

treatment of United States and foreign personnel killed in the April 14, 1994, shootdown of two U.S. Army Black Hawk helicopters by two U.S. Air Force F-15 fighters over Iraq. Following the incident, U.S. Secretary of Defense William Perry found it inappropriate to compensate the families of the Americans who were killed in the tragedy citing the Feres doctrine—a legal principle denying compensation for death or injury incident to military service.

However, Secretary Perry provided payments of \$100,000 to the families of each of the foreign nationals involved in the accident, in spite of the Feres doctrine. These voluntary payments, made under the Secretary's emergency and extraordinary expense authority were characterized as humanitarian gestures offered in recognition of the unique circumstances surrounding the incident.

It is time that we offer the same gesture to our own citizens who were involved. In the interest of fairness and justice, the law must be applied in an equal fashion. If it was appropriate to pay the foreign nationals involved, then it is also appropriate to pay the Americans. It is outrageous that the United States Government would treat British, French, and Turkish soldiers better than our own.

If enacted, H.R. 2986 will require the Secretary of the Treasury to make \$100,000 payments to the families of each of the Americans killed in the April 1994 Black Hawk fratricide incident. I urge my colleagues to support our troops and families by supporting this important relief measure.

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

### HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 12, 1997*

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, another week and still no campaign finance reform. We are now down to the final days before we adjourn for the year, if we don't take action now on campaign finance reform next year will be too late.

On Monday of this week, I spent the day on several University campuses in my district. I had an opportunity to meet with students who are concerned about a variety of issues, including student financial aid, the environment and their future job prospects. I was struck, however, by the feeling among students that their voice doesn't matter. They believe that the influence of money on the political process means only the rich and powerful special interests have access to Members of Congress. I have tried to do my part, through meetings like the ones I held Monday, to change that perception. But, we will not be able to completely change that image until we adopt comprehensive campaign finance reform.

These students represent the future. If we expect them to be the leaders in the next century, we must give them hope that they can make a difference. To achieve that goal we must pass campaign finance reform, and we must do it now.

Mr. Speaker, the people of western Wisconsin refuse to accept "no" as an answer. Please do not let them down, schedule a vote on campaign finance reform.

#### THE FURTHER POLITICIZATION OF THE NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

### HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 12, 1997*

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member hopes that his colleagues might read and they remember the following editorial from the October 11, 1997, edition of the Omaha World-Herald next month when the Nobel Peace Prize is formally awarded. It will be used as an unreasonable and irresponsible point of pressure or attack on the American use of landmines in the demilitarized zone on the Korean peninsula by both domestic and foreign critics.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Oct. 11, 1997]

#### NOBEL DECISION RAISES QUESTION: WHAT ABOUT PEACE IN KOREA?

The Nobel committee awarded the Nobel Peace Prize to the international committee promoting a treaty to halt the use of anti-personnel land mines. A more appropriate recipient, in our opinion, would have been the U.S. government for its 44 years of preventing war along the demilitarized zone that separates North and South Korea.

Mention of Korea is appropriate in connection with the Nobel committee's decision. By honoring the anti-mine campaign, the Nobel people have implicitly condemned one of the tools used by U.S. forces to prevent invasion or infiltration of South Korea by troops, saboteurs or assassins from the north.

President Clinton had asked treaty sponsors to exempt Korea, allowing the U.S. to sign the treaty and still maintain the option of using mines along the DMZ. When his request was refused, he said the United States could not sign the treaty.

So the awarding of this year's Nobel prize to the anti-mine campaign is a slap at Clinton, too, and a slap at the hundreds of thousands of American troops who have rotated through the U.S. divisions in Korea since the 1950s. (During part of that time, the head of the anti-mine committee, Jody Williams of Putney, Vt., was campaigning against U.S. efforts to keep Central America from going communist.)

The United States, of course, is not the cause of the land-mine problem to which Princess Diana called attention. She went to Angola and hugged children who had been maimed by exploding mines left over from that country's civil war.

U.S. forces don't scatter land mines at random, leaving them to be exploded years later by grazing animals or playing children. That's the behavior of terrorists, dictators and guerrilla groups. Iraqi military units. The Viet Cong. East African warlords. Balkan terrorists.

By contrast, America, like most other western nations, is pledged to follow the 1947 Geneva Convention, which requires armies to record the placement of mines and remove the devices when no longer needed.

The United States halted exports of land mines years ago, even to its allies. U.S.-made mines are manufactured to defuse themselves after a certain time, usually 60 days. Older mines in the U.S. inventory are being destroyed. Fewer mines are being used in Korea, although the United States wants to keep the right to use them.

In Korea, 35,000 U.S. troops augment the South Korean army in holding back the million-man army of the north. They guard a 487-square-mile demilitarized zone that stretches more than 100 miles through rugged mountains, steep valleys and forested hills.

Many times over the past four decades, infiltrators from the north have tried to slip across the DMZ into the south. Minefields stand in their way. Some people say that the United States must give up such defenses to persuade outlaw nations and terrorists not to scatter mines across the countryside. This argument fails to account for the fact that the United States is a superpower to which other nations, often by default, have entrusted certain responsibilities. Giving up a tool for carrying them out is more difficult for a superpower than for nations that have fewer international obligations.

Our suggestion that the United States receive a Nobel prize was only half-serious. The award is generally reserved for individuals and institutions.

In terms of contributions to the peace of the world, however, America's role on the Korean peninsula has few parallels. Because South Korea was kept out of a Soviet or Chinese orbit, democracy and free enterprise took root there. Because Japan didn't need to arm itself against a Soviet or Chinese threat based in South Korea, Japan emerged from its post-war recovery as a peaceful industrial democracy. Other nations around the Pacific rim took inspiration from the economic success of South Korea and Japan. Much of the region is now prosperous, non-communist and free.

The careful use of mines played a role in that success. It's unfortunate that the anti-mine people will now have yet another forum, the Nobel ceremonies in December, from which to paint the U.S. position as irresponsible.

#### TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HOSPICE OF SAINT JOHN, LAKEWOOD, CO

### HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 12, 1997*

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a high honor and privilege to allow my colleagues to know of the wonderful work being done by the Hospice of Saint John in Lakewood, Colorado. Twenty years ago, in 1977, this program was founded by Fr. Paul von Lobkowitz, a priest of the Sovereign Order of Saint John of Jerusalem, Knights of Malta, to serve the sick and the dying. This month the Hospice of Saint John celebrates twenty years of caring. In those years its staff of professionals have cared for more than 12,000 dying patients and their families.

The Hospice of Saint John was only the second in-patient hospice program to be opened in the United States. It has stood the test of time in a medical environment that favors the bigger corporations. The Hospice of Saint John continues to be independently run and directed by the Order of Saint John of Jerusalem and its professed and lay members.

The Hospice of Saint John was the first hospice program in the state to provide care for AIDS patients when many other programs of the day refused to care for them. Today the Hospice's commitment to AIDS patients and their families and friends remains as strong as ever, as does its care for every one of its patients. Many of its patients include young men and women whose lives are cut short by ravaging diseases. In its twenty years the Hospice of Saint John has never turned away a single patient for a lack of financial means.

Remarkably, it has never received a dime of federal money other than Medicare and Medicaid funds.

This program is worthy of our collective recognition. For the past twenty years Fr. Paul and his staff at the Hospice of Saint John have cared for those who we sometimes tend to forget. They have toiled in the trenches for all humanity. They deserve our respect and support and on this occasion of their twenty years of dedicated service to my state I ask you to join with me in saluting them and their service to us all.

AMERICA NEEDS THE PAYCHECK  
PROTECTION ACT

**HON. BOB SCHAFFER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1997

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, during a recent weekend of site visits in the eastern Colorado congressional district I represent, a constituent approached me and posed a sensible question, "Why am I forced to contribute my hard-earned dollars to my union's political activities?" He went on to explain that for him, every paycheck includes a deduction for union dues. These dues pay for legal services and collective bargaining costs. Dues, he agrees, are useful to promote his trade. He has no problem with union dues so long as they are used for their intended purpose.

He objects, however, to the millions of dollars his union puts toward political causes he does not support and at the expense of thousands of union members like him. Most union members disagree with giving their wages to political activities because they are excluded in deciding how their money is spent.

Something needs to change.

In 1947 Congress passed the Labor-Management Relations Act, also known as the Taft-Hartley Act. This legislation prohibited so-called closed shop workplaces, where one could not be hired without first joining a union.

Calling the act a "slave labor bill," President Harry Truman vetoed the measure. Subsequently, Congress voted to override the veto, thereby enacting Taft-Hartley into law.

Convinced the bill would destroy the labor movement, union members felt justified in circumventing the legislation. Rather than require workers to join the union prior to employment, labor bosses instead required union membership after the worker was hired.

The Taft-Hartley Act challenged the unions' ability to maintain membership which no longer rested upon the utility of their collectivism, but upon the ability to lobby Congress. Thus, unions became proficient political machines.

Union bosses recruited and supported candidates who would pledge allegiance to the unions. In return for loyalty, unions produced money and manpower to aid political campaigns. The tactic proved decisive. For many years, Congress operated in lockstep with the unions.

Workers who opposed the unions' political antics turned to the Supreme Court. In 1988, the Court ruled in *Communications Workers v. Beck*, 487 U.S. 735, that nonunion members can only be required to pay for the costs of

collective bargaining, contract administration, and grievance adjustment but not political activities. Unions made little effort to educate their members about *Beck*, and found ways to keep workers from exercising their *Beck* rights.

Today, many union members continue to pay for more than just collective bargaining. They are also paying for politics. During the 1996 congressional and Presidential campaigns, for example, labor unions spent more than \$400 million on political activities. A recent poll indicated that 68 percent of union members are unaware of the *Beck* decision.

Testimony before Congress confirms the difficulty workers have had exercising their *Beck* rights. This past spring, worker after worker told Congress of the near-impossible task of actually recovering hard-earned wages.

Under current laws, the only way some union members can refuse contributions to political activities is to quit the union, which also means quitting their jobs and risking their livelihoods.

Saying "no" should not come at such a high price. That is why I introduced H.R. 2608, the Paycheck Protection Act. The Paycheck Protection Act protects workers who are forced to contribute to political activities by way of their union dues. The Paycheck Protection Act requires separate, prior, written, voluntary authorization before any money can be deducted from a wage earner's paycheck for political activity. By requiring prior approval, the wage earner is given a choice. Furthermore, the bill applies to corporations just as it does unions.

More than one-third of the U.S. House is already cosponsoring the Paycheck Protection Act, and over 70 percent of working Americans express support for the Paycheck Protection Act. I believe we may finally have a chance to help American workers by protecting their paychecks.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT PALMER  
INGRAM

**HON. KAREN MCCARTHY**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1997

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. DREIER, and I, rise today to pay tribute to the life of a man who has touched so many lives and who has contributed so much to our community: Mr. Robert Palmer Ingram.

We submit into the RECORD an article in honor of Mr. Ingram's memory and contributions as recounted by Diane Stafford in my hometown newspaper, the *Kansas City Star*:

Robert Palmer Ingram, an indefatigable salesman and civic leader, died Tuesday in his sleep at his Kansas City home. He was 80 years old.

Since arriving in Kansas City in the mid-1940s, Ingram founded or led more than a dozen companies, was a director of at least seven others, served as a trustee or a governor of six major civic or educational organizations, was an honorary consul to Belgium and held offices or memberships in many other clubs, councils and committees.

Fueled by his voracious reading, Ingram brought curiosity and wise counsel to wide-ranging endeavors. He shunned the spotlight but left a public imprint as the former owner and publisher of Ingram's, the *Kansas City*

monthly business magazine that continues to carry his name.

To classical music lovers, Ingram was known as the man who poured millions of dollars into classical music radio station KXTR, keeping it on the air for years despite unprofitability. He also owned KBEA, which had a "Music of Your Life" format. He sold those properties in 1996.

Henry Bloch, co-founder of H&R Block Inc., said that many times through the years, including Monday, he saw Ingram eating lunch alone and reading at the River Club.

"I've known him for a long time, and I can say he did a lot for Kansas City—in real estate, with the radio stations and the magazines," Bloch said. "He was a very nice person."

Quick-thinking, quick-moving and often slightly disheveled, Ingram whirled his thin frame from meeting to meeting, wedging in reading and note scribbling whenever time would allow. He and his wife, Beth Ingram, at one time said they subscribed to as many as 150 periodicals.

"He slowed down recently, but he stayed so upbeat about Kansas City," said Mike Morrissey, past chairman of the Greater Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, who sometimes ate lunch with Ingram at the Kansas City Club. "He was very supportive of anything you ever wanted him to help you with. He and Beth were very generous in the Kansas City community, not only financially but with their time."

Former Kansas City Mayor Richard L. Berkley said he admired Ingram "for remaining active and participating in so many civic, cultural and political activities. . . . It was impressive to see him still come to the Civic Council meetings and other events he was involved in, even when you knew it was getting more difficult for him to move around."

Ingram's energy left a brick-and-mortar legacy for the city. One project, TenMain Center, a downtown redevelopment effort in the 1960s, nearly ruined his wealth and his health after the intended prime tenant (the Kansas City Board of Trade) and fellow investors pulled out.

Ingram stuck with the office tower project, though, and saw it through to fruition.

At one time he owned 10 downtown buildings but in later years retained ownership only of the Argyle Building, a renovated tower that housed the offices of Ingram Properties and his publishing enterprises.

Ingram eschewed many outward trappings of wealth but admitted a fascination with high society. Even in failing health in recent months, he attended a swirl of benefits and functions.

His interest in wealth and society, in part, led to his ownership of *The Independent*, the area's society journal.

The Lyric Opera of Kansas City was a major beneficiary of the Ingram's philanthropy since it founding in 1958. Ingram money turned the old theater library into a luxurious gathering space for benefactors.

Ingram largess also created a new music library for the Kansas City Symphony.

He was born in Norfolk, Va., and grew up in a suburb of Pittsburgh, where, he said, he began selling door to door "anything he could" by age 8.

By age 10 he was following the stock market and buying his first stocks. And by age 12, he grandly noted later, he had learned to use rejection as a spur to do better.

He studied journalism at Washington and Lee University and at the University of Pittsburgh but left college without getting a degree because, he later said, he thought he needed a job more than he needed more education.