

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNITION OF ALBANIA AT THE HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a deserving, befitting occasion for Albania and the friends of Albania everywhere. Today we have rectified an unintentional omission of Albania from the scroll of the "Righteous Among Nations" here at the Holocaust Memorial Museum. This omission resulted from the fact that for more than 50 years Albania had been sealed behind a wall that was erected by one of the most repressive governments in this century. Its citizens were forbidden from any contact with the rest of the world, and its history was a forbidden topic of discussion among the Albanian population. One of the most noble chapters in that history is the contributions that the people of Albania made in shielding its Jewish population, as well as many Jews who fled to Albania, from the ravages of the Holocaust.

The evidence of this considerable contribution came to light when my good friends and colleagues, former Congressman Joseph DioGuardi, and Congressman TOM LANTOS visited Albania shortly after the fall of the Communist dictatorship there in 1990. They discovered there was hard evidence that during the dark days of the Second World War in this mostly Moslem country, people of conscience risked their lives to protect their fellow men, women, and children from the monstrously inhumane period we now call the Holocaust.

Former Congressman Joe DioGuardi brought back this rudimentary evidence and commenced the painstaking task of identifying the names of individuals and linking them to the heroic actions which we recognize today. Joe's research was then turned over to the experts in this country and to those associated with Yad Vashem, the Holocaust Memorial in Jerusalem, who after some period of time were able to verify the names of the Albanians which are now unveiled on the wall of the Righteous Gentiles—names which now are engraved in stone so that history will not once again be able to overlook them.

I salute Joe DioGuardi and TOM LANTOS for their excellent work in helping to add to our collective consciousness of the fact that out of even the most horrible evil, good can surface. In Albania, as in everywhere else in Europe that was subjected to the boot of the Nazis, people resisted, and attempted, at risk to their lives and those of their families, to protect the innocent people who were slated for extermination simply by virtue of their adherence to the Jewish faith.

To our Albanian friends joining us today, it is hoped the examples of your forebears whose names are now inscribed in this memorial will serve as an inspiration as we again face new conflicts fueled by ethnic hatred in the Balkans. May you preserve and keep alive

their dedication, their spirit of toleration, and reverence for life.

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments, to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and to provide information on the cost of Federal mandates on the private sector, and for other purposes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Jackson-Lee/Clay amendment to H.R. 5 which will help ensure that the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act will not apply to, among other things, laws and regulations necessary to protect American children against the tragedy of hunger and homelessness.

In cities and rural areas throughout our Nation, millions of American men, women, and children go to sleep on our streets cold and hungry and without hope. It is estimated that twelve million children under age 18—one in five—go hungry each day. On any given night in Los Angeles County, there are up to 84,000 homeless people and, more tragically, 9,000 are children.

Chronic hunger and homelessness are among the greatest threats facing our Nation's children. At a time when they are in greatest need of adequate nutrition and shelter, hungry and homeless children are likely to have their physical and emotional growth and educational development permanently limited. If we doom the chance of American children to become productive workers by failing to invest in them and protect them now, we forge a dubious future for this Nation.

Since the 1970's, the Federal Government has recognized that it must play a major role in addressing homelessness and hunger for families and their children. We have recognized that we have a moral obligation of the highest order as the greatest democracy in the world to protect the most vulnerable members of our society—our children. Existing programs to supplement the nutritional needs of children are critically important to maintaining a safety net for children and their families.

At a time when we should be mounting an unrelenting attack on poverty in America, H.R. 5 threatens a massive retreat from the war on hunger and homelessness. The conditions of hunger and homelessness, and its resultant human suffering, are growing and pervasive problems that will only be exacerbated by the

procedural barriers imposed by H.R. 5 and other provisions of the Republican contract with America.

Those who argue that the problem can be addressed through charitable groups are turning a deaf ear to the warnings of organizations such as Catholic Charities, one of the largest in the country, that clearly state they cannot shoulder this responsibility on their own.

We must not be so short sighted in our efforts to bring the Federal deficit under control to abandon our children and leave them without adequate nutrition or housing.

While the road to a total solution for hunger and homelessness is a long and difficult one, our responsibility as Members of Congress is clear: We must continue to protect American children from hunger and homelessness. The Jackson-Lee/Clay amendment is an important step in that direction.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD HIDALGO

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to pay tribute to a former Secretary of the Navy, Edward Hidalgo, who recently passed away. Hidalgo, who served the Navy as the Secretary from 1979 to 1981 was also a lawyer in Washington who specialized in international corporate law.

Hidalgo, born in Mexico City, came to the United States in 1918 and grew up in New York. He graduated magna cum laude from Holy Cross College in 1933 and in 1936 he graduated from Columbia University Law School. He received another law degree in civil law from the University of Mexico Law School. He practiced law in New York before his service in the Navy.

He began his service in the Navy in 1942, during World War II, during which time he was assigned to the State Department where he was a legal advisor in 1942 and 1943. He was later assigned to the Pacific as an air combat intelligence officer aboard the carrier *Enterprise*. Hidalgo received the Bronze Star for his service.

Following World War II, in 1945, he worked on the Eberstadt Committee on the unification of the Armed Services. He was special assistant to Navy Secretary James Forrestal in 1945 and 1946. After which he continued to practice international law in Mexico and then Paris.

Hidalgo became the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for manpower, reserve affairs, and logistics in 1977. In October 1979, he became the Secretary of the Navy.

Edward Hidalgo not only faithfully served this country throughout his lifetime, but lived his life to the fullest in all that he partook. I urge my colleagues to join me in sending sympathy to the members of his family that he leaves. Survivors include his wife, Belinda, four children, and six grandchildren.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

INTEREST RATES SHOULD NOT BE
RAISED

HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Alan Greenspan and the Federal Reserve to not raise interest rates again for the seventh time in a year. For months we have seen good numbers in unemployment and the gross national product, yet our working people have not seen this prosperity. This recovery is a slow one, and many have not felt its positive affects on their lives. While we all struggle to find an answer to these puzzling economic times, one thing seems clear: Another interest rate hike by the Fed is not the answer.

True, many traditional indicators are up. However, there are many warning signs that the economy is slowing down. Commercial real estate, retail sales and single-family home construction is lagging behind, as is the recovery of our working people.

These are difficult times. People in my district are working longer hours for less pay, in jobs that they are often over-qualified for. Many don't even know if the job they have today will be there for them tomorrow. In many companies, the trend is to hire workers for temporary positions, those that do not provide health care and other benefits. This kind of instability and uneasiness does not make my constituents feel like the economy is strong—they wonder when the recovery will help them.

It is true that the Fed needs to guard against inflation—but these times do not warrant another change. Inflation indicators show no signs of a drastic change upward. Therefore, the Fed has no need to make drastic moves in raising rates. Since our economic recovery has begun, the Fed has kept monetary policy tight, in order to keep growth slow. Now, it is time for the Fed to allow the recovery to reach those that need a boost the most—the working people of America.

LINE-ITEM VETO

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues and I came prepared to cure Congress of its spending addiction. We offered up our prescription in our Contract With America. Now we are busy carrying out the treatment.

Last week, we passed the balanced budget amendment, and this week we are ready to administer the next part of the cure—the line-item veto. Our President will have at his disposal the same legislative scalpel that 43 of our Nation's Governors use to cut wasteful spending out of their budgets.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize former President Ronald Reagan as the "Godfather" of the Federal line-item veto. It would be a great honor to cure this Nation of its spending illness and pass on the legacy of the Reagan budgetary remedy—the Federal line-item veto. This is the fiscal treatment the American people have been waiting for.

Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer works hard for every dollar they earn and have to send to Washington. The least we can do is make sure that we work together to spend those dollars wisely.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained by official business outside of the Chamber, and was therefore unable to vote during rollcall No. 80. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

RIVERHEAD PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, an invaluable public servant is retiring after years of exemplary service as the town supervisor of Riverhead. Since 1979, Joe Janoski has been well respected by many people throughout the State, county, and town governments for his knowledge and experience in local government. In addition to this service, Joe serves as a member of many community organizations including: Knights of Columbus; Lifetime Member of the Polish Town Civic Association; and the Boy Scouts of America.

He is known and respected for his presence at all community functions. He is recognized for his outstanding service and dedication to the community by numerous community organizations including the Riverhead Tri-Club—Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions—and was awarded Man of the Year by the Riverhead Chamber of Commerce.

His greatest accomplishments are the re-birth of balanced economic growth of the town and the professionalization of Riverhead government. He led the way for townwide extension of public water, upgrading and improvement of the town's sewer district facilities, establishment of a scavenger waste facility, establishment of a juvenile aide bureau, and many other milestone projects.

We all wish Joe the best in his well-deserved retirement and owe him a big thank you.

THE STATE OF THE UNION
ADDRESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, February 1, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

There was a lot of pressure on President Clinton going into his State of the Union Address, with many calling it one of the most critical speeches of his presidency. Ameri-

cans want him to cooperate with Congress, but also to show he has backbone and can stand up for his principles. The changes voters called for in November have clearly put him on the defensive and have left him struggling to find his agenda for the next two years. The President spoke about where he wants to take our country and how he intends to work with the new Congress to accomplish his goals for the nation. He had mixed success.

Overview: President Clinton said the country is stronger than it was two years ago, but he is concerned that not all Americans shared in the gains. He insisted that government should work better for average Americans.

His overall emphasis was that we should work together for the common good. He is clearly worried that the "common bonds of community" have become "badly frayed"—citizens are working together less and shouting at each other more. He stressed the shared responsibilities of government and citizens. In contrast to his speech in 1994, he articulated no new major federal programs. His speech was short on demands for action, but long on appeals for responsibility and comity.

He endorsed some traditional programs—school lunch, Head Start, clean air and water—and called for an increased minimum wage and a national campaign against teenage pregnancy. He considerably scaled back his goals for health care reform. He sounded conservative themes when he advocated downsizing government, cutting regulations, reforming welfare, cutting taxes, and strengthening defense. He attacked lobbyists, and called on Congress to pass lobbying and campaign finance reform. He spoke only briefly about foreign affairs, urging Congress to pass the Mexican loan guarantees, the START II Treaty, and new legislation to strengthen our hand against terrorists.

Apparently the American people still listen to President Clinton. Polls indicate that some 80% of viewers approved of the direction he laid out for the country in his speech.

Drawbacks: The speech was too long—eighty-one minutes. This president clearly likes to talk; as usual, he spoke easily and forcefully. He spoke with humor, extended a conciliatory hand, and acknowledged his own mistakes.

But I left the speech feeling that in some ways an opportunity was lost. He had a chance to explain his core principles to the American people in simple terms. Yet the speech was clearly too long and too diffuse, and did not convey forcefully his convictions and his agenda. It covered some three dozen different programs and subjects, making it hard for listeners to pick out a few central themes.

Major Points: Politically his speech was right down the middle—a very centrist speech. He avoided the extremes of the right and the left, favoring a smaller, less costly government but still acknowledging a role for government.

The President stressed putting away partisan differences and pettiness and working toward the common good. These comments were well received by the American people, but the partisan nature of Members' applause throughout the speech instead might suggest a difficult year ahead.

"Opportunity" and "responsibility" were words often repeated, and he talked at length about a "new covenant" between government and the American people: Government will help them obtain the tools they need to improve their lives, while in return asking them to take responsibility for themselves and their communities. This means,

for example, asking welfare recipients to work when possible and college students to perform community service in return for student loans.

He said that the federal government can be downsized. He noted the 100,000 federal jobs he has already cut and pointed out how changes already in the works will result in the smallest federal workforce next year since the days of President Kennedy. At the same time, he said that government still has an important role to play. He does not view government as the enemy, but as a partner: It should not do things for us that we can do ourselves, but we should use government to do those things we can only do together.

The President said Congress should not go too far and roll back the progress made on cutting the deficit, reforming education, fighting crime, or improving public health and the environment. He said the new Congress should not respond to voter anger by taking it out on the most vulnerable in society—particularly the elderly and young children. As the President put it, we want lean government not a mean government.

The President stressed the need to prepare the American people for the demands of the new global economy. He mentioned vigilance on the deficit, reducing barriers to American exports, and his Middle Class Bill of Rights to help middle class families raise and educate their children, train for higher paying jobs, buy a first home, and save for retirement. He put a heavy emphasis on education as a key investment in our country's future.

The President was precise and forthright on some issues, like welfare reform and tax cuts, and oblique on others, like a balanced budget amendment, unfunded federal mandates, and deregulation. At times he displayed forceful leadership, and at other times he did not dispel the doubts about his position and his leadership.

What's Next: In the weeks ahead, the President must sharpen his vision for America. And then he needs to follow through. That will be the real test. Many Americans comment on a wide gap between the Clinton promises and the Clinton performance, and they question how long the President's positions will stand. He needs a strong follow through and a sharply focused agenda to build on the favorable reactions to his speech.

EYE BANK ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA—MARCH 1995 NATIONAL EYE DONOR MONTH PROCLAMATION

HON. LARRY COMBEST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, across the country, transplantation surgeries are saving and enhancing many lives. Eye, organ, and tissue donation and transplantation have benefited thousands of people nationwide. Today, I am asking that we take a moment to focus on eye donation and on the importance of preserving and restoring sight through the miracle of corneal transplantation. The benefits of sight restoring transplant surgery extend beyond the individuals who received the transplants; they also extend to the recipients' families, communities, and businesses. In recent years, the efforts of Congress, educators, and the media have had an enormous positive impact on the success of eye donor programs.

Every year thousands of corneal transplants are performed across the country, restoring precious sight to young and old. In 1993, over

90,000 eyes were donated to eye banks across the United States. From those eyes, over 40,000 corneas were used in transplantation procedures. The remaining eyes were used for research, training, and other surgical procedures. While the figures for 1994 are still being tallied, even greater totals are projected.

Anyone can be an eye donor. Neither cataracts, poor eyesight, nor age prohibit one from being a donor. However, it is important for individuals who want to be donors to inform family members of their wishes.

Since 1961, when the Eye Bank Association of America [EBAA] was founded, EBAA member eye banks have made possible one-half million corneal transplants, with a success rate of over 90 percent. The EBAA is the Nation's oldest national transplant association. The EBAA is dedicated to the restoration of sight through the promotion and advancement of eye banking. It has led the transplantation field with the establishment of medical standards for the procurement and distribution of eyes and comprehensive training and certification programs for eye banking personnel. These standards have been used as models for other transplantation organizations. There are over 110 member eye banks operating in over 150 locations in 43 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Canada, Saudi Arabia, England, and Australia.

Despite the extraordinary efforts of eye banks, there are still many people who wait in darkness for corneal transplant surgeries due to a lack of donated tissue. At any time in the United States, about 6,000 people are on waiting lists for corneal transplants. Public education is the best way to increase donation, as it enables people to talk to their loved ones and learn of their wishes before times of crisis and grief.

We, in Congress, can lead the effort to educate the public about the need for eye donation and encourage more Americans to become donors. We have joined the Eye Bank Association of America every year since 1983, and do so again by proclaiming March 1995 as National Eye Donor Month. In so doing, we call on all Americans to support us in promoting the worthy endeavor of enhancing the lives of fellow citizens through the restoration of sight.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF RIDGEWOOD-BUSHWICK SENIOR CITIZENS CENTER

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this moment to offer my congratulations to the Ridgewood-Bushwick Senior Citizens Center [RBSCC] on its 25th anniversary celebration.

Through the leadership of its founder and first director, Assemblyman Vito Lopez, and the support of its staff, the elderly community of Bushwick has a center that is dedicated and committed to them and their families. Like the arches that support our city's bridges, the RBSCC is the arch for the Bushwick senior community. It bonds the older generation with the younger one. It is a place where our pioneers interchange ideas and provide solutions. It provides nutritional, recreational, and sup-

port services to over 600 seniors. When the daily struggles of life become overwhelming, the center is a safe haven.

Its continuous success is greatly due to the endless commitment and dedication of its staff and volunteers. Their hard work exemplifies that they, like Assemblyman Vito Lopez, share a common vision for a growing community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Assemblyman Vito Lopez for realizing his vision, the staff and volunteers for their undying labor, and the seniors for giving us insight and strength. Congratulations.

TRIBUTE TO GOSHEN COLLEGE

HON. TIM ROEMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the significant achievement of an institution in my district, a college of distinction that has been educating young people for 100 years: Goshen College in Goshen, IN.

Goshen College was originally founded in 1894 as the Elkhart Institute. In 1903 this institution evolved into Goshen College and adopted the motto "Culture for Service." Throughout the college's long history, it has maintained a partners-in-education relationship with the Mennonite Church which has supported the college as it developed and helped shape its direction. True to the spirit of its motto, the college has focused a great deal of energy to developing multicultural awareness. In 1968 the college added a study service trimester to its general education requirement. This unique program gives students the opportunity to live in a foreign country while studying language and culture and completing a service project. Goshen College has pioneered multicultural education and has become a model for other foreign study programs at colleges throughout the United States.

The fact that Goshen College has been educating and molding young adults for 100 years speaks to the dedication of the people who have been a part of that tradition. Mr. Speaker, I commend Dr. Victor Stoltzfus, president of Goshen College, and the many fine faculty, staff, and students who have given their hearts and energies to the college over the years. I am proud and honored to recognize this milestone in this illustrious history, and I know that Goshen College will continue to thrive in its second century.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL BUDGET STRUCTURE ACT OF 1995

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Federal Budget Structure Act of 1995. I am joined by my good friend and colleague, Representative BOB WISE, one of Congress' most forceful advocates of capital budgeting. While maintaining a unified budget, this

legislation seeks to identify, define, and present separate operating and capital components of the Federal budget, and to distinguish between Federal funds and trust funds.

I want to emphasize that this legislation retains the unified budget. It does not attempt to reduce the appearance of the Federal budget deficit through smoke and mirrors by taking capital expenditures off-budget. It seeks to provide what the existing budget presentation does not—adequate information on the revenues, expenditures, surplus/deficit amounts, and financing requirements for capital activities of the Federal Government. It also attempts to provide a distinction between Federal funds and trust funds, and between capital and operating activities in a manner which does not hinder identifying the resources needed to meet the Government's capital infrastructure needs.

As a concept, capital budgeting is very simple. It is nothing more than a planning device relied upon by business leaders and many State and local officials to help prioritize spending for the future. A capital budget, properly implemented, would improve the budget as a reporting, control, accounting, priority-setting, and fiscal policy tool. A capital budget assumes that capital is a limited resource, and for planning purposes, there is a need to develop the best possible strategy to insure that future demands can be met.

The benefits of a capital budget are many. A capital budget:

Focuses attention to a greater degree on the deteriorating physical infrastructure of the Nation and allows us to make more rational investment decisions;

Promotes intergenerational equity by burdening future generations with debt service only for activities that provide future tangible benefits;

Provides more equitable budget treatment of capital activities by avoiding the current front-end loading of the full costs in the first year; and

Shows that borrowing to finance capital investments is accompanied by an increase in the Nation's assets.

A capital budget that remains part of the unified budget may also help us better define "What is a balanced budget?" As we move in the direction of a balanced budget, we need to more fully explore whether it makes sense for the Federal Government to balance its annual budget under current bookkeeping practices.

I am always frustrated by the process by which we make our budget decisions and the lack of information at our disposal. Cuts are displayed either agency by agency, function by function, or program by program but generally there is no distinction about the substance of the cuts, whether they're reductions in investment spending such as new highways, or cuts in operational expenses of an agency.

When the House is fashioning budget resolution, as we're doing now, there is a similar lack of information about the nature of our spending proposals; that is, to what degree are we investing in assets, consumables, operating expenses, and human enterprise programs. The current budget process makes no distinction.

Capital budgeting can help all of us do a better job planning for future spending in a more informed manner. It is not a gimmick and does not attempt to gloss over one Federal activity at the expense of another. It simply seeks to identify two very fundamental and

distinct economic activities—spending on assets, and spending on operations.

I encourage all Members to cosponsor and support this worthwhile legislation.

TRIBUTE TO MORTON A. SCHRAG

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask you and our colleagues to join me in congratulating Morton A. Schrag on the occasion of his retirement as director of the Westside Jewish Community Center in Los Angeles.

As a long-time member of the Westside Center, and as the congressional representative of a substantial number of its members, beneficiaries, and staff, I have profound gratitude for all Mort Schrag has done for the center and our entire community.

During the nearly two decades that Mr. Schrag served as the center's director, the constituency it served underwent radical changes. A previously Anglo area realized a sharp increase in the number of African-American families. In addition, a Jewish community consisting primarily of Jews who emigrated from Europe decades ago or were born in this country experienced an enormous influx of newly arrived refugees primarily from the former Soviet Union and Iran.

An individual less brilliant, creative, and dedicated than Mort Schrag would have been overwhelmed by the challenge of so many radical changes occurring over such a short period of time. Mort Schrag welcomed these challenges and used them to vastly expand the range of the Westside Jewish Community Center's programs.

Under Mort Schrag's leadership, the decades old educational and recreational programs were sustained and expanded. Intensive new programs were instituted to help immigrants acquire English language skills, master the culture of their new land and, in countless cases, achieve the coveted status of American citizen.

Two of Mort Schrag's innovations attracted national attention and emulation. He established a Senior Adult Day Care Center that addressed the special social, cultural, and interpersonal needs of individuals whose advancing age led to their social isolation and limited their ability to continue activities in which they were previously involved.

Mr. Schrag also established a Community College of Jewish Studies that brought Westside Center together with five area synagogues. This was a bold move and represented a dramatic collaboration of two traditions—the once secular centers movement and the traditional synagogue institutions—that had previously cooperated only at a minimal level.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and our colleagues to extend to Morton Schrag every wish for good health and success in all future endeavors, and for continued vigorous community involvement.

TRIBUTE TO PROCTOR CARTER

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker today I wish to pay tribute to a great Missourian, Proctor Carter, who recently passed away. Born on April 10, 1907, this former World War II Army veteran, served the State of Missouri as the director of State division of welfare for 27 years, the longest tenure served by any welfare director in the United States.

Educated at the University of Missouri, Carter received a bachelor's degree in journalism, and a master's degree in art. He worked for 1 year at United Press International in Dallas, TX. After that he was assistant to the administrator for the Missouri Relief Commission, and an assistant administrator of the State Social Security Commission. In 1946 he became the director of the State division of welfare. After his retirement, Carter was a consultant to the Missouri Senate, informing on welfare legislation and appropriations. Carter was also an active member of the Academy of Missouri Squires, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, and the American Public Welfare Association.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sending sympathy to his two sons, Robert Joe Carter and John Wallace Carter. A wonderful friend and community leader, Proctor Carter will be missed by all who knew him.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate and honor the proud history of African-Americans during national Black History Month.

African-Americans have made invaluable contributions to the economic, cultural, scientific, and social fabric of our society. By celebrating February in this manner, our country can continue to learn about and draw upon the strength that this history of struggle, endurance, and achievement lends to us all.

This year we will pay tribute to the year 1895, and its importance to three prominent African-American leaders: W.E.B. DuBois, Frederick Douglass, and Booker T. Washington. In 1895, W.E.B. DuBois, a distinguished scholar, became the first African-American to receive a Ph.D. In that same year, we lost the Father of the Civil Rights Movement, as Frederick Douglass passed away. And Booker T. Washington, noted college president and statesman, gave his famous Atlanta speech. It was a significant period in the annals of African-American history.

As I reflect on the themes of accomplishment and selfless work, I am quickly drawn to my district and a gentleman who embodied the ideals of these great men, until his passing last December at the age of 96. The Rev. Robert Moody was a pastor, activist, educator, humanitarian, and friend to all who knew him.

For over 50 years, he championed the causes of equal rights and education as pastor of Shiloh Baptist Church. He mentored

countless young people and emphasized the importance of education to young people. He broke Hartford's color barrier and became its first African-American member of the board of education. He uplifted his congregation and turned a once debt-ridden church into a thriving house of worship.

The Reverend Moody, like others we honor this month, was a rare and wonderful individual who, through words and action, helped make a difference to countless people throughout the State of Connecticut and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, there are countless men and women who, like the Reverend Moody, improve the lives of many people on a daily basis. They may not be as famous as W.E.B. DuBois, or Frederick Douglass, or Booker T. Washington, but they are heroes in the same tradition. I honor the memory of the Reverend Moody, and the many others like him. And I also salute the future leaders who will challenge this Nation to reach its great potential.

DOROTHY QUINN OF NASSAU HONORED FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO GOP

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, those of us here in Washington who were pleased with the results of last November's elections tend to forget that the spadework for the Republican tidal wave of victories was done, not here in Washington, but in the precincts, towns, and villages across the country.

Countless volunteers in our 22d Congressional District did a lot of that spadework over the years at the grassroots levels. I have personal reasons for being grateful, because these volunteers have repeatedly helped return me to Congress with more votes than anyone else in the whole New York delegation. They were equally instrumental last year in the election of George Pataki as Governor. I'd like to single out one of those outstanding volunteers today.

Dorothy Quinn of Nassau has been doing yeoman's work for the Republican Party since the Eisenhower years. Her first involvement in local politics was stuffing envelopes, but this experienced inspired her and several others to form a Nassau Women's Republican Club. In 1957 she was elected the club's first president, an office she has held more than once.

Under her leadership the club grew in leaps and bounds. That leadership was recognized in her being chosen vice chairman of the Rensselaer County Republican Committee, and in her serving on the New York State Committee.

Also under her leadership, the Nassau Women's Republican Club was an active player in State and national party affairs, including trips to Washington and the State Capital in Albany. Dorothy Quinn herself participated in State and national conventions.

Mr. Speaker, where would we be without dedicated individuals like Dorothy Quinn? Our political system, wisely crafted by our Founding Fathers, is the envy of the world precisely because it takes advantage of such talents and energies.

She will be honored at a dinner February 14. Mr. Speaker, let us rise to pay our own tribute to an outstanding lady I am proud to call my friend, Dorothy Quinn, of Nassau, NY.

IN MEMORY OF HON. BRADFORD MORSE

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty, in the midst of our busy schedules, to remind our colleagues of the passing of one of our former colleagues, a man whose service to this institution, our country, and to the cause of world peace, is one of the great political legacies of our time.

I refer to the Honorable Bradford Morse of Massachusetts, who served admirably in this Chamber from the time of his first election 1960, until he resigned in May 1972 to become Under Secretary General of the United Nations.

As a colleague in this body, Bradford Morse served with great distinction. His understanding of and concern for the conduct of American foreign policy, especially during the Vietnam war, demonstrated Brad's extensive abilities.

Brad left the House at President Nixon's request to assume the position of Under Secretary General of the United Nations which had been made vacant by the death of Nobel Peace Prize laureate, Ralph Bunche. As Under Secretary General—the senior American in the United Nations—Brad was concerned with political and General Assembly affairs, humanitarian affairs, and human rights.

Those fortunate enough to have served with him in the House will recall his willingness to contribute all his time and his energies to any task he was asked to undertake, and to work with others in a spirit of cooperation that transcended party lines. One of the sayings for which he is remembered is "Let's get on with the job," and when Bradford Morse said that you knew he would be the first to get on the job. He was the kind of man who knew not only the details of complex international policies, but the first names and family histories of security guards in the Congress at the United Nations.

His work in the international arena earned him the respect, the gratitude, and the love of all who worked with him. He became Administrator of the United Nations Development Program, from 1976 to 1986, and Director of the International Emergency Operation for Africa, from 1984 to 1986. It has been said of Brad that millions of Africans are alive today because of his selfless dedication and hard work, but not one of them knows his name.

It has further been said of him that he was always ready with a firm handshake, a welcoming smile, and a genuine effort to forge a consensus whenever conflict arose. That seems to me to capture the essence of this great public servant.

It is the nature of our calling to see colleagues come and go, in a blur of elections and in a whirl of events, one after the other. But some of those colleagues leave an indelible mark on this institution because of their character, their talents, their warmth, and their

love of humanity. Bradford Morse was among this small, select group. He got on with the job, did his very best, and brought out the best in others. His service to our country, as a Congressman and as a statesman, is one of which his family, his home State of Massachusetts, and all his many friends should be proud.

Mr. Speaker, Bradford Morse left this body prior to my first election, so I never personally enjoyed the honor of serving with him as a colleague. However, I came to know him well throughout the 1970's and 1980's, when he was known nationally and internationally as one of the most knowledgeable individuals in the field of international development and relations. He was universally revered for his expertise and his professionalism.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to join with us in extending our condolences to Brad's family and in paying tribute to an outstanding public servant, one of those officials who make us all proud to be in public life.

Permit me also to avail myself of this opportunity to invite our colleagues to join at the graveside memorial services to be held at Arlington National Cemetery on Monday, February 6, 1995, at 3 p.m.

POSTHUMOUS TRIBUTE TO JAMES LERON CHERRY

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor to pay tribute to one of Miami's unsung heroes, James Leron Cherry. His untimely demise on January 16, 1995, leaves a great void in our community.

Born in Moultrie, GA, Mr. Cherry overcame the abject poverty into which he was born. He worked even at an early age helping his father do odd jobs to put food on the family's table and clothes on his siblings. But he also developed an insatiable thirst for education, along with the acumen for learning the intricacies of carpentry and woodwork. At his country's calling, he enlisted in the U.S. Army and was assigned to the European theater during World War II. After the war and through his resilience and gritty determination, he obtained his college education from my alma mater, Florida A&M University, graduating with both bachelor's and master's degrees.

Married to the late Representative Gwen Cherry, my dear friend and predecessor in the Florida Legislatures, Mr. Cherry fully lived up to his calling as an educator. He was employed by the Dade County Public Schools in Miami where his high standards for learning and achievement won him the accolades of his beloved community. Promoted as coordinator of adult education at Miami Northwestern High School in the early 1960's, his successes in educating many a wayward inner-city youth become legendary. He gained the confidence of countless parents who saw him as the educator par excellence, entrusting him with the future of their children and confident that they would learn from him the tenets of scholarship and the pursuit of academic excellence under the rigors of a no-nonsense discipline.

His approach to educating the inner-city young boys and girls who came under his tutelage emphasized personal responsibility. In times of crises crowding his students' learning, his forthright guidance and counsel was one based on faith in God and faith in one's ability to survive the vicissitudes of life.

Our community was deeply touched and comforted by his undaunted leadership, kindly compassion, and personal warmth. He preached and lived by the adage that the quest for personal integrity, academic excellence, and professional achievement is not beyond the reach of those who are willing to dare the impossible. This is the legacy that James Leron Cherry bequeathed to us. I am greatly privileged to have known this noble human being.

LEGISLATION AMENDING TITLE 18
OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, for as long as I can remember Federal employees who are members of employee organizations, like credit unions, child care centers, health and fitness organizations, recreation associations, and professional associations, have been able to represent the views of the employee organization to the employing department or agency. I think all would agree that active employee participation in matters of employment should be encouraged.

Until now, Federal employees' ability to represent to their superiors the interests of their employee organization has peacefully coexisted with §205 of title 18, United States Code, which prohibits a Government employee, except in the performance of official duties, from acting as agent or attorney for anyone before any agency or court of the United States in connection with a covered matter. A covered matter is described at 18 U.S.C. §205(h) as including "any judicial or other proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, investigation, charge, accusation, arrest, or other particular matter." Until now, issues affecting employees as employees, such as pay and benefits issues, have not been viewed as covered matters.

The Department of Justice [DoJ] has recently issued legal opinions and guidelines stating that managers or supervisors who are Federal employees and who represent the interests of their peers or associations before senior management officials are guilty of a violation of 18 U.S.C. §205 and could be prosecuted as felons and subject to imprisonment and fines. Technically, according to DoJ, an employee who asks to use office space on behalf of an employee organization may have violated the law and could be subject to criminal prosecution.

Mr. Speaker, 18 U.S.C. §205 was enacted in 1962 and there has not been a problem until DoJ issued its opinion. Now, if a Federal employee wishes to discuss child care on behalf of her employee organization, she is in technical violation of the law. This situation is

outrageous and must be corrected. I have contacted the Attorney General about this issue and am awaiting a response. In the meantime, I am introducing legislation which reverses the Department of Justice's interpretation of the law to allow a Federal employee to represent an employee association or the interests of its members to the executive branch or any agency of the Government.

This small technical change will protect the rights that Federal employees have enjoyed for years until the Department of Justice removed them through its interpretation of the law. This legislation is a good-government measure, is good for Federal employees, and maintains the integrity and purpose of §205. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to cosponsor this legislation and urge the House to make this technical change to the law as soon as possible.

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. REPRESENTATION OF VIEWS.

Section 205 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i) and by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

"(h) Nothing in this section shall prevent an officer or employee of the Government, if not inconsistent with the faithful performance of such officer's or employee's duties, from representing an employee association before, or the interest of the members of the association to, the Executive Branch or any agency of the Government. For purposes of this subsection, an employee association is an association or component of an association, a majority of whose members are officers or employees of the Government."

IN HONOR OF VIVIAN T. HOPE

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take the opportunity to congratulate Mrs. Vivian T. Hope on 50 years of service to the Glynn County School System.

Born and raised in Brunswick, GA. Mrs. Hope received her bachelor of arts degree from Albany State in Albany, GA and received master of education degrees from Armstrong State College, Savannah State College, and Georgia Southern University. She also holds an educational specialist degree from Nova University in Florida.

Vivian Hope began her career in Glynn County in 1965 teaching fifth grade at Burroughs Elementary School. In 1967, she became one of the first African-American instructors to teach at Goodyear Elementary School. She later continued her career at Risley Sixth Grade Center and Glynn County Middle School, where she served as a team leader and chairperson of the social studies department. Vivian has received numerous honors. While at Glynn County Middle School, she was selected the 1981 Teacher of the Year. In 1988–1990 she participated in various Georgia Educational Leadership Conferences; in 1992, she was selected to participate in the State of

Georgia Governor's School Leadership Institute. Most recently, Vivian served on the Southern Association Visiting Team for Bibb County, located in the 2nd district of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, throughout Mrs. Hope's career, she has been a role model to both students and aspiring young teachers. When asked, "If you had it to do all over again, would you? Her response, "Of course, with any job you have your good days and your bad, but for me, I wouldn't change a thing."

Too often, we forget to acknowledge those who spend 6 to 8 hours a day educating our children. Today, I salute Vivian Hope for spending 30 years with our children.

In conclusion, I also want to add that one of her best students is her own daughter, Theresa Hooper. Many of us know Theresa, and have had the pleasure of working with her on various State and national issues. She originally worked on the Senate Appropriations Committee, but in 1992, we on the House side had the good fortune of having her work with us. She is bright, intelligent and a true professional.

With people like Theresa serving as a sample of her mother's fine work, we can be sure that Mrs. Hope's legacy will live on for many years.

The world is clearly better for her outstanding contributions to America. Congratulations Mrs. Hope.

HONORING DELLA LAMB COMMUNITY SERVICES OF KANSAS CITY, MO

HON. KAREN MCCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Della Lamb Community Services, which will have its annual awards banquet on Sunday, February 5, 1995.

Della Lamb has stood as a beacon of hope in Kansas City for almost 100 years, providing a wide range of services to our central city. These services include day care, youth programs and summer camp, adult education, including GED and basic skills instruction, and special programs for senior adults, including much-needed transportation services.

The services provided by Della Lamb touch hundreds of Kansas Citians every month. I commend the staff, volunteers, and supporters of Della Lamb for the wonderful contributions they make to our community.

In addition, I would like to pay special tribute to the executive director of Della Lamb, William C. "Duke" Akers, who has served Della Lamb for 20 years.

During the tenure of Mr. Akers, Della Lamb has grown from a one-location neighborhood house to an eight-location charitable endeavor with an annual budget of \$3.5 million. The growth of services coordinated by Mr. Akers and the Della Lamb family have an impact on people every day. I commend Mr. Akers for 20 years of service to Della Lamb and I thank him for the valuable contributions he makes to our community.

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM
ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments, to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and to provide information on the cost of Federal mandates on the private sector, and for other purposes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Vento amendment to H.R. 5 which will ensure that the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act will not apply to laws and regulations that involve life-threatening public health and safety measures.

The amendment clearly recognizes the Federal Government's steadfast responsibility in protecting the health and safety of the American public. If we ignore this responsibility, the result will be devastating.

If the act passes without the Vento amendment, landfills, incinerators, hazardous waste dumps, toxic waste storage facilities, and manufacturers could pollute our air and our water unchecked by oversight of the Federal Government. This rampant pollution will have a severe negative impact on the health of the American public.

Children, the elderly and those with weakened immune systems are especially vulnerable to diseases caused by environmental pollution.

Many respiratory diseases and several forms of cancer are directly attributable to environmental causes.

These polluting facilities are disproportionately likely to be located in low-income and minority communities.

Currently, dust from a concrete recycling plant in the city of Huntington Park in my district is polluting that community's air and water.

Both the local rate of respiratory infection and of asthma in children have risen alarmingly since the plant began operation.

The citizens of that community are now turning to the government for assistance and protection against this threat to their health.

The industry assumption is that people living in these communities are politically weak and so consumed by the daily grind of making a living that they will not have the resources to organize against these facilities, as people in upper income communities tend to do.

Unfortunately, this assumption is firmly grounded in the reality of many communities throughout our country.

The Federal Government must not abandon its role in protecting the health of all Americans, particularly the most vulnerable in our country.

As Representatives of our respective communities, we have a clear obligation to protect the health and safety of the American people.

If we abandon it now, we may cause damage to future generations before our mistake can be corrected.

I urge the passage of the Vento amendment.

MR. HSU'S MEETING

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in every advanced society, regulation of the airways and the electronic media is both a necessity and a recognized duty of government. In the United States, we have long believed that the airways belong to the public. Therefore, the United States licenses frequency assignments in each market. Section 301 of the Communications Act of 1934 clearly states that no one may operate a radio, television, or other wireless transmission facility without a license from the Federal Communications Commission. This law was enacted to prevent several parties from attempting to use the same frequency and, in the process, destroying their ability to reliably broadcast. It also ensures that the public is compensated for one of its greatest assets and ensures that persons granted use of this resource do not abuse their privilege.

Mr. Speaker, other developed nations have followed the lead of the United States by enacting laws like our Communications Act. In 1993, the Republic of China on Taiwan enacted comprehensive legislation to permit the licensing of new radio stations and the establishment of cable television stations. Under this law, many former operators of underground radio stations, which had been operating illegally for many years, were permitted to apply for new licenses. To date, 17 of the 20 former operators of these underground stations have received licenses after their applications were reviewed by a nonpartisan professional licensing board. These licenses were granted without regard to the operators' political affiliations. In fact, three licenses were awarded to operators who are openly opposed to the current party in power.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of the Republic of China has been extremely generous in its licensing policies. In the United States, anyone found to be illegally operating a commercial radio station rarely gets a chance to obtain a commercial radio station after being found in violation of the law. Despite this generous policy, several operators of illegal radio stations in Taiwan have refused to apply for licenses and have continued to operate illegally, thereby jamming the frequencies lawfully allocated to licensed operators.

Mr. Speaker, one such illegal radio operator is Mr. Hsu Rongchi. This week, Mr. Hsu has requested and, in fact, has been granted, a meeting with a select few Members of the U.S. Congress to discuss the issue of licensing radio stations in the Republic of China. It is my expectation that Mr. Hsu will argue that the Republic of China on Taiwan has prevented him from exercising his right to free speech by shutting down his illegal radio operation.

Mr. Speaker, I fully respect Mr. Hsu's right to meet with Members of the U.S. Congress. I also respect the right of Members of Congress to solicit the opinion of foreign citizens on foreign policy related matters. At the same

time, I am deeply concerned about how this meeting may be portrayed in the American and foreign media. In my 12 years in Congress, I have witnessed on numerous occasions foreign nationals who have deliberately misrepresented their interaction with Members of Congress in order to achieve their own political objectives.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is important to emphasize that Mr. Hsu has not been granted a hearing by the House Committee of International Relations or the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific. I sit on this full committee and this subcommittee. In the House of Representatives, they have exclusive jurisdiction to hold hearings on issues impacting United States-Republic of China relations. While Mr. Hsu and others may be billing this February 2, meeting with Members of Congress as a hearing, it is actually a meeting with a few Members of Congress. Furthermore, the fact that a few Members of Congress have conceded to meet with Mr. Hsu should not be portrayed as any affirmation by the U.S. Congress of Mr. Hsu's viewpoint, or for that matter, that the U.S. Congress views this issue of great importance. In fact, I believe that the majority of my colleagues would disagree with Mr. Hsu's opinions regarding the fairness with which the Republic of China on Taiwan licenses radio stations.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that my remarks will have clarified for all those interested parties what is and is not taking place this week in the U.S. Congress regarding the radio licensing issue.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE WARD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, due to unavoidable circumstances, I missed rollcall vote No. 65—during consideration of H.R. 5, Unfunded Mandates Reform Act—on January 30, 1995. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PROPOSING A BALANCED BUDGET
AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES A. LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, some concerns have been expressed about how the balanced budget amendment, if ratified, could effect the Federal Government's ability to issue debt, manage its cash position, and borrow money at the lowest rate.

For instance, under present budgetary requirements, budget outlays for direct loans, such as those provided by the Eximbank and USDA, consist of the net present value of the

subsidy, rather than the net disbursement of cash. However, Treasury still must borrow the full amount of the loan. It is expected that cash disbursements will exceed \$70 billion during fiscal year 1995–99. Under House Joint Resolution 1, the debt limit would have to be increased by a three-fifths majority of each House in order to accommodate these disbursements, even if the budgets were balanced in those years and the loans eventually were paid back in full.

In addition, the Federal Government's cash requirements vary from year to year, making it difficult to estimate its revenue needs. For example, a large number of unexpected thrift and bank failures in 1 year could cause the budget to be unbalanced.

Finally, some have argued that given the constraints of a balanced budget amendment and the three-fifths requirement, Congress will look for ways to borrow money off budget, which is usually more costly than on-budget financing. A good example of a more costly off-budget financing scheme was the reliance on REFCORP bonds to finance part of the S&L bailout.

While the above budgetary concerns at first blush would appear problematic, they should not pose insurmountable obstacles to successful implementation of a balanced budget amendment. Many of these cash management problems can be addressed with more prudential planning. Furthermore, section 8 of House Joint Resolution 1 allows Congress to enact laws to implement this constitutional amendment. Through legislative adjustments Congress retains the flexibility to square the various nuances and vagaries of Federal Government debt management with the constitutional requirement of a balanced budget.

PROPOSING A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support House Resolution 28, the bipartisan, bicameral balanced budget amendment. We have spent considerable time in this House debating and discussing the merits of competing balanced budget amendment proposals. The message that has resonated through this debate is this country's desperate need to balance its budget.

Currently, our national debt exceeds \$4.3 trillion. Since this House last voted on a balanced budget amendment in March 1994, our debt has increased by more than \$160 billion dollars. The gross interest payments on this debt alone are costing us \$816 million per day. In fact, these interest payments have increased so significantly that 14 percent of the entire Federal budget is devoted to interest payments on the debt. Therein lies the insidious nature of this deficit debacle.

As the interest payments continue to skyrocket. Devouring larger and larger portions of the budget, there is a devastating regressive effect on the rest of the budget. These interest payments are severely hampering our ability to fund important discretionary programs. While future generations will suffer increasingly from this effect, the problem is also very real in the present. Our interest payments this year alone will be 8 times higher than expenditures on education and 50 times higher than expenditures on job training.

My constituents in western Pennsylvania will need continued assistance from job retraining and economic development programs. This is why I stand today in support of this balanced budget amendment. The Mon-Valley needs the help of innovative and intelligent Federal programs to assist in the retraining of displaced workers so they are prepared to join new, high-technology industries. Programs are needed to cleanup the abandoned industrial sites so fresh businesses will locate there bringing with them secure jobs in these growing industries. These are just the types of programs that are being crowded out by the increasing interest payments on our debt.

It is imperative that a balanced budget amendment passes both Houses of this Congress so that it can move to the States for the ratification process. Only then will people throughout the country be afforded the opportunity to closely examine how the amendment would work and what specific actions would be necessary to achieve a balanced budget early in the 21st century. However, the only way our citizens will have that opportunity is if we move now to pass the Stenholm/Schaefer alternative.

It is the only alternative that is purely bipartisan in nature and has a chance of also passing in the Senate. This is a practical reality that cannot be overlooked.

Language in this amendment would require a three-fifths vote in both Houses to allow an increase in our national debt level which gives this alternative the strong safeguard necessary for it to be effective, and I sincerely hope my colleagues will recognize the power of this rigorous balance. The Stenholm/Schaefer amendment unites the underlying principles of all versions of the balanced budget amendment. We cannot let another opportunity to pass this amendment slip away. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Stenholm/Schaefer alternative now, and when we take a vote on final passage.

HELSINKI COMMISSION HEARING ON DEVELOPMENTS IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Helsinki Commission, which I chair, convened its third hearing to hear from Dr. Haris Silajdzic, the Prime Minister of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In 1992 and 1993, Dr. Silajdzic testified in his previous position as Foreign Minister, describing the horrors taking place in his country and, knowing they could have been prevented, urgently asking for help. The hearing reviewed the tragic situation that still exists in Bosnia and Herzegovina,

as well as the continued relevance of policy options that should have been taken by the international community long ago. Having to do that was frustrating to me, and I cannot begin to imagine how it must frustrate the Prime Minister.

We must not, though, accept the unacceptable. That is exactly what the Serb militants want us to do. It is clear that the people of Bosnia, despite their endurance of a third winter of war, are not prepared to abandon the defense of their homes, their families, their country. Indeed, Bosnia and Herzegovina seems motivated to defend international principles, even if they must do so almost completely alone.

In contrast, much to my dismay, the international community has been beaten back by the Serb militants in what has become a game of bluff. The Serb militants clearly escalate the violence, because they know we are unwilling to escalate in response. Our threats against them lack any credibility. Officials directing United Nations and NATO efforts have failed not only to stop vicious Serb aggression, but also to enforce their own Security Council resolutions. Instead, they have resorted to mutual recriminations, twisted explanations, and even blaming the victims for their fate.

Last summer, the so-called Contact Group—comprising the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and Germany—offered the Bosnian Government and the Serb militants a plan on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, with a deadline for an unconditional answer and warnings of repercussions for any side rejecting it. Sarajevo accepted it, in time and without condition. The militants effectively rejected it. As sanctions were then eased on Serbia in response, the deadline for Bosnian Serb acceptance was extended indefinitely. Earlier this month, U.S. officials presented this plan as simply a starting point for negotiations, and met with the Bosnian Serb leaders in their stronghold, Pale. To my dismay, the Secretary of State concluded that the "Bosnian crisis is about Bosnia, but the NATO alliance is far more enduring, far more important than the Bosnian crisis." I was amazed and appalled.

Let's keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary's comment refers to what is, in fact, a well-documented genocide, and these diplomatic gestures were made toward those who orchestrated it. Through all the complexities of the Balkans that we must consider, one generic fact remains—you reward the aggressor, and you get more aggression. It is as simple as that.

The Helsinki Commission, through the leadership of the previous cochairs of the Helsinki Commission, noted that calls for a negotiated settlement, however correct, are meaningless if accompanied by an artificial neutrality and not by severe repercussions for those who operate outside acceptable parameters and seek what they want through the use of force. Collective partnerships, however desirable, will erode if partners allow one of their own to be carved into ethnic pieces.

Enunciating international principles, however promising, is empty if countries abandon them for historical affinities and big-power politics. Commemorations of the end of World War II a half century ago, however appropriate, ring somewhat hollow when genocidal acts that stir memories of the Holocaust are allowed to occur. The world's commitment to human

rights, however boldly expressed, is questioned when our collective consciences are unaffected by the horrors that continue to be reported from Bosnia and Herzegovina today.

At the hearing, Prime Minister Silajdzic expressed his gratitude to the U.S. Congress for its strong and consistent support for Bosnia and Herzegovina through this terrible period. He noted that, 50 years after Auschwitz, concentration camps again appeared in Europe, this time in Bosnia, and this time the images are brought into our homes directly, especially through television. Rather than responding on the basis of principle, justice, and order, however, he described realpolitik and pragmatism as the order of the day. When a forceful response is eliminated, he concluded, the Bosnian Serb militants and their supporters in Belgrade are the only ones who benefit.

Given the current dynamics, the Prime Minister presented a reasonable course of action, specifically that the Contact Group meet at the ministerial level and set a deadline for a definite and final answer from the Serb militants. If the Serbs accept the plan in time, changes to the map could be made within 30 days, as long as these changes maintain the 51/49 percentage formula and are adopted by consensus. Negotiations on constitutional arrangements, international guarantees and other items would follow.

If, on the other hand, the Serbs reject the plan, the response adopted last July by the Contact Group foreign ministers should be reaffirmed, specifically the tightening of sanctions, the expansion and better protection of designated safe havens, including the use of air strikes, and lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina. On the latter, he added that recognition of the right to self-defense is the minimum that must be granted to the victims of this aggression.

I told the Prime Minister that the Helsinki Commission is dedicated not necessarily to the defense of his country, but to the promotion of principles adopted in Helsinki almost 20 years ago. In reality, however, these two different goals have come to mean the same thing. In this new Congress, the Commission will remain true to that goal and I, therefore, support his suggestions. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will debate the current policy options.

As we do consider policy options, I would like to repeat a remark made at the hearing by fellow Helsinki Commissioner, Mr. STENY HOYER. He argued that one of the reasons we have allowed aggression and genocide to proceed in Bosnia is that some have convinced themselves that the conflict there is a civil war—an internal ethnic conflict—the inevitable result of age-old hatreds. To correct the picture, Mr. HOYER quoted from a recent book, "Bosnia, a Short History," by Noel Malcolm, the introduction to which states:

Paradoxically, the most important reason for studying Bosnia's history is that it enables one to see that the history of Bosnia itself does not explain the origins of this war. Of course, the war could not have happened if Bosnia had not been the peculiar thing that it was, which made it the object of special ambitions and interests. But those ambitions were directed at Bosnia from outside Bosnia's borders. The biggest obstacle to all understanding of the conflict is the assumption that what has happened in that country is the product—natural, spontaneous, and at the same time necessary—of forces lying within Bosnia's own internal history. That is

the myth which was carefully propagated by those who caused the conflict, who wanted the world to believe that what they and their gunmen were doing was done not by them, but by impersonal and inevitable historical forces beyond anyone's control. * * * And the world believed them."

Why the world believed them, I do not know. Perhaps naive assumptions about what was happening as Yugoslavia disintegrated; perhaps a cynical realpolitik that cares little about human suffering. Regardless, we cannot allow the resulting disaster to continue.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked for a leave of absence after 5:30 p.m. to conduct business in my district in Illinois. Because I was in the district I was unable to cast my vote on three amendments. Had I been present I would have cast my vote against the Mink amendment, rollcall No. 77; against the Beilenson amendment, rollcall No. 78; and against the Moran amendment, rollcall No. 79.

THE TAX FAIRNESS FOR AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1995

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, to introduce H.R. 783, the Tax Fairness for Agriculture Act of 1995, which clarifies the proper application of present tax law to membership payments to tax-exempt agricultural and horticultural organizations.

Agricultural and horticultural organizations are dedicated to the improvement of agriculture and agricultural conditions, products, and efficiency and have been exempt from the Federal income tax since its inception. These organizations are typically composed of first, farmer/rancher members and second, nonfarmer/rancher or associate members. Generally speaking, both classes of members pay the same amounts and enjoy most of the same rights and privileges of membership. Both classes of members pay the same amounts and enjoy most of the same rights and privileges of membership. Both classes of members are also typically entitled to purchase various goods and services, including insurance. The existence of associate members and the availability of various benefits to all members have been common practice among agricultural and horticultural associations for many decades.

Last year, the Internal Revenue Service [IRS] issued technical advice memorandum [TAM] 9416002 in connection with an audit of a State Farm Bureau. The TAM reversed longstanding IRS practice by asserting that the associate members of such organizations were not bona fide and their membership payments were taxable access payments to purchase insurance. Relying principally on the fact that associate members of the Farm Bureau had

limited voting and office-holding rights, the IRS concluded that Farm Bureau's facts were indistinguishable from two 1991 court decisions involving unions in which associate members received absolutely no benefits other than access to an insurance program.

Mr. Speaker, the TAM conflicts with the longstanding recognized practice of agricultural and horticultural organizations and contradicts past IRS guidance and practice. At least two prior IRS rulings, technical advice memorandums 8302010 and 8302009, under materially the same facts now at issue, hold that associate membership payments of agricultural organizations are not taxable. These TAMs correctly conclude that membership payments were not taxable because, despite certain differences, the associate members received largely the same rights and benefits as "regular" members, whose membership payments are clearly not taxable. The availability of insurance to all members, associates included, was judged insufficient to taint the membership payments generally.

Mr. Speaker, although the TAM literally applies only to one State Farm Bureau, it is now being applied to other agricultural organizations around the country. If the TAM is allowed to stand and is extended to other entities, most county and State agricultural organizations could face potentially huge deficiencies for what has until now been unchallenged and appropriate conduct. These deficiencies and the costs of contesting them could jeopardize the continued economic viability of many agricultural organizations and, thus, the important exempt purposes they serve.

The legislation we introduce today, would effectively restore the historical position taken by the IRS, that the membership payments of associate members of agricultural and horticultural organizations are not taxable. The legislation has two components. First, agricultural organizations that reasonably relied on the prior authorities and practice I discussed before would be shielded from unwarranted and potentially devastating audits. For this purpose, it is recognized that the treatment of associate member payments as tax exempt has been the longstanding recognized practice of agricultural and horticultural organizations and reliance on that practice was reasonable. Also, the legislation would establish a prospective safe harbor for annual payments by members of agricultural organizations of \$100 or less. Thus, regardless of whether an organization charged some of its members more than \$100 or less were not bona fide members and, therefore, that their membership payments were taxable. This will preclude wasteful and costly disputes in cases involving relatively nominal membership payments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KWESI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I was, unfortunately, detained in my congressional district in Baltimore earlier today and thus forced to miss a record vote. Specifically, I was not present to record my vote on rollcall vote No. 80, the

amendment offered by Mr. SANDERS of Vermont.

Had I been here I would have voted "yea."

WE NEED AN AFRICAN-AMERICAN
MUSEUM ON THE MALL

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am once again introducing a bill to establish an African American Museum as part of the Smithsonian and to be located on the Mall in Washington, DC. I do this on the first day of black history month to highlight the need for and the importance of such a museum.

The story of black people in America has yet to be told. As a result, the understanding of American history remains incomplete.

African American history is an integral part of our country, yet the richness and variety of that history is little-known and little-understood.

Too few people know that Benjamin Banneker, an outstanding mathematician, along with Pierre L'Enfant, designed this city. Some of our Nation's greatest cowboys were black, including Bill Pickett and Deadwood Dick.

How many people know that Dr. Daniel Hale William was a pioneering heart surgeon in the last century? And that Ernest Everest Just, Percy Julian, and George Washington Carver were all outstanding scientists?

One of the greatest periods in America's cultural history was the Harlem renaissance. Writers, artists, poets, and photographers like Langston Hughes, James Van Der Zee, Countee Cullen, and Aaron Douglas were all part of the renaissance.

More recently, the civil rights movement changed the face of this country and inspired movements toward democracy and justice all over the world.

There is much, much more—and it must be told to all Americans. Until we understand the African American story in its fullness and complexity, we cannot understand ourselves as a Nation. We must know who we are and what we have done in order to truly consider where we must go from this day forward.

I am pleased and delighted that many of my colleagues have cosponsored this bill. I urge all my colleagues to support this worthwhile and important legislation.

HONORING MARGIE LEE

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1995

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to pay tribute to a woman who is a resident of the Eleventh District of Virginia, Margie Lee. Margie is retiring

from the Social Security Administration after 37 years and 8 months of dedicated service. She has held many positions in her 37 years at the SSA, including acting area director for the Washington, DC, metropolitan area, district manager of the Alexandria, VA, Social Security District, assistant district manager in Alexandria, VA, and Wheaton, MD, District, and various other positions in the Washington, DC, and the Chicago area.

Her most recent assignment was as special projects coordinator out of the Chief Judges Office, Office of Hearings and Appeals, SSA. In recognition of her work Margie's awards include the Ewell T. Bartlett Memorial Award, 1990 for Humanitarian Service and the Commissioners Citation, the highest award given at SSA after serving as the Federal coordinator of the Combined Federal Campaign.

Margie has been a long-time resident of Reston and been very active in her community. She is a charter member of the Reston Chapter of the Links, Inc.; past president of Reston chapter, and serves on area and local committees. She is also a member of Jack and Jill, St. Augustine Catholic Church. Member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in honoring Margie Lee for her hard work, dedication and many years of service at the Social Security Administration.

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM
ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MARTINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments, to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and to provide information on the cost of Federal mandates on the private sector, and for other purposes:

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening to congratulate my colleagues for passing H.R. 5, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

Monday in my hometown of Clifton, NJ I met with local officials to talk about the importance of this legislation. Most of us know how difficult it is to be a local official, I can tell you I know first hand. I have had to deal with unfunded mandates first hand.

As we dealt with this bill on the House floor, the burden of unfunded Federal mandates did not go away. Local governments are still toiling under their yoke, losing money by the minute in manpower and paperwork complying with one-size-fits-all regulations from Congress.

Take my home State of New Jersey for example. Just recently we avoided what would

have amounted to one of the most costly mandates in the country. As a commuter State, New Jersey was faced with drastic measures to slow the growth of automobile emissions in order to comply with one of the most infamous unfunded mandates on the books, the Clean Air Act.

In order to meet the rigorous standards of the act, the Environmental Protection Agency informed New Jersey that it must use a new, unproven testing system. The State itself was not supposed to have any input on the testing method, but rather meekly submit to the commands of the EPA.

What did this do to New Jersey drivers? Well, it simply set up a system in which they could not win. First, they would have to take an emissions test that almost every car was expected to fail. Then, they would have to pay \$300 to \$400 each to repair their cars only to take the test again. Fortunately, the State was able to head off EPA sanctions at the last moment and avoid the imposition of such a test.

I will give another example. As I stated before, I came to Washington as a former local official, on both the municipal and county levels. On the county level, I met with special frustration when confronted with unfunded Federal mandates.

As the Passaic County Freeholder Board moved to restructure a government that, just like everywhere else, had its inefficiencies, we were continually confounded by obligations placed on us by Washington. I led the fight to reorganize the county health administration, and a little initiative and persistence paid off: I was able to shave \$107,000 from that department's budget. Due to similar efforts from my fellow Freeholders, we were able to reduce county spending by 7 percent in 1993.

But, as you may have already guessed, the Passaic County taxpayers could not directly reap the rewards of the frugal actions of the Freeholder Board. In 1993, we were actually forced to raise taxes. That part of our county budget that was mandated from above went up 10 percent, even faster than we could cut discretionary spending.

I am sure many of my colleagues have had similarly frustrating experiences. Stories like these have to stop, and I believe they soon will.

With the passage of H.R. 5, this House took a major step in the right direction. But the fight against unfunded mandates is far from over. You see, H.R. 5 is first and foremost an accountability measure.

There is nothing in this bill that says Congress may never pass another unfunded Federal mandate again, it only makes sure that Congress knows exactly how much its legislation costs. Because of this we have to remain vigilant over the next 2 years and continue in the spirit of H.R. 5 by refusing to pass the buck down the line.

I congratulate this body as a whole, my colleagues on the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, and especially the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. CLINGER, for their strong leadership on this vital issue. You have all done your country a great service today.

