to fire all basketball players who have the HIV virus.

This past week, Congress did something just that absurd.

A little-noticed provision of the annual military spending bill requires the Pentagon to fire all soldiers, sailors and Marines who test positive for the HIV virus, even if they perform their duties as skillfully as Magic Johnson makes a no-look pass. The military strongly objected to this provision, but Congress did not care. The president has called the new policy unfair, but because it is part of a larger bill that includes urgently needed funding for our troops in Bosnia, he will sign it into law.

Under current policy, military personnel with the HIV virus are permitted to remain in the services as long as they are able to perform their duties. If their health deteriorates, the military initiates separation procedures and provides disability benefits and continued health insurance coverage for them and their dependents. So they can remain near health care providers, military personnel with HIV are placed on "worldwide nondeployable status," which means that they cannot be sent on overseas missions. Soldiers with other serious chronic illnesses, such as severe asthma, cancer and diabetes are also nondeployable. In fact, only about 20% of the more than 5,000 nondeployable personnel are infected with HIV.

The congressional authors of the new policy, led by Rep. Robert K. Dornan of Orange County, argue that nondeployable personnel degrade military readiness because they cannot be sent overseas. However, their true motive appears to be less lofty than protecting the readiness of our forces. The new policy irrationally singles out military personnel with HIV. If backers truly believe that nondeployable personnel harmed readiness, why wouldn't they seek to oust soldiers with diabetes and asthma? The only conceivable answer is that readiness is not their real motivation. Their motivation is discrimination, pure and simple.

Can anyone seriously contend that 1,059 HIV-positive soldiers—less than 0.1% of the total force—can meaningfully affect readiness? The Pentagon doesn't think so. Its top personnel policy expert, Assistant Defense Secretary Fred Pang, recently wrote that "as long as these members can perform their required duties, we see no prudent reason to separate and replace them. . . . The proposed provision would not improve military readiness or the personnel policies of the department."

If Magic Johnson can run and leap with the best of them, why can't a military clerk file with the best of them, or a military driver drive with the best of them?

Perhaps the worst aspect of the new policy is its total rejection of the compassion and camaraderie for which the armed forces are rightfully praised. The United States of America does not kick its soldiers when they are down. We have a proud tradition of standing by those courageous enough to dedicate their careers to the defense of our nation. That tradition will end the day this new policy is enacted.

Military personnel discharged under the new policy will lose their jobs even if they exhibit no signs of illness. They will lose their right to disability benefits and their spouses and children will lose their health care coverage. This policy is worse than wrong, it is un-American.

The same day that President Clinton signs the bill that includes this new policy, a bipartisan group of senators will introduce legislation to repeal it. The president and our senior military leaders support repeal. Despite their strong support, the odds are unclear. But I am certain about one thing:

Those who vote ''no'' should take a good look in the mirror.

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE WILLARD CURTIN

HON. JAMES C. GREENWOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, Henry David Thoreau wrote in 1849:

> Even the death of friends will inspire us as much as their lives. . . . Their memories will be encrusted over with sublime and pleasing thoughts, as monuments of other men are overgrown with moss, for our friends have no place in the graveyard.

I am here today to honor the memory of Willard Curtin, who served in this esteemed body as the Representative from my district from 1957 until his retirement in 1967.

Mr. Curtin's life was dedicated to public service and his memory should inspire us all.

Before running for Congress, Mr. Curtin served as Bucks County's district attorney from 1949 to 1953. Prior to that, he was Bucks County's first assistant district attorney.

He ran for Congress in 1956 to succeed retiring Representative Karl C. King. His campaign theme was based on his belief that President Eisenhower's policies were sound and should be continued. He served Bucks and Lehigh Counties during the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations.

Mr. Curtin retired to Florida where he continued to lead an active life. His grandson will always remember him as the energetic, active, sharp minded man that he was, even to the end of his life. He also will share with his grandchildren this story: One of Mr. Curtin's most prized possessions was his grandfather clock. When he would go away, Mr. Curtin would stop the clock's pendulum so it would not disturb the other residents in his building. Even though he had not traveled in a long time, the clock was stopped 6 minutes after 1 o'clock. The coroner later estimated the time of his death to be at 1:10 a.m.

I ask you all to join me in remembering the hard work and dedication that Mr. Curtin gave to this country so generously.

TRIBUTE TO HARVEY D. KERN

HON. ANTHONY BEILENSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute today to Harvey D. Kern, who is retiring as director of public affairs for the Los Angeles County-University of Southern California [LAC-UCS] Medical Center.

In addition to serving as director of public affairs for over 9 years, Mr. Kern oversees volunteer and chaplain services and serves as a government relations representative for the medical center, which is the largest acute care hospital in the United States and provides a variety of patient care services, teaching and research opportunities, and includes the largest HIV/AIDS outpatient center in the country.

Mr. Kern is a native of Los Angeles and received his bachelor of science degree in public health from UCLA and his master of health science degree from Cal State University, Northridge [CSUN]. His long and distinguished career in the health care field includes 32 years with the Los Angeles County Department of Health Sciences, as a faculty member of CSUN for 23 years, and as an assistant professor at USC. He is a fellow in the American Public Health Association, past president of the Los Angeles County Health Services Management Forum, and serves on the joint public affairs committee of the California Healthcare Association.

Mr. Speaker, we ask our colleagues to join us today in saluting Harvey D. Kern for his many years of dedicated service in the health care field. We send our warmest congratulations on his many contributions and accomplishments, and our very best wishes for the future.

HARD BARGAIN FARM—ALICE FERGUSON FOUNDATION

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize the Alice Ferguson Foundation and the Hard Bargain Farm Environmental Center located in Accokeek, MD. On January 23, Hard Bargain Farm was named the winner of Renew America's National Environmental Award. This award is part of the 6th annual Renew America National Awards for Environmental Sustainability. The awards are given each year to programs throughout the Nation that demonstrate leadership and excellence in environmental sustainability.

I have long been a supporter of the educational programs offered by Hard Bargain Farm and commend them on this selection from a pool of over 1600 applicants in 24 categories. I have been honored to work hand in hand with them throughout the Fifth Congressional District to protect the Potomac River through education efforts, environmental stewardship, and conservation action projects.

Mr. Speaker, this recognition of Hard Bargain's achievement and dedication to the environment marks two important firsts. Not only is this the first time that Renew America has honored a Maryland organization in the institutional education category, but it is also the first time that a National Park Program has received such recognition.

For the past 25 years, Mr. Speaker, Hard Bargain Farm has worked in a unique and highly effective partnership with the National Park Service to develop quality environmental education programs. I commend the leadership and experience of the Alice Ferguson Foundation and am very proud to rise today with my colleagues in recognition of this very special award.

THE PUBLIC'S TRUST

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, February 21, 1996, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

IMPROVING PUBLIC TRUST IN GOVERNMENT

It is no longer news that Americans have lost confidence in the federal government. Anger at the government and disgust with elected officials have increased, causing voters to jump in different directions. Americans believe government fails to deal adequately with crime, economic insecurity, and other of the country's biggest problems. They have concluded that government either makes things worse or in incapable of making them better.

It has always been true that people in this country have been skeptical of power and have cherished the right to beat up on their leaders, and in many respects that attitude is healthy. The Constitution of the United States is based on assumptions of wariness of government and each other. That's what checks and balances are all about.

But most elected officials, including me, believe today that public cynicism is severe, intense and stronger than it once was. Restoring confidence in government actions is a daunting task.

CAUSES

Most agree that the distrust of government and elected officials reflects a broader loss of reliance on each other, a civic breakdown in which divorce, crime, and economic anxiety all play important roles. Many Americans are frustrated by an increasingly impersonal economy. Their anxieties are fostered by a changing economy and the highly partisan nature of current politics. People wonder whether there's anything they can depend on. More fundamentally, the experts think that the mistrust of government is part of a larger problem. Americans just don't trust one another as much as they used to.

The media bear some responsibility for the mistrust of government as well. They tend to emphasize and encourage conflict and to downplay consensus. They encourage people to think things are worse than they are. You cannot be very upbeat after watching the evening news. It certainly exaggerates the violent and the sensational, and reduces complexity to a 15 second sound bite. The impact of television often is to isolate people; prevent sustained engagement with other people; and, because of its emphasis on violence and the dark side of human nature, increase pessimism about our fellow human beings.

Elected officials, of course, share much of the blame. It has become easier to lead people by dividing them than by finding areas of agreement. Running against the government in order to serve in it has been the standard practice in American politics for a long time. Elected officials take great delight in attacking the very institutions they serve in and are responsible for. They also create high expectations by promising quick-fix solutions but rarely delivering on them.

SOLUTIONS

So how do we deal with these problems of distrust? It's very clear that political rhetoric will not help much. The credibility of all elected officials is simply too low.

It is important that elected officials try to connect with people through town meetings and face-to-face contact. In the end there's really no substitute for an elected official to spend time with his or her constituents. People want their representatives to listen and be accountable. They have to see some connection between themselves and the government. But there are limits to public meetings. After all, elected officials have been holding them for years without putting the brakes on public distrust of government.

Elected officials have to learn to promise less and produce more. They can help by not

promising anything they cannot deliver. They have to make people comfortable with government, and that means producing what the citizens want. In more specific terms it means ongoing efforts to balance the budget and reform education, welfare, and other areas of public dissatisfaction. But there are limitations even to government reform. Reforms always fall short of their goals and the standard political reform agenda, while it may be worthwhile, does not solve all the problems.

Elected officials also have to do a better job of giving people basic facts. One recent poll showed that most Americans can't name their member of Congress or the Vice President, or believe, incorrectly, that more federal money is spent on foreign aid than on Medicare. In a time when there is an explosion of information, data and statistics, it's important to try to identify those facts which are more important than others. Each of us has to take seriously our responsibilities to make ourselves well-informed citizens.

I also happen to think that elected officials need to pay less attention to public opinion polls which now dominate American politics. The idea that elected officials listen to the pros and cons and then make judgments and go back and explain them is still a pretty good basic approach to government. Restoring civility in political debate can help too. No matter how much elected officials disagree with one another at the end of the day they have to sit down with each other and try to reach an agreement.

There also has to be a lot more emphasis on the many good things that are happening in our families, communities, and states. People everywhere every day act in such ways to restore trust, but it often gets little attention. This is not a time for handwringing, but a time to point out the good things, and build upon our successes.

CONCLUSION

It's important to remember in the end that we as a nation cannot thrive or survive without public faith in our institutions, our economic destiny, and our own values.

Three decades ago a majority of Americans believed that most people could be trusted. Today two out of three believe the opposite. We have to ask ourselves what happened to a nation of endless optimism, opportunity, and good heartedness. Many things have set us back: job layoffs and economic insecurity, crime and drugs, government scandals and policy failures. This will not be quickly turned around, but we must make the effort.

The other day I ran into a constituent who said to me he did not know the names of any of his elected officials. He could not name the Vice President or identify the majority party in Congress. He said to me, ''I don't care. I just don't have time for it.'' I strongly suspect that gentleman does not have the right solution to our problems.

TRIBUTE TO STEVE JOHNSON

HON. SAXBY CHAMBLISS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Steve Johnson who is celebrating 30 years of faithful service to the Baptist Church. Having served as the pastor of Mabel White Memorial Baptist Church, in Macon, GA, since 1984, Steve Johnson is a man who is loved by the members of his church and all those who know him. Through his commitment to serving God and the church, Steve has touched and changed the lives of many special people.

Steve Johnson also deserves to be recognized for his outstanding service to the community of Macon. Serving on the board of directors for the Cherry Blossom Festival and the First Presbyterian Day School, Steve is working with others to make our communities happier and safer places to live and raise our families. I am fortunate to have had the opportunity to know Steve and his wife Connie for many years, and I am proud to call them friends. I hope you will join me in congratulating Steve during this special time in his life and for 30 years of unparalleled service to the Baptist Church.

THE ENTREPRENEURIAL INVESTMENT ACT

HON. RICHARD H. BAKER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. BAKER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation that will be known as the Entrepreneurial Investment Act. The legislation will make it possible for roughly 5,000 of the Nation's 5,300 bank holding companies to make equity investments in the customers of their community-based banks.

Business often needs equity capital to create new or retain existing jobs. This legislation acknowledges that a community banker knows his customer and is well positioned to invest some of his excess holding company capital in equity investments. Passage of the Entrepreneurial Investment Act will mean that communities will be better served by facilitating private sector economic development and job growth.

This legislation has been drafted in consultation with the Federal Reserve.

EFFORTS TO PREVENT POACHING

HON. DANA ROHRABACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, wildlife poaching in Africa has reached such proportions that elephant and endangered rhinoceros populations have been decimated in several countries. The poaching goes on because of the demand for ivory and animal parts used in traditional medicine in Asia. At one time, wildlife conservation groups criticized the Republic of China on Taiwan for not doing enough to stop this traffic into Taiwan. The Government there has long since cracked down with strict enforcement and stiff penalties for offenders.

Now, they have opened a new front in the war on wildlife poaching. The Government of the Republic of China on Taiwan has just announced a grant to the nonprofit United States-based Wilderness Conservancy to purchase a special spotter airplane that will be used in Kruger National Park in South Africa, where game rangers will patrol with it to locate poachers before they do their dirty work. The airborne spotters will radio the location of potential poachers to rangers on the ground who will apprehend them. Kruger is one of the world's great game reserves and has only recently begun to feel the threat of poaching. The Wilderness Conservancy is experienced in assisting antipoaching forces throughout Southern Africa, with spotter aircraft and a range of supplies and support services for game rangers and their families.

Saving the rhinoceros and elephant from extinction is dangerous, round-the-clock work. This generous gift makes possible a unique three-way cooperative effort between the people of Taiwan, a conservation-minded American organization and the men and women on the antipoaching front lines in South Africa.

THE LONG ISLAND ADVANCE'S 125TH ANNIVERSARY—PURCHASED FOR $500 IN 1871

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and to congratulate the Long Island Advance for 125 years of dedicated service to the people of Suffolk County.

''The Policy of Honesty—The Might of Right and The Expediency of Principle,'' were words that appeared in large type across the top of the first page of the Advance when it was first published in September 1871.

Now, reaching the century and a quarter mark with its 125th anniversary edition scheduled for the first issue in September 1996, many changes have taken place in printing, personnel, and location, but the spirit expressed then continues today.

The Advance was the third newspaper to be established in Patchogue, Long Island, NY. The pioneer weekly was the Suffolk Herald founded by a Mr. Van Zandt and discontinued in 1865. In 1870, the Long Island Star was brought to Patchogue by John S. Evans from Port Jefferson. After a few issues it collapsed.

Timothy J. Dyson, a former newspaper correspondent and printer from Brooklyn, purchased $500 worth of equipment that Auston Roe, a member of one of Patchogue's oldest families, had bought from what was left of the short-lived Star. Mr. Dyson, with this equipment from the remnants of the old Star, founded and renamed the paper the Advance. He set about keeping pace with the village of Patchogue, the town of Brookhaven, the County of Suffolk, and even Long Island as a whole, with bits and pieces of the entire world thrown in.

Communications then, not being what they are today, often left much to be desired. Editors were hard-pressed to get news, and sermons often took up a great deal of space on the front pages, because in effect, villages in those days revolved around the church.

Although the Advance suffered many ups and downs, and rapid changes of proprietorship in its earliest days, its course was firmly charted and for the past 103 years, under the ownership of one family, it has weathered many storms to sail a true course, constantly gaining in circulation. After 125 years of serving the community at large, it is one of Long Island's better known weekly newspapers.

Thomas S. Heatley purchased the Advance in 1876 but sold it in 1885 to Rev. S. Fielder

Palmer, a former pastor of the Patchogue Congregational Church, and H. Judson Overton. It was renamed the Patchogue Advance. Reverend Palmer stayed for only a few issues and sold out to Mr. Overton, who became its sole proprietor and editor.

On May 18, 1888, he sold out to Martin Van Deusen, who continued its policies and increased its circulation to the four-figure mark. He operated the paper until June 25, 1892, when James A. Canfield, of Hudson, MI, took over the helm. Since then it has remained in his family for 103 years. Under his proprietorship, the newspaper grew and prospered, playing a larger part in community affairs, and sometimes even leading many issues of the town.

In 1924, John T. Tuthill, Jr., Mr. Canfield's son-in-law, became publisher upon the death of Mr. Canfield. He was publisher for 48 years, except for a stint in the Navy during World War II where he rose to the rank of captain. In the post-war years, the Advance was one of three of the largest and most influential weekly newspapers in Suffolk County. The other two being the News-Review of Riverhead, published by Frank C. Forbes, my own uncle, and the Long Islander of Huntington. In 1972, Captain Tuthill's son, John T. Tuthill III, became publisher upon Captain Tuthill's death. Today, he remains the Advance's publisher.

Congratulations to the Long Island Advance. May it continue to serve the community for hundreds of years to come.

TRADE AND JOBS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, February 7, 1996, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

TRADE AND JOBS

Hoosiers have different perspectives on foreign trade. Some are concerned that imports of cheap goods and services and the relocation of U.S. companies to other countries help keep U.S. wages down and eliminate good jobs. They want the U.S. to take steps to limit foreign competition. Others think trade creates jobs and boosts growth by opening new markets for our goods and services. They want the United States to take better advantage of export opportunities in other countries.

Both perspectives have some merit. Trade has a number of benefits for jobs and the economy, while trade and plant relocation can also suppress wages and cost jobs. But regardless of where they stand on trade, most Hoosiers would agree that our goal should be to minimize the harm of trade and maximize the benefits. The private sector and governments must work together to help firms take advantage of opportunities created by trade while assisting workers who are adversely affected by it.

BENEFITS AND COSTS OF TRADE

Exporting to other countries supports jobs at home—several million, by most estimates. Imports of goods and services expand choices for consumers and help keep domestic prices down. But workers are sometimes innocent victims of trade developments and other economic forces over which they have little control. While some plants in Indiana have added jobs due to increased exports in recent years, others have liad off workers because of competition from lower-wage countries in Latin America and Asia.

Although the primary responsibility rests with the private sector, I do think federal, state and local governments can help firms and workers respond to both the opportunities and the challenges of trade.

HELPING FIRMS

When U.S. firms sell more goods and services in foreign markets, the job security and wages of their workers generally increase. The State of Indiana and the federal government each manage a variety of programs that help firms identify and take advantage of export opportunities.

The Indiana Department of Commerce gives Hoosier businesses specialized advice on how to crack key export markets. It also helps firms participate in international trade shows where they can pitch Indiana products to new foreign customers. The federal government runs several cost-effective export-promotion programs. Every dollar spent promoting exports of manufactured goods contributes to sales that produce an estimated $10 in tax revenues for the Treasury.

U.S. export-promotion programs were streamlined in 1993 and 1994. Overlap among programs was reduced, coordination was improved, and services to small businesses were upgraded. These changes saved operating expenses. And, as Hoosier executives have told me, they also made the programs more effective in generating export sales.

Last year I opposed the unsuccessful effort in Congress to abolish certain export-promotion programs and to cut the budgets of those that survived by 25%. Most other exporting nations already spend more proportionally than we do on export promotion. These short-sighted cuts would have amounted to unilateral disarmament by the U.S. in the international competition for export sales. I will continue to oppose measures that could reduce our ability to expand our share of world markets and create new opportunities for U.S. workers.

HELPING WORKERS

Job training, vocational education, and income assistance can help workers in several ways. By upgrading job skills, training can boost the wages and job security of U.S. workers who compete with foreign workers. For workers whose jobs have already been lost, training can open the door to careers in industries that are flourishing. Temporary income assistance can help laid-off workers make ends meet while they pursue job training and education.

The State of Indiana and the federal government both run programs designed to help workers respond to the challenges and opportunities of trade. In addition to backing a range of vocational education efforts, the state provides special job training services to workers confronting serious foreign competition. These programs are often run through Ivy Tech vocational schools, which work closely with companies to identify worker skills most in demand.

The federal Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program offers three kinds of help to workers whose jobs are lost due to imports: training, job-search counseling, and income assistance for six to twelve months beyond the expiration of state unemployment benefits. In 1995 TAA provided $212 million in income assistance for 39,000 workers and $130 million in training for 33,000 workers.

We need to do a better job of helping American workers get a leg up on foreign competition. Most of the world's other major economic powers provide more help to trade-impacted workers than we do. TAA only helps workers after their jobs have been lost due to imports, and it doesn't help workers laid off because jobs were shifted to other countries. The track record of TAA is also mixed. Many recipients of TAA benefits do not land jobs that pay better than the ones they lost.

Responding to these concerns, the President in 1994 proposed in overhaul of dozens of federal job training programs, including TAA. The idea was to create a single, streamlined program that would help any worker whose job was jeopardized or lost due to trade or other changes in the economy. Workers would be given vouchers worth several thousand dollars that they could use to help pay the cost of the job training or vocational education program of their choice.

Unfortunately, improving U.S. worker training programs has not been a priority of the Gingrich-led House, which has sometimes been willing to let workers fend for themselves in the face of stiff international competition. Work on the President's proposal ground to a halt in 1995. Instead of trying to work with the President to strengthen TAA and other worker training initiatives, congressional leaders have tried to cut funding.

CONCLUSION

With foreign competition growing, we should be increasing, not decreasing, our investment in workers. Improving the skills of our workforce is among the most important things we can do as a nation. Working with the private sector, Congress and the President must take steps to help U.S. workers retain jobs and wages before they are lost, and prepare for the new jobs that our economy creates.

TRIBUTE TO DICK FIFIELD

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dick Fifield who is retiring after 22 years of dedicated service with the Alabama Farmers Federation. I have known Dick for many years and I consider him to be one of the strongest advocates of farm programs in the country. He has fought for the small family farmer and his leadership on behalf of Alabama farmers will be missed.

Dick is a native of Wisconsin who began his career in agriculture with a degree from Beloit College in 1951, followed by an MS in horticulture from the University of Illinois in 1972. He served his country as a member of the U.S. Army Counter Intelligence Corps as a special agent from 1951 to 1954, and taught at the University of Illinois from 1971 to 1974 as an assistant horticulturist before moving to Alabama and joining the Alabama Farmers Federation in 1974.

As director of horticulture, poultry and forestry, Dick designed the federation's monthly food price survey and began annual farm market days in Birmingham, Huntsville, and Montgomery. He established and operated a producer-farmer market inside a shopping mall in Birmingham, a new and innovative idea at the time. Dick played a leading role in the design and construction of the Alabama State Farmers' Market, built in 1984.

As director of natural and environmental resources at the Farmers Federation, Dick Fifield worked with farmers to promote optimum employment of their land resources.

He helped farmers to understand and implement State and Federal regulations affecting family farming operations.

As director of national affairs, Dick has served as the organization's liaison with the U.S. Congress since 1980.

In this role, Dick has helped formulate national agricultural policy since the 1981 farm bill. He served as a member of the National Peanut Grower Group's Technical Advisory Committee and was actively involved in the formulation of GATT and NAFTA legislation related to peanuts and other commodities of interest to Alabama.

Dick will continue to operate his family farm in Chilton County, AL, as well as his family-owned nursery in Montgomery. And I'm sure he will continue to be a strong voice for agriculture. I doubt he will miss living out of a suitcase, since he has spent the better part of the past 15 years traveling every week between Montgomery and Washington. His retirement is certainly well-deserved.

In honor of his lifetime of dedicated service to Alabama farmers, Dick recently received the Alabama Farmers Federation's Special Service to Agriculture Award. I join his many friends and colleagues in congratulating Dick on a job well done.

SELF-INSURANCE IS WORKING

HON. HARRIS W. FAWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call my colleague's attention to an article from ''The Self-Insurer'' summarizing the 1994 National Survey of Employer-Sponsored Health Plans showing the continued growth of self-insured plans. The Foster-Higgins study indicates that 74 percent of large employers now chose to self-fund their plans, up 16 percent from the previous year. Not surprisingly, the study reveals that the larger the employer, the more likely it is to self-insure: 91 percent of companies with 20,000 or more workers self-insure, 82 percent of those with 5,000 to 9,999 workers, but only 44 percent of those with 200 to 499, and dropping down to just 13 percent for businesses with fewer than 50 employees.

Today, there is a revolution in the delivery of private health care in America. Self-insured employer plans under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act [ERISA] are in the thick of that revolution. And these plans are working. These ERISA group health plans are now the primary provider of care in the private market. They cover 70 percent of all employees—70 million workers—and represent a distinct success story in modern American private health care.

Mr. Speaker, by paying their claims directly, rather than purchasing an insurance policy, self-insured employers have escaped excessive regulation and been able to keep their health care costs down during health costs' upward spiral of the past several years. Self-insured employers have the flexibility to design coverage that fit their workers' needs, at a price they can afford. Self-insurance is keeping costs down and can be expected to continue to be part of the health care solution.

[From the Self-Insurer, July 1995]

The 1994 National Survey of Employer-Sponsored Health Plans, an annual report analyzing employee health benefits statistics, bases its finding on data collected from 2,097 employers throughout the United States. This study, released in June, is the research firm's ninth report on the subject.

Although the survey included large employers (those with 500+ employees) and small employers (those with 1–499 employees), many of the results provided in the report summary are geared toward the large-employer market. According to Frank DiBernardino, a principal at A. Foster Higgins, the reason for this is that overall statistics are often skewed when small employer data is included.

''We split the data between large and small employers because so many small employers were included in the survey that [their data would] distort the results,'' DiBernardino said.

SELF-INSURANCE

Last year's growth was most pronounced in the small and medium-sized markets, according to the report.

With respect to large employers and traditional indemnity plans, 74 percent of the companies surveyed chose to self-fund their plans, up from 64 percent a year before. Of that 74 percent, 82 percent purchased some from of stop-loss coverage.

For large employers utilizing PPO plans, the statistics show that 77 percent chose to self-insure those plans in 1994, compared with 62 percent in 1993. Of the self-insurers, 83 percent used some form of stop-loss coverage with their self-funded plans.

DiBernardino points out that, while the stop-loss data was not broken down into large and small employer groups, the 12-percent to 13 percent of employers who do not purchase stop-loss are most likely those with 10,000 or more employees.

According to the survey, half of all point-of-service (POS) plans were self-funded in 1994. For DiBernardino, this proves that it is possible to marry capitated and non-capitated services in one plan and make them fundamental with respect to a self-funded environment.

THIRD PARTY ADMINISTRATORS

The study also shows that more large employers are using TPAs. Thirty-nine percent of all the large employers with indemnity plans in the survey used TPAs; the percentage was even higher (45 percent) when only companies with 500 to 999 employees were considered. For large employers choosing PPO benefit plans, the figures indicated that 33 percent used TPA services, a substantial increase from 17 percent in 1993.

TPAs have also continued the trend of low administrative costs, with 7 percent of all claims costs being attributed to the administration of self-funded benefits, versus 15 percent of paid claims costs on administration for fully insured benefit plans. TPAs are a popular choice for self-funded employers, DiBernardino said, because they are more sensitive to the needs of their clients.

''TPAs tend to be more responsive to the needs of their customer than the commercial insurance companies or the Blue Cross/Blue Shield companies. TPAs tend to process claims more quickly and with a lower error rate than commercial carriers, plus they tend to be more connected to the market,'' he said.

MANAGED CARE ENROLLMENT ON THE RISE

The figures also indicate that an increasing number of employers are utilizing managed care to help control rising health care costs. In 1994, 23 percent of all employees covered were enrolled in HMOs, compared with 19 percent in 1993. POS plans showed the greatest increase, however, with the number of participating employees at 15 percent in 1994—more than double the 7 percent enrolled in 1993.

Fifty-five percent of all employers surveyed in 1994 offered HMO plans, a 9 percent rise from 1993. That percentage is even higher among larger employers, with 87 percent of the companies that employ more than 20,000 workers offering one or more HMOs in their health plans.

DROP IN TOTAL COSTS SHORT-TERM

Glancing at the report, it may seem that 1994 was a landmark year for health care costs in the United States, as it was the first year that costs actually declined from the previous year. But according to DiBernardino, the drop indicated by the survey results was influenced by short-term factors and does not represent real savings for the industry. He attributed this disparity to three major causes.

The first is the massive shift from indemnity plans to managed care plans that occurred last year. The second: an increase of more than 100 percent in the use of carve-out plans to cover areas such as prescription drug or mental health benefits (where costs are growing).

DiBernardino estimates that the number of carve-out plans more than doubled in 1994. Third, actions to stem the growth of retiree benefits caused health care costs to drop, he said, but he predicts those savings will be a one-time-only occurrence.

''These are the reasons why costs decreased last year. It was, in a sense, a lie. A statistical anomaly,'' said DiBernardino.

''Does it mean the problem is behind us? No. It was a one-time advantage.''

MARY RODRIGUEZ HONORED BY DALLAS LIGHTHOUSE

HON. JOHN BRYANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this past December, one of my constituents, Ms. Mary Rodriguez, received an outstanding honor. She earned the Dallas Lighthouse for the Blind's Ronald Pearce 1995 Blind Employee of the Year Award. Ms. Rodriguez achieved this status by demonstrating outstanding job performance and exemplary work practices.

Mary, who is totally blind, assembles certificate binders for the vinyl fabrication department of the Dallas Lighthouse, where she has been an employee for 8 years. Mary's dedication to her work is apparent in the amount of time she spends on the clock. For the past several months, Mary had been working a shift and a half, which breaks down to 12 hour days. She is now pursuing her GED.

Because of this award, she is eligible for the Peter J. Salmon National Blind Employee of the Year Award, selected by National Industries for the Blind [NIB]. NIB is the central nonprofit agency for industrial centers employing people with vision impairments under the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act of 1938.

I commend Ms. Rodriguez for her motivation to succeed, learn, and grow in the workplace—all of which have contributed to her achievements this year.

TRIBUTE TO MARY EVA GOMEZ

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mary Eva Gomez, a special woman who has spent much of her life working for the betterment of her community.

Mary Eva was born to Juan and Laura Gutierrez on February 28, 1931, in Hanover, NM. Her early education was spent in the Grant County schools until she moved on to St. Mary's Academy, where she graduated from high school. While in New Mexico, Mary Eva began her community involvement. She became an accomplished violinist, which earned her a seat with the Grant County Symphony in 1951 and 1952. She also served as organist and choir master for Holy Family Catholic Church in Hanover.

Mary Eva and her husband Ramon, whom she married in 1949, moved to California in 1957, settling in Pico Rivera in 1964. She and her husband have 6 children and 11 grandchildren.

Mary Eva has served as a strong advocate for the children of the El Rancho Unified School District. From 1964 to the present, she has taken an interest in the education that the children of Pico Rivera receive. From attending countless Parent Teacher Association meetings to serving as a distinguished member of the district board of education, Mary Eva has demonstrated her genuine concern for the children of the community.

Mary Eva has served her community in many other ways. She is an active member in the Pio Pico Women's Club, a member of Auxiliary V.F.W. Post 7734, and an educator and minister at St. Hilary's Catholic Church for which she raised $1,500 for its food for the homeless project. This is only a fraction of her community involvement.

Although her accomplishments are many, her work on the El Rancho Unified School District Board of Education from 1981 through 1995 is what most deserves notice, and commendation. Her presence will be sorely missed but her deeds will be dearly remembered.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and honor that I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Mary Eva Gomez, a special friend, energetic public servant and community leader, an individual who has given so generously to so many.

THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS BILL

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, February 14, 1996, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS BILL

With my support, Congress this month enacted into law a sweeping telecommunications reform bill, the most far-reaching measure passed by this Congress. It affects services that virtually every American uses and which generate hundreds of billions of dollars annually. The bill, which President Clinton has signed into law, is the culmination of several years of efforts to reform the nation's telecommunication laws, which were last comprehensively rewritten in 1934. There has long been broad consensus that those laws were outdated, failing to take into account rapidly advancing technology, but often vast disagreement about how best to change them.

WHAT DOES THE LAW DO?

Many telecommunications services are currently provided by highly regulated monopolies. Often, competition has been expressly prohibited: for example, local phone companies cannot provide cable TV, and vice versa. The purpose of the new law is to create one giant marketplace for telecommunications services. It aims to end monopolies, allowing largely deregulated competition. The goal is to expand consumers' choices while lowering their costs, spurring innovation along the way.

Phone service: The breakup of the Bell system in 1984 generally prohibited one company from offering both local and long-distance service to the same customers. The new law eliminates those barriers, requiring local phone companies to open up their networks to competitors, including long-distance companies. Once there is competition, local phone companies could offer long-distance services to their subscribers. In addition, public utilities, like electric companies, will now be permitted to provide telecommunications services through a separate subsidiary.

The bill contains protections for rural communities, which may see less competition because of the high cost of providing service to these areas. The law allows the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and states to order carriers to provide quality phone service at reasonable rates in rural areas, and exempts small phone companies from some requirements if they prove economically burdensome. In addition, the bill prohibits ''slamming''—the practice of duping customers into unwittingly switching their long-distance carrier.

Television: The new law permits phone companies to offer cable service and allows television networks to own cable systems. It also deregulates cable television rates over the next three years, except for basic service. Some current restrictions on the number of radio and television stations that one company may own are relaxed.

Congress deferred final action on the contentious issue of advanced television services, such as high-definition TV. Broadcasters argue that they need additional broadcast spectrum in order to make the transition to high-definition TV, while phone companies and cable operators argue that broadcasters should have to pay for any additional spectrum.

V-chip: The law requires all newly manufactured TVs with 13-inch or larger screens to include a ''v-chip.'' Broadcasters have one year to voluntarily establish rules for rating video programming that contains sexual, violent, or indecent material and to transmit such ratings during broadcasts. The v-chip would then enable parents to block objectionable programming from their TV sets.

Computing: The new law bars the transmission of obscene materials to minors over a computer network. Violators could be punished with up to two years in jail and fines as high as $250,000 for an individual and $500,000 for a company. The law protects providers of on-line service, like America Online, from prosecution if their systems are merely the means by which someone transmits the indecent material. The law also endorses efforts by software companies to design programs that parents and others can use to block objectionable material.

OUTLOOK

The new law is a watershed in U.S. telecommunications policy. The transition from highly controlled monopolies to competition is likely to be bumpy at times, and the effects will not be the same for all consumers. Some companies are better positioned to take advantage of the new opportunities, and some industries and regions of the country are likely to see fiercer competition than others. In the short term we may see more joint ventures and mergers, as companies that were previously barred from entering each other's business are now able to cooperate. The end result may be a handful of industry giants, each of which offers the customer a wide range of information and entertainment services.

The new laws breaks down barriers that have existed for decades and sets off a competitive free-for-all. Consumers who find themselves annoyed by frequent solicitations to change their long-distance carriers are in for more of the same, as expanded choices become available in cable and local phone service. But greater competition is likely to drive prices down over time, and companies will have to innovate in order to compete.

The law, of course, does not please everyone. Many computer users and advocates of free speech protest that it places unconstitutional restrictions on speech. Consumer groups warn that cable and telephone services could be more expensive.

The challenge Congress faced in writing this law was to establish a level playing field for all providers of telecommunication services, ensuring that no one provider would become so dominant as to establish a new, and unregulated, monopoly. I am optimistic that the new law will do that, but I also agree with those who say that none of us can predict precisely how it will play out. While the bill goes far to break down barriers to competition, and junks volumes of regulations, the final product leaves many issues to the FCC. My strong suspicion is that the bill does not deregulate the industry as much as some proponents claim. I believe that Congress must keep a close watch to ensure that the promise of the new law is realized, and be prepared to take action if consumers are adversely affected.

In the end, this bill was finally pushed forward because the congressional leadership desperately wanted a major legislative achievement to point to. And it was accomplished through a genuinely bipartisan effort, involving congressional leaders on both sides of the aisle and the Clinton Administration. The lesson we should learn is that fostering consensus across party lines is the way to get things done. I hope that we see more of that in the days ahead.

HONORING AFRICAN-AMERICANS

HON. OWEN B. PICKETT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, as we again celebrate Black History Month, it is important to take note of the profound influence that African-Americans have had on American history and American society.

From the early days of our Republic when much of our country's economy rested on the backs of slave labor, to the complex commercialism of modern America the thread of black history has steadily grown and expanded.

While much remains to be done to achieve equal opportunity that is more than just a phrase or slogan we can still take pride in the stunning achievements made by so many African-Americans that has often been overlooked in our recorded history.

These contributions have covered the spectrum of cultural, economic, political, and scientific advances that are widely heralded and well known, but many others, less publicized, have equal significance to society.

African-Americans comprise about 12 percent of our population and are our largest minority group. We need but look around us, in our workplace, in entertainment, sports, politics, religion, sciences, education, and throughout our daily lives to understand the importance of their accomplishments.

I realize that the celebration of Black History Month has origins that go back much farther than the formal program we celebrate today which originated in 1976. It was Dr. Carter G. Woodson, who in 1926 first began setting aside a period of time in February to recall the now voluminous heritage, achievements, and contributions of African-Americans.

Singling out any one person or achievement without also giving equal acknowledgment to the many others of equal fame or public acknowledgment would not do justice to the rich history of one of our Nation's most important minority groups.

I join all Americans in saluting Black History Month 1996.

TRIBUTE TO RODNEY SLATER

HON. EARL F. HILLIARD

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Mr. Rodney Slater, President Clinton's Federal Highway Administrator. Recently, Mr. Slater was of great assistance to the small rural community of Gee's-Bend, AL, in authorizing a new ferryboat to replace the one dismantled by segregationists in 1962 in order to keep many civil rights protesters from easily crossing the Alabama River to march in the streets of Camden for their freedom.

Mr. Slater and his staff at the Federal Highway Administration actually understood the need of these citizens to help transport their families across the Alabama River to the county seat of Wilcox County in Camden, AL, in a timely manner. Rather than acting like an impersonal bureaucratic machine, Mr. Slater's office responded with kindness and understanding.

Since 1962, the predominately African-American citizens of Gee's-Bend have had to travel over 1 hour, each way, to visit their doctor, hospital, bank, and for their children to attend the public schools of the county due to the closing of the ferryboat.

However, the arduous journey of these good people will soon be shortened from over 1 hour each way, to only 10 minutes each way, due to the wisdom of Administrator Slater. Mr. Slater took such an interest as to personally visit the proposed site of the new ferry to ensure that the project was needed and worthy of our taxpayers' support.

President Clinton should be commended in selecting such an upstanding man of honor, integrity, and fairplay as Mr. Slater. He is a friend of all lovers of freedom, democracy, and equality.

TRIBUTE TO OCEAN COUNTY FREEHOLDER JAMES J. MANCINI

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. SAXTON. It is an honor and a privilege to pay tribute to my good friend, Ocean County Freeholder and long-time mayor of Long Beach Township, James J. Mancini.

Freeholder Jim Mancini, as chairman of the Ocean County Office on Aging, serves the largest senior population in the State of New Jersey. Ocean County's nutrition sites, transportation programs for the elderly, and senior outreach programs are considered among the finest in our State. Freeholder Mancini has worked closely with me through the years in our effort to preserve and protect such programs as Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. His support has been invaluable.

As liaison to the Ocean County Library Commission, Freeholder Mancini has worked tirelessly to expand the system to 17 branches throughout the county.

A former member of New Jersey's General Assembly, he continues to serve as mayor of Long Beach Township, a position he has held for 28 years. This dedicated public servant also serves as chairman of the board of Southern Ocean County Hospital and as vice president of the Long Beach Island, St. Francis Community Center. The civic associations to which he has devoted many hours are too numerous to mention.

All these associations and activities were carried out while always putting his wife, Madeline, and their nine children first.

The residents of Long Beach Township pay him a great tribute by dedicating their municipal facility in his honor and name.

Jim Mancini represents what is so very good about our country—he is an honorable man, a family man, a man who is willing to go the extra mile for what is right. He has proven the point of the old saying, ''If you want something done, give the job to a busy person.''

I offer him my personal thanks and the gratitude of all those he has so faithfully served throughout the years.

As he celebrates his 70th birthday among family and friends, I wish him all the best that life can offer.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM D. SHAW

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to ask that you and my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in paying tribute to Dr. William D. Shaw.

Dr. Shaw is being honored by his many family members and friends on March 2, 1996, for his 33 years of service and dedication to the field of education. Dr. Shaw began his career in 1962 as a teacher in the Concord Public School District of Michigan. He continued in numerous teaching and administrative positions in Concord before moving on to East Lansing, MI, where he became a instructor at Michigan State University. In 1974 he joined the staff of Bedford Public Schools as director of instruction. Fortunately, in 1978 he moved to the Swartz Creek community schools. During his years of serving the students of Swartz Creek he held the positions of assistant superintendent for instruction and assistant superintendent for instruction and business operations. Dr. Shaw has maintained an involvement in his profession through membership in numerous county and State associations. Additionally, he has served as a adjunct lecturer at both Michigan State University and Central Michigan University.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and all my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Dr. William D. Shaw on his retirement from 33 years to the field of education and wish he and his wife Mary the very best in retirement.

SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO GERALD ''JERRY'' PROPHET

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize one of Michigan's most distinguished and devoted police officers. Sgt. Gerald ''Jerry'' Prophet is retiring from the Michigan State Police on February 29, 1996, after 24 years of commitment to preserve the safety of the citizens of Michigan. He is being honored for his exceptional service on March 2, 1996, at the Candlelight Banquet Center in Bridgeport, MI.

Sergeant Prophet was born in Heflin, AL, on July 31, 1947. His family moved to Michigan when he was a young boy and he graduated from Ferndale High School in 1965. Jerry joined the Michigan State Police in 1972 and rose to the rank of sergeant. He always places protecting the citizens of Michigan over himself which is a tribute to his honorable service. His dedication to the needs of the people of Michigan and his fellow officers earned him the thanks and respect he so much deserves.

An example of his dedication and one of the most notable aspects of his career was when he received a life saving award from the Michigan State Police. Jerry responded to an urgent call and rushed to the home of a Michigan citizen who stopped breathing. He performed CPR and ultimately saved her life.

Despite his demanding schedule, Jerry is also committed to the spirituality of his community. He serves on the usher board and is a member of the men's club and the courtesy committee at Bethel AME Church in Saginaw.

Sergeant Prophet not only served the people of Michigan, but served his country as well. Before joining the Michigan State Police, he served in the Navy and was stationed in China Lake, CA, and Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. He was honorably discharged from the Navy in 1970 with the rank of yeoman 2d class.

Never losing sight of the importance of education and learning, Sergeant Prophet received an associate degree from Delta College in 1978 and is expected to graduate with

a bachelor's degree from Saginaw Valley State College in 1997.

Jerry could not have achieved these great accomplishments without the support of his loving family and including his mother Vanilla Prophet and his brothers and sisters, Graylon, Calvin Conrad, and Sharon Prophet, Sandra Jean Foster, Tonia Hickman, and Teri Atkins.

Although he is leaving the police force, I am confident that he will continue to serve and protect his community, I request that my colleagues join me in wishing Sergeant Prophet and his family best wishes as he enters a new phase of his life.

IN HONOR OF 32-YEAR CAREER OF MORRIE TURNER

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the African American Advocate in celebration of Mr. Morrie Turner's dedication to art and education, and to chronicle his 32-year career as a prominent cartoonist and creator of the nationally syndicated cartoon strip ''Wee Pals.'' Morrie Turner is the first African-American to be a syndicated cartoonist and to publish a cartoon strip in a mainstream, metropolitan newspaper. He uses his skills and talents to educate children—and adults—about black history, community issues and services, health and safety.

For four decades, Morrie has produced ''Wee Pals.'' The multiethnic cast of characters are reflections of his childhood neighborhood. He highlights the cultural and historical accomplishments of African-Americans through ''Soul Corner.''

Morrie Turner is a native and resident of Oakland—San Francisco Bay Area, CA, born on December 11, 1923, one of four brothers to James Edward and Nora C. Turner. He attended Cole Elementary and McClymonds High School in Oakland; and graduate from Berkely High School in 1942. In 1943, he was drafted into the U.S. Army.

Morrie began to draw at an early age which provided him with joy and satisfaction. With the support of his family, wife Letha and son Morrie, Jr., he began to pursue a cartoon career. Though it was difficult to break into cartooning with black characters, Morrier's ''Wee Pals'' was syndicated in 1964. He began to receive fan mail from across the country. Many of his fans did not know he was black. One letter asked, ''Do you really know some Black people?'' Morrie responded, ''Just my mother, father, wife, and son, for starters.''

Morrie actively participates in the life of the community. In 1960, he was a delegate to the White House Conference on Children. In 1967, he entertained troops in Vietnam. He spends much of his time sharing with young people about cartooning and black history in schools across the country. He assists many nonprofit organizations and public agencies by producing books, T-shirts, and educational materials.

On February 24, 1996, at the Oakland Museum, Morrie Turner was honored by the African American Advocate and the bay area community for his significant contributions in promoting harmony, understanding, and acceptance of cultural diversity. The vision that ''Wee Pals'' characters may be used in classrooms and on the streets to promote cultural understanding and to provide our youth with role models will ensure ''Wee Pals'' as Morrie Turner's legacy to our children and our children's children.

CASTRO'S RUTHLESS ACT OF VIOLENCE

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage over Fidel Castro's act of violence by shooting down two small unarmed civilian planes last Saturday.

Shooting down unarmed civilian planes is a flagrant violation of international law and a horribly inhumane act. There are legitimate ways for a country to protect their national borders, but the Cuban Government ignored every one of them last Saturday by shooting down these planes. International law dictates that civilian planes should not be fired upon even if they do fly into forbidden airspace. It requires warning off the approaching aircraft. But the Castro government decided to react in the most brutal way by ignoring American urgings to stay on a peaceful and legal path.

Mr. Speaker, Since Castro's rise to power, Cuba has surpassed every other Nation in the Western Hemisphere in human rights violations. Because we cannot rest in the face of the oppression of the Cuban people, I fully support the steps taken by the Clinton administration as well as the Helms-Burton legislation which imposes tighter sanctions on Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow these acts of violence to be perpetuated against any person, Cuban or American. Fidel Castro has no respect for the dignity of human life. Maybe the passage of Helms-Burton as well as additional steps taken by the administration will teach him, if not the value of human life, then the repercussions he faces when he kills unarmed American civilians.

THE NATIONAL MEDIA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, February 28, 1996, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE NATIONAL MEDIA

Public respect for the national media has fallen in recent years. As the power of the media has shifted from local and state newspapers to national networks, I find people increasingly mistrustful of the media. Constituents ask whether they can believe what they read or see. Or, as one constituent asked, how can we know the truth? That's the most fundamental question of all.

American journalists have long had a reputation for independence and integrity combined with hardnosed reporting and sharp investigative skills. Americans have traditionally looked to the media, particularly the national media, to get basic factual information on national events. The national media often put the spotlight on difficult problems and can be an important force for change.

That pattern is changing. There are still many outstanding journalists today, and, at its best, American journalism can be very good indeed. Nonetheless, I am impressed by how many Americans are tuning out the national media, getting their information instead from non-traditional sources, such as talk radio and TV talk shows, tabloid newspapers or television shows, or special interest publications. They simply don't trust the national media anymore to give them basic facts or unbiased reporting. They find alternative media more accessible and more responsive to their concerns.

WHAT HAS CHANGED

It is hard to say why the national press is held in lower esteem today, but my suspicion is that many of its wounds have been self-inflicted. Some journalists appear to have trouble sorting out what's hot news and what's meaningful, what's topical and what really has consequences for the nation. My sense is that the press now seeks to shape public attitudes more than it questions, examines and describes the real world to the fullest extent possible.

Journalists are trained to seek out facts, but increasingly blur fact and opinion and infuse their stories with their opinions rather than objective facts. It often seems there are no reporters in Washington. That's an exaggeration, of course, but it makes a point that many in the media today seek to shape policy, rather than report the news. Many Washington journalists are striving to be colorful personalities. They want to get on the television talk shows. They will often make bombastic arguments and predictions and outrageous statements. What they do not exhibit is professional detachment.

Washington reporting has also become much more speculative, less factual. There is just too much careless reporting, too much cynicism, too much reliance on unnamed sources, too much instant analysis, too much of an effort to entertain, not enough effort to inform objectively.

I am astonished at the number of times I have found that journalists do not check facts, but simply write what they first hear. I wonder whether reporters are scrupulously accurate or whether they try to reshape a quote or ignore a fact or concoct a source in order to make the point they want to make. I have often had the experience of being interviewed only to discover that the journalist had already made up his mind about what to say in the piece, and was only searching for a quote to buttress his view; or have attended an event covered by the press, but find later what appears in print or on television is not the way it was.

The Washington media also show limited interest in promoting informed debate on important issues. In so many of the talk shows, squabbling and shouting matches replace dialogue and discussion. There seems to be a premium on fostering conflict rather than consensus, in encouraging extremes and discouraging moderation. The press also loves to report the misdeeds and the personal failings of public figures.

REPORTING ON POLITICS

Constituents ask overwhelmingly about the ''what'' of politics: what are we going to do about the health care system, what are we going to do to reform welfare. The national media, in contrast, often seem to think of politics as just a big game filled with players whose motive is to win, and picking the winners and the losers becomes their primary preoccupation. They see politics as a contest between political leaders, not as a clash of

ideas and proposals. They appear to have less to say about the substance and little interest in the impact of legislation on people's lives.

My impression is the Washington press corps often shows a lack of diligence, a follow-the-leader mentality. If one journalist writes about a topic, everybody writes about it. If one talks about it, everybody talks about it. If one states a ''fact,'' others accept it without checking. I often ask myself how many journalists out there think for themselves.

What worries me in all this (and other critics of the media) is that the media suggest that politics is little more than the struggle between ambitious politicians for power and has less to do with how we as a country deal with the serious problems confronting us. There are excellent members of the national press corps, but there just seems to be a very large gap between the way many journalists approach a story and the way other people do.

CONCLUSION

One important role of journalism in this country is to try to provide a common ground of knowledge and analysis, an effort to clarify the national debate and link it to people and their lives. The media in our society have a high mission and bear the responsibility to carry it out.

Fortunately, there is a self-correcting process in the media. The competitive instinct is very strong among the multiple sources of information and that sometimes leads to excess and inaccuracies, but also contributes to a corrective process whereby the facts eventually get out straight. If one news outlet reports a story badly, other rival organizations will try to set the record straight.

The proliferation of alternative news sources may also be a positive development. Some argue that the national press is responding to competitive pressures from the tabloid media by trying to imitate them, and this is certainly a concern. Competition, however, may also force the mainstream media to get back to basics—to do what they do best, namely solid beat reporting and in-depth investigative pieces. There has certainly been a trend in the regional press toward issue-oriented coverage of politics and news, and the national media could learn from this positive development.

MEMORANDUM ON THE BALLISTIC MISSILE THREAT

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the President vetoed the defense authorization bill last December due primarily to the legislation's direction that a national defense system be deployed by the year 2003. As I commented during the veto override debate, on a political level, the veto did serve to more clearly define the stark differences between the Clinton administration and this Congress on key national security issues such as ballistic missile defense. It is unfortunate that an issue as fundamentally important as whether or not the American people should be defended against the threat of ballistic missiles in the decade ahead has become so controversial—but it is where we find ourselves.

Adding further to the controversy, the Department of Defense announced last week that they do not intend to spend all of the funding appropriated for national missile defense programs this fiscal year, as well as the surprising decision to delay several of the most promising theater missile defense programs—an area in which I did not believe there was much controversy until now. The combination of the President's strong opposition to deploying a national missile defense and now, an apparently conscious decision to scale back theater missile programs leaves us plenty to begin sorting through.

The National Security Committee has a responsibility to raise the visibility of important security issues and through discussion, debate and even disagreement, to hopefully inform and educate the citizens of this country. Today, we started that effort with the first in a series of full committee and subcommittee hearings on ballistic missile defense. In addition to hearings, I have prepared a short paper, ''Memorandum on the Ballistic Missile Threat,'' which I distributed to the members of the National Security Committee yesterday.

The text of the memorandum is as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON THE BALLISTIC MISSILE THREAT

(By HNSC Chairman Floyd Spence)

INTRODUCTION

As last year's debate and veto of the FT 96 National Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 1530) demonstrated, Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) has become a defining national security issue. Today, the United States has no defense against even a single ballistic missile. According to polls, this fact is not appreciated by the American people, who continue to believe that we have the means today to protect ourselves against ballistic missile attack. Although the technology exists to develop and field a limited defense against such threats, the American people remain hostage to a national strategy of conscious vulnerability, codified by the 1972 anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty and reinforced by Cold War notions of strategic stability.

The debate over whether deployment of a national missile defense is warranted ought to pivot in large part on forward looking assessments of the ballistic missile threat to the United States. In his December 28 veto message, the President stated that H.R. 1530's call for a national missile defense system addresses a long-range missile threat ''that our Intelligence Community does not foresee in the coming decade.'' The purpose of this memorandum is to address this issue and to provide a better understanding of the missile threats facing the United States now and in the future.

A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

The Clinton Administration has acknowledged that the shorter-range, or theater, ballistic missile threat is real and growing. Secretary of Defense William Perry has stated that ballistic missiles ''are clearly becoming a common battlefield weapon.''[1] More than 15 countries currently possess ballistic missiles. Most are based on Soviet-derived designs like the SCUD, which was used by Iraq during the 1991 Gulf War. However, the types of theater missiles being sought and acquired by third countries today are of increasing range, lethality, and sophistication.

In addition, more than 25 countries currently possess, or are seeking to acquire, weapons of mass destruction (WMD), including nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. According to unclassified estimates, some 24 countries currently have ongoing chemical weapons programs.[2] Ten countries are reportedly pursuing biological weapons research.[3] At least as many are reported to be interested in developing nuclear weapons.[4] The trend toward proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the missiles that can carry them is ''decidedly negative,'' with ''no limits on the ambitions of unstable actors to acquire the most advanced and deadly weapons available, either through internal or external sources.[5]

The Administration is less convinced, however, of the threat posed by longer-range missiles. In particular, a recently completed National Intelligence Estimate (NIE), prepared by the intelligence community, concludes that the threat to the United States posed by long-range ballistic missiles is lower than previously believed.[6] A letter by the CIA's Director of Congressional Affairs to Senators Levin and Bumpers, written on behalf of the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI), John Deutch, asserts that the previous intelligence community estimate of the missile threat to the United States, as reflected in the language of H.R. 1530, ''overstates what we currently believe to be the future threat.'' The letter states that it is ''extremely unlikely'' any nation with intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) would be willing to sell them; declares that the U.S. early warning capability is ''sufficient to provide many years in advance of indigenous development''; and judges the prospect of an operational North Korean ICBM within the next five years to be ''very low.''[7]

The Administration's conclusions on these issues are seemingly at odds with previous intelligence community estimates; are at variance with the view of other responsible experts within and outside the intelligence community; and have raised troubling questions concerning the politicization of intelligence.[8]

THE ALLURE OF BALLISTIC MISSILES

There are numerous reasons why a growing number of nations seek to acquire ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction. Such weapons provide a military edge against regional adversaries and serve as symbols of national power and prestige. Ballistic missiles offer small and medium powers—for the first time—a strategic weapon potentially capable of deterring great powers militarily and politically. An adversary armed with ballistic missiles and WMD may deter the United States from undertaking certain actions for fear of retaliation against U.S. regional assets of allies. Long-range ICBMs are even more attractive assets for hostile powers wishing to deter the United States from exercising its power projection capabilities by placing U.S. territory directly at risk and threatening our most valued asset: the American people. Importantly, the lack of any effective defenses against ballistic missiles may actually serve to encourage hostile states to acquire missile capabilities and makes them the weapon of choice for nations seeking to threaten others. As the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London has concluded, ''the ballistic missile, mainly on account of its range, speed and cost relative to that of a manned aircraft, is a favored delivery means for proliferating states and is likely to remain so until a proven anti-ballistic missile defense system has been deployed.''[9]

The proliferation of these weapons heightens the risk that adversaries will seek to use them or threaten their use against the U.S. or American allies and interests. For instance, in the Gulf War, Iraq used SCUD missiles against Israel as political weapons in an attempt to draw Israel into the conflict and fracture the allied coalition. Libya recently declared its willingness to fire ballistic missiles at Naples, Italy, the home of the U.S.

Footnotes at the end of article.

Sixth Fleet.[10] In fact, Libya launched ballistic missiles against a NATO base in Italy in 1986. Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi has spoken of his desire to acquire ''a deterrent—missiles that can reach New York,'' and has stated, ''We should build this force so that they [the U.S.] and others will no longer think about an attack.''[11] Palestine Liberation Front leader Abu Abbas warned ominously in 1990 that ''some day we will have missiles that can reach New York.''[12] And Iranian President Hashemi Rafsanjani has called missiles ''the most important and the most essential weapons of the world.[13] Clearly, the incentive to develop or otherwise acquire these weapons is enhanced by the lack of defenses against them.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ANALYSIS

The conclusions expressed in the CIA letter referred to above have required the intelligence community to adopt a number of benign assumptions about the ballistic missile threat to the United States that are not supported by previous intelligence estimates or independent analyses.[14] For example:

An assumption that nations will be limited to their indigenous industrial and technological base when developing ICBMs and that foreign assistance will be minimal or nonexistent. By discounting the likelihood that ICBM components or entire missiles may be purchased from more advanced nations, the intelligence community appears to place faith in a universal adherence to the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) or in self-imposed restraints on trade of such items. However, the MTCR, which establishes guidelines for controlling the transfer of missile equipment and technology, is a voluntary effort, lacks the force of international law, contains no enforcement mechanisms, and has been repeatedly violated. For example, Russia has transferred critical missile components, in contravention of MTCR guidelines, to India and Brazil.[15] More recently, missile guidance components capable of being used in an ICBM were intercepted in Jordan in transit from Russia to Iraq.[16] Regardless of whether this particular transfer was sanctioned by the Russian government or was a ''rogue operation,'' the incident is troubling and demonstrates that the MTCR provides no guarantee against the transfer of ICBM technology.

In addition, several known proliferant states—such as China and North Korea—are not members of the MTCR. Chinese sales of intermediate-range missiles to Saudi Arabia and North Korean exports of SCUD missiles and production technology to Iran and Syria are clear indicators that arms control regimes like the MTCR cannot halt potentially dangerous transfers of missile technology.

Furthermore, the assertion in the December 1995 CIA letter that sales of ICBMs are ''extremely unlikely'' is seemingly at odds with the assessment by Larry Gershwin, former National Intelligence Officer for Strategic Programs at the CIA, who stated in 1993, ''We also remain concerned that hostile nations will try to purchase from other states ballistic missiles capable of striking the United States.''[17] Indeed, Russia has aggressively marketed variants of the SS–25 and SS–19 ICBMs for space launch purposes.[18] A recent change in the START I Treaty would allow Russia to transfer a missile to any other country as long as it is called a ''space launch vehicle'' and it remains under Russian control.[19] However, as a practical matter, the United States has no ability to verify that such a missile will be used to launch a satellite (as compared to a warhead), or that Russians ''control'' it.

The intelligence community's focus on indigenous production also discounts the possibility that the ''import'' of scientific expertise acquired from other nations may accelerate the indigenous development of potentially hostile states of long-range missile capabilities. Former DCI James Woolsey has testified that ''the acquisition of key production technologies and technical expertise would speed up ICBM development.''[20] Given Russia's dire economic situation, the prospect that Russian scientific and technical talent will seek work elsewhere (the ''brain drain'' factor) is troubling.

In short, the compliance problems and loopholes intrinsic to arms control agreements, the increasing availability of foreign expertise, the strong incentives that exist for missile and component sales by states in need of hard currency, and the geopolitical desirability of long-range missiles, justify a more sober assessment of the likely future missile threat to the United States.

An assumption that countries with the capability to develop ICBMs will not do so. The recent intelligence community assessment reflects an apparent and questionable conclusion that those nations most technically competent to develop ICBMs, such as Japan, Ukraine, and India, have little motive to acquire ICBM acquisition could easily and rapidly change, and it is prudent to assume relations and attitudes among nations will be relatively constant in the international order in the coming decade. Indeed, few predicted the monumental changes in the strategic environment that have occurred over the past 5–10 years. At a minimum, any analysis that assumes continuity must be balanced with an equity valid analysis that postulates alternative futures.

It is conceivable, for example, that India might want ICBMs to deter the United States or other powers from becoming involved in any future India-Pakistan conflict. Ukraine might want ICBMs if it finds, once Keiv is bereft of all nuclear weapons now based on its territory, that the United States loses interest in Ukraine's future, or if Ukraine wishes to increase its leverage in future dealings with Moscow. And Japan may look at some future point to acquire long-range missile capabilities for deterrence purposes if it no longer has faith in U.S. security assurances, or if China or Russia assumes more aggressive international or regional stances.

It is important to note that existing SLVs in these and other countries could be transformed into ICBMs in reasonably short order. In fact, there is no practical ability to distinguish between an ICBM and SLV for verification purposes—thereby denying the United States ''timely warning'' of a new missile threat. A report of the Proliferation Study Team, chaired by former National Security Agent Director LTG Williams Odom (USA, Ret.), noted in 1993 that ''[t]he conclusion that the probability is quite low for the emergence of new ballistic missile threat to the United States during this decade or early in the next decade can be sustained only if plausible but unpredicted developments, such as the transfer and conversion of SLVs, are dismissed or considered of negligible consequence.''[21] Moreover, according to the study team's report, the transfer and conversion of SLVs would require ''relatively modest effort.''[22]

The System Planning Corporation found in a 1992 report that conversion of SLVs to military ballistic missiles would be ''fairly straightforward'' and that extending the range of missiles has already been achieved by China, North Korea, Iraq, and Israel.[23] Additionally, a report prepared in 1992 by Science International Corporation concluded: ''The increasing availability of space launch vehicles and space launch services could result in the ability of certain Third World countries to threaten the continental U.S. with United States with ICBMs carrying nuclear, chemical, or biological payloads in the mid- to late-1990s.''[24]

An assumption that there is a low risk of deliberate, unauthorized, or accidental missile launch by Russia or China. According to Russian sources and U.S. experts, the Russian General Staff may have operational control of the strategic nuclear forces and could launch those forces without President Yeltsin's permission. Given the elevated emphasis being placed on nuclear weapons in Russia's new military doctrine, this is a particularly worrisome prospect. Russian General Geliy Batenin, former commander of an SS–18 ICBM division and a military advisor to President Yeltsin, has warned that the General Staff and even individual ICBM flight crews could execute an unauthorized missile launch. Batenin has also warned that Russian nuclear submarines may carry launch codes that would allow a submarine commander to conduct an unauthorized launch of SLBMs.[25]

Russian political instability, the erosion of Russian military discipline, and the deterioration of technical infrastructure, including radar and early warning systems, are conditions that increase the possibility of unauthorized or accidental nuclear use.[26] Brookings Institution analyst Bruce Blair has testified that ''The world remains unsafe as long as there are thousands of launch-ready nuclear weapons at the fingertips of a Russian command system that is tottering on the edge of civil collapse.''[27] The Russian General Staff's unauthorized nuclear alert during the August 1991 coup attempt, the October 1993 Parliamentary crisis, the January 1995 nuclear alert in reaction to Norway's launch of a meteorological rocket, and recent nuclear sabre rattling against proposed NATO expansion, should cause more than a little concern about the Russian nuclear threat.[28] It is disturbing the extent to which knowledgeable Russians are apparently more worried about the possibility of unauthorized or accidental use of Russian nuclear weapons than the US intelligence community.[29]

The solidity of China's command and control system is also in question. Based on admittedly limited knowledge, it appears that technical control over China's ICBM force is significantly less structured than that of either Russia or the United States. Also, China's willingness to use ballistic missiles for political purposes was evident in the recent series of Chinese missile launches against ''targets'' off the coast of Taiwan. And the reported Chinese warnings to the United States that it would consider nuclear strikes against American cities to deter U.S. involvement in a possible future conflict with Taiwan reinforce the conclusion that China believes ballistic missiles carry both political and military utility.[30]

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

The desire of nations to acquire ballistic missiles that can threaten the United States or U.S. and allied interests has not abated. In fact, the absence of ballistic missile defenses may actually encourage other states to acquire such weapons. Perhaps the only way Third World nations can directly challenge the United States in the next ten to twenty years given overall U.S. military capabilities is by developing or acquiring missiles capable of deterring U.S. action or making the ''price'' of such action exceedingly high.

The ability of other nations to acquire ballistic missile capabilities will expand and under any circumstances is unlikely to be halted by arms control regimes like the MTCR. The countries of greatest proliferation concern are either not members of these regimes or have failed to abide by their

international nonproliferation obligations under them.

Indigenous development of ICBM capabilities is one way, but not the only or even most probable way, for other nations to acquire long-range missile capabilities. Given the willingness of regimes such as North Korea to trade in missiles and components, and Russia's refusal or inability to control the flow of missile components as well as scientific and engineering talent to Third World countries, the trend is clearly in the direction of more proliferation rather than less.

The Russian military is not immune to the tremendous societal strains currently underway in Russia. These strains, along with changes in military doctrine that increase reliance on nuclear weapons, call into question the sanguine assessment that the risk of a deliberate, accidental, or unauthorized ballistic missile launch from Russia remains low. Likewise, Chinese threats to use ballistic missiles raise troubling political and military concerns.

The intelligence community's recent downgrading of the long-range missile threat is premised on assumptions that are highly questionable. The latest intelligence community estimate of the long-range missile threat to the United States is at variance with previous intelligence estimates, the public testimonies and statements of acting and former U.S. intelligence officials, and the analysis of respected non-governmental experts.

The American people remain entirely vulnerable to a ballistic missile attack. As recent focus groups have reaffirmed, Americans are surprised and angered when presented with the knowledge that they remain unprotected against this threat.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Secretary of Defense, ''Annual Report to the President and the Congress,'' February 1995, p. 241.

[2] Testimony of R. James Woolsey, Director of Central Intelligence, before the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, 24 February 1993.

[3] Cited in ''Proliferation, Potential TMD Roles, Demarcation and ABM Treaty Compatibility,'' report prepared by the National Institute for Public Policy, September 1994, p. 7.

[4] U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, ''Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction: Assessing the Risks,'' August 1993, p. 64.

[5] Institute for National Strategic Studies, ''Strategic Assessment 1995: U.S. Security Challenges in Transition,'' National Defense University, 1995, p. 116.

[6] Director of Central Intelligence, ''Emerging Missile Threats to North America During the Next 15 Years,'' NIE 95-19, November 1995.

[7] Letter dated 1 December 1995. In a similar vein, the former Deputy Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO), William Evers, has described the view of the intelligence community this way: ''Russia, the former Soviet states, and China will not use [ICBMs] intentionally, will not launch them accidentally, and will not sell them.'' (Comments at a conference sponsored by the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, Inc., 28 April 1995, reported in John Donnelly, ''House Panel to Examine Russian Command and Control Issues,'' Defense Week, 26 June 1995, p. 1+.)

[8] Because NIEs are classified, a detailed discussion of their findings is not possible here. However, a comparative analysis of past and present NIEs indicates that the official assessment of the ballistic missile threat to the United States has been downgraded. The issue of politicization of intelligence is highlighted in Rowen Scarborough and Bill Gertz, ''Missile-Threat Report 'Politicized,' GOP Says,'' Washington Times, 30 January 1996, p. A1+.

[9] International Institute for Strategic Studies, ''The Military Balance 1995-1996, p. 281.

[10] ''Libya: Gadhafi Ready to Use Missiles,'' Minneapolis Star Tribune, 1 January 1996, p. 4.

[11] Speech on 18 April 1990, reported by Tripoli Television Service, 19 April 1990, and translated in Foreign Broadcast Information Service, Daily Report: Near East and South Asia, FBIS-NES-90-078, 23 April 1990, p. 8.

[12] Cited in ''A Terrorist Talks About Life, Warns of More Deaths,'' The Wall Street Journal, 10 September 1990, p. 1.

[13] Cited in Thomas L. McNaughter, ''Ballistic Missiles and Chemical Weapons: The Legacy of the Iran-Iraq War, International Security, Fall 1990, p. 6.

[14] See footnote 8.

[15] See, for example, R. Jeffrey Smith, ''U.S. Waives Objection to Russian Missile Technology Sale to Brazil,'' Washington Post, 8 June 1995, p, A23; Fred Hiatt, ''Russian Rocket Sale Strains U.S. Ties,'' Washington Post, 24 June 1993, p. A29.

[16] See R. Jeffrey Smith, ''U.N. Is Said to Find Russian Markings on Iraq-Bound Military Equipment,'' Washington Post, 15 December 1995, p. A30. According to a U.S. official, Iraq's missile program ''poses a threat to all of Europe.'' A U.N. official, noting that Iraq is seeking to develop a longer-range missile, stated, ''Should Saddam build such a missile, it could easily reach London or Moscow.'' See Stewart Stogel, ''Missile Plans by Iraq May Aim at Europe,'' Washington Times, 16 February 1996, p. A1+.

[17] Speech before the American Defense Preparedness Association, 18 May 1993.

[18] See, for examply, Anna Bakina, ''Strategic Missile Under Conversion Into Space Booster,'' ITAR–TASS, 17 July 1995, cited in Foreign Broadcast Information Service , ''FBIS Report: Arms Control and Proliferation Issues,'' FBIS–TAC–95–004, 8 August 1995, pp. 38–39 ''RSA To Turn Swords Into Plowshares,'' Kommersant Daily, 7 July 1995, p. 9, cited in Foreign Broadcast Information Service, ''SS–19s To Be Converted into Rokot Space Carrier Rockets'', FBIS Report: ''Arms Control and Proliferation,'' FBIS–TAC–95–014–L, 4 August 1995, p. 97; Vitaly Chukseyev ''Russia to Supply Boosters For U.S. Missiles,'' ITAR–TASS, 13 October 1995, cited in Foreign Broadcast Information Service, ''Daily Report: Central Eurasia,'' FBIS–SOV–95–198, 13 October 1995. p.30.

[19] See Bill Gertz, ''U.S. Relaxes START, Raising Missile Fears,'' Washington Times, 9 November 1995, p. A1+.

[20] Testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on International Security, International Organizations, and Human Rights, 28 July 1993.

[21] The Emerging Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States'' February 1993, p.1.

[22] ibid, p.1.

[23] Ballistic Missile Proliferation: An Emerging Threat,'' 1992, pp. 26–28

[24] Sidney Graybeal and Patricia McFate. ''GPALs and Fforeign Space Launch Vehicle Capabilities,'' SAIC February 1992, p. 18.

[25] See Allen Levine's interview of Russian General Batenin, in ''Soviet General Says Unrest May Spark Nuclear Terror,'' Atlanta Constitution, 16 October 1991, p. 2.

[26] See Kurt Campbell, Ashton Carter, Steven Miller, and Charles Zraket, *''Soviet Fission: Control of the Nuclear Arsenal in a Disintegrating Soviet Union,''* Center for Strategic and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, November 1991.

[27] Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Subcommittee on European Affairs, reported in Rowen Scarborough, ''Russia Losing Nuke Control, Senators Told,'' Washington Times, 23 August 1995, p. A1+.

[28] On the Russian nuclear alert in January 1995, see ''Norwegian Science Rocket Puts Russian Defense On Alert,'' Washington Times, 26 January 1995, p. 16; ''Russian Radars Alert Moscow After Detecting Missile Launch,'' Agence France-Presse, 25 January 1995; Vasiliy Kononenko, ''Yeltsin Leaves Chechnya Behind in Lipetsk, But Takes the 'Black Attache Case' With Him,'' Izvestiya, 27 January 1995, p. 1; Nikolay Devyanin, ''Football: All That Has Happened, Alas, Had to Happen,'' Moskovskiye Novosti, No. 7, 29 January-5 February 1995, pp. 1, 12.

[29] See, for example, Alexei Arbatov, ''The Mysteries of the Nuclear Button,'' Moscow New Times, No. 4, January 1992, pp. 20-23.

[30] See Patrick E. Tyler, ''As China Threatens Tawian, It Makes Sure U.S. Listens,'' New York Times, 24 January 1996, p. 1+.

BELMAR ST. PATRICK'S DAY PARADE

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of Sunday, March 3, 1995, the 23d Annual St. Patrick's Day Parade will move through the streets of Belmar, NJ.

Mr. Speaker, from its modest beginnings little more than two decades ago, the Belmar event has become the biggest and best-attended St. Patrick's Day Parade in the State of New Jersey, and one of the finest in the Nation. While not quite as big as the New York City parade, the Belmar event has steadily been attracting crowds of more than 100,000 people, drawn from the Jersey Shore area and throughout our State, surrounding States and other nations, including Ireland itself. Thousands of marchers are expected this year, including members of community organizations, elected officials, marching bands, floats, bagpipers, and leaders of Irish-American organizations. Both the participants and the many spectators always have a wonderful time.

The grand marshal this year is Mr. John F. Kelly of Sea Girt, NJ, a retired Elizabeth, NJ, police officer and a member of numerous community organizations. The deputy grand marshal is Rosemarie Plunkett Reilly of Belmar, the director of the Reilly Funeral Home. A previous grand marshal, Monmouth County Freeholder Thomas J. Powers, will again serve as parade commentator.

The Belmar St. Patrick's Day Parade was established in 1973 by members of the Jerry Lynch Social & Athletic Club. Mr. Lynch is credited with being the parade founder. The first parade, held in 1974, had club members marching in top hats and tails, followed by four marching bands, and numerous fire engines. That year, the crowd of spectators was not much bigger than the contingent of marchers. The first grand marshal was my predecessor, and a name well-known to many of the Members of this body: the late Congressman James J. Howard, a life-long resident of the Jersey Shore who took great pride in his Irish heritage. For their tireless efforts to ensure that the 1996 parade will be another memorable experience, I wish to pay tribute to all of the members of the Belmar St. Patrick's Day Committee, particularly the chairman, Dave Stanley.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to pay tribute to the Belmar St. Patrick's Day Parade, a great and proud tradition of the Jersey Shore for Irish-Americans and people of all backgrounds.

TRIBUTE TO LOIS MCDANIEL

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, Lois McDaniel is a native of Batesburg, SC and embodies the philosophy that hard work pays big dividends. Lois attended South Carolina State College and Pace University's evening program. She currently serves as the calendar information officer for the Department of City Planning and secretary to the New York City Planning Commission for land use and zoning matters. In her capacity she conducts televised public hearings at city hall for the N.Y.C. Planning Commission.

Prior to joining the Department of City Planning, Ms. McDaniel served as executive secretary to the president of the Bedford-

Stuyvesant Restoration Corp. A homeowner in east New York since 1969, Lois has been involved in numerous civic activities within the Community Board 5 area. Her efforts have supported senior citizens, block associations, the Democratic Club of East New York and Union 1180.

Ms. McDaniel is actively involved in food drives for City Harvest's food distribution program for the homeless, and is also involved in numerous other charitable efforts. I am proud to acknowledge her efforts to serve the people of Brooklyn.

IN SUPPORT OF BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. MARTIN OLAV SABO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for Black History Month. This year, we are celebrating African-American women of yesterday, today, and tomorrow. In Minnesota, we are fortunate to have a fine tradition of civic leaders who have dedicated their lives to enriching the lives of others through their selfless contributions. Today, I'd like to recognize three, among many, of the African-American women in Minnesota who have become shining role models for us all.

In this brief history, the State of Minnesota has had many gifted leaders who were also African-American women. In 1923, Ethel Ray Nance (1899–1992) was the first black woman hired by the Minnesota Legislature and was the first black policewoman in Minnesota. During her long life, Ms. Nance was an activist in several civil rights organizations, including the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP]. She also served as the director of research for the National Urban League.

In more recent years, Nellie Stone Johnson, who celebrated her 90th birthday in December, 1995, has been one of the most outspoken and thoughtful leaders in Minnesota's African-American community. Generations of Minnesotans owe Nellie a great deal for her dedication to community-building, to civil rights, and to economic fairness. In the tradition of Hubert Humphrey and Walter Mondale, Nellie Stone Johnson has been rock solid in her commitment to the most vulnerable in our society.

Finally, representing a new generation of African-American women leaders, Minneapolis Mayor Sharon Sayles Belton, elected in 1993, is the first African-American and the first female mayor of Minneapolis. Mayor Sayles Belton began her public service career immediately after college—when as a civil rights worker she traveled to Jackson, MS, to register voters. She later became the first African-American president of the Minneapolis City Council. As mayor, she has continued her efforts to strengthen families and children by focusing on education, crime prevention, and the economic development of neighborhoods in the city.

I am proud to say that these women, and many other African-Americans, have had an important impact on my life and the lives of many Minnesotans. I wish to thank them for their service to the community, the women's movement, and the United States of America. All citizens should be grateful for their accomplishments and endeavors. Mr. Speaker, as we observe Black History Month, I commend Ethel Ray Nance, Nellie Stone Johnson, Mayor Sayles Belton, and all African-Americans for their contributions to our society.

TRIBUTE TO MERLE BAGLEY

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Mrs. Merle Bagley for her contribution to the Brooklyn community. Mrs. Bagley migrated to New York from North Carolina in the 1960's. Her life's work has revolved around her dedication to children, not only her own, but society's children. She has successfully raised 10 children, a major accomplishment in itself. But equally important is the community work she has done on behalf of the Bedford-Stuyvesant Youth and Action Board, where she serves as the vice president of the Pacific Street Block Association, and is a member of the Earnestine Grena Senior Citizen Center.

Mrs. Bagley has been involved in community work since her retirement, and has lived in the East New York section of Brooklyn since 1973. She is active in the Linden Houses Tenant Association, and is an appointed member of Planning Board 5 and Area Policy Board 5. Merle Bagley's efforts have enriched the community she lives in and loves, and I am pleased to bring her to the attention of my colleagues.

51ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE FLAG RAISING ON MOUNT SURIBACHI

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week our Nation commemorated one of the most significant events in our history. The capture of Iwo Jima was not only one of the bloodiest military confrontations in which our Nation was ever involved, but it was also one of the most necessary. This barren island was crucial to ensure the success of our bombing missions into the heart of the Japanese Empire, and was key to the military maneuvers which led to our victory in the Pacific theater of World War II.

Most historians agree that the photograph of six marines raising the American flag on top of Mount Suribachi is the most duplicated photograph ever taken. To this day, no American can remain unmoved by the simple message of heroism and grim determination which that photograph so eloquently portrayed.

Last week, the New York Vets organization conducted solemn ceremonies in Rockland County, NY, commemorating the 51st anniversary of that significant event. I was honored to have been asked to share my thoughts at this ceremony, and would like to share them with our colleagues at this time:

Thank you for inviting me to join with you on this solemn occasion.

Back in 1936, President Roosevelt Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his acceptance speech for his second nomination for President, told his audience that our generation ''has a rendezvous with destiny.'' President Roosevelt foresaw the war clouds accumulating throughout the world, and knew what we would be facing. And, he was correct in his analysis of the burdens with which our generation so uniquely had to cope.

When you think about it, no generation in recorded history was saddled with responsibilities as awesome as those with which we had to grapple. Not only did our generation have to endure the depths of the Great Depression—the greatest economic crisis of all time—but it also fell to our watch to fight World War II, the most stupendous and complex conflict in all of history before or since. World War II was the only war in our Nation's history fought on two major and widely diverse fronts: the European theater and the Pacific. Very few nations ever had successfully tackled the massive burden of a two front war and emerged victorious.

It is befitting that we meet today to commemorate what symbolized that war for all people. The capture of Iwo Jima was a pivotal event in our efforts. I can personally attest that, on the B–29 bombing missions over Japan in which I participated, we thanked God that Iwo Jima was in our hands, for several of our missions would not have returned had we not had Iwo Jima available for emergency landings.

It is important that we bring to mind the photograph of the flag raising on Mount Suribachi, which most historians contend is the most frequently reproduced photograph in all history. It is important because it symbolized for the whole world the burdens and the sacrifice which our generation had to make.

Now, despite all of the trials and tribulations of our generation's life time, we are being called upon one last time for one last sacrifice. We have one last important responsibility to perform for all humankind.

Today the world is replete with revisionist historians: people who contend they know more than we do about what we lived through, what we witnessed, and what we sacrificed. We have lived to witness the phenomenon of our own Smithsonian Institution attempting to assemble a display which inform people that we, the United States, were the aggressors in our war against Japan, and that we were motivated solely by racial considerations. The Smithsonian Museum went so far as to assemble a display which, believe it or not, portrayed the sufferings of the Japanese people, without once mentioning the cruel Bataan death march, or the inhumanity of Japan's POW camps, or their racial degradation and enslavement of the Asian and Pacific peoples who Japan had temporarily conquered. It did not portray the cruelty of the Japanese Government, which demanded not just obedience from their people, but actual worship. It did not tell of the dreaded Kamikaze pilots, whose eagerness for self-sacrifice struck terror into the hearts of many brave Americans.

It is only through the strong protests of many of our own generation that this display was never opened to the public, but that victory was only one battle. We have much further to go to win the war.

We have been reading almost daily of commentators and self-appointed historians who contend that the Holocaust never took place. In fact, the lack of knowledge of generations

younger than our own is appalling. In Orange County, NY a few years ago, the death of a World War II veteran was recorded in the daily newspaper with this incredible line: ''He was a survivor of when the Japanese dropped the atomic bomb on Pearl Harbor * * *''

Our generation has one last task before it. The Great Depression, World War II, and the subsequent cold war are topped by one final burden: it is our responsibility to bear witness to what we have seen and what we have lived through.

It is important that we tell our youth, our grandchildren, our families, and any journalists we encounter of the goals, the ideals, and the vision of World War II. It is up to us to bear witness that the inhumanity of the Nazi and Imperialist Japanese war machines were not just in our imaginations.

It is incumbent upon us to leave permanent records of the sacrifices we made. We know that we cannot depend upon future generations to do this.

Accordingly, we are burdened with this final responsibility.

TRIBUTE TO JACQUELINE BERGMAN

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, Ms. Jacqueline Bergman has distinguished herself as the first female member president of the International Association of Lions Clubs, and I think it is important to recognize this landmark achievement. In 1987 she was installed as the first woman member of the Brooklyn Downtown Lions Club. This is indeed significant because it demonstrates that barriers to advancement for women are being overcome.

Ms. Bergman has served the Lions organization well. She has chaired major fundraisers, been the recipient of the organization's highest award by being designated as a Melvin Jones Fellow, and edited the club's newsletter. Jacqueline has also served as a delegate to numerous district, State, and international conventions. Jacqueline lives in Brooklyn Heights, has two children, Andrew and Mona, and adores her grandson Andre. Her commitment to service is only exceeded by her desire to do the best job possible. I am honored to recognize her dedicated efforts.

TRIBUTE TO ROSA LIVERPOOL

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, the Borough of Brooklyn is fortunate to have Rosa Liverpool as a citizen. Rosa has been an achiever in spite of adversity. She was the first African American graduate from the Slovak Girls Academy, and subsequently earned her undergraduate degree from Mercy College, and her master's degree in counseling from Manhattan College.

After receiving her degrees, Rosa began working for the city of New York. She has particular expertise in early identification and reporting of abuse and neglect of children. In 1979 Rosa began working with patients and their families who were addicted to opiates. Presently, Ms. Liverpool is the district guidance counselor for Community School District 19. She is also the child abuse and neglect liaison as well as the suicide prevention specialist for district 19. Rosa has been actively involved in the East New York community of Brooklyn.

Ms. Liverpool chairs the education committee for the Rosetta Gaston Foundation, and is also a member of Community Board No. 5. She has worked with local store owners to provide donations for block activities, and coordinated job fairs for East New York residents. Rosa leads by her example, and is destined to leave a lasting legacy.

TRIBUTE TO AGENTS PETER HARGRAVES, CHRIS REILLY, AND LARRY SALMON

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate three special agents of the State Department's Bureau of Diplomatic Security, Peter Hargraves, Chris Reilly, and Larry Salmon, who received Valor Awards at the U.S. Department of State on February 15. I was pleased to have a member of my staff represent me at this very moving awards ceremony where Secretary Warren Christopher presided. The Valor Award is one of the Department of State's highest awards and is given to those employees who demonstrate exceptional bravery in the face of life-threatening danger. Special Agents Hargraves, Reilly, and Salmon exhibited particular noteworthy courage in 1995 in their efforts to ensure the safe and secure conduct of U.S. foreign policy abroad. I am pleased to take this opportunity to recognize these three courageous public servants. At a June 29, 1995, oversight hearing on the Diplomatic Security Bureau, our House International Relations Committee heard about the details of some of the courage of these agents and their sacrifices in the service of their Nation. I am pleased to see they have been further honored by the Secretary of State.

Special Agent Peter Hargraves was the former Regional Security Officer assigned to the U.S. Embassy in Sarajevo. On August 19, 1995, Special Agent Hargraves was accompanying a United States peacekeeping delegation to Sarajevo for a meeting with the Bosnian Government. During the trek to Sarajevo over the dangerous Mt. Igman Road, one vehicle in the convoy, its weight too much for the road's shoulder, began a fatal spin down the mountain. The vehicle stopped 500 meters later. Special Agent Hargraves, who managed to get out of the vehicle, disregarded his own severe personal injuries and repeatedly returned to the burning vehicle in an effort to save others. After pulling one individual from the wreckage, his efforts were halted when the vehicle exploded. Special Agent Hargraves is still recovering from injuries suffered in this accident, which claimed the lives of three U.S. peace negotiators. Special Agent Hargraves is a true American hero. The citation on his award reads, ''For exceptional bravery and heroic devotion to your colleagues, in support of efforts to bring peace to the peoples of Bosnia.''

Special Agency Chris Reilly was the former Regional Security Officer assigned to the United States Embassy in Bujumbura. On June 14, 1995, Special Agency Reilly accompanied United States Ambassador to Burundi Robert Krueger and former Burundian Foreign Minister Jean Marie Ngendahayo, on a fact-finding mission to the province of Cibitoke in northwestern Burundi. Late in the afternoon, during the return trip to Bujumbura, the eight vehicle motorcade came under heavy automatic weapons fire from at least two unidentified gunman. Special Agent Reilly immediately instructed the Burundian driver to leave the area. The driver froze. Special Agent Reilly, sitting in the front passenger's seat, reached over and shifted the car into reverse and stepped on the accelerator. After backing up, he shifted the car to drive and managed to get the driver to put his foot on the accelerator and leave the area. Our Ambassador, and the Foreign Minister escaped injury as a result of the heroic actions of Special Agent Reilly. Special Agent Reilly's citation reads,

> For valor during an attack on an official motorcade in Cibitoke province, Burundi, on June 14, 1995. While the Ambassador's vehicle came under heavy automatic weapons fire, your rapid and effective response contributed directly to saving the lives of the Ambassador and the Burundi Foreign Minister. Your actions reflect the highest credit upon you and the Diplomatic Security Service.

Special Agent Larry Salmon, the Regional Security Officer at the United States Embassy in Windhoek, was on temporary assignment in Bujumbura, and had accompanied Special Agency Reilly on the trip in which the Ambassador's motorcade was attacked on June 14, 1995. Special Agent Salmon was driving the unarmored follow car directly behind Ambassador Krueger's car. When the attack began, Special Agent Salmon's vehicle was peppered with bullets. A Burundian bodyguard sitting in the backseat was injured by gunfire, and Special Agent Salmon was hit in the right shoulder by shell fragments. Special Agent Salmon spotted one of the assailants firing an AK–47 at the convoy. Without hesitation, he drew his Smith and Wesson and proceeded to fire six rounds at the attacker through the shot-out right rear window. Once Special Agent Salmon fired his weapon, the assault stopped. The Ambassador's vehicle and the follow car escaped. Special Agent Salmon's quick reaction to this attack saved the lives of the two people in his vehicle, and contributed to the safe escape of the Ambassador and Foreign Minister. His heroic response to such a life threatening situation demands our utmost respect. Special Agent Salmon's citation reads,

> For valor during an attack on an official motorcade in Cibitoke province, Burundi, on June 14 1995. While the Ambassador's vehicle came under heavy automatic weapons fire, your rapid and effective response contributed directly to saving the lives of the Ambassador and the Burundi Foreign Minister. Your actions reflect the highest credit upon you and the Diplomatic Security Service.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to further recognize and share with my colleagues some of the details of the exceptionally courageous efforts by these special agents who

risked their lives to protect American personnel carrying out our foreign policy broad. Their actions set the standard for valor in the line of duty. These American heroes are a credit to the Bureau of Diplomatic Security, the Department of State, and the people of the United States of America.

We must do all we can to protect American personnel abroad who we ask to carry out U.S. foreign policy, often in far away, and often dangerous places. The Diplomatic Security Bureau and agents like Hargraves, Reilly, and Salmon deserve our full support and understanding, as they carry out this difficult, and often dangerous task.

TRIBUTE TO JO ANNE SIMON

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, Jo Anne Simon is an outstanding community activist who represents the brownstone community of Boerum Hill in downtown Brooklyn. Ms. Simon is the president of the Boerum Hill Association. The association serves the historic community that has thriving merchant businesses.

Jo Anne works closely with local community board and public officials to ensure that critical issues such as education, crime prevention, historical preservation and quality of life issues are responsibly addressed on behalf of community and neighborhood members. Ms. Simon recognizes that her efforts must be special because Boerum Hill is a very special Brooklyn enclave.

An attorney and former teacher of the blind, Jo Anne has been very active in the disability rights movement. She is a founding member of the Association of Higher Education and Disability, a national organization which advocates for equal access to higher education. She currently serves on its board of directors. I am pleased to bring Jo Anne Simon's community activism to the attention of my colleagues.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT E. DOYLE

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, Robert E. Doyle recently passed away at his home in Schenectady, NY. Robert was known as the ''Commish''. He served longer than any other State Liquor Authority Commissioner in the United States. He was considered by his colleagues as the dean of liquor administration.

Robert was born in Thendara, NY. This is in Herkimer County. He was a 1952 graduate of Siena College, and he served during World War II in the Pacific campaign as a Pfc. in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Robert began his tenure with the State Liquor Authority in 1959 as a deputy commissioner. His advice and counsel were sought by public administrators, elected officials, industry executives, and community leaders. He was a warm and caring man willing to help virtually anyone with a problem.

He retired from his post as commissioner in 1995. Mr. Doyle's wife Geraldine Fitzgerald Doyle passed away in 1990. He had five children and eleven grandchildren. He also had a brother, the Very Reverend Mathias Doyle, and three sisters Mary Lou Provost, Gayle Michon, and Joanne Dee.

Robert Doyle had made numerous contributions to his Nation, his State, and his Family. He was truly a good man.

Many including the family, the State of New York, and others mourn his loss. The ''Commish'' passed away on February 14, in the year of our Lord 1996.

TRIBUTE TO LETICIA P. JOHNSON

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater calling than attending to the education and nurturing of our children. For the past 20 years Leticia P. Johnson has been performing that very vital task. Leticia is a graduate of Brooklyn College and received a master's degree in supervision and administration.

Leticia believes that early childhood learning sets the stage for positive human development. Leticia has dedicated herself to getting society and educators to focus on the total needs of our children.

Leticia's participation in various organizations reflects her commitment to children. She is a member of the National Black Child Development Institute, and is the cochair of the Early Childhood Task Force. Leticia is also a member of the Bedford-Stuyvesant Community Conference Inc. For the past 10 years she has served as the director of Young Minds Day Care Center, sponsored by Fort Greene Citizens Council Inc. Brooklyn sees the fruits of Leticia's efforts each time a child is nurtured and educated in her institution. I am happy to acknowledge her selfless efforts.

OFFICER ROBERT ALLMOND HONORED AT POLICE CEREMONY AWARDS

HON. JON D. FOX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a resident of the 13th Congressional district who recently was named one of the best law enforcement officers in the Nation.

Abington Township, Montgomery county, Police Officer Robert Allmond was recognized as one of 10 honorable mentions during the Police Officer of the Year ceremony. Officer Allmond received the distinction from the International Association of Chiefs of Police and Parade magazine after his name was submitted for consideration by Abington Police Chief William J. Kelly and Edie Richards, director of community development for the Township of Abington.

Mr. Speaker, there are 604,000 police officers in the United States and many past winners have been picked for single outstanding incidents involving a shooting incident or dangerous rescues. Officer Allmond's award is based on a long-term commitment to community policy work which has reduced crime, brought community support for police officers and raised neighborhood esteem.

Officer Allmond began his assignment in 1992 as community policing officer in the Crestmont area where crime, violence, and drug abuse were the highest in the township, according to Chief Kelly. Eighteen months later, a survey showed that overall fear of crime in the neighborhood had dropped by 12.75 percent, community support for police had increased 63 percent and neighborhood esteem was up by 4 percent.

Officer Allmond initiated several programs in Crestmont including organizing trips for youngsters to the New Jersey State Aquarium at Camden, the Franklin Institute Science Museum, the Philadelphia Zoo and the Academy of Natural Sciences. He has also taken children to Philadelphia Eagles, Phillies and 76ers games and arranged for weeks of free bowling so youngsters could participate in a league-like environment.

Almost as important as the outings was the fact that community leaders like Chief Kelly, the township commissioners, police officers, dispatchers, township staff and parents went along as chaperones and got involved with the children.

Officer Allmond organized a program to bring doctors and nurses into the neighborhood using a community policing vehicle as a mini-medical office to do free blood-pressure screenings and other tests for low and moderate income residents. The Lions Club used the vehicle to provide free vision screenings.

Allmond helped coordinate a Citizen's Police Academy to create better understanding between police and residents. Citizens were invited to participate in a 30-hour course about police duties and many Abington police officers volunteered to teach the courses and became involved in the interaction between police and citizens.

Officer Allmond also worked with Abington Memorial Hospital, a leader in community health services, to take information about the outstanding Children's Health Insurance Program [CHIPS] to the community, again using the specially equipped van. CHIPS officers subsidized health insurance for children based on family income.

Officer Allmond's work with the Crestmont Community Policing Program was recognized earlier this year when the program was one of six national winners of the Audrey Nelson Community Development Achievement Award and was honored by the National Community Development Association ''for exemplary and creative uses of community development block grant funds which best address the needs of families, homes and neighborhoods of low and moderate income.''

Officer Allmond's boss, Chief Kelly, has said of this outstanding citizen: ''Bob's initiative, energy, and willingness to try new approaches are greatly responsible for his success, but at the same time, I know that he would be the first to point out that area residents and local beat officers are the keys to the long-term success of these programs in this neighborhood.''

Mr. Speaker, that is high praise for the 34-year-old officer who joined this outstanding police department in 1986. Office Allmond has

shown that what lies at the heart of a troubled neighborhood is complex and unique to that community and cannot be fixed, necessarily, with a brick and mortar approach to community development, or with a cops and robbers approach to law enforcement.

Prior to the implementation of this outstanding community policing program under Officer Allmond, we had been treating the symptoms without diagnosing the illness. It took Officer Robert Allmond and a very courageous community to show us what and where the problems really were.

This is the heart of community policing and I urge all my fellow Members to investigate this program and help create similar models in their own districts.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have Office Robert Allmond as a member of one of Montgomery county's finest police departments. His service to the people of Abington Township have made that community one of the finest places on earth to live, work and raise our families.

CORRECTION OF VOTES IN COMMITTEE REPORT

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee's report, House Report 104–463 on H. Res. 366, the rule for the consideration of H.R. 2854, the Agricultural Marketing Transition Act contains one erroneously reported rollcall vote due to a typographical error during the printing process. The vote was correctly reported in the original report filed with the Clerk.

Below is a correct version of that vote as contained in the Rules Committee report as filed with the House.

The amendment number referred to in the motion is to amendments filed with the Rules Committee.

The corrected rollcall vote for rollcall No. 290 is as follows.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 290

Date: February 27, 1996.

Measure: Rule for consideration of H.R. 2854, Agriculture Market Transition Act.

Motion By: Mr. Hall.

Summary of Motion: Make in order Volkmer Amendment No. 12, retain permanent law.

Results: Rejected, 3 to 7.

Vote by Member: Dreier, ''nay,'' Goss, ''nay,'' Linder, ''nay,'' Pryce, ''nay,'' McInnis, ''nay,'' Waldholtz, ''nay,'' Moakley, ''yea,'' Frost ''yea,'' Hall, ''yea,'' and Solomon, ''nay.''

TRIBUTE TO TUSHIA N. FISHER

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Ms. Tushia N. Fisher who is employed as a special assistant to the New York State Senate Minority Leader, Martin Connor. She is a student enrolled in the State University of New York, Empire State College, in a combined master's degree program in political science.

Tushia is a remarkable example of a 1990's woman, dedicated to her family, striving to improve herself as a single parent, and dedicated to improving and empowering her community. Tushia believes that children are our future. She has embarked on a campaign, starting with her 6-year-old son Jamere Jamison, to improve the plight of African-American youth. Her efforts include volunteering at the Interfaith Hospital holiday drive, as well as the City Kids Foundation. Additionally, Tushia is an active member of Concord Baptist Church. She provides a wonderful example for single and dedicated parents about how to pursue personal and professional development while providing volunteer service to her community. I am happy to cite this wonderful community success story.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT OF 1996

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that will start public broadcasting on the road to self-sufficiency. This bill is certainly not the total solution to the challenge that faces us. Rather, it is a first step in the process.

Last year, the House leadership, recognizing the need to cut Government spending and balance the budget, challenged public broadcasting to find alternative sources of funding for their operations. After some initial misgivings the industry responded to this challenge with enormous enthusiasm, seeing this not as a threat but rather as an opportunity. I have been very impressed with the thoughtful and insightful response, and while I cannot agree with all of the proposals, it is obvious that there is strong sentiment for innovation and change.

My bill can help to accomplish this move away from Government support and ensure that public broadcasting continues to serve the educational and entertainment needs of the American public, the purposes for which it was established. I believe that the overarching goal of reorganizing public broadcasting should be to return to the original concept of local, community stations, and funding for these stations should come from sources other than the Federal Government. It should come from local public subscription, city and State appropriations, sponsorship by educational institutions, regional foundations, mergers or local marketing agreements with profitable commercial stations, and flexible use of spectrum. It should also depend, now more than ever before, on the pursuit of innovative ideas and entrepreneurial activities.

It is now time for public broadcasting to become self-sufficient and prepared to compete in the dynamic marketplace of the 21st century. We are, therefore, embarking on a historic change from our Government's policy, the origins of which date back several decades. Public broadcasting, with the help of Federal and State governments, has evolved in its 30-year history into a mature industry providing quality programming to American viewers. We want a healthy and independent future for public television and radio, and it is our responsibility to ensure that public broadcasting continues to serve the educational and entertainment needs of the public. It is our obligation not only because of its inherent value but also because we have decades of Government investment to protect.

Government support for public broadcasting began with Federal matching grants to construct educational television facilities in 1962. That 5-year program, although helpful, did not address the need for long-term financing. It was this financing problem that resulted in the establishment of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television in 1965, which was also funded by private money, this time from the Carnegie Foundation. The Carnegie Commission was the immediate catalyst for enactment of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. In addition to providing needed financing for public television and radio, the act created the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB]. The act attempted to ensure CPB's role in developing an independent educational broadcasting system that provided high quality objective and balanced services to the local community.

As the industry has matured, it has been at the forefront of exciting innovation, including such things as distance learning, which combines television satellite, computer, video disk, and telephone to bring greater educational opportunities to students regardless of their geographic or economic situation. I believe most people would agree that over the years public television has consistently provided high quality programming to the American public. From historical series such as ''The Civil War'' and ''Baseball'' to the excellent children's programming such a ''Barney and Friends'' and ''Sesame Street,'' public television has offered interesting, educational, and entertaining programs for just about everyone.

However, public broadcasting is not without its faults or its critics. Last Congress, the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance held a hearing that was invaluable in revealing the gross inefficiencies of the system. Even some of the system's strongest supporters say that it is mismanaged and should realize new operating efficiencies through consolidations, automation, joint operating agreements, mergers, and other forms of partnerships. Others say that the industry has failed to take advantage of revenue sources through licensing and merchandising agreements.

This bill is designed to address many of these failings and correct many of the problems. It does so in several ways. First, it gives public broadcasting stations additional flexibility and offers new and innovative earned income options. For example, in markets where there are two overlapping stations, a licensee would be allowed to operate one as a commercial station and one as a ''pure'' public broadcasting station. The profits from the commercial station would be used to fund the second public broadcasting station. Neither station would be eligible for grants from CPB. In the case of duopolies, the licensee could elect to sell one station, as long as the proceeds from the sale go to the retained public broadcasting station. This station would not be eligible for CPB grants.

The bill would also allow VHF and UHF channel swaps. It further provides that stations

voluntarily surrendering their licenses for auction by the FCC would be allowed to keep 50 percent of the proceeds. The remainder would go to the U.S. Treasury. Under the bill, stations would now be allowed to accept compensation for broadcasting programs produced by, at the expense of, or furnished by persons other than the station licensee. This would allow partnerships with commercial entities. Finally, the bill expands the definition of underwriting.

Second, the bill has as one of its key purposes the elimination of redundancies within the entire public broadcasting system, including duplicative stations and burdensome bureaucracies. Consequently, CPB is prohibited from issuing more than one grant per market to television licensees, but is allowed more discretion for radio grants.

Third, it relieves the Corporation for Public Broadcasting of most of the congressionally imposed mandates that have limited CPB's ability to function in a sound, business-like manner. The bill eliminates most of the congressionally imposed mandates on CPB, including set-asides and unnecessary reporting requirements. The intent is to allow CPB to use good business judgment in its decision-making process and to prepare for its eventual privatization. Even after the transition to private non-profit corporation, CPB would still be required to report to Congress annually on the status of the trust fund.

The bill also changes the way that members of the board of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting would be selected. Presently, the President appoints the members. The bill establishes a selection committee composed of the Speaker and minority leader of the House and the majority and minority leaders in the Senate to nominate individuals, after consultation with the public broadcasting industry, with expertise in investment management, corporate finance, telecommunications, education, and public broadcasting. The President would appoint from this list. Afterward, the board would be appointed in accordance with the bylaws of the Corporation.

Finally, it establishes a public broadcasting national trust fund, using revenue to be derived from a now fallow resource, thereby ensuring that Government funding will cease. The bill directs the Federal Communications Commission to auction vacant noncommercial channels and to transfer the proceeds to the trust fund. The bill also directs the FCC to ensure that the auction brings in as much revenue as possible by moving the cities of licenses, if necessary, while avoiding harmful interference. Before transferring auction proceeds to the trust fund, the Secretary of the Treasury is required to verify that the fund has been established in accordance with the law. CPB would manage the trust fund and distribute the income from the corpus. If CPB substantially violates the purposes of the law, the corpus would revert to the United States. The bill authorizes $250 million in fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000, after which the trust fund would begin to dispense income from the corpus to fund public broadcasting.

This legislation would get the Federal Government out of the business of financing public television, but that goal cannot be achieved overnight without adversely affecting public radio and television. In view of the decades of Federal tax dollars that have been spent to ensure a public broadcasting system, the Government has a stake in ensuring that public broadcasting survives. I, for one, would not like to see decades of Federal funding for public broadcasting go to waste.

One thing is clear: reforming public broadcasting is a daunting task. First, it is a controversial and very emotional issue. Second, it is complex. Public broadcasting is composed of different and unique components and the solution for one may not necessarily be appropriate for the other. Third, the public and those of us in Congress have differing views about how to change the current system.

Despite the difficulty of the job that lies before us, and regardless of our views on public radio and television, we can all agree that Government money is scarce. The American people expect us to be fiscally responsible and examine all federally funded programs. They expect us to make the difficult choices about where to cut Federal spending. That is what good Government is all about. The American public deserves to have the highest quality television and radio programs. The approach taken in this bill will allow that fine tradition to continue, but this time, without Government funds.

RETIREMENT OF DAVID R. LAMBERT, AMERICAN SEED TRADE ASSOCIATION

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, David R. Lambert was appointed as executive vice president of the American Seed Trade Association [ASTA] on June 29, 1990, by the board of directors. ASTA, one of the Nation's oldest trade associations, will acknowledge the achievements of its executive vice president on Wednesday, February 28, 1996, at a retirement celebration. As a long-time member and supporter of the ASTA, I am pleased to add my personal congratulations and hearty wishes for a happy and fruitful retirement.

During the course of Dave's tenure, many noteworthy accomplishments come to mind. One, though, that is particularly significant is his leadership when Congress considered and ultimately approved the Plant Variety Protection Act Amendments of 1994. An important intellectual property rights issue for seedsmen and farmers, these amendments went a long way in providing the real protection and ready assurance American farmers have come to know and expect from the seed industry. In shepherding these amendments, Dave effectively brought together the agricultural community and united the Congress in an issue that will surely affect America's agriculture for decades to come.

To list Dave's good deeds and successes would likely take several volumes. It would be more expedient perhaps to just itemize issues and areas like crop insurance reform, biotechnology, international trade, and export opportunities. The list would continue just like Dave's tenacity and dedication to the American seed industry.

Dave will no doubt continue to play a role in America's agriculture. Undoubtedly, after a distinguished 16-year career at the ASTA, Dave's 23 years of experience and service in Washington, DC, will be remembered by many. His work prior to joining the ASTA included a 7-year association with the National Grange. Prior to working in agricultural organizations, Dave was with the U.S. Army and retired as a lieutenant colonel.

ASTA will long remember Dave's outstanding leadership and vision. I will always recall how the ASTA helped position and support America's foundation to agriculture—the seed. I will also recall, with great fondness, how a small seed company in Iowa, Latham Seed Co., benefited from his dedication and insight.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, February 29, 1996, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 5

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the nominations of Thomas Paul Grumbly, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Energy, Alvin L. Alm, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Management), and Charles William Burton, of Texas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Enrichment Corporation.

SD–366

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1376, to terminate unnecessary and inequitable Federal corporate subsidies.

SD–342

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

344 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act.

SD–226

MARCH 6

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold oversight hearings on issues relating to competitive change in the electric power industry.

SD–366

Governmental Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Government Reform Committee to examine the implementation of the Government Performance and Results Act.

2154 Rayburn Building

Select on Intelligence

To hold hearings to examine the role and mission of U.S. intelligence.

SD–106

Special on Aging

To hold hearings to examine telemarketing scams that target the elderly.

SD–562

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the interstate transportation of human pathogens.

SD–2226

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings on the Chechen conflict and Russian democratic development.

2200 Rayburn Building

MARCH 7

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 745, to require the National Park Service to eradicate brucellosis afflicting the bison in Yellowstone National Park, S. 796 and H.R. 238, bills to provide for the protection of wild horses within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Missouri, and prohibit the removal of such horses, and S. 1451, to authorize an agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and a State providing for the continued operation by State employees of national parks in the State during any period in which the National Park Service is unable to maintain the normal level of park operations.

SD–366

Governmental Affairs

To resume hearings on S. 356, to declare English as the official language of the Government of the United States.

SD–342

MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management and The District of Columbia Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the oversight of government-wide travel management.

SD–342

MARCH 13

10:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the reform of health care priorities.

SR–418

MARCH 14

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Jewish War Veterans, the Retired Officers Association, the Association of the U.S. Army, the Non-Commissioned Officers Association, and the Blinded Veterans Association.

345 Cannon Building

MARCH 19

10:00 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To hold hearings to examine the asset forfeiture program, focusing on issues relating to the Bicycle Club Casino.

SD–342

MARCH 20

10:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To resume hearings to examine the reform of health care priorities.

SR–418

MARCH 27

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Veterans of World War I, AMVETS, the American Ex-Prisoners of War, the Vietnam Veterans of America, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

345 Cannon Building

SEPTEMBER 17

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the American Legion.

335 Cannon Building