

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
HOLY TRINITY UNITED CHURCH

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Holy Trinity Baptist Church of Philadelphia, PA on its 100th anniversary.

In the spring of 1891, 65 members of the Shiloh Baptist Church in Philadelphia organized a new church and gave it the name Holy Trinity Baptist Church. The founding members called upon Rev. R.W. Christian to serve as the first pastor of the church. In the fall of 1892, the congregation moved from its temporary meeting place at Kater Hall to its present site. There the congregation built a chapel and, in 1901, purchased its first pipe organ.

Under the administration of its second pastor, Rev. Taliaferro, Holy Trinity Baptist Church was reconciled with its mother church, Shiloh Baptist Church. Holy Trinity Baptist Church was then recognized as an established Baptist church by the denominational authorities.

Rev. W.F. "Pop" Graham shepherded the church from 1911 until 1932. Rev. Graham, who was born into slavery in Mississippi, was a great pastor and community leader. He was succeeded by Rev. Charles Roy Jones in 1935.

In 1962, the Holy Trinity Baptist Church selected Rev. Cecil Dubois Gallup as its fifth and current pastor. Among the many accomplishments of Rev. Gallup's pastorate have been the formation of the Holy Trinity Enterprises, Inc., which purchased and rehabilitated more than 22 middle-income housing units in the surrounding neighborhood, the completion of two major capital fund drives and the establishment of a transportation service for church members.

In honor of its good work and in celebration of its 100th anniversary, I would like to extend my warmest congratulations to the Holy Trinity Baptist Church.

TRIBUTE TO PROF. CHARLES
GABRIELLE

HON. CRAIG T. JAMES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, the Military Order of World Wars recently awarded its prestigious Patrick Henry Award for Patriotic Achievement to the noted composer Prof. Charles Gabrielle, a resident of Palm Coast, FL.

Professor Gabrielle is an internationally renowned composer of patriotic music. His

"Christopher Columbus Suite" is the official music of the Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Jubilee. His other compositions include "Lilia Craig Overture" and "Concertino for Clarinet."

The Professor is an intensely loyal American who professes his love for our Nation through patriotic music. Professor Gabrielle has honored America with a number of patriotic compositions including "Armed Forces Medley"; "Vietnam Veterans March"; and "John Paul Jones March."

His most recent composition, "John Paul Jones March," is performed by the U.S. Navy Band and community bands. The musical tribute to the famed American naval hero is unique in that it can also be performed by high school bands—offering both a musical and historical lesson to the youth of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring a great composer and a great American, Prof. Charles Gabrielle.

A TRIBUTE TO HANDS IN ACTION—
AN ORGANIZATION DEDICATED
TO PREVENT CHILD ABUSE

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, 1,200 cases of child abuse are reported in Dade County every month. Only a quarter of these cases go to trial. This does not include those incidents not even accounted for. Too often there are no shelters available for these young victims of abuse and they are then either returned to the surroundings in which they were abused, placed in minimally supervised foster care or housed at Jackson Memorial Hospital following their medical release.

Hands in Action/Manos en Accion is a non-profit organization in south Florida whose main purpose is to "Stop the pain of child abuse." Since its establishment in 1987, the organization has yet to issue one paycheck to any board member. All the people who work for the organization are strictly volunteers. Any money raised by the organization is used in some way to help benefit child abuse victims.

Hands in Action plans to build a \$2.5 million facility to accommodate 96 abused, abandoned, and neglected children. In addition, 8 attached cottages, each built to shelter 12 children will be equipped with bedrooms, bathrooms, laundry facility, kitchenettes, dining, and social areas. Protected outside recreation fields will also be furnished. Every attempt will be made to establish a reassuring, home like atmosphere and avoid institutionalization. Metropolitan Dade County is producing a 50-year lease with a \$1 per year fee on an 8.5-acre site.

When the facility is finished, the Children's Center will be transferred to the CHS, Chil-

dren's Home Society of Florida. Established in 1902, it is the oldest and most important league in Florida devoted solely to the well-being of children.

I would like to give special recognition to the board of directors of Hands in Action. These include: Carmen Portela, Maria V. Gonzalez, Alina Cepero, Elena Rosado, Elsie Plasencia, Carmen Corpion, Elida Fine, Rosa Perez, Sylka Naranjo, Gloria Fernandez-Justiniani, Deborah Davis, Maria Cardenas, Roymi Eguaras, Regina Fernandez-Cacicedo, Louisa Ferrero, James Fine, Haydee Garcia-Rios, Odalys Mon, Ada Monserrat, Miriam Novo, Jacqueline Perez, Rick Rodriguez-Pina, Jorge Rouco, Belen Saborido, Silvia Seoanes-Levison, Rita Suarez, Lynette Muraurieta, Mark Swanson, Annie Betancourt, Mercy Diaz-Miranda, Judge William Gladstone, Dr. David Perez-Ginart, Maria Zorrilla, and Fran Yacovone.

THE STRENGTH OF THE
RECOVERY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, July 10, 1991, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE STRENGTH OF THE RECOVERY

The recession which began last July appears to be coming to an end. Modest upturns in housing starts, industrial production, business payrolls, consumer confidence, and the index of leading indicators are all signs that the economy may be turning around. Yet the general view in Washington is that growth after the recession will be sluggish and the burst of activity that came immediately after the other post-World War II recessions will not happen this time.

MAGNITUDE OF RECESSION

When this recession is finally over, it will probably be considered about average for the post-war period. Its 11-month duration to date puts it right in the middle of the 9 post-war recessions, and its real GNP decline of 2.1% is only slightly less than the 2.3% average. Since last July businesses have cut almost 1.5 million workers from the payrolls, roughly the same as the other recessions lasting as long.

The impact of the recession has been uneven, with the Northeast and California suffering the biggest job losses. The hardest-hit industry has been construction, where 1 out of every 10 jobs has been lost. Even service sector and government jobs have declined. At some time during the past year one-fifth of U.S. households had at least one family member unemployed.

OUTLOOK FOR RECOVERY

While many Americans are anticipating a rapid recovery as we come out of the reces-

* 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.

sion, the strong opinion of experts is there will not be robust growth, but more like a long, steady slog. In other post-war recoveries, the economy has typically grown 4-6% in the first year. While some economists are predicting fairly strong growth, driven largely by sectors that fell furthest in the recession, such as housing, autos, and consumer durables, few expect it to approach the post-war average. Most experts look for annual growth rates in the 2.5-3% range.

They cite a number of reasons for a substandard recovery. For consumers, the biggest problem is the debt incurred during the 1980s buying spree. This debt burden, plus declining real incomes, falling home prices in many parts of the country, and the need by many families to save for college expenses and retirement, means that many households will be spending more conservatively. Consumers will not be able to fuel a strong recovery as they did from 1982 to 1990.

The credit crunch and high interest rates are also hurting. Businesses are having difficulty obtaining credit to fund new factories or to buy new equipment as many banks, hurt by bad loans from the 1980s, are tightening up lending. High interest rates on credit cards and personal loans will restrain consumer spending. Mortgage rates are also higher than they should be. And in many cities from coast to coast, a glut of office buildings and shopping centers will depress commercial construction for years to come.

A major bright spot during this recession has been the boom in exports for many U.S. industries. But exports will probably not be as positive a factor in the year ahead. A slowdown in economic growth in many of our trading partners—including recessions in Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia—and a recent rise in the value of the dollar mean that demand for U.S. goods abroad will probably cool off.

Government spending will not provide much help either. The President and the Congress have adopted a hands-off approach to this recession. They are sticking to the budget deal they made last fall and are avoiding stimulative tax cuts or anti-recession spending bills. Budget actions at the state and local level—new taxes, spending cuts, layoffs—will have an unusually negative impact on an economy trying to come out of recession.

There are some bright spots, especially the end of the war in the Persian Gulf, which brought down oil prices and raised consumer confidence. Businesses have also worked off most of their excess inventories; when sales start to rise, businesses will have to increase production and jobs. But most economists do not think these factors are enough to propel the economy to rapid economic growth and strong job creation.

POLICY STEPS

What can be done to strengthen the recovery? First, the Federal Reserve should lower interest rates further. That will spur business investment and consumer spending on big-ticket items. The Fed's caution is apparently to prevent inflation from becoming a problem. But with oil prices down, home prices falling, more than 8 million workers unemployed, and consumer prices now rising at a 1.8% annual rate, inflation should not be the Fed's main concern.

Second, the Congress and the President can speed and strengthen the economic recovery. They should help the jobless until they get back to work. Each month hundreds of thousands of jobless workers exhaust their unemployment benefits. Some of the \$8 billion surplus in the Unemployment Insurance

trust fund should be used to extend benefits until the job market picks up. The federal government should also get back on a schedule of deficit reduction once the recession ends. Less federal borrowing will help reduce interest rates and channel more of the nation's savings into other economic uses.

For the longer run, governments at all levels should invest more. More and better infrastructure—roads, bridges, water and sewer systems, mass transit, airports, harbors—can help make private industry more productive. So can more government attention to research and development and to upgrading our schools. The increase in investment will pay off in the long run through a more productive economy and higher incomes.

CONCLUSION

We need to have a little patience. A recovery is not going to perform miracles. It will not instantly solve every social problem, revive all the depressed regions in the country, or even save badly managed companies. It will gradually reduce unemployment, restore corporate profits, and ease the fiscal squeeze on state and local governments.

My concern is that the nation seems to be in a long-term malaise and that can only be solved with vigorous economic growth. Yet we have been doing poorly in several areas—capital accumulation, investment, research and development, technology transfer, education—that ought to be a major part of a long-term U.S. economic policy. We should not be satisfied with a sluggish economy when this country badly needs vigorous growth.

HEALTH SERVICE ACCESS AND IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. JAMES A. McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 2877, the Health Service Access and Improvement Act, to help bring needed basic services to our inner cities and rural areas and to help health professionals to serve the public where the need is greatest.

In our health care system works well for people who have good insurance and live in areas with plenty of doctors. We have more sophisticated medical technology and highly trained specialists than any other Nation. Yet millions of Americans have inadequate access even to the basic, primary care that saves lives and dollars by preventing disease—prenatal care, immunization, hypertension screening, mammography, preventive dentistry, and other services.

A major reason for this disparity is the fact that America is the world's only industrial democracy without universal health insurance coverage. This is a national disgrace which this Congress and the administration must address. But even if every American had coverage, there would still be major gaps in access to service.

Overall, this country has enough physicians to meet its needs. But we have serious shortages in nursing and serious problems with the distribution of health professionals. Too many medical school graduates go into highly specialized practice, and too few into fields like family medicine, internal medicine, obstetrics-

gynecology, and pediatrics. Additionally, many rural areas have too few people to support even a single physician or clinic, and many urban areas have too few people with adequate insurance to support the network of providers they need.

One reason for these shortages is the high cost of professional education. Unlike other developed countries, we expect most health care professionals to pay for their own training. While student loans are often available, they must be repaid with interest, and educational costs are so high that this repayment can be a serious drain even on a young doctor's income.

The pressure of student loan repayment is one reason so few medical graduates go into primary care—a decline from 39 to 23 percent in the last 10 years. Four out of five medical students graduate with indebtedness averaging \$46,000; 1 in 20 owes over \$100,000. Debts are even greater for minority graduates. Medical student indebtedness has more than doubled in the past decade. Often these debts are piled on top of amounts already owed for undergraduate education. Lending agencies consider repayment of a \$50,000 debt impossible at an annual income of \$39,000, yet resident stipends at teaching hospitals this year average \$32,000 even 5 years after graduation. Although the dollar amounts are smaller, nurses and physicians' assistants face similar repayment problems.

Congress recognized this problem of indebtedness years ago in establishing the National Health Service Corps, which provides scholarship aid and student loan repayment for health professionals who agree to provide primary care in underserved areas. Just last year, after many years of neglect, the corps was reauthorized and expanded.

But the National Health Service Corps can do only as much as its appropriation levels permit. The domestic expenditure limits we have adopted for the next few years will prevent this program from meeting its full potential. That is why I have introduced the Health Service Access and Improvement Act. It is designed to encourage through the tax system the kind of public service in health care that the corps encourages through direct subsidies.

The act permits a physician, dentist, certified nurse practitioner, certified nurse midwife, or physician's assistant to deduct from his or her taxable income the principal and interest payments on a student loan for professional education. In order to qualify for this deduction, the professional must agree to provide primary care in an underserved area for at least 4 years. The act also allows medical school graduates to complete their postgraduate training before starting to repay their student loans, instead of requiring them to begin repayment after 2 years.

This legislation should help increase the supply of trained providers of primary health care in our underserved rural and urban areas. It is no substitute for the National Health Service Corps, student financial aid, community health centers, and other programs aimed at improving access to primary care. It is certainly no substitute for universal health coverage. But I believe it can make an important difference in the career choices of health

professionals, a difference that will be reflected in the future health of our people.

H.R. 2877: SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

Section 1. Short title: Health Service Access and Improvement Act.

Section 2. Provides for deductibility from taxable income of up to \$10,000 of annual principal and interest payments on debt for professional education of physicians, dentists, certified nurse practitioners, certified nurse midwives, and physicians' assistants who obtain at least 75% of their gross income from primary health services performed for a medically underserved group under an agreement with Secretary of Health and Human Services. Agreement must be to perform such service for at least four years; tax deductibility is limited to seven years of services under agreement. Defined "medically underserved groups" as those included in health professional shortage areas under the National Health Service Corps Act, Medicaid patients, jail and prison inmates, and patients of community and migrant health centers, McKinney Act services to the homeless, public housing residents, federally qualified health centers, Title X family planning clinics, Department of Veterans Affairs facilities, Indian Health Service funded facilities, and states mental hospitals. Provides for recapture of taxes if the taxpayer defaults on the agreement. Takes effect in 1993 taxable year.

Section 3. Extends the period of deferment on repayment of guaranteed and federally insured "Stafford" and "Perkins" loans from the current two years until the completion of accredited internship or residency programs.

H.R. 2877

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Health Service Access and Improvement Act".

SEC. 2. DEDUCTION FOR INTEREST AND PRINCIPAL PAYMENTS UNDER CERTAIN EDUCATION LOANS BY INDIVIDUALS PERFORMING CERTAIN SERVICES.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by redesignating section 220 as section 221 and by inserting after section 219 the following new section:

"SEC. 220. MEDICAL OR DENTAL EDUCATION LOAN REPAYMENTS BY CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of an individual performing qualified services for any month during the taxable year, there shall be allowed as a deduction an amount equal to the interest and principal payments made by such individual during such taxable year under a qualified health education loan of such individual.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount allowed as a deduction under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed \$10,000.

"(2) SPECIAL RULE WHERE SERVICES PERFORMED FOR PART OF YEAR.—If an individual performs qualified services for 1 or more months in the taxable year but not for all months in such year, the limitation of paragraph (1) shall be the amount determined by multiplying \$10,000 by a fraction—

"(A) the numerator of which is the number of months in the taxable year for which the individual performed such services, and

"(B) the denominator of which is 12.

"(3) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the limitations of this subsection shall be applied separately with respect to each spouse.

"(c) QUALIFIED HEALTH EDUCATION LOAN.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified health education loan' means any indebtedness incurred to pay qualified educational expenses which are paid or incurred within a reasonable period of time before or after the indebtedness is incurred.

"(2) QUALIFIED EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified educational expenses' means qualified tuition and related expenses of the taxpayer for attendance as a candidate for a degree as a qualified health professional at an educational institution described in section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii).

"(B) QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—The term 'qualified tuition and related expenses' has the meaning given such term by section 117(b)(2); except that such term shall include reasonable living expenses while away from home.

"(d) QUALIFIED SERVICES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Any individual shall be treated as performing qualified services for any month if such individual is a qualified health professional and if—

"(A) at least 75 percent of such individual's gross income for such month from the performance of services as a qualified health professional is attributable to primary health services which are—

"(i) performed for individuals who are members of a medically underserved group, and

"(ii) performed pursuant to a qualified agreement, and

"(B) such professional has not received any scholarship under the National Health Service Corps Scholarship Program or a loan repayment under the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program (or any predecessor of such Programs).

"(2) PRIMARY HEALTH SERVICES.—The term 'primary health services' means health services regarding family medicine, internal medicine, pediatrics, obstetrics and gynecology, dentistry, or mental health.

"(3) QUALIFIED AGREEMENT.—The term 'qualified agreement' means any agreement with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide professional health services to a medically underserved group specified in such agreement if—

"(A) such agreement contains the conditions described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 338D(b)(1) of the Public Health Service Act,

"(B) such agreement has a term of at least 4 years but not more than 7 years, and

"(C) such agreement contains such other provisions as such Secretary may determine to be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.

Such an agreement shall permit the individual to change the medically underserved group to whom the individual is providing services if such change is approved by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

"(4) QUALIFIED HEALTH PROFESSIONAL.—The term 'qualified health professional' means any physician, dentist, certified nurse midwife, certified nurse practitioner, or physician assistant.

"(e) MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED GROUP.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'medically underserved group' means—

"(A) residents of rural areas, members of rural or urban population groups, or patients of rural or urban medical facilities, that are designated under section 332 of the Public Health Service Act as health professional shortage areas,

"(B) patients who are eligible for services under title XIX of the Social Security Act,

"(C) patients of any facility described in paragraph (2), and

"(D) inmates of any penal institution operated by the Federal Government or by any State or local government.

"(2) RELEVANT FACILITIES.—The facility referred to in paragraph (1)(C) is any facility that—

"(A) provides health or mental health services with funds provided under section 329 of the Public Health Service Act (relating to migrant health centers), section 330 of such Act (relating to community health centers), section 340 of such Act (relating to homeless individuals), section 340A of such Act (relating to residents of public housing), or section 1001 of such Act (relating to family planning),

"(B) is a federally qualified health center, as defined in section 1905(1)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act,

"(C) is a health care facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs,

"(D) provides health or mental health services with funds provided by or through the Indian Health Service, or provided under the Act of November 2, 1921 (commonly known as the Snyder Act), or

"(E) is a State mental hospital.

"(f) RECAPTURE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If during any taxable year an individual ceases to perform services as required in any qualified agreement—

"(A) no deduction shall be allowed under this section to such individual for such taxable year, and

"(B) such individual's tax under this chapter for such taxable year shall be increased by the recapture amount determined under paragraph (2).

"(2) RECAPTURE AMOUNT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the recapture amount is an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) the aggregate increase in the taxpayer's liability for tax under this chapter for all prior taxable years which would have resulted if no deduction had been allowed under this section, plus

"(B) interest at the overpayment rate established under section 6621 on the amount determined under subparagraph (A) for each prior taxable year for the period beginning on the due date (determined without regard to extensions) for filing the return of the tax imposed by this chapter for the prior taxable year involved.

No deduction shall be allowed under this chapter for interest described in subparagraph (B).

"(3) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply if the cessation is on account of—

"(i) the death of the individual,

"(ii) the individual's inability to perform services by reason of any physical or mental condition, or

"(iii) any furlough, reduction-in-force, or other circumstance not within the control of the individual.

"(B) MEMBERS OF RESERVES.—If an individual who is a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces is called to active duty while performing services pursuant to a qualified agreement, such individual shall be treated as continuing to perform qualified services pursuant to such agreement while

on active duty pursuant to such call. The preceding sentence shall apply only if such professional commences to perform qualified services pursuant to such agreement upon completion of such active duty.

"(4) SPECIAL RULE.—Any increase in tax under paragraph (1) shall not be taken into account in determining the amount of any credit allowable under this chapter or the amount of the minimum tax imposed by section 55.

"(5) LIABILITY FOR RECAPTURE MAY NOT BE DISCHARGED.—An individual's liability for any increase in tax under paragraph (1) may not be discharged in any proceeding under title 11, United States Code.

"(g) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 163(h).—No deduction shall be allowed under this section for any interest otherwise allowable as a deduction under this chapter, and nothing in section 163(h) shall be construed to disallow any deduction under this section."

"(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to section 220 and inserting the following:

"Sec. 220. Medical or dental education loan repayments by certain individuals.

"Sec. 221. Cross references."

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1992.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF STUDENT LOAN DEFERMENTS.

"(a) STAFFORD LOANS.—

"(1) GSL LOANS.—Section 428(b)(1)(M)(vii) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1078(b)(1)(M)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", except that the two-year limitation of this clause shall not apply in the case of a borrower serving in an accredited internship or residency program".

"(2) FISL LOANS.—Section 427(a)(2)(C)(vii) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1077(a)(2)(C)(vii)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", except that the two-year limitation of this clause shall not apply in the case of a borrower serving in an accredited internship or residency program".

"(b) PERKINS LOANS.—Section 464(c)(2)(A)(vi) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1087dd(c)(2)(A)(vi)), is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", except that the two-year limitation of this clause shall not apply in the case of a borrower serving in an accredited internship or residency program".

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply on and after the date of enactment of this Act with respect to loans made under the Higher Education Act of 1965 before, on, or after that date.

THE 110TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COOKMAN UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Cookman United Methodist Church of Philadelphia, PA, on its 110th anniversary.

Cookman United Methodist Church was founded in 1877. At that time, its five members were organized under the North Broad Street Mission with the Reverend John W. Sayers serving as pastor. As they searched for land to build a church for their growing congregation, they worshipped in a temporary meeting place at Addison Hall. On June 20, 1881, the congregation purchased the land on which the church stands today. There they built a chapel and changed the name of the congregation to the Cookman United Methodist Episcopal Church after Alfred Cookman, a prominent pastor of the day.

In June 1988, Cookman became a part of the newly formed North Central Ministry, a cooperative ministry including Cookman, Seventh Street, Memorial Temple, Zoar, and Mount Zion Churches.

Today, Cookman United Methodist Church has 85 members. Its programming includes an active Sunday school, youth groups, basketball programs, policemen's breakfasts, bible study groups, three choirs, United Methodist Women, several committees, and an administrative council. The building provides space for Head Start, a senior citizens' center, a dance class, adult education, and literacy programs.

Through its affiliation with the North Central Ministry and through its full schedule of programs, the Cookman United Methodist Church is truly a pillar of its community, giving guidance and assistance to its neighbors.

In honor of its good work and in celebration of its 110th anniversary, I would like to extend my warmest congratulations to the Cookman United Methodist Church.

TAYLOR HIGH SCHOOL TOPS AT FFA COMPETITION

HON. CRAIG T. JAMES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the talented students of the Future Farmers of America chapter at Taylor High School in Pierson, FL.

Under the direction of its committed and hard working adviser, Jana Register, Taylor's FFA chapter earned 35 awards at a recent State competition in Orlando.

According to the DeLand Sun-News, nine students were honored individually for various projects, and two students were State winners. I would like to take this opportunity to honor the winning students and list their awards.

Denise North, agri-science student of the year.

Tara French, agriculture processing.

Shane Cowart, floriculture and placement in agriculture production.

Skeeter Beatty, placement in agriculture and State winner for floriculture.

Ronnie Peterson, floriculture.

Chris Willis, diversified livestock production.

Amy Mew, swine production, and feeder steer awards.

Tom Cowart, swine production.

Austin Yelvington, feeder steer production.

MEDICAL COVERAGE VERSUS COST

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, America's health care system is facing conflicting goals that threaten to tear it apart. On one hand, there is the desire to provide universal health care for the 37 million uninsured in our country. On the other hand, both Federal and State governments, faced with limited resources, must emphasize controlling skyrocketing health care costs. It is estimated that Medicaid costs alone will reach \$200 billion by 1996. Can these two goals be met so that we can provide health care to all Americans without bankrupting local and State governments? The current health care debate has too often focused on an ideal system rather than confronting these conflicting demands. To this point, only the State of Oregon has made the tough choices necessary to solve their health care problems. Oregon's proposal would overhaul the Medicaid program and provide all its citizens with health care coverage. This proposal is sure to make Oregon a testing ground for future health care reform.

Medicaid is a State and federally financed health care program whose eligibility is linked to federally assisted welfare programs, such as Aid to Families With Dependent Children [AFDC] and Supplemental Security Income [SSI]. Furthermore, all pregnant women with incomes up to 133 percent of poverty, and all children up to the age of 6 whose family's income is up to 133 percent of poverty, are also covered by Medicaid. Even with these provisions, only 50 percent of those who live below poverty are covered by the Medicaid program.

Oregon's health care system had left 450,000 people in the State uninsured, and there was a growing consensus that their system needed reform. A State commission was formed to recommend improvements in the Medicaid system. The commission realized that, although basic health care coverage for those below poverty was the goal, the State's budget would not allow universal care to be obtained through increased spending. Their conclusion was that for everyone in the State to have health care coverage, care would have to be rationed.

The tough choices came when determining which procedures would or would not be covered in the new system. A list of 709 procedures, ranked in order of importance, was established. In preparing this list, preventive care and treatment for curable diseases took precedence over expensive medical procedures. For this reason, mammograms will be covered by the new statewide insurance plan, although they were not covered by Medicaid. Of the 709 procedures, the State could provide coverage for 587.

Rationing care in this manner has been criticized as being both inadequate and inhumane. The commission also recognized that their proposal is not ideal. However, they felt it was preferable to allowing 450,000 people to remain uninsured. There will certainly be difficult moments on the individual level when

people are denied treatment. On the other hand, denying one person expensive treatment for a terminal illness may allow 10 women to receive mammograms, or 10 babies to be fully immunized. Choosing between these cases is difficult, but necessary in order to reform our health care system and maximize the value of health care spending.

Critics of this proposal point out that Oregon is providing universal access at the expense of those who already have little to give, namely poor women and children. This could be a reflection of the small political power base that these groups have rather than the best method to improve the Medicaid system. The proposal, though, comes to grips with the fact that health care resources are limited. Our Nation's health care debate must be centered on this principle if we are to accomplish real reform of the current system. If nothing else, Oregon's health-care proposal reminds us that tough choices lie ahead.

MORE R&D MONEY NEEDED

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today we consider three pieces of legislation critical to maintaining America's competitive edge—NSF authorization, the High Performance Computing Act, and the American Technology Pre-eminence Act. I welcome these initiatives, but believe that far more must be done.

America's competitive position in the global economy stands at a critical juncture. For the past decade, the rule has been to shoot for the quick fix, rather than the long-term investment in our human and capital resources. The Reagan and Bush administrations have taken our standing in the global economy for granted, and left our technological leadership by the wayside. The spending policies of the 1980's have left America the world's largest debtor nation. Instead of investment in R&D, capital and human resources, the catalysts of economic growth became junk bonds, leveraged buy-outs and unnecessary defense spending. As a result, the quality of American goods and the productivity of our work force are no longer the world's best.

This body has taken the first steps toward remedying the mistakes of the eighties. In this year's budget, we have taken at least a minor step toward giving education the priority it deserves. Funding for civilian R&D is beginning to recover from the unwarranted cuts it received in the 1980's. The value of job training programs is finally receiving recognition. And legislation such as that we consider today will lead us further in the right direction.

For the National Science Foundation, we authorize 20 percent more funds than last year. With the High-Performance Computing Act, we add a long overdue degree of coordination between the six agencies conducting R&D relating to high-performance computing systems. And the American Technology Pre-eminence Act will assist American industry in carrying successful research into the marketplace. These initiatives are long overdue, and I am pleased to support them.

But we must keep in perspective how little we invest in civilian R&D—today, we authorize a total of just under \$3.5 billion to enhance our competitive position in the world. Yet earlier this year, the House voted to appropriate over \$37 billion to support the R&D activities of the Department of Defense alone, and we are asked to support another \$2.5 billion for Defense-related R&D in the Department of Energy.

Our overwhelming success in the Persian Gulf conflict attests to the need for our military to utilize the best available technology. Yet look at other areas of research. Cancer kills a greater number of Americans than Saddam Hussein ever could. This year we appropriated only \$8.5 billion for the NIH, of that, only \$2 billion for cancer research. We will spend only \$166 million on solar and renewable energy R&D this year, only \$277 on conservation. And last month, we appropriated only \$2.7 billion for the National Science Foundation.

The global marketplace will continue to become more integrated and fiercely competitive, and I welcome today's initiatives. But we spend a far lower percentage of GNP on civilian R&D than do our Western trading partners. And we must encourage the private sector to become more involved. In Japan, industry provides 69 percent of total R&D funds. American industry provides only 51 percent, and defense contracting accounts for nearly one-third of that.

The course we choose at the beginning of this last decade in this century will shape America's role in the next. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation before us today. But let us keep in perspective how much further we have to go.

FOREIGN FIRMS AND THE ARAB BOYCOTT

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to prohibit the awarding of Government contracts to foreign firms that comply with the Arab boycott of Israel. A foreign firm bidding for a contract would have to certify that it does not comply with the boycott. The department or agency awarding a contract would have to determine that a foreign firm does not honor the boycott.

The Arab boycott was imposed in 1948 against Israel and any individual or company which trades or invests in Israel. The boycott isolates Israel and greatly weakens its economy. The boycott is the equivalent of economic warfare against Israel, costing over \$500 million annually in lost commerce.

United States firms who invest in or export to Israel are also at a competitive disadvantage because of the boycott. Just recently over 400 U.S. firms were added to the Arab blacklist. Although U.S. law prohibits compliance with the boycott, most other nations do not have similar laws. There is simply no justification for the Government to do business with a foreign firm that would be in violation of U.S. law if it was headquartered in this country.

It is an outrage that our Arab partners in the war against Iraq continue to impose a boycott against Israel and United States firms that do business with Israel. The United States put its soldiers on the line to protect the sovereignty of the Arab nations and Israel showed patience and restraint during the war. The very businesses that are being discriminated against may well be the same firms that were making products used in the war against Iraq.

The President must, in the aftermath of the war with Iraq, create an international consensus to end the boycott. This legislation will give him additional leverage to use in achieving that objective. In 1990, over \$7 billion was awarded to foreign firms for defense contracts, a large pool of money that should be examined to see whether or not the firms involved comply with the boycott.

An end to the boycott would open trade and investment opportunities to U.S. firms. It would represent an important breakthrough in the Middle East peace process.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

WITHDRAWAL OF SOVIET TROOPS FROM HUNGARY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention today to the recent, long-awaited withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary. As you know, I have been actively involved in efforts to achieve Hungarian sovereignty throughout my years in Congress. The Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation has diligently worked toward liberation since the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, and I have consistently supported their activities.

I would like to extend my sincere congratulations to the Hungarian people. On June 30, 1991, officials of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation; Istvan B. Gereban, copresident; Dr. Andras Pogany, president; and Ilona Maria Gyorik, secretary general; released the following statement regarding Hungary's recent liberation. In the hope of fulfilling the remaining dreams of the Hungarian people, I insert the statement in today's RECORD.

STATEMENT OF HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS' FEDERATION

Today the last goal of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution has been fulfilled. With the withdrawal of Soviet troops and war material from its territory, Hungary regained its sovereignty. Now, with freedom and independence accomplished, the people of Hungary alone assume full responsibility for shaping the future of their country and their own lives.

In this solemn moment of history we pray that the leaders of our native land possess the statesmanship and inspiration to address the overwhelming tasks before them. They must pave the way for prosperity, provide the opportunity for the pursuit of happiness and heal the Hungarian soul wounded by a half century of oppression by foreign ideologies. Separate, but an equally important issue is the need to integrate Hungary with the Euro-Atlantic community thereby

invigorating Hungary's economic well being and ensuring its renewed sovereignty.

The nation's unity in purpose is vital in obtaining these goals. The Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation is hopeful that the spirit of 1956 will fill the minds and hearts of Hungarians providing the will and skill to rebuild the nation to what it always aspired, a nation of common spirit, principles, commitments and cultural tradition, not of blood, birth or creed.

As we celebrate the final victory of our Revolution we pay respect to the memory to those who sacrificed their lives in the struggle for freedom in 1956. We express our gratitude to our friends and supporters in the United States who stood with us in the past 35 years in our plight and pray with them that our common achievement, a liberated, free, sovereign Hungary, will forever survive.

**CARL SCHAFFER NAMED
PRESIDENTIAL "POINT OF LIGHT"**

HON. CRAIG T. JAMES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the President's 492d "Point of Light," Mr. Carl Schaffer of Palm Coast, FL.

A retired salesman, Carl writes regularly for the local newspaper, the Flagler Palm Coast News-Tribune, and is an active member of the Flagler Palm Coast Kiwanis Club.

But, it's Carl's work as a volunteer for Hospice of Volusia and Flagler Counties—a support group for terminally ill patients and their families—that caught the President's eye.

Despite his own complicated medical problems, which cause him to undergo dialysis four times a day, Carl has helped more than 40 terminally ill patients. Often, the people he's trying to help have just a few days left to live. But no matter how desperate the situation, Carl is there to help. His calling is to make those final days as worry-free and comfortable as possible.

Carl is on call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. He's there to listen when patients and their families need him; he's there to offer encouragement and kindness; he's there to run errands or do laundry.

In short, he's a friend. A caring friend.

Carl has firsthand knowledge of how important local hospice programs are to terminally ill patients and their families. In 1989, Carl's wife, Betty, died from cancer. With the help of hospice, Carl cared for his wife at home.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that two comments by Carl in a recent newspaper article sum up this humble man's courage and commitment to his neighbors and friends.

"I have heard people who retire here say, 'There is nothing to do.' There is plenty to do. If possible, get involved in something," Carl said.

He then said, "Since Betty died, this has kept me busy. It doesn't keep my mind completely occupied, but I feel if someone out there is in need of help, we should help. My only regret about this whole thing is Betty isn't here to share it with me. But, maybe she is—who knows?"

Mr. Speaker, please join me in both congratulating and thanking Carl Schaffer for his determination and hard work. We need more like him.

CONGRATULATIONS TO RHODE ISLAND'S SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT CORP. AND THE RHODE ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to congratulate Rhode Island's Solid Waste Management Corp. and the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management for their efforts in earning one of only nine national awards given by the Environmental Protection Agency to honor achievements in recycling. Out of a field of 200 nominees from all over the country, Rhode Island was the only New England winner.

Rhode Island's outstanding recycling program certainly deserves recognition. Designed and implemented 5 years ago, Rhode Island's program is the Nation's first statewide mandatory recycling law. The program has made great strides toward reducing waste levels both at the source and in the waste stream.

The statistics are very impressive. Commercial waste in landfills in Rhode Island has decreased by 24 percent since July 1989, and today almost 15 percent of Rhode Island's residential waste stream is recycled.

The program's source reduction methods have been very successful as well. The methane gas recovered from landfills is used to heat 18,000 homes. And the 2-year-old materials recycling facility is one of the most technically advanced in the country.

Rhode Island should be proud of its demonstrated national leadership in recycling. I encourage other communities across the Nation to look to the Rhode Island model as a base for further efforts to insure a better environment into the future.

YEAR 1891: A SAD DAY FOR NEW ORLEANS

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year I brought to the attention of my colleagues an issue of great importance, the 100th anniversary of a sad day in civil injustice. On March 14, 1891 in the city of New Orleans, there was a brutal murder and lynching of 11 people of Italian descent.

Since I last brought this matter to your attention, many people have expressed interest in this important issue. I would like to thank all of the people who have played a part in bringing this issue of discrimination to the forefront so it will not be forgotten.

I would especially like to thank Joseph Maselli, president of the American-Italian Renaissance Foundation, who has done exceptional work in securing the validity of this episode. Through the years the facts have sometimes been distorted but Joe Maselli has made sure that the truth would not be overlooked. He has published articles on this subject and has provided accurate information allowing us a careful examination in racial and ethnic discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated before, throughout history people have been discriminated against because of their race, religion, color, and political beliefs. By creating an awareness of this episode and seeing the dangers of prejudice, discrimination, and the failure of justice, all Americans will benefit.

Following is a descriptive article provided by Mr. Maselli published in the Italian-American Digest outlining the events that took place on this tragic day in history:

On October 15, 1890, Police Superintendent David C. Hennessey was gunned down by unknown assailants, purportedly identified only as "Dagoes." On the basis of this vague evidence heard by only one man who did not testify during the trial, authorities indiscriminately arrested nineteen Italian Americans. Of the nine brought to trial, none was convicted, yet a violent mob was allowed to storm the jail and shoot, beat to death or otherwise slaughter eleven innocent men.

During the past five years, at least fifty articles, books and various publications have been written on the subject. In most of these attempts to describe the 1890 killing, the facts have been grossly distorted. The consensus of writers have concluded that the New Orleans killing was the beginning of the Mafia in the United States. It is our intention to not only disagree with this, but to reveal who actually killed the chief.

Information: David C. Hennessey, Superintendent of Police, was shot by alleged assassins at midnight of October 15, 1890. His friend, Captain William J. Connors, who found him said he whispered "the dagoes did it." J.C. Roe, a policeman assigned to guard Hennessey's house tried to shoot at the attackers but his revolver jammed—so he ran.

Question: Chief Hennessey died about nine o'clock the next morning, nine hours after he was shot during which he was awake and lucid much of the time. Hennessey said "I'm not going to die—I'm going to get over this. Those people can't kill me." Why didn't he tell reporters, police or friends who shot him?

Conclusion: Chief Hennessey at no time told who shot him because he either did not know or he recognized the assassins as individuals related to Chief of Aids Thomas Devereaux.

Information: The Hennesseys made headlines in October 1881. Mike was charged by Thomas Devereaux, chief of aids, (detectives) with conduct unbecoming an officer. Mike, while drunk had assaulted a man in a house of ill repute. Mike and his cousin, David, went gunning for Devereaux, and on October 13 found him in the brokerage office of John W. Fairfax, where David walked up behind the chief, put a pistol to his head and pulled the trigger. Fatally wounded, Devereaux got off one last shot wounding Mike. The Hennessey cousins were charged with murder, but were acquitted. Mike moved to Galveston, then to Houston, where he was shot to death on September 29, 1886. There were

reports that the killer had been sent from New Orleans.

Question: Why was Mike Hennessey killed?

Conclusion: Revenge for the killing of Chief Thomas Devereaux was the motive behind the killing of the Hennessey cousin.

Information: David C. Hennessey, after the trial, joined Farrells' Harbor Protection Police as a private policeman until Mayor Joseph Shakespeare appointed him superintendent.

Why Major Hearsey, publisher of *Daily States* was extolling the virtues of David Hennessey from October 1890 to April 1891, he must have forgotten two editorials he had written about a decade earlier after the Devereaux shooting. "The fact is patent that neither of the two murderers nor their victims were proper men to hold any position on the police much less the responsible positions they did hold, said one. "The Hennessey's are desperate men and no one can read the story of yesterday's terrible tragedy, conflicting as the reports are, without a conviction that Dave Hennessey is a murderer." "We are astounded that a jury in a Christian and enlightened country would return such a verdict as 'not guilty' in this case," said the other. All the facts proved, beyond question, "that this was a deliberate and bloody assassination."

Question: When David C. Hennessey was killed, only one man claimed "the Dagoes did it"—his friend, William J. Connors, Captain of Boylan Protective Police, a private agency.

Conclusion: Revenge for the killing of Chief Thomas Devereaux was the motive—not the Italians, New Orleans had over a fifty year history of this type of crime.

Information: The combination of chicanery and terrorization called "practical politics" was introduced into New Orleans during the elections of 1842 and 1844. By 1848 the politicians began to use newly arrived immigrants as repeaters and in other forms of illegal voting. After this almost every political campaign in New Orleans was marked with violence. The independent or opposition voter who attempted to register his preference at the polls was threatened. He could expect no aid from the police, for they not only failed to restrain the hoodlums, but often assisted in their acts of terrorization.

EXAMPLES

1854: Policeman Mochlen was stabbed to death while leading a gang of rowdies in an attack on a reform leader.

1854: Chief of Police Steve O'Leary was shot while trying to eject reformers from his office.

1856: Polling places seized by armed men. "Election was disgraced by violence and bloodshed." "Most of the outrages committed by Americans during the 'degeneration' were directed against aliens and citizens of foreign birth." This fact was seldom mentioned in the newspapers.

1858: Crime became so bad, vigilante committees took over. Prostitution, gambling, bars, saloons and every other type of illegal activities flourished due to the police pay off system.

October 29, 1874: Louisiana Governor William P. Kellogg waged a gun battle on Canal Street with a man who was to become publisher of the *Times Democrat*, Edward A. Burke.

October 11, 1881: Chief of Aids, Thomas Devereaux, killed by David C. Hennessey and his cousin, Mike Hennessey, both New Orleans policemen.

December 14, 1883: Three men were killed and eight wounded in a gun battle among

rival politicians which included Sheriff Brewster, Tax Collector Houston and other prominent individuals.

January 12, 1885: Tax Collector James D. Houston, shot to death.

1885: Commissioner of Police Patrick Mealey had two employees who were charged with a stabbing.

1885: Captain A.H. Murphy was killed by policemen John Murphy and Patrick Ford at the bequest of Ford's brother, Thomas, who had been selected by the machine as the next mayor of New Orleans.

January 1, 1888: Patrick Mealey—murdered by special policemen Louis Clare and John Gibson.

Question: Did you notice there were no Italians involved in any of these terrible crimes?

Conclusion: The facts are obvious. The control of the lucrative rackets and other profitable enterprises were the plums for the winners—who cared about the average citizens especially the immigrants? But when a scapegoat was needed, the Italians made an easy target since they could not speak the language, and had difficulty defending themselves. The control of the city could be accomplished and the blame for lawlessness diverted to the Italians.

Information: The public attitude towards Italians on October 18, 1890 was very poor when Mayor Joseph Shakespeare appointed a committee of fifty to aid the police. Shakespeare ordered, "Arrest every Italian you run across. The Grand Jury indicted nineteen Italians, ten as murderers and nine as accessories to the crime.

Ten charged with murder; Peter Natali, Antonio Scaffidi, Charles Triana, Antonio Bagnetto, Manuel Politz (Polizzi), Antonio Marchesi, Pietro Monasterio, Bastian Incardona, Salvador Sunzeri, Loretto Comitez. Nine as accessories before the fact: Asperi Marchesi (fourteen years old), Joseph P. Macheca, James Caruso, Charles Matranga, Rocco Gerachi, Charles Patorno, Frank Romero, John Caruso, Charles Pietza. The Prosecutor was District Attorney Charles H. Luzenberg. On February 16, 1891 nine of the accused were brought to trial before Judge Baker. The defense lawyers were Thomas J. Semmes and Lionel Adams, former district attorney. For some strange reason neither J.C. Roe nor Captain William J. Connors testified during the trial. As the trial wore on it became apparent that the state's case, led by prosecutor Luzenberg, was strictly circumstantial, therefore Judge Baker acquitted two and abandoned the case against one. On March 12, the jury received the case after the four weeks trial and on the 13th acquitted three more and could not reach a decision on the remaining three. Results—nine men cleared out of the nine men brought to trial but the completely innocent men were brought back to Parish Prison because they still faced a conspiracy charge.

On March 14, so-called leading citizens sent out the following notice: "All good citizens are invited to attend a mass meeting on Saturday, March 14 at 10 A.M. at Clay Statue to take steps to remedy the failure of justice in the Hennessey case. Come prepared for action." Then, a mob led by William S. Parkerson and John C. Wickliffe, walked to Parish Prison armed and ready to kill eleven men; seven were shot down in the prison yard and two were shot in the 'dog house.'

Politz and Antonio Bagnetto were hanged on New Orleans streets. These "leading citizens" were responsible for the largest number of innocent men lynched in our country's history. No investigation of the lynching was

ever made and yet history will show that the Italian American economic growth suffered for years. On the other hand, the killers all prospered during this same period. Killed by Vigilantes: Antonio Bagnetto, jury acquitted; Antonio Marchesi, jury acquitted; Joseph Macheca, jury acquitted; Manuel Politz, jury dismissed—could not reach a decision; Antonio Scaffidi, jury dismissed—could not reach a decision; Pietro Monasterio, jury dismissed—could not reach a decision. No Trial—Frank Romero, Loretto Comitez, James Caruso, Charles Triana, Rocco Gerachi.

Question: What was the real reason behind these prominent people taking the law into their own hands?

Conclusion: The control of the waterfront and shipping industry was at stake. Evil and corruption had lived side by side in New Orleans for over 80 years. The real criminals were afraid that hardworking, industrious, honest citizens would begin to influence the majority of the public.

"Nearly nine decades later, the question of whether the accused Sicilians really killed Hennessey still has not been answered. They could have done it, but the prosecution did not prove in their trial that they were guilty. A grand jury tried to find incriminating evidence against the twelve men who served and were forced to take cover in unsupported generalities while it was endeavoring mightily to justify the tragic denouncement.

HIGHER EDUCATION FIELD HEARING IN NORTH CAROLINA

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on June 28 in Raleigh, NC, the House Education and Labor's Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, at my request, held a hearing on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Our distinguished colleagues, TOM SAWYER, TIM ROEMER, and TIM VALENTINE participated in the hearing. I am particularly appreciative of TOM SAWYER's help; he chaired the hearing and added much to it with his insightful comments and questions. I am also grateful to Chairman BILL FORD. Although he could not attend the hearing, he was crucial to its convening, and I appreciate his help and that of his staff.

The hearing focused on a matter of critical importance to this country: The reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Most of the witnesses discussed the tremendous problems low- and moderate-income people face in financing a college education and what the Federal Government can do through title IV of this act, "Student Assistance," to help deserving families and their children. But we also received valuable testimony about other titles of this act: Title VIII, "Cooperative Education"; title II, "Academic Library and Information Technology Enhancement"; and title VI, the "International Education Programs." In all, the hearing helped underscore for me the importance this act has to thousands of students and their families.

The first panel was composed of representatives of community colleges and public universities. On this panel, we heard from Dr.

Larry Monteith, chancellor of North Carolina State University [NCSU]; Mr. Robert W. Scott, president of the North Carolina System of Community Colleges; Dr. Tyronza Richmond, chancellor of North Carolina Central University; Dr. Bruce Howell, president of the Wake Technical Community College; and Dr. Douglas Hunt, special assistant to the chancellor of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill [UNC-CH].

From this panel, we heard about the need to simplify the process for obtaining financial aid and to increase student access to grant moneys. Many of the witnesses on this panel and other panels highlighted the dramatic shift in Federal aid from grants to loans that has taken place in the 1980's, leaving our students with heavy debt and reducing their career options. In the mid-1970's, 76 percent of Federal aid was in the form of grants, 20 percent in loans. By 1987-88, 67 percent of the aid was in the form of loans, 29 percent in the form of grants. All the panelists agreed restoring some balance between grants and loans was of the utmost priority in this reauthorization.

Title II, especially section C, was also cited as critical for area universities. Through this program designed to strengthen library resources, Duke, UNC-CH, and NCSU, have been able to develop a system to share bibliographic information electronically. Students on all three campuses can access materials from what is in essence a combined library, second in size only to Harvard. This network has also led to significant savings for these universities, since certain duplications in the holdings of these libraries can be eliminated.

I was also grateful to see the support from all the panels for my bill, H.R. 394, restoring the tax deductibility of student loan interest and the full tax-exempt status for scholarships and fellowships. Although this bill is not within the purview of the House Education and Labor Committee, it clearly is relevant to student aid policy and of great importance to thousands of families straining to meet education costs.

The second panel focused on private colleges and universities. This panel was composed of Mr. John Henley, president of the N.C. Association of Independent Colleges and Universities; Dr. John Burness, senior vice president of public affairs at Duke University; Dr. Prezell Robinson, president of St. Augustine's College; Dr. Clauston Jenkins, president of St. Mary's College; Dr. Allen Page, dean of undergraduate education of Meredith College; Dr. Talbert Shaw, president of Shaw University; and Dr. James B. Hemby, Jr., president of Barton College.

There were many interesting insights presented by this panel. With regard to student assistance, Dr. Burness presented evidence that roughly 25 percent of the annual increase in tuition at private universities during the 1980's may be attributable to institutions filling the financial gap caused by the Federal Government's shift away from grants to loans. There is indeed, then, a vicious cycle with regard to student financial aid, with the unwillingness to provide an adequate amount of aid leading to even more aid being needed.

President Robinson's testimony detailed a dropout rate of 75 percent among undergraduate students at his college between their freshman and senior years. He attributed

much of this decrease to financial aid problems for students. This provides further evidence of the insufficiency of President Bush's proposal which would cause 400,000 more students from low- and moderate-income families to lose Pell grants.

The increasing importance of nontraditional students to these universities was also discussed. For example, at Shaw University, 40 percent of the students are now nontraditional students; at Meredith College the figure has also risen rapidly. These students face different problems than those faced by a high school graduate moving straight into a 4-year program. Many nontraditional students have children and this raises questions of child care, transportation, and other factors that affect student performance. These demographic changes must be taken into account during the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

Presidents Jenkins and Hemby were particularly helpful in suggesting how student aid programs could be made more accountable and how scarce Federal dollars could be spent more effectively. Our Nation's budget deficit makes this willingness to set clear priorities a necessity during the reauthorization process.

The third panel focused directly on the student aid program. The subcommittee heard from Mr. Matthew Heyd, student body president at UNC-CH; Ms. Hasoni Andrews, a student at NCSU; Mr. James A. Belvin, Jr., director of financial aid at Duke University; Mr. Larry K. Garrison, director of financial aid at Western Piedmont College; Ms. Sherri Avent from the office of student aid at St. Augustine's College; Ms. Eleanor Morris, director of financial aid at UNC-CH; and Mr. Steven Hitchner, director of ECPI Computer Institute.

If anyone doubts the importance of the student assistance programs, I would suggest that they read Hasoni Andrews' testimony. It was moving to me and everyone else in attendance to hear this student's story. She has taken the investment our country has made in her education and made the most of it.

It was also instructive to hear the discussion between Mr. Belvin and Ms. Morris on the proposal to allow certain institutions to make Stafford loans directly to students without third party participation by lenders and guarantee agencies. Ms. Morris argued for the proposal, because in her opinion, it would reduce the cost and complexity of the program. Mr. Belvin argued against it, citing the administrative burden for the university and the potential impact on the Federal Treasury. He also suggested that there were better changes that could be made to the loan program including a limit on third party profits.

Finally, we discussed briefly another shift in student financial assistance in the 1980's: The proportion of loans and grants going to for-profit proprietary schools. The increases are dramatic, the percentage of Stafford loans going to proprietary schools increasing from 6.1 percent in fiscal year 1980 to 30 percent in fiscal year 1988 and the proportion of Pell grants going from 12 to 24 percent. This shift is an area of great concern because while many of these schools address legitimate training needs, some subsist on Federal loan

moneys to an unhealthy degree and have high default rates. This raises serious questions about the optimal mix of aid recipients and the need for accountability in aid programs. I know the House Education and Labor Committee will pay close attention to this issue.

The final panel focused on an issue too often neglected in this country; international education. Witnesses for this panel were Dr. Frank Hart, acting provost for NCSU; Dr. Crauford D. Goodwin, professor in the department of economics at Duke; and Dr. Donald J. Raleigh, office of international relations at UNC-CH.

A number of issues were covered by this panel. It was stressed that the whole campus needs to get involved with international education. Too often, area studies still have 50 or 60 people in the whole college involved, with little impact on or knowledge passed to the rest of the campus.

The panel also highlighted that we have much to gain from interaction with other countries. We can learn from the research being done in other countries, and this is especially important at a time when we are falling behind in basic industries. Giving our researchers the skills to work and learn in foreign labs is of critical importance. As Dr. Goodwin put so convincingly in his statement,

In areas of pure theoretical physics, and areas of applied technology like highway building, electronic chip and automobile design or agriculture, we can no longer count on innovation originating only here. Nor can we count on new ideas from abroad always arriving conveniently in English and in the public domain. The ideas may be imbedded in Korean or Czechoslovakian working papers and may never leave a corporate or government laboratory. It is necessary now increasingly for scientists and engineers in our country to establish close personal collaborations overseas in order simply to gain access to innovation and remain on the frontiers of their fields.

In all, it was a productive hearing. I urge my colleagues to study the transcript of these hearings. I believe that the day we spent in Raleigh can provide valuable guidance as we attempt to keep the doors of educational opportunity open and enhance the contribution of higher education to our Nation's strength.

COMPARING TAX SYSTEMS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, July 3, 1991, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

COMPARING TAX SYSTEMS

While public anger over taxes has lessened since the late 1970s when tax revolts swept the nation, many Americans still believe they are overtaxed. Taxes always seem to be going up on what we earn, what we buy, and what we own. To put the U.S. tax system into perspective, it may be helpful to compare it to what is done in other countries.

OVERALL TAX BURDENS

It may come as a surprise to many, but Americans pay less in overall taxes than peo-

ple in any other major industrial country. Annual government receipts from federal, state, local; and payroll taxes last year in the U.S. totalled 32.6% of gross domestic product (GDP). By contrast, the tax burden was 35% of GDP in Japan, 39% in Britain, 42% in Germany, and 48% in France. The tax leader was Sweden, where taxes continue to exceed half of the country's domestic output.

Over the past two decades U.S. taxes have basically remained around 30-32% of GDP. Yet over the same period taxes in many other countries moved up quickly. Taxes among the twelve nations of the European Community increased from an average of 31% of GDP in 1970 to more than 40% last year. Japan, whose taxes were around 20% of GDP in 1970, has had the sharpest rise. Since 1987 the U.S. has replaced Japan as the industrialized country with the smallest overall tax burden.

In the U.S. about two thirds of the taxes collected are federal (primarily income taxes and social security payroll taxes) and one third are state and local taxes (primarily sales and property taxes). This is roughly similar to the breakdown elsewhere, though in some countries, especially the Scandinavian countries, a larger share of taxes is collected below the federal level.

SOURCES OF TAX REVENUE

The major industrial countries rely primarily on three sources for the vast majority of their tax revenues: taxes on personal income, social security taxes, and consumption taxes such as sales taxes. Corporate income taxes and property taxes generally play less prominent roles. Yet there are still significant differences in emphasis. Germany and France receive most of their revenue through social security taxes. Canada and Sweden rely primarily on personal income taxes. Contrary to popular perceptions, Japan puts a much higher emphasis on corporate income taxes than other countries. For example, Japan gets almost three times more of its revenue from corporate income taxes than the U.S. does. The United States relies primarily on personal income taxes as its main source of revenue, with social security taxes a close second.

The biggest difference between the U.S. tax system and those of other countries is their much greater reliance on consumption taxes. In the U.S., federal excise taxes on gasoline, alcohol, and tobacco plus state and local sales taxes account for 15% of our total revenue. Consumption taxes in other countries typically account for twice that. A widely used consumption tax overseas, especially in Europe, is the value-added tax (VAT). It is a sales tax collected from companies at each stage of the production of goods and services. The adoption of a VAT by Japan in 1989 leaves the U.S. as one of the few major economies without one.

OTHER COMPARISONS

The U.S. has the lowest personal income tax rate of the major industrial countries. The maximum personal tax rate for upper-income Americans has dropped from 70% in 1981 to 31% today. The top personal rate in Germany is 53%, while in Japan it is 50%. The U.S. has one of the lowest top corporate tax rates, now 34%. Only a handful of countries have top corporate rates lower than 40%. Many countries are following the lead of the U.S. in lowering tax rates in order to reduce the distorting effects of the tax code on decisionmaking and to reduce the use of tax shelters.

Although many Americans find our income tax system incomprehensible, it is less con-

voluted than those in many other countries, especially after passage of the 1986 Tax Reform Act. Japan's system for taxing capital gains, for example, is extremely complicated.

One measure of tax fairness is progressivity—the extent to which wealthier people shoulder proportionately more of the tax burden. The U.S. tax system is considered to be slightly progressive overall. Many European systems are generally considered to be more progressive.

Various provisions in the U.S. income tax code differ significantly from those of other countries. Our largest tax deduction, for home mortgages, is more generous than in other countries. For example, Canada has no mortgage interest deduction and homeowners in the United Kingdom can deduct interest on only the first \$57,000 of their mortgages, compared to \$1 million in the U.S. Although the tax treatment of capital gains differs widely, they are generally taxed more heavily in the U.S. than in Japan and Germany. Unlike the U.S., many countries tax employer-paid fringe benefits such as medical insurance, and most take steps to avoid our practice of taxing dividends twice, both at the corporate level and in the hands of the shareholders.

CONCLUSION

Although Americans pay less in taxes than their counterparts overseas, that does not mean the U.S. should raise taxes. The average American claims, with considerable justification, that taxes should not be increased until current tax dollars are used more efficiently and effectively. But it does mean that arguments to the effect that modest increases in U.S. taxes will undermine American competitiveness may at times be overstated. This is increasingly recognized abroad. As other countries compare their level of taxation to ours, they are skeptical when we say we cannot raise taxes to narrow our budget deficit or to pay for programs to meet important needs at home and abroad.

And as for the overall structure of our tax system, while it certainly has flaws, it is increasingly being modelled by other countries. Few U.S. tax experts would trade our system for any other.

THE AMERICAN JOBS AND MANUFACTURING PRESERVATION ACT OF 1991

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman OBEY of Wisconsin and I are introducing the American Jobs and Manufacturing Preservation Act of 1991 to remove perverse Federal tax incentives that encourage U.S. companies to shut down manufacturing plants and other operations in the United States and to supply the U.S. market from abroad.

Over the past decade, thousands of U.S. workers have lost jobs with companies that have relocated their plants abroad only to manufacture similar, if not identical, products for sale in the U.S. market. Domestic businesses that have remained to manufacture goods for sale in the U.S. market can't compete with multinational companies who gen-

erally enjoy the lucrative benefit of U.S. tax deferral on its foreign subsidiary's income until it makes a dividend payment to the U.S. parent company.

Specifically, our bill removes the tax deferral that exists for certain income arising from runaway manufacturing plants controlled by a U.S. parent corporation. Identical legislation was passed by the House of Representatives in 1987, but was dropped in conference with the Senate.

In my judgment, it's patently unfair that our tax laws continue to shortchange both American workers and producers. We ought to reconsider a Federal Tax Code that pays our best and strongest companies to locate overseas. In 1987, the Joint Tax Committee estimated the tax deferral benefit provided to U.S. companies that locate overseas, but manufacture for sale in the U.S. market, to be about \$600 million over 3 years. It's no wonder U.S. companies go abroad to produce goods for U.S. consumption when we offer tax deferral that makes it more advantageous for them to operate abroad. This is especially true when foreign countries entice them with low tax rates or labor costs.

In this respect, the Federal Tax Code's deferral provisions fly in exactly the opposite direction of the incentives we ought to be providing. We ought to encourage more companies to invest in the strength of this country, the American worker, by repealing these incentives for moving abroad. Yet, current tax policy helps to accelerate the exodus of domestic plants and jobs to foreign countries.

This legislation pulls the plug on misguided U.S. tax deferral provisions by imposing U.S. taxes currently on the income that arises from a U.S. controlled plant that manufactures and sells a product to be used or consumed in the United States. The legislation does not prevent U.S. firms from being competitive with foreign firms that produce goods for foreign markets. But, we just think that it's unfair that American workers, who've been the backbone of our Nation's economy, are losing thousands of jobs every year as companies shutdown U.S. operations to seek greater profits by supplying the U.S. market from overseas.

It's time that Congress acted to protect the American worker and American economy from the greed of many companies who would dislocate thousands of workers in America in search for greater profits abroad. At a minimum, we must stop participating in the out-migration of American businesses by refusing to pick up the tab for the move. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation to help protect America's economic future.

A detailed explanation of the bill follows:

The bill imposes current tax on U.S. shareholders of a controlled foreign corporation to the extent of the corporation's "imported property income." The bill also adds a new separate foreign tax credit limitation for imported property income, whether earned by a controlled foreign corporation or directly by a U.S. taxpayer.

Imported property income means income (whether in the form of profits, commissions, fees, or otherwise) derived in connection with manufacturing, producing, growing, or extracting imported property; the sale, exchange, or other disposition of imported property; or the lease, rental or licensing of imported property. Imported property in-

come does not include any foreign oil and gas extraction income or an foreign oil-related income.

The bill defines "imported property" as property which is imported into the United States by the controlled foreign corporation or a related person. It also includes any property imported into the United States by an unrelated person if, when the property was sold to the unrelated person by the controlled foreign corporation (or a related person), it reasonable to expect that the property would be imported into the United States or that the property would be used as a component in other property which would be imported into the U.S. The Treasury Department would provide guidance concerning whether it is reasonable to expect that property sold to an unrelated person will be imported into the United States. Imported property does not include any property which is imported into the United States and which, before substantial use in the United States, is sold, leased, or rented by the controlled foreign corporation or a related person for direct use, consumption, or disposition outside the U.S., or is used by the CFC or a related person as a component of other property which is sold, leased, or rented.

The term "import" means entering into, or withdrawal from the warehouse, for consumption or use. The term "import" for this purpose generally includes licensing or any grant to use marketing or manufacturing intangibles in the United States. For example, assume that a CFC produces a film in a foreign country. The CFC licenses that film to unrelated U.S. persons for viewing in the United States. Assume that the royalty payment is not subject to Subpart F under current tax law because it's derived in the conduct of an active trade or business and it is received from a person other than a related person. Under the bill, the income of the CFC that is attributable to the royalty is subject to current tax under Subpart F as imported property income; for foreign tax credit purposes, that subpart F inclusion is U.S. source income.

The term "import" doesn't include foreign currency, securities, or other financial instruments.

Under the look-through rules of the foreign tax credit limitation, interest, rents, and royalties from a CFC in which the recipient (or in certain cases, a related party) is a 10 percent owner are to be treated as imported property income to the extent properly allocable to imported property income of the CFC. Thus, foreign taxes imposed on other income could not offset U.S. tax on this income.

In the case of income that would both foreign base company sales income and imported property income, that income is to be treated as imported property income.

In the application of subpart F to imported property income, various exceptions obtain. For example, assume that a CFC derives imported property income that's taxed by a foreign country at an effective rate greater than 90 percent of the maximum U.S. rate, and its U.S. shareholders elects the high tax kickout (section 954(b)(4)) from subpart F treatment. Subsequently, distributed dividends from the CFC will be treated as imported property income on a pro rata basis.

These provisions apply to taxable years for CFCs beginning after December 1991 and to U.S. shareholders within which such taxable years of such CFCs ends. In the case of imported property income earned by a U.S. person directly, the amendments apply to taxable years beginning after December 1991.

THE FHA ENERGY EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES ACT

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, most of the attention in the debate over national energy policy has centered primarily on macro issues such as whether to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and sensitive coastal areas to exploration and leasing, and whether and how to promote greater use of nuclear power. What has received less attention are the broad range of policies that should be implemented as part of a comprehensive strategy to promote energy conservation and the use of renewable forms of energy. Many of these policies involve giving people incentives to reduce the amount of energy they use, and they can be easily and inexpensively implemented by the Federal Government.

Today I am introducing legislation that would lead to substantial energy conservation simply by making a minor change in an important Federal program. This legislation, which is entitled the "FHA Energy Efficiency Incentives Act of 1991," would give a boost to a program currently underway in the Federal Housing Administration [FHA] that allows better income-to-loan ratios on FHA-backed mortgages to homeowners who purchase newly constructed energy efficient homes. FHA started this policy on its own, but they commit no funds to the program. As a result, FHA's local offices, mortgage bankers, and real estate agents barely are aware of its existence. My legislation would give the program a legislative mandate by codifying the FHA policy and extending it to existing homes in which energy conservation improvements have been made, or in which the mortgagor commits to making such improvements.

The FHA currently insures over 700,000 mortgages, which amounts to 5.6 percent of the Nation's housing units. In addition, residential sector energy use accounts for 21 percent of our overall energy use. Hence, any serious effort to conserve energy must include the residential sector, and it makes common sense to use one of our foremost mortgage assistance programs to provide energy efficiency incentives to homeowners.

Specifically, the FHA Energy Efficiency Incentives Act would do the following:

Mandate FHA to allow those whose homes meet certain energy efficiency qualifications to take on larger monthly mortgage payments. Currently, FHA sets a maximum allowable mortgage-to-income ratio for prospective mortgagors. The rationale is that those who live in energy efficient homes pay less money per month for energy, and can therefore afford larger mortgage payments.

Direct HUD to come up with energy efficiency standards for homes to determine who qualifies under the act.

Set aside \$1 million initially, and then \$250,000 per year, to require FHA to come up with booklets and other informational devices to encourage homeowners to take advantage of the program and to educate mortgage bankers and real estate agents about the program.

Require lenders to give written notice of the program to all potential mortgagees.

Require FHA to report to Congress annually on the results of the program.

The Electric Power Research Institute recently estimated that efficiency measures installed in the residential sector could cut energy consumption by the year 2000 by 289 to 484 billion kilowatt-hours. If just half of the homes using FHA-backed mortgages took advantage of the FHA incentives, we could realistically expect to save between 3,000 and 5,000 megawatts per year, roughly the equivalent of three to five nuclear power plants.

My legislation has the added benefit of providing relief to first-time homebuyers. In the first quarter of 1990, over 80 percent of all first-time homebuyers relied on FHA mortgages. The inflated price of homes, especially in the Northeast, is a major impediment to buying a home, as down-payment costs can be exorbitant. The main attraction of an FHA-backed mortgage is that it requires a smaller down payment, which allows low-income residents to afford more expensive homes. My legislation would accomplish the same goal by allowing higher monthly mortgage payments. In effect, lower income residents would qualify for more expensive homes if those homes are energy efficient.

The FHA Energy Efficiency Incentives Act provides a simple mechanism for saving energy and making expensive homes more affordable, and I urge the support of my colleagues for this sensible and significant measure. I also wish to submit the following letter of support for this legislation from the Solar Energy Industries Association, with whom I worked closely in preparing this legislation.

SOLAR ENERGY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,

Washington, DC, July 9, 1991.

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TORRICELLI: The Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA), the national trade organization of the photovoltaic and solar thermal manufacturers and component suppliers, strongly supports your initiative to require FHA financing to notify homeowners of the potential for solar water heating as well as other "high value" conservation applications in enabling them to better qualify for financing.

While FHA has supported the concept of solar and energy efficiency as a way to lower the maintenance costs of housing and therefore open more disposable income for the mortgage, FHA has not been aggressive in promoting solar and energy efficiency applications as a tool for housing affordability.

The U.S. solar industry applauds your efforts. While the U.S. has solar water heating in 1.2 million buildings nationwide, the City of Tokyo alone has 1.5 million buildings with solar water heating. If the U.S. is to maintain competitive in world markets, we must increase the penetration of solar energy in the United States. Solar water heating already displaces 1,366 megawatts of electricity and has the potential to easily save that amount twenty fold. Solar systems are now nationally certified by the non-profit Solar Rating & Certification Corporation (SRCC) in both the manufacturing and installation.

Thank you for not letting the lessons of the Iraqi War slip away. The United States

continues to import over half our energy and these imports constitute one of the single largest components of our national trade deficit.

Sincerely,

SCOTT SKLAR,
Executive Director.

THE ACCESS TO LIFE-SAVING
THERAPIES ACT

HON. TOM CAMPBELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, FDA has traditionally focused on the danger of approving a harmful or useless drug; at the same time it has ignored the risk of delaying approval of a drug with distinctive benefits. The reasons for this unbalanced approach are easy to understand: Persons hurt by a bad drug know it and complain to the media and Congress, while those denied the benefits of a valuable, unapproved drug seldom realize what they have lost.

Consider the history of misoprostol, the first drug to prevent gastric ulcers, an illness that kills 10,000 to 20,000 people each year. Misoprostol was approved in a relatively quick 9½ months—FDA typically takes 2 to 12 years to approve most new drugs; FDA heralded misoprostol as 94 percent effective. The question arises: How many lives were lost while it was being reviewed? Using the above figures, we can estimate that 8,000 to 15,000 lives were lost during FDA's review period. Furthermore, by the time the drug was approved in the United States, it was already available in 43 countries, in some of them 3 years earlier.

All who have worked with bureaucracy know it can be a frustrating experience. But this type of bureaucracy is literally deadly. The problem extends far beyond gastric ulcers to Alzheimer's, AIDS, heart disease, cancer, and other diseases. Recently, FDA denied approval to THA, a drug for Alzheimer's that has helped many people in clinical trials. Sadly, because FDA is not completely satisfied with the efficacy of THA, many who might benefit from it are prevented from doing so. Two drugs for AIDS, ddI and ddC, have shown great promise, and AIDS victims are desperately seeking access to them. Again, although ddI and ddC have passed FDA's toxicity tests, FDA still puts off approval while it deliberates whether or not the drugs are completely effective.

Today, I am introducing the Access to Life-Saving Therapies Act, which would allow individuals who have been diagnosed as having a life-threatening or seriously debilitating illness to gain access to drugs and biologics once they have passed FDA's toxicity tests. Patients would be required to sign a disclosure that fully explains the experimental nature of the drug. Those individuals who wish to use only drugs that have passed all the FDA's tests could do so; but those desperately sick people who wish to adopt a higher degree of responsibility and risk could do so, as well.

Mr. Speaker, AIDS and its opportunistic infections have made the need for expedited ap-

proval critical. Many experts believe that we already have in the pipeline drugs that in wide and combined use can make HIV disease a manageable illness. The chief obstacle to making those drugs available to everyone is a rigid standard of efficacy which requires waiting for certain proof when we already have credible evidence that efficacy is probable. During the time spent assembling proof of efficacy for new AIDS drugs like ddI, ddC, and d4T, drugs which experts now agree are probably effective, tens of thousands of lives and billions of health care dollars will be tragically and unnecessarily lost.

In developing this bill, I have worked with grassroots disease organizations, doctors groups, pharmaceutical companies, and economists. My bill is endorsed by the Cancer Patients Action Alliance, the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, the PATH Foundation—an AIDS research organization—economist Milton Freidman, Citizens for a Sound Economy Chairman James Miller, and the Life Extension Foundation. A number of other groups have expressed support for the goal of expediting drug approval and have pledged to work with me on this issue in the coming months.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this bill is both pragmatic and compassionate: Pragmatic because it will contain health care costs, which we all know is vital; compassionate because it offers greater hope to those individuals and families who desperately seek new medical therapies. I urge the speedy passage of the Access to Life-Saving Therapies Act.

IMPROVE COAL EFFICIENCY, PROTECT ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY

HON. TERRY L. BRUCE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, as Congress develops a responsible domestic energy security policy, it is important that we protect energy and environmental security here, and develop methods we can export to help other countries do the same abroad. The Clean Coal Technology Efficiency Improvement Act of 1991, which I am introducing today along with a number of my colleagues, helps accomplish that mandate.

While most Americans believe that crude oil is the world's most abundant fossil fuel, it is coal which actually holds that distinction. In the United States, coal accounts for approximately 90 percent of all recoverable reserves of fossil fuels, making coal use a necessary component of any domestic energy security plan. Coal use helps protect the Nation's energy security.

Unfortunately, only 33 percent of the energy contained in coal currently leaves power plants as electricity in the United States. In the Middle East, Africa, Eastern Europe, and China, efficiency levels often drop well below 25 percent. With global electricity needs expected to increase by 70 percent in the next two decades, the efficient use of coal must be a national and global priority.

While global warming theories are still speculative, the ability to use our resources more efficiently provides us with the readiness to continue using our most abundant domestic fuel, and with a critical global warming insurance policy. Efficient clean coal use helps protect the Nation's environmental security.

While unilateral efforts to combat global warming would be ineffective, it is possible that worldwide agreements could be reached which require reductions in greenhouse gases. Goals without the tools to accomplish them would be meaningless, however. The Clean Coal Technology Efficiency Improvement Act adds two rounds to the Nation's \$2.5 billion investment in clean coal use to focus almost entirely on efficiency improvements.

The bill establishes a Clean Coal Technology Export Coordinating Council charged with aiding in the export of efficient clean coal technologies developed in the United States. In addition, it authorizes a Clean Coal and Renewable Energy Technology Transfer Program to encourage the use of U.S.-developed clean coal and renewable energy projects in other countries. Exports of efficient clean coal technologies help foreign governments protect their energy and environmental security, while providing jobs at home.

The Clean Coal Technology Efficiency Improvement Act makes sense for the economy and the environment. It is worthy of strong support.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE
CENTRALIA ORPHANS

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to the winningest basketball team in the Nation. The Centralia High School Orphans have a long and prestigious career in southern Illinois. Since the tipoff of the first Orphans game in 1906, the team has compiled 1,668 career victories, more than any high school or college in the Nation.

Although the Orphans freshman season in 1906-7 consisted of only four games, it would be the start of what was to become a southern Illinois basketball dynasty. In 1915 this powerhouse team was coached by the legendary Arthur Trout. He called the plays for the Orphans until 1951. During his time on the bench he led the Orphans to 809 victories, including State championships in 1918, 1922, and 1942. It was also during the era of Coach Trout that the Orphans had their most victorious season. In 1941 the Orphans won 44 games while losing only two. Unfortunately they were shot down during their bid for the State championship.

The Orphan pride at C.H.S. is truly something to behold. The community support that is given to the young men who have played for the Orphans is unprecedented. An Orphan fan is like no other; "Orfans" are among the most dedicated and innovative anyone has ever seen. Orfans are not only the cheerleaders or the students who sit in what is fondly known as the Orphanage but the parents, the towns-

people, and the C.H.S. faculty all get caught up in orphanmania.

Throughout the years the Orphans have dedicated their efforts to the pursuit of excellence. The only way to achieve perfection is through dedication and the Orphans have always persisted in the endeavor to be true champions.

A fine coach, Bob Bogle, is now pacing the sidelines for the Orphans. He and the team are determined to improve upon their historic achievements. I have no doubt that they will realize this goal and continue to make opponents fearful of meeting in the center jump circle.

These exceptional young people are a shining example for all to follow and I am proud to be able to represent them in Congress.

25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in order to commemorate the 25th anniversary of Metropolitan Archbishop Philip Saliba as primate of the Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America.

In August 1966, Archbishop Philip was elected to shepherd the Antiochian Archdiocese and since then, he has time and time again, exhibited visionary leadership.

Philip Saliba was born into a traditional Orthodox Christian family in Abou Mizan, Lebanon in June 1931. Following a traditional education, at the age of 14, he was accepted into the Balamand Orthodox Seminary in Tripoli, Lebanon, and later graduated from the Orthodox secondary school and Assiyeh Orthodox College in Damascus, Syria. In 1949, at the tender age of 18, he was ordained as a deacon and assigned to the Antiochian Orthodox spiritual leader, Patriarch Alexander III. In September, 1953, Deacon Philip enrolled at the Kelham Theological School in Nottinghamshire, England, and in September 1954, he began theological studies at the University of London.

Philip Saliba's experiences during these still-impressionable years made a profound impact in shaping what became Philip's priorities as a priest and then as prelate: The need to cultivate and ensure integrity among the church hierarchy, the strengthening of orthodox theological training focusing on the importance of orthodox youth education, and providing security for the clergy and their families.

In 1956 Philip arrived in the United States to study at Holy Cross Orthodox Seminary in Brookline, MA, and was subsequently assigned to St. George Orthodox Church in Detroit, MI. On March 1, 1959, Philip Saliba was ordained an orthodox priest receiving his first pastoral assignment at St. George Church in Cleveland, OH. As the years progressed, Father Philip continued to study orthodox earning a masters in divinity studies from S. Vladimir's Seminary in Crestwood, NY in June 1965.

In 1966, after the death of the Archbishop of the Antiochian Archdiocese, Father Philip was

nominated and then elected to fulfill this distinguished post. The new 35-year-old archbishop was now able to embark upon the objectives—theological, humanitarian, and administrative—that had always driven him to serve both the church and those around him.

In his 25 years as Archbishop, Philip Saliba's numerous accomplishments reflect the priorities he had established for himself so long ago. His Eminence achieved the first measure of orthodox unity in the United States by merging his Antiochian Archdiocese with the only other Antiochian jurisdiction in the United States. In the early 1970's, Archbishop Philip organized and established the first archdiocese-wide woman's organization, and appointed the first woman to the archdiocese board of trustees.

In 1975, Archbishop Philip founded the philanthropic organization, the Order of St. Ignatius of Antioch, whose membership now exceeds 1,000 members and has donated over \$5 million to the archdiocese and humanitarian projects around the world. In addition, the Food for Hungry People Program, instituted in 1975, has donated over \$1 million to needy organizations and individuals the world over, without regard to race, creed, or nationality. In 1978, the archbishop directed the purchase and subsequent development of the 300-acre Antiochian Village, a summer camp and educational center in Ligonier, PA.

Archbishop Philip has been very involved in the search for peace in Lebanon and the Middle East in general. The archbishop constantly meets with other Christians, Jews, and Moslems seeking formulae for political solutions to these most difficult questions. Archbishop Philip has met with Presidents Reagan and Bush, State Department officials and leaders of other countries, among others in hopes of seeking the way of a peaceful solution.

Archbishop Philip's arduous work has been awarded with many commendations and medals, among which are the Order of Cedars from the Lebanese Government and the Cross of Lebanon from the Lebanese Antiochian Archdiocese. He has been bestowed with honorary doctorates from his alma maters, Wayne State University and the S. Vladimir's Seminary. As impressive as each of these are, his most cherished honor was receiving the "Liberty Award" presented to him by Mayor Edward Koch of New York City in conjunction with the 100th anniversary of the Statue of Liberty; Archbishop Philip was one of only a few Americans to receive this honor.

On the eve of Archbishop Philip Saliba's 25th anniversary as primate of the Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America, I congratulate him for his work as a theologian and humanitarian and as a fine example to all who choose and are proud to be Americans.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN J. WELLMAN

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity today to pay tribute to John H.

Wellman of Ashland, KY., who died May 27 at King's Daughters' Medical Center in Ashland at the age of 77.

John Wellman has a long and distinguished career as an employee of the Kentucky National Guard for 39 years. He was a life member of the Enlisted Association of National Guard of Kentucky, and served as a member of the U.S. Army during World War II. In fact, his son Adj. Gen. Billy G. Wellman is a past commander of the Kentucky National Guard.

John Wellman was a pillar in his community, serving as a member of the Poage Masonic Lodge 325; El Hasa Shrine; Apperson Chapter 81, R.A.M.; Everett Council 65, R.&S.M.; Ashland Commandry 28; and and Knights Templar.

In addition to his lovely wife, Hazel Justice Wellman, John Wellman is survived by three sons. Billy G. Wellman of Lawrenceburg, KY.; Charles J. Wellman of Flatwoods, KY; and Donald R. Wellman of Melbourne, FL.

My wife Carol and I extend to the family of John Wellman, a highly admired eastern Kentuckian, our sympathy.

THANKS TO JIM BACKLIN

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago this Nation had the honor and privilege of recognizing all those young men and women who served in the military during the Persian Gulf war. The national victory parade in Washington, DC, was the largest military event honoring the Armed Forces since World War II and it was a great success.

But I would just like to take a moment to personally thank a Hill staffer, James P. Backlin, with the Republican Study Committee, for his behind-the-scenes work on the victory parade. All too often we forget to mention those people who aren't in the spotlight, but are very much deserving of our appreciation.

This West Point graduate and Vietnam war veteran had a vision that he shared with me way back in February, a vision for a national event that would celebrate the return of our soldiers who risked their lives in the Persian Gulf for the United States of America, and an event that, at the same time, might heal some of the wounds from the Vietnam and Korean wars by providing recognition for their efforts.

Jim was a vital force in organizing bipartisan congressional efforts to see this vision become a reality. As a result, 800,000 people from the Washington metropolitan area were able to participate in a very special weekend. We were able to thank our gulf war heroes and enjoy the national excitement that comes from a great victory such as that experienced by America in the Persian Gulf.

Thank you Jim, for your vision and hard work. It was appreciated.

EVOLVING POLISH ECONOMY

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, in April, I was able to travel with a delegation from Toledo, OH to Poznan, Poland, the sister city to Toledo. During our visit, I observed the evolving Polish economy. I put these thoughts on paper to the U.S. Ambassador to Poland, the Honorable Thomas Simons, and received a detailed reply to my impressions. I thought my letter to Ambassador Simons and his subsequent reply would be of interest to my colleagues.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 26, 1991.

Hon. THOMAS SIMONS,
U.S. Ambassador, American Embassy—Warsaw,
New York, NY.

MY DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR AND YOUR CAPABLE AND GRACIOUS WIFE PEGGY: Please let me first extend my sincere appreciation for the extraordinary hospitality and diplomatic efforts you extended, along with Peggy and the Embassy staff, to accommodate the visit of our large delegation from Toledo, Ohio. I hope you and your staff will feel welcome in my Washington office on any of your subsequent visits back to the States.

Know also that Poznan Principal Officer Christian Kennedy and Public Affairs Officer Tom Carmichael arranged a fine itinerary for us and met fully all our requests. I consider it fortunate to have two such capable diplomats working with us in Poznan on this endeavor. I also wish to report back to you on my impressions of the evolving Polish state economy, especially as we observed it in the Poznan/Wielkopolskiego region. Though my observations certainly cannot compare to those of your staff who experience it daily, nonetheless you may find these comments useful.

SISTER CITIES RELATIONSHIP

Officially, our delegation—with great pomp—signed a Toledo-Poznan Sister City relationship on April 4 in the Poznan City Hall. President (Mayor) Wojciech Kaczmarek signed on behalf of Poznan. Our intention is now to develop this relationship far beyond a "goblet to goblet" exchange. The Mayor of Poznan as well as Executive Committee member Andrzej Porawski, are scheduled to visit the U.S. for the first time this summer. We intend to augment their visit with as much technical training in various areas as we become aware of through the Poznan Consulate working along with Sister Cities International.

The range of initial requests to our community in Ohio were diverse and quite substantial. Our community is now in the process of developing an agreement with Poznan by mid-summer that formalizes the broad array of possible co-ventures, including high school and university exchanges, technical and economic assistance, municipal internships, business, religious and cultural proposals that were suggested in dozens of meetings. We will work with the Poznan Consulate and Sister Cities International to identify achievable projects. When Sister Cities may not be an appropriate funding source to carry out the designated project, our community will identify other avenues to accomplish the outlined tasks.

To name just a very few of the requests—joint venture investments in several businesses, including the Antoninek Glass Fac-

tory and, of course, a wide array of proposals for helping Polish agriculture and food processing in the northwest region; the Chief of Police of Poznan has asked for police training exchanges; the Director of the Poznan Museum wishes to plan an exhibition of Polish modernists at the Toledo Museum of Art; journalists requested practical training through radio and television exchanges. Agriculture remains a key priority for the Poznan region and for us stateside, as food processing and agriculture are Ohio's biggest businesses. I have asked the Consulate to help us prioritize and outline the Poznan region's requests by mid-year. Mr. Andrew Golebiowski from Sister Cities International will assist in these efforts. Again, we are very lucky to have someone of his caliber on the team.

I would also like to bring to your attention the fact that several U.S. cities now have Sister City relationships with Polish communities. For those relationships that are truly "active," and can bear fruit, I would like to recommend that on your next visit to Washington you might jointly brief the respective Members of Congress from those communities over breakfast. You could suggest additional, direct ways our communities might be able to cooperate and more fully impact the Polish situation. Perhaps including the Polish Ambassador to the U.S. in the meeting might be useful. I would certainly welcome such an opportunity and know other Members of Congress who would as well.

ECONOMY: ONE, TRADE LAWS AND PRIVATIZATION

This was my fourth visit to Poland over a period of 15 years. I was favorably struck by the number of new, privatized shops and houses that are popping up like mushrooms everywhere. The goods are diverse and abundant, but of course too high-priced for most Poles. The contrast between a small, growing wealthy class and everyone else was apparent.

I also developed an uneasy concern that Poland is being glutted by a wave of imports, many times snuffing out nascent Polish businesses that have not yet had a chance to "get off the ground." Example: I purchased a brightly packaged box of apricot juice: origin—Debrecen, Hungary. There is no reason why such a product should not be manufactured in Poland. I became increasingly concerned about Poland's likely external trade deficit. As I travelled around, I wondered whether trade laws in Poland are being developed in conjunction with the economic reforms to help give the local market some short-term breathing space in key industries. The process of transforming inefficient industries to productive ones is one with which even the U.S. has grappled. For example, just a few years ago, a well-known U.S. motorcycle manufacturer was granted a five-year hiatus from import competition to allow the firm to modernize to meet global competition. Without this carefully managed trade approach, the U.S. would have no remaining domestic manufacturing capability in motorcycles.

Another example: I visited a formerly productive greenhouse operation in the Poznan region where the entrepreneurial owner is closing down his operation for a number of reasons—old technology, rising costs of coal (30% increase in 1990), and changing tax law. He is converting his productive operation to a wholesale outlet for foreign imports! The Danes and other north European agricultural exporters are literally wiping him out of business before he can catch up. He simply

can not catch up to the West, as fast as it can overtake him. I really wondered what would be left of Poland in five years if Polish domestic firms are not given the chance to develop. It broke my heart to see agricultural potential—so vital for Poland's future—being wiped out. In fact, what I saw too often was the potential for real wealth development in Poland being stifled while wholesaling, retailing and services were the net result of market opening that disadvantaged Poland and advantaged more developed economies. My question: Is careful thought being given to the positive impact carefully tailored and managed trade laws could have on the Polish privatization process that is evolving?

FOREIGN INVESTMENT

I was not totally surprised, but still disappointed, to hear that foreign investment in Poland now totals 1/10 of that which has occurred in Hungary, even though Poland's population is five times greater. We were told few U.S. businesses have travelled through the Poznan region. In fact, it was estimated overall that perhaps one dozen U.S. investments—joint ventures or otherwise—were currently in the pipeline for all of Poland. I took the time to discuss this situation with many experts and received the following suggestions:

First, I was told the Polish Embassy in the U.S. has no active commercial attache to assist U.S. companies. Commercial activities are being handled through trading companies, in New York and elsewhere, I guess. In fact, I was told some of the holdovers at the Embassy are from previous regimes. This remains a concern to business people.

Second, further, there is no list of potential Polish investments that might be attractive to U.S. firms "shopping around" for Polish partners. Such a list must be assembled to simplify transactions with U.S. businesses. A good source to assemble such information certainly includes all the Western accounting firms now doing business at the Marriott: Paine Webber, Deloitte & Touche, Price Waterhouse, Ernst & Young, Coopers & Lybrand. All have been combing Poland, establishing value of assets, etc. and working with some U.S. businesses. The Polish government needs to access the information these firms are amassing and use it to encourage U.S. joint ventures. Further, it needs to present this information on investment prospects more easily and systematically to interested Western investors. Poland should also develop ways to target its U.S. business outreach outside New York and restructure its commercial operations at the Polish Embassy in Washington, D.C.

On the U.S. side, I also noted there were few commercial officers at the U.S. Warsaw Embassy and, of course, none in Poznan, the most entrepreneurial region of Poland.

BANKING

Because of my long-standing interest in banking, I concentrated on this aspect of Poland's economy during my visit. Let me state my opinions are based on having met with the following institutions: Citibank, Wielkopolskiego Bank Kredytowego (former state bank; perhaps \$1 billion assets); Market Bank (Polish Episcopate, small tradesmen and Polish American Enterprise Fund, \$2 million assets); Gospodarazy Bank Wielkopolski (emerging bank for cooperatives, no asset estimate); Krakowskie Towarzystwo Bankowe (working with Polish American Enterprise Fund, no asset estimate). All we met agreed the Polish debt forgiveness will help lure Western investment.

At the regional level, I found progress has been made in establishing the basic banking structure that is emerging. But there are also enormous needs—almost overwhelming—for training in all aspects of doing business with the West. As an aside, unless Citibank is willing to become the new national Bank of Poland—and I don't think it should—certain clear distinctions in Polish banking law must be drawn between various banks' purposes early on.

I did not have the opportunity to meet with the Minister of Finance on this issue but I hold several concerns. It did not appear to me that a "Polish banking structure" exists. Clear definition does not exist between financial services that various institutions will provide. Of course, the U.S. has a banking structure that some now criticize as being too segmented. However, I found major efforts being expended in the Poznan region in creating parallel banking structures that might perform similar functions. For example, both the WBK and GB appear to be aiming to serve agricultural needs. Though WBK has the capital and the desire to do so, it didn't appear to me the Bank had any concept of agricultural lending as distinct from other commercial transactions. The GB is attempting to work with the French Agricole banks and had just signed an agreement with the French for technical assistance during the week of our visit. However, French agriculture is so heavily subsidized, and its interest lies in directly selling French processing equipment to the Polish. I am concerned about the implications of this partnership for Poland. Poland's agriculture, if it is to survive, could be competing with the Common Market and adding to its surplus woes. The problem of overproduction in West European agriculture is well known; is it possible Western Europe will blunt Poland's ability to become self-sufficient? At a minimum, Poland should be able to serve its own domestic market.

All banks we talked with seem to be establishing "training academies," including Citibank. WBK has purchased a former palace for its training center and it perceives itself as a potential training center for all of Poland. WBK will be travelling to Evanston, Illinois in May-June to participate in a foreign banking training session at Northwestern University. Market Bank is training lenders inside 56 former state banks in conjunction with the Polish American Enterprise Fund, South Shore Bank in Chicago and Depaul University in Chicago. GB is working with Co-Bank of Denver, Colorado, but seemed relatively unfamiliar with the agricultural banking structures and cooperative systems for agriculture various nations have instituted. In short, there may be duplication here as well as no clarity between various banks' purposes.

Moreover, the basic laws in Poland appear not to operate according to a "commercial code" that is considered "normal" for doing business with the West. I understand there are 20,000 lawyers in Poland, many of whom need to be retrained to conduct business with the West. The American Bar Association is working in Hungary and Czechoslovakia but not in Poland. I wonder why? Legal exchanges need to be increased to teach basic banking law and business law, property law, patent and copyright, insurance, arbitration, commercial code and contracts. Paris, Bonn and London use the same basic commercial contracts. So should Poland.

AGRICULTURE

Our group met with high level faculty at the Poznan Agricultural University. We also visited several farms. It became clear, the Poles need more definition regarding the technical assistance and investment they seek in agriculture. For example, it was suggested by the faculty that potato chip technology was desirable for that region. However, the Ohio State University expert travelling with our delegation informed me that Poland's potatoes are too soft for potato chip processing.

Therefore, I would appreciate from the Embassy—perhaps with cooperation of the U.S. Department of Agriculture specialist I met during our visit—any briefing papers you could provide me which would better define the specific agricultural needs in the region. We discussed with Poznan University a range of possibilities: grain research (rye, wheat, barley (low rainfall conditions)); potato processing, including for animal feed; rape seed production; maize for animal feed; milk processing; sugar beet processing; alfalfa adaptable to mechanization; sweet clover as a potential crop; silage alternatives; dairy cattle feeding and milk collection system; livestock and meat production; drainage systems for rainfall; greenhouse technologies; and institution of a cooperative extension service.

Any guidance the USDA expert could provide on areas in which we might concentrate our efforts would be appreciated. We will tailor our university efforts and farmer to farmer exchanges accordingly.

Thank you for your attention and your service.

Sincerely,

MARCY KAPTUR,
Member of Congress.

EMBASSY OF THE UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA,
Warsaw, Poland, June 10, 1991.

DEAR MS. KAPTUR: Thank you for your extremely thoughtful and informative letter of April 26.

I greatly appreciated the chance to get your reflections and insights based on your recent visit here. As you have observed, Poland faces a massive and difficult task transforming from a centrally planned to a market economy. The success of Poland's unprecedented experiment is crucial to our policy in Central and Eastern Europe. We are convinced that Poland is on the right path, and we are attempting to do whatever we can to support its bold efforts.

SISTER CITIES RELATIONSHIP

I fully agree that the Sister Cities Program offers an exceptional tool for promoting both friendship and commerce. I have very high hopes for the Toledo-Poznan relationship. We will be calling on you if we need any assistance in helping to make it work. I would also very much like to take you up on your offer to brief members of Congress from communities with Sister City relationships when I am next in Washington. I will try to let you know possible dates for such a meeting well in advance of any future trips.

As you know, some of the relationships are more successful than others. We are working hard to add new linkings, and to revive those that have become inactive. In addition to Poznan-Toledo, the programs that we are aware of at present are: Chicago-Warsaw; Cleveland-Gdansk; Portsmouth, New Hampshire-Gdansk; Rochester-Krakow; Buffalo-Rzeszow; Philadelphia-Torun; Fort Wayne-Plock; State of Maryland-Lodz; Anderson Valley, California-Skierniewice; Grand Rap-

ids-Kielce; Tempe-Lublin; Charlotte-Wroclaw; St. Louis-Szczecin; Brooklyn, N.Y.-Gdynia; Milwaukee-Bialystok; and State of New Hampshire-Gdansk Voivodship.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Encouraging the U.S. private sector to invest in Poland is certainly among our highest priorities. Many American companies are understandably cautious given the somewhat unpredictable economic and political situation, but we are doing all in our power to convince them, and we note that a number of important businesses have recently taken the leap:

Coca Cola broke ground in April for the first of eight plants (total investment \$50 million) it will construct in Poland.

Levi Strauss has started work in Plock on its \$25 million project to renovate a factory to produce jeans.

R.J. Reynolds has initiated work on a new tobacco processing facility. Already 200 Polish employees have been hired.

A joint venture has been signed between the American construction firms Epstein Engineering and Golub, and the National Bank of Poland for a \$100 million banking and financial center in Warsaw.

The new American Chamber of Commerce here has already signed up more than 70 members.

The long-awaited new foreign investment bill has been submitted to the Sejm and is expected to be deliberated this month. It will simplify the investment process and remove government permits for most deals. Also, the Business and Economic Treaty, which President Bush and former Prime Minister Mazowiecki signed in March 1990, is still unratified in Poland. We are working on that problem, but Polish ratification may take more time. We hope adoption of the new law and treaty will provide a renewed impetus for foreign investment.

On the subject of business promotion here, you may have read about Vice President Quayle's visit here and the dedication of the American Cultural/Business Center in Warsaw on June 5. The facility will be completed in 6-8 months and will double the available facilities for visiting U.S. businessmen.

In the area of U.S. exports, just this week contracts were signed with AT&T and McDonnell-Douglas. AT&T will provide \$100 million in telecommunications equipment and network management systems to the Polish Post, Telephone and Telegraph Corporation. McDonnell-Douglas will supply LOT Polish Airlines with eight MD-80 series medium-range aircraft in a deal estimated to be worth about \$350 million.

TRADE POLICY

You also remarked on the appearance of a "glut of imports," especially food and consumer goods, during your visit. Certainly the availability of all kinds of goods—domestic and foreign—has been one of the most visible features of Poland's economic transformation. The government has come under pressure to raise tariffs—which were largely suspended since last year as an anti-inflation and anti-monopoly measure—to protect farmers and domestic industry. The government raised tariffs on some 30 agricultural products in early May after farmers protested against alleged "dumping" of EC agricultural products. An entirely new tariff schedule is planned for introduction later this year which should provide for an average level of tariffs of 10 percent. The May zloty devaluation (14 percent) will also cut into the import surge, but it is clear that many new private import businesses will continue to import as much as they can sell.

While the desire for "transitional" protection of industry is understandable, the success of the reform will require import competition for a number of reasons. Closing off the domestic market would impede Poland's ability to develop a competitive industrial structure, which is the ultimate goal of current efforts.

Helping Polish industry to compete can best be managed by assuring opportunities for Polish producers to sell their goods on the world market. In Poland's association agreement negotiations with the EC, the government has pressed the EC on the need to open its market—and quickly—to Polish products. We have supported the Poles on this issue and will continue to work with them to search for ways to increase Poland's exports both to the U.S. as well as the EC and other markets. In May, an interagency team visited Warsaw, under the President's "Trade Enhancement Initiative" for Central and Eastern Europe, to assess Poland's export prospects and to propose concrete measures for expanding access to our market and the EC.

BANKING

Your reflections on the banking sector were also of great interest to me. Further development and reform of the financial sector is absolutely essential to Poland's transition. The government has begun work, with support from the IMF and World Bank, on a comprehensive overhaul of the banking law which it hopes to complete later this year. As an interim step, the government has already submitted to the Sejm a bill of amendments, which attempt to strengthen oversight of the banking system and to clarify procedures for bank privatization. The Ministry of Finance recently transformed Poland's nine state-owned commercial banks into joint stock companies (the first step towards privatization), and hopes to privatize two banks by the end of this year. At the end of 1990, there were already 63 banks licensed as financial institutions, of which 22 were privately owned. Six licenses have been issued for banks with foreign participation. I cut the ribbon at the opening of the first of these—the American Bank in Poland—several weeks ago; its share-holders include Bankers Trust, Time Warner, Inc., Morrison Knudsen, and the Polish-American Resources Corporation. So, it appears this sector is changing and developing, if not always at the speed that we would wish. We are looking at ways we might assist by placing a U.S. adviser on banking at the Ministry of Finance, and possibly also seconding an adviser to work with one of the state commercial banks that is slated for eventual privatization.

AGRICULTURE

Regarding Agriculture, I am pleased to enclose a copy of our Agricultural Office's most recent Situation and Outlook Report which should give your staff a good basic understanding of the state of Polish agriculture. The Embassy Agricultural Office specializes in providing marketing information to USDA and in assisting U.S. firms seeking to export agricultural products to Poland. It is not in a position to evaluate the specific sectoral needs raised in your letter, except in a very general way. Recently, however, USDA has begun to take an active role in assisting Polish Agriculture. A former Agricultural Research Service (ARS) scientist, Dr. James Smith, has been here since early March evaluating Polish agricultural research facilities and programs, and is expected to report his findings to Washington in late June. He can

be reached through USDA's EE-USSR Secretariat (tel. 382-0368). Next week (June 10), ten veteran U.S. county extension agents are scheduled to arrive in Warsaw. In teams of two they will spend six months in each of five district extension offices. One is Leszno, just south of Poznan. Their experience should begin to give us a good notion as to what type of assistance and investment would be most beneficial to Polish agriculture. Certainly, development of the marketing system and modernization of virtually the entire food processing sector, though outside the realm of "production" agriculture, would be of major value.

Thank you again for your valuable comments.

With highest regards.

Sincerely,

THOMAS W. SIMONS, Jr.,
Ambassador.

WHAT THE BILL OF RIGHTS MEANS TO ME

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, this year we are celebrating the 200th anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to our Constitution, commonly known as the Bill of Rights, which define the rights and freedoms that are guaranteed to every American citizen.

In recognition of this important document, the members of the Signal Hill Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Barrington, IL, chose the Bill of Rights as this year's theme for their annual essay contest on American history. The winner, Laura L. Long, an eighth grade student at Barrington Middle School, wrote a very effective essay on "What the Bill of Rights Means to Me." In her essay, Laura clearly demonstrates her understanding of the important role that the Bill of Rights plays in her everyday life.

I urge my colleagues to read Laura's testament to American freedom.

1991 TOPIC: "WHAT THE BILL OF RIGHTS
MEANS TO ME"

(By Laura Lynn Long)

I stared at the dingy prison wall. Detained . . . the word echoed in my mind. Everything was unfamiliar—unreal. I was in prison. I was not told why. I did not know where my family was or when I would be released. The only thing that seemed real was the solid stone wall.

The earlier events seemed incredible . . . unbelievable. I remembered the angry faces of the officers—the destructive search of our hotel room. It was strange; they did not have a warrant for the search. Even stranger was that they did not accuse me of any crime. I was told that I was under "suspicion."

I was frustrated and confused. It was not fair. I was supposed to be protected against these things. I was an American citizen, and my rights were being infringed.

It was then that the horrid thought struck me. The rights that I had been born with and had so taken for granted were gone now. I was completely powerless against the cruel government that now held me prisoner. I was trapped. I was cold and alone, and the icy stillness of the cell walls stared blankly back at me.

This could not be real. It seemed like a plot from a movie; the heroine, a victim of a prejudiced dictative government, struggles to gain the rights and freedoms that all people, regardless of race, age or gender, deserve. I had seen news stories in the paper of the tortured protesters in foreign countries, battling for justice. The problem which had not long ago seemed so distant had become a harsh, terrifying reality for me.

As I stared around at my bleak surroundings, I prayed for my release with the thought of "if only" heavy on my mind. If only I had never come here. If only I were at home safe and warm in my own room. If only I had realized what I had before it was yanked out of my grasp. If only . . .

The cold of the prison cell seemed to seep slowly and steadily through me. Gloomily, I stuffed my hands into my pockets. In the bottom folds of the smooth denim, I found a crumpled and tattered sheet of paper. Upon opening it, I was met with the words "Bill of Rights: Quiz 1" written in bold print. A single tear crept over my face as I saw the "A" written in red below my name, for I knew I had received that grade for memorizing names and dates, not for the realization and understanding of the value of this portion of the Constitution.

I gave my attention to the small checkmark at the bottom of the page. The question next to it read, "What three men refused to sign the original constitution because it lacked a Bill of Rights?"

I smiled wryly as the answer came to me—Edmund Randolph, George Mason, and Eldridge Gerry. I knew that I had not thought of these as people who had contributed to building this young and struggling nation into a strong, more unified state, but as more words to commit to memory.

I studied the long columns of questions, not only remembering the answers, but relating the important events and accomplishments of early America to how I lived. I read the ten amendments that make up the Bill of Rights and wondered why I had not realized how important they were before. If it were not for the Bill of Rights, I would not be permitted to attend the church of my choice, or read any type of political criticism in the newspaper or anywhere else. If there was not a Bill of Rights, I would not be protected against a sudden unwarranted search of my property, and if convicted of a crime, I would be forced to testify against myself under oath. As I sat on the concrete floor in my small prison room, it was hard to believe that I could have taken my liberty so much for granted.

I felt so frustrated that I had just now become aware of how lucky I was to be an American and to enjoy the freedoms guaranteed to me by the Bill of Rights. Angrily, I crumpled the test into a diminutive wad and tossed it heavily to the ground.

Suddenly, the dim-lighted room seemed to shrink, and the stone walls were drawn closer and closer together. The gray that surrounded me became an indistinguishable blur.

I bolted upright. The family room was silent except for the faint ticking of the clock and the monotonous drone of the television. Realizing that my terrifying experience was only a dream, I stretched and yawned. The clock struck two A.M. Almost simultaneously, the television station began sign-off. The network insignia appeared as "The Star-Spangled Banner" played in the background.

While the anthem sounded, I reminded myself that I should not wait until my rights

were taken away to recognize how fortunate I am to live in this country. I reached into my pocket and pulled out the test paper. It was only then that I believed I truly understood the meaning of the words of the song.

The anthem neared the end. As "the land of the free, and the home of the brave" resounded throughout the room, it was clear to me. My freedoms were a gift, a birthright, insured in large part by the first ten amendments to the Constitution. I will be brave in spirit and steadfast in resolve: The Bill of Rights . . . as a proud American I will understand it, protect it, and pass it on. Whatever it takes, I will pass it on.

CULTURAL FESTIVAL OF INDIA

HON. DICK ZIMMER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, the Cultural Festival of India, a cultural celebration of national significance, will take place in my home State this weekend. For decades New Jersey has welcomed wave upon wave of new Americans to our country—first through the famous Ellis Island, and now through Newark International Airport.

And so, as residents of the Garden State, we are proud to host the Cultural Festival of India. The festival will be the largest celebration of Indian heritage ever held in the United States. Nearly 1 million visitors will experience all the wonders of this culture which is relatively new to our shores.

Since 1989, thousands of volunteers and nearly 100 cultural and religious organizations from India and across America have been preparing for this celebration. One of America's newest and most vital immigrant populations will showcase its traditional foods, music, arts, and entertainment for all to experience in the heart of New Jersey.

With every new wave of immigrants on our shores, the United States becomes a richer nation. Mr. Speaker, I personally encourage every descendant of immigrant ancestors to join me in celebrating this addition to our melting pot.

PLAYING BOTH SIDES OF THE FENCE

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, has campaign spending gotten completely out of control? Not only are candidates spending more and more money and time on their campaigns, but political action committees [PAC's] are now routinely hedging their bets by contributing to more than one candidate in a single race.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the following excellent editorial which appeared in Roll Call this week.

I am pleased that Roll Call has pointed out this fundamental oddity in the current system of political giving. Too often, political action committees, in what people outside the belt-

way must surely see as cynical maneuvering, literally play both sides of the fence in an election by making campaign contributions to opposing candidates in a single race. What is going on here? Are the views and the opinions of individual contributors to PAC's so unimportant that it matters not what candidate a PAC contributes to, just that the PAC has made the contribution and thus bought the access?

Mr. Speaker, I have been and continue to be an active participant in the campaign finance reform debate. In my own bill, H.R. 389, I have included a provision that would make it illegal for PAC's to contribute to more than one candidate in a single election.

Tell me, is there a better place for campaign finance reform to start than with the elimination of this very obvious example of influence-buying?

The text of the editorial follows:

WHEN PAC'S GIVE MONEY TO BOTH CANDIDATES

While we have long opposed efforts to curtail the right of political action committees to contribute to Congressional candidates, we'll admit to being totally exasperated by one PAC practice: giving to both contenders in an election. If you give money to a Republican and a Democrat slugging it out in a close race, it's quite obvious that the main purpose of your donation is not to support a candidate's views. The purpose is to buy influence—or, to put it in a more genteel fashion, as Tom Baker of the Home Builders' PAC did in an interview with Roll Call last week: "We try to make friends up there." Baker's organization, the PAC of the National Association of Home Builders, gave a total of \$49,300 to both candidates in eight of the 15 races that were won by challengers last year according to a study by Public Citizen, a consumer advocacy group affiliated with Ralph Nader.

In those eight cases, the Home Builders' PAC gave money to the incumbent during the race and the winning challenger afterward. Even worse, 70 PACs in the 15 races that Public Citizen studied gave to both candidates before Election Day. Talk about covering your bets! If a PAC really believes that both candidates in a race are equally qualified (or equally favorable to its cause), then logic would dictate that it give to neither. Why waste the money?

"Double-giving" illustrates that the noble sentiments expressed by some PAC officials—that they're merely supporting the "kind of people we want to see in Washington"—are often cynical rhetoric. No wonder PAC's have such a lousy reputation. PAC officials say that they're misunderstood; that PAC's enable a lot of little people to participate in the political process; that companies, industries, interest groups, and unions should have a way to express their preferences with money as well as votes; and that the PAC system of reporting provides excellent disclosure. All absolutely true. But if Congress really does go ahead and ban PACs, these same officials will have to bear part of the blame. Covering your bets by giving to both candidates is a lousy way to do political business.

RADIO FREE CHINA

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, a free market of ideas and information is essential for the development and sustenance of democracy, whether in the United States or in China. The Chinese people cannot be isolated from an open flow and exchange of information if democracy is to flourish in the country.

In February of this year I introduced H.R. 1156 to establish Radio Free China to broadcast uncensored news to the Chinese people. Representative BENTLEY introduced a similar bill to establish surrogate broadcasting to other countries in Southeast Asia. In May, the House report on the fiscal year 1992 State Department authorization bill recognized the need for surrogate broadcasting to countries in Asia, where many basic freedoms, including access to information, are being denied.

Radio Free China would function more as a local radio station than as an official voice of the United States. Besides local news, the station would provide political discussion, cultural affairs, and reports on democratic movements elsewhere in the world.

I urge Members to cosponsor H.R. 1156, which, by establishing Radio Free China, clearly signals the active commitment of the United States to encourage democratic development in China.

INTRODUCING OF THE COMMUNITY RIGHT TO KNOW MORE ACT OF 1991

HON. GERRY SIKORSKI

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

In 1984, few people had ever heard of methylisocyanate. That is until a Union Carbide plant released tons of the toxic material into the air in Bhopal, India—poisoning tens of thousands of people, many fatally. In the aftermath of this tragedy, I argued that our communities should not be kept in the dark about the toxic chemicals in the air we breathe, the water we drink and the playground where our kids play.

I introduced community right to know legislation along with my colleague Bob Edgar. The amendment was straight forward. It required manufacturers to report to EPA on their emissions of toxic chemicals. And it required EPA to compile this information into an annual national survey of chemical emissions and to make the survey available to the public.

Our argument was straightforward too: Americans have a fundamental right to know what poisons are being released into their communities. I thought this was common sense.

My opponents said it was radical. They said it would cost money, cost jobs, and cost U.S. competitiveness. They said it was unworkable, unfair, un-American. They said it would confuse—even harm—communities by giving them meaningless and unnecessary statistics.

We hotly debated right to know. The Reagan-Bush administration fought it. The chemical companies fought it. And even 211 of my own colleagues fought it. In the end, it won by a single vote on this floor.

And my opponents were dead wrong.

The right to know law has proven to be one of the most significant actions taken by Congress on the environment in the 1980's. It ushered in a new era of environmental protection by empowering workers and concerned citizens. It changed environmental protection from simply end-of-the-pipeline pollution controls to a system that simulates pollution prevention and less use of toxic chemicals overall. And it has proven to American companies that they can achieve environmental protection as a profit.

Now there are rare reviews for community right to know. The administration touts it. Wall Street embraces it, and industry reports it is saving millions of dollars because of it.

Just last month, EPA Administrator Bill Reilly said community right to know is fast becoming one of the most powerful tools we have to reduce toxic emissions. In just the second year of reporting, EPA found that chemical companies have reduced their toxic emission by 1.3 billion pounds—or 18 percent. However, EPA also found that America's chemical manufacturers are forcing the Nation to live with over 6 billion pounds of toxic emissions including 400 million pounds of carcinogens. That's more than 25 pounds for every man, woman, and child in America.

While those numbers frighten and anger us, the knowledge has empowered us. They have put pressure on big polluters to do more than just meet minimum pollution control standards. In California's Silicon Valley, 2,000 angry protestors marched on an IBM plant after community right to know data singled out the facility as the State's worst emitter of ozone-destroying CFC's. IBM now plans to eliminate CFC's by 1993. And in my own State of Minnesota, Northfield citizens used community right to know to discover that Sheldahl Corp. was spewing dangerous methylene chloride into the air. Thanks to community action, Sheldahl plans to cut emissions 90 percent by 1993.

Armed with right to know information, EPA is now asking 600 of America's worst polluters to reduce their most dangerous emissions by half. And faced with increasingly public awareness, many companies are reviewing production processes on their own to see where they can cut chemical use and emissions. Many companies are finding to their surprise that it pays to reduce pollution at the source. They can cut costs, curb emissions, and make operations more efficient. They save raw material costs, processing costs, disposal costs, clean-up costs, and liability costs. In short, they can achieve environmental protection at a profit. And gain a competitive edge.

This June 11 Wall Street Journal article proves just that. It reports that a Texas Du Pont plant, which makes plastics and paints and spews out a staggering 110 million pounds of toxics annually, will slash its emissions 75 percent by cutting chemical use and save \$1 million a year. Likewise, Dow, Monsanto, Arco, and my own State of Minnesota's 3-M are all finding they can profit by cutting

toxic chemical use and emissions sharply. I would like to request this article be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks.

There are very few two-fers in life. But community right to know is proving to be both proenvironment and probusiness.

Knowledge is power. And money. But we need to know more. The General Accounting Office reported last week that critical information gaps remain. Today's community right to know law covers only the tip of the toxic iceberg. It is estimated that some 400 billion pounds of toxic emissions still go unreported each year, or more than 95 percent of all chemical emissions, Yes 95 percent.

How can this be? It is because right to know is limited in three fundamental ways: EPA inaction, reporting loopholes, and lack of information on chemical use as well as chemical emissions.

For example, Federal facilities shoot nearly 5 billion pounds of toxic and radioactive wastes into the environment—without having to report a drop. In some States, such as Maine, Uncle Sam is the single largest polluter.

Emissions of mercury from electric utility plants are estimated to be almost eight times greater than total mercury emissions from all sources now covered. And mercury from municipal incinerators is three times as much as all sources now covered. Yet both electric utilities and incinerators are exempt from public reporting.

The mining industry creates some 134 billion pounds of toxic waste annually, about as much as all other industries combined. Nearly 15 billion pounds are from deadly cyanide generated by gold mining. No public report.

Water treatment plants emit five times more chloroform into the air than the chemical plants that manufacture chloroform. No public report.

Oil and gas wells emit 1,700 times as much barium, 450 times as much arsenic, 97 times as much benzene, 33 times as much toluene, 7.5 times as much chromium, and 3 times as much lead as that of all manufacturing industries combined. No public report.

On and on and on its goes. Food production; airplane maintenance; photograph development; auto repair; construction; dry cleaning. Even the hazardous waste treatment industry. No public report.

Congress gave EPA the authority to extend reporting requirements to include additional facilities. But we are now in the program's fifth year and EPA has declined to identify even one additional polluter.

Congress also gave EPA the authority to identify additional toxic chemicals. But EPA has added only 16 new chemicals—most under pressure from citizen petitions. And the agency has eliminated six chemicals from the list in response to industry requests, and is considering proposals to cut nine more.

To date, many of our most notorious pollutants are not regulated by right to know, including, dioxin, furans, DDT, and CFC's. In fact, the public is still in the dark on over 500 chemicals recognized as toxic by EPA under other environmental laws including: 5 extremely toxic substances and 43 ozone-depleting chemicals listed under the Clean Air Act; 40 Clean Water Act priority pollutants; 16 Safe

Drinking Water Act toxics; 200 chemicals identified as known or probable human carcinogens; 69 pesticides requiring special review; and 90 reproductive toxins.

Right to know is also limited by a serious administrative loophole in the existing law. Currently a company does not need to report on emissions that are recycled outside of its facility. And because recycling and waste treatment firms are also exempt, this allows a company to ship millions of pounds of toxic wastes offsite without ever informing the public.

Finally, right to know is limited by lack of information on chemical use as well as emissions. A firm focused only on limiting emissions may solve one problem only to exacerbate another, for example by shifting chemicals out of wastes into the workplace, or into its products. Release data alone cannot tell the whole story about the large amounts of chemicals that pass through our lives and communities each day—as they are handled in the factory, emitted from products in our homes, or spilled on our highways.

In fact, many experts think that the dangers from these sources may be even greater than from chemical releases, for example:

EPA estimates that 288 persons have died and nearly 11,000 injured from chemical transportation accidents—mostly from sulfuric acid, chlorine, ammonia, and hydrochloric acid. But no public report is needed.

Tens of millions of workers are routinely exposed to toxic chemicals in the workplace, with EPA attributing 250 cancers each year in workers exposed to just four chemicals—formaldehyde, tetrachlorethylene, asbestos and methylene chloride. No public report.

And recent EPA studies indicate that for many people, their annual exposure to toxic chemicals from consumer products and buildings materials found in their homes and offices is orders of magnitude higher than from outdoor exposures. These chemicals include formaldehyde, styrene, methylene chloride, and hundreds of others.

From emergency workers and firefighters—to handlers and shippers—to our very own kids, the American public is exposed each day to a vast array of toxic chemicals for which no information is available.

Additional data on actual chemical use will help prevent this toxic shall game. It will do this by encouraging firms to reduce overall use of toxic chemicals—not just their waste streams. Only by focusing on the beginning of the pipeline can firms discover how to adjust production processes, switch to safer chemicals, or change their products to reduce toxic use.

We have passed a good many laws to control the spread of toxic wastes into the environment. Laws that require scrubbers on factory smokestacks. Laws that require catalytic converters on our cars. And laws that require workers to wear respirators. But ultimately the source of all toxics problems is the creation and use of toxic chemicals in the first place.

Some States have awakened to the need for a fundamental shift from pollution control to pollution prevention. In 1989, Illinois, Massachusetts, and Oregon passed the Nation's first toxic use reduction laws. Now, more than a dozen States, including my own State of Min-

nesota, have enacted laws which promote toxics use reduction, and bills are pending in New Jersey, California, and other states.

Now Congress should take a leadership role. The time for strengthening the law has come. The Community Right to Know More Act of 1991 broadens the existing law in four ways:

It expands public reporting of toxic chemical releases to bring in a new universe of facilities, including Federal facilities, regardless of which SIC code they fall under, as long as they have more than 10 employees and manufacture more than 25,000 pounds of toxic chemicals annually, or otherwise use 10,000 pounds annually.

It expands the list of chemicals that must be reported to included those already found to be hazardous under other environmental laws, such as the Clean Air Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act.

It requires companies to report, for the first time, not only the dangerous chemicals they release, but also what toxics they use and produce. It would also require industries to develop plans to cut their use of toxic materials.

Finally, the bill expands and improves waste reporting requirements under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, makes those requirements uniform across the Nation, closes reporting loopholes, and gives the public greater access to right to know information.

In 1985, I argued that the public has a fundamental right to know about the toxic chemicals in the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the playgrounds where our kids play. Some called this idea radical. I called it common sense. Now I say communities have a right to know more. This idea is still sensible. I hope all of my colleagues will join me in this important effort.

CLEAN WATER ACTION, ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION, ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND, FRIENDS OF THE EARTH, GREENPEACE, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY, NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, OMB WATCH, SIERRA CLUB, UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, BOARD OF CHURCH AND SOCIETY, U.S. PUBLIC INTEREST RESEARCH GROUP,

July 11, 1991.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations urge you to co-sponsor the Community Right to Know More Act of 1991, introduced by Representative Gerry Sikorski.

The Community Right to Know More Act of 1991 would amend the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). It expands public reporting on toxic chemical production, use and releases, requires companies to develop plans and goals for reducing toxic chemical use, and closes loopholes in the current RCRA waste stream reporting.

The 1986 Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (EPCRA or Title III of Superfund) requires industries to publicly report on toxic chemicals released into the environment each year. This reporting, listed in the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI), has provided communities with vital information on chemicals released into their neighborhoods. It has also spurred some industries to reduce their use of toxic chemicals.

Unfortunately, only a limited number of chemicals and facilities are covered by TRI;

only an estimated 5 percent of the toxic releases into the environment are reported. In addition, the law fails to provide the public with any information on toxic chemicals produced and used by these same companies.

Representative Sikorski's Community Right to Know More Act of 1991 expands the Toxic Release Inventory to include chemicals already found to be hazardous under other environmental laws. The bill expands the list of covered facilities beyond the manufacturing sector and closes loopholes in the existing reporting system. The Community Right to Know More Act of 1991 also requires industries to develop plans and goals for reducing their toxic chemical use.

Toxics use reduction is an essential element of our effort to significantly reduce the 500 million tons of toxic waste produced in the United States each year. If companies reduce their use of toxic chemicals, they will also reduce their generation of hazardous wastes. Rather than continually trying to choose between a variety of unsafe hazardous waste disposal technologies, we should encourage industries to reduce the hazardous wastes they generate in the first place.

The Community Right to Know More Act of 1991 will link the data collected on toxic chemical use and releases with the existing RCRA waste stream reporting by requiring waste generators to provide information on the estimated hazardous chemical concentrations in waste streams. It will also improve public access to the RCRA waste stream data.

For all of these reasons we strongly encourage you to co-sponsor and support the Community Right to Know More Act of 1991. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Hartmann, U.S. Public Interest Research Group; Deborah A. Sheiman, Natural Resources Defense Council; Lois Epstein Kevin Mills, Environmental Defense Fund; Machant Wentworth, Izaak Walton League of America; Rick Hind, Greenpeace Action; Thom White Wolf Fassett, United Methodist Church, Board of Church and Society.

Melinda Taylor, National Audubon Society; David Gardiner, Sierra Club; Velma Smith, Friends of the Earth; Joe Schwartz, Environmental Action; Kenneth A. Brown, Clean Water Action; Virginia DeSimone, League of Women Voters; Alair MacLean, OMB Watch.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 11, 1991] CHEMICAL FIRMS FIND THAT IT PAYS TO REDUCE POLLUTION AT SOURCE—BY ALTERING PROCESSES TO YIELD LESS WASTE. THEY MAKE PRODUCTION MORE EFFICIENT—DOWN REUSES A TOXIC SOLVENT

(By Scott McMurray)

The chemical industry's record on the environmental has been a sorry one. Despite tougher regulation and pressure from the public interest groups, it still account for nearly half of all the toxic pollution produced in the U.S.

Yet lately, a new force has been driving the industry to clean up its act: economics.

In a major shift, chemical companies are viewing waste not as an unavoidable result of the manufacturing process, but as a measure of its efficiency. The more unusable by-products a process creates, the less efficient it is—and the more economic incentive there is for making it better.

That's what Du Pont Co. discovered at its Beaumont, Texas, plant, which makes prod-

ucts for plastics and paint. For years, the facility had been spewing out a staggering 110 million pounds of waste annually. Du Pont engineers argued that reducing the pollution would be too expensive.

NOT WASTE AFTER ALL

But when they took a second look last year, they found just the opposite was true. By adjusting the production process to use less of one raw material, they were able to slash the plant's waste by two-thirds. Yields went up and costs went down. The savings: \$1 million a year.

"When I heard about it, I just said: 'That's amazing,'" says Edgar Woolard, Du Pont's chairman and chief executive officer. He says the company now even sees waste reduction as a way to achieve a competitive advantage.

Environmentalists heartily support this view. Slashing toxic waste production "is very similar to energy conservation in the 1970s: There is a potential for massive savings," says David Roe, a lawyer with the Environmental Defense Fund.

The entire chemical industry, says Environmental Protection Agency administrator William Reilly, is "getting religion" about the benefits of cutting wastes.

Other industries, from semiconductor makers in Silicon Valley to metal processing companies across the Rust Belt, are also beginning to focus on toxic waste reduction as a way to cut costs, curb pollution and make operations more efficient. But it's the chemical industry that has the most to gain from waste reduction savings simply because it churns out so much.

According to the EPA, in 1989, the last year for which figures are available, the industry produced nearly half of the 5.7 billion pounds of toxins generated nationwide and tracked by the EPA. Chemical company officials say that, since then, the proportion has stayed roughly the same, though the total amount of toxins released in the country is believed to have declined. Some environmentalists have argued, however, that the EPA significantly understates the total amount of toxins discharged into the environment.

A BIGGER PICTURE

Richard Mahoney, Monsanto Co.'s chairman and chief executive officer, estimates that there is \$125 million worth of material that currently isn't recovered from the waste that leaves the company's plants. What's more, other costs associated with waste are rising. They include processing, disposal and cleanup, not to mention lawsuits and government fines when those jobs don't get done right.

Dow Chemical Co., for instance, recently spent \$30 million building a waste incinerator and dump to handle toxic materials at its plant site in Midland, Mich. And, earlier this year, Monsanto paid the state of Massachusetts \$1 million to settle claims that its Everett, Mass., plant didn't report certain waste-water discharges. It paid another \$192,000 to a trust fund that supports the cleanup of Boston harbor. Last year, it forked over \$27 million to clean other sites. At year end, it had an accrued liability of \$120 million on its balance sheet to cover certain future cleanup costs.

Chemical companies, however, might have made substantial cuts in toxic emissions sooner had they recognized some of the potential economic advantages, such as lower materials costs. "One of the differences is that we're now putting some of our best people into this area," says Robert Luft, Du Pont's senior vice president, chemicals.

"When you do that, you can start making some fast progress."

THE LEGACY OF BHOPAL

In the past, chemical companies used to focus merely on complying with federal and state pollution laws for specific chemicals or plants. They didn't pay much attention to the aggregate amount of waste they produced each year, or the future liability it represented. Waste disposal costs were low, and the typical approach to pollution often was the dilution solution: Dilute wastes in massive amounts of air up a smokestack or water out the end of a sewer pipe. More-permanent solutions were unattractive. They almost always involved adding equipment, which meant higher costs, and, thus, intense corporate resistance.

That began to change after the deaths of more than 3,800 people in Bhopal, India, following the release of a cloud of toxic gas at a Union Carbide Corp. subsidiary in 1984. The disaster led to U.S. legislation in 1986 directing the EPA to compile and publicize a survey of toxic emissions, which put pressure on big polluters to do more than just meet minimum government standards.

In the process, companies began to discover economic advantages, as well. Some came from increasing production efficiency, while others came from finding other uses for some of the byproducts. Along the way, companies began to conclude that pollution was a sign of a bad manufacturing system. "When you make a lot of waste you know you don't have control of your operation," says Mr. Woolard, Du Pont's chairman.

Dow Chemical has been applying the same philosophy to its operations. For example, it estimates that, by recycling a toxic solvent used to make its Verdect herbicide, it is now saving about \$3 million a year, and halving the amount of solvent going out the door as waste.

At its Plaquemine facility near Baton Rouge, La., Dow spent \$15 million on waste reduction projects last year that it says have already saved \$18 million in toxic waste disposal and raw material costs. The company promotes these projects internally with the acronym WRAP: Waste Reduction Always Pays.

Monsanto says that its nylon fibers plant in Pensacola, Fla., has cut its toxic air emissions by about 90% since 1987, and saved a few million dollars a year in raw materials expense. The plant is capturing a toxic solvent in a mineral-oil bath before it escapes up a smokestack. It then recycles the solvent back into the production process. The mineral oil isn't wasted either: It is returned to the plant, where it captures more solvent.

CAPTURING A CARCINOGEN

Monsanto says its Sauget, Ill., plant, across the Mississippi River from company headquarters outside St. Louis, cut its air and water emissions of PDCB, a carcinogenic chemical used in making mothballs, by 90%, or one million pounds. The company cooled the plant's waste vapor and captured the crystallized chemical for reuse before it was emitted. Loading the product directly into tank cars under sealed conditions cut vapor emissions even further.

In some cases, the industry is constructing new plants that incorporate the latest waste reduction technology. A new Du Pont herbicide plant, near Dunkirk, France, is expected to produce 90% less pollution than an existing facility. Among other things, it will distill and recycle solvents.

In other cases, chemical companies are tying together production processes at dif-

ferent plant sites to cut waste and save on raw material costs. Last fall, a Du Pont plant in Mobile, Ala., that makes herbicides and insecticides began tapping into the waste stream leaving the plant, pulling out solvents and titanium byproduct that it used to incinerate. The solvents get recycled into the plant's own operations, while the titanium is treated and shipped to a Du Pont plant in DeLisle, Miss., where it is used to make paint pigments. By integrating production this way, the Mobile plant cut its annual toxic emissions by about 25 million pounds, nearly 20%.

GETTING ALONG

Besides cutting costs, these waste reduction programs help companies earn public good will, as well as meet demands from regulators and environmentalists. Arco Chemical Co. is using several waste reduction processes to meet the stiff environmental standards that apply to the expansion of its Channelview, Texas, propylene oxide plant just east of Houston. The Arco Chemical plant, where 17 workers died in an explosion last July, is an area of back-to-back oil and chemical plants that parallels the ship channel leading to the Gulf of Mexico.

"Roll down your car window and the aroma will knock you over," is how George Smith, of the Sierra Club's Houston chapter, describes the area.

The environmental group feared Arco Chemical's plant expansion would fill the air with an excessive amount of benzene, so it threatened to put the plan through a lengthy public hearing process. In response, Arco Chemical agreed to install a distillation process to recover benzene from liquid waste at the plant. The process keeps much of the benzene from reaching the plant's water treatment unit, where it could partially evaporate into the air before decomposing.

As it turns out, the added cost of the distillation process is largely offset by savings from the benzene that's recycled, says John Evans, environmental superintendent for the plant. And when all waste processes are in place, including catalytic converters that break down hydrocarbons before they go up the smokestack, the expanded facility will emit substantially fewer toxic chemicals than the original plant, even though production will have increased 200%, Mr. Evans says.

Environmentalists say the chemical industry still has a long way to go before it gets unqualified praise. But chemical companies contend that both regulators and the public will continue to see a substantial reduction in their output of toxic wastes. Monsanto, Dow and Du Pont all say their emissions have declined by between 30% and 50% in the past four years. They add that the numbers will continue to drop in the years ahead. The EPA is providing additional incentive: Last month, the agency proposed extending the deadline for required pollution controls at plant sites if companies speed up voluntary cuts in their emissions.

Even though some of the short-term costs for the new waste reduction programs have been high—more than \$200 million a year at the largest chemical companies—Monsanto's Mr. Mahoney says it is money well spent. "Our initiative and commitments to environmental protection will, over the long term, make us more efficient, more cost effective and more competitive," he predicts.

THE TOXIC TOP 10 U.S. COMPANIES RANKED BY THE AMOUNT OF TOXIC WASTE PRODUCED BY THEIR VARIOUS FACILITIES¹

| Company | Facilities | Toxic waste (in millions of pounds) |
|-------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|
| Du Pont | 85 | 348.40 |
| Monsanto | 33 | 293.83 |
| American Cyanamid | 29 | 202.09 |
| BP America | 18 | 123.66 |
| Remco Group | 2 | 119.08 |
| 3M | 51 | 106.04 |
| Vulcan Materials | 2 | 93.15 |
| General Motors | 133 | 87.87 |
| Eastman Kodak | 23 | 79.48 |
| Phelps Dodge | 19 | 77.42 |

¹ 1989 figures (latest available).

Source: Environmental Protection Agency.

MFN STATUS IN CHINA'S AND OUR BEST INTEREST

HON. VIN WEBER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, the debate over extending most-favored-nation status to China isn't a referendum on China's human rights record. No one in this body would try to defend the actions of the Chinese leadership. The question is how we can best influence China, and what actions are ineffective or counterproductive.

The fact is, MFN status serves our interests as well as China's, and it works better as a carrot than as a stick. Our future economic growth is tied to free and open international trade, including the huge developing market of China. In addition, extending—not denying—MFN status is our best chance to influence the Chinese leadership. Promoting trade with China strengthens those parts of society most committed to both economic and political reform.

Disapproving MFN holds little hope of changing China's actions. The aging Chinese leadership is so committed to maintaining control, and the leverage of MFN status is so limited, that our action would have little effect. Just as Saddam Hussein weathered the effects of sanctions while his people suffered, so, too, would the Chinese Government endure the impact of MFN removal as the Chinese people suffer the consequences.

A strong trading relationship, however, can begin to establish a more liberalized economy in China, which in turn will lead to political change. In southern China, the region that is the chief beneficiary of foreign trade, a fledgling entrepreneurial sector has begun to flourish, supporting more moderate political forces as well.

Promoting economic liberalization will inevitably weaken a totalitarian political structure. Through continued trade ties with China, we have the best opportunity to affect its centralized economy and the political machine that depends on it.

We also should not ignore the impact of denying MFN status on our own economy, particularly the agricultural sector. Last year, the United States exported \$814 million in agricultural products to China. Minnesota shipped \$1.4 million in food products and \$1.3 million to Hong Kong. Imposing trade barriers will cer-

tainly lead to retaliation against our leading exports to China: Agricultural commodities. China will simply turn to other willing sellers.

In addition, we need to consider the damage this action would have on the outpost of capitalism, Hong Kong, and its effect on our trade and business. Much of our trade with China goes through Hong Kong, and it will suffer greatly if China loses MFN status. In 1990, United States exports to China totaled nearly \$5 billion, almost all funneled through Hong Kong. Half of the 252 American regional business headquarters located in Hong Kong are engaged in trading activities with China. U.S. investment of over \$6 billion accounts for almost one-quarter of foreign direct investment in Hong Kong. An American Chamber of Commerce survey indicated that 70 percent of member firms in Hong Kong would be adversely affected by withdrawal of MFN status.

No one doubts the need for internal reform within China. Yet, we need to act in a way that is effective and will support our own interests. By disapproving MFN status, we reduce our ability to influence economic and political reform and deprive our country of the benefits of international trade.

JAPANESE BURDENSARING AND WORLD HUNGER

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, today this Member, together with 19 other Members, has introduced a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress about a way that the Government of Japan could make a substantial contribution for the benefit of the world's hungry people while also improving its trade balance and trade relations with the United States.

The Japanese Government has grown to be the world's largest foreign-aid donor overall, larger even than the United States. With over 750 million people worldwide still living in debilitating hunger and malnutrition, there is a substantial role that the Japanese Government could play through its aid program to address the specific need for food for hungry people too poor or displaced to provide for their own needs. Up to now, commodities have played a very minor role in Japanese aid. The United States has been addressing this need for many years as the largest food aid donor for international hunger relief and development. Over \$40 billion in donations and concessional sales of food have taken place through the U.S. Food for Peace Program since 1954. This historic commitment by the United States will continue, and it now needs to be joined by substantial commitments to hunger from the Japanese Government if there is to be concrete progress toward the achievable goal of eliminating hunger and serious malnutrition in the world by the year 2000.

Through this resolution we are encouraging a cooperative approach between United States agriculture and Japanese financing that can help achieve that goal. We encourage the Japanese to look to the United States as a

principal source of supply for food aid donations to private voluntary organizations and the World Food Program. Such purchases could contribute significantly to reducing bilateral trade tensions and the United States trade deficit with Japan, which partly derives from highly unfortunate trade restrictions on agricultural imports into Japan, which should be eliminated speedily.

Food aid, as always, needs to be carefully managed to avoid potential negative effects on commercial sales and on local agricultural production. The resolution includes suggested safeguards against these problems.

Japan's use of its foreign assistance funds for the purchases of United States agricultural commodities and products would improve United States-Japanese trade relation, increase United States agricultural exports, increase farm income, lower the United States trade deficit, and most importantly, help feed millions of hungry people around the world.

Mr. Speaker, this Member encourages all our colleagues to join us as cosponsors of this resolution.

H. CON. RES.—

Whereas 750,000,000 people worldwide, more than three times the population of the United States, suffer from moderate to severe malnutrition and do not consume enough calories to perform sustained manual labor;

Whereas 9,240 people, mostly children under the age of five, die every day from hunger-related causes and others suffer brain damage due to malnutrition;

Whereas medical research documents that full economic productivity by adults and full mental development of young children both require adequate nutrition;

Whereas permanent impairment of body or mind due to chronic or temporary hunger contributes to a cycle of lowered economic productivity in which millions of individuals and families are incapable of generating sufficient income to escape from the cycle of hunger and lack of productivity;

Whereas adequate nutrition and other health measures have resulted in lowering rates of infant mortality below 50 per 1,000 during the twentieth century in countries containing over 50 percent of the world's population, and it is technically feasible to achieve such a reduction worldwide by the year 2000 through elimination of persistent hunger and other health measures;

Whereas sufficient food can be produced on a global basis to adequately feed the population of the world, to prevent brain damage due to malnutrition, and to eliminate lack of economic productivity due to hunger.

Whereas such food supplies must come from production both in the countries which are net exporters of agricultural commodities and products and also from increased food production in food-deficit countries in the developing world;

Whereas development assistance in the form of food can be productively used to alleviate hunger and malnutrition among impoverished people and also as a resource to promote improvements in local agriculture, health, sanitation, education, environmental sustainability and basic infrastructure;

Whereas private voluntary groups, other nongovernmental organizations, and international organizations have experience in the design and successful administration of projects using food assistance for development-related projects and for emergency relief;

Whereas the United States has demonstrated a sustained commitment to mak-

ing food available for development and relief purposes through the Public Law 480 Food for Peace and other food donation programs, totaling \$41,000,000,000 in gross value between 1954 and 1988;

Whereas the policy of the United States has been to encourage cooperation among the bilateral aid programs of various donor governments and international organizations such as the World Food Programme in pursuit of hunger alleviation and related developmental goals;

Whereas the Japanese commitment to double its official development assistance from \$25,000,000,000 between 1983 and 1987 to \$50,000,000,000 between 1988 and 1992 and to provide a larger proportion of its aid programs as grants will make Japan the largest net bilateral development assistance donor;

Whereas it is in the interest of both the United States and Japan to promote hunger alleviation, sustainable economic growth and political democracies in developing nations;

Whereas Japan has barriers to the importation of certain United States agricultural commodities and products, such as rice;

Whereas there has been a lack of progress on negotiating reduced barriers to many United States commodities which would be highly competitive in an open Japanese market;

Whereas it is also in the interest of both the United States and Japan to reduce bilateral trade tensions between the two nations, particularly in the area of agricultural trade; and

Whereas the United States' agricultural production capabilities and Japan's financial capabilities are complementary factors that must be coordinated for dramatic global progress to be made in reducing preventable deaths from hunger-related causes during the next decade: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President should direct the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development to encourage the Government of Japan to use a portion of its increased foreign assistance funds to significantly increase the availability of international food aid supplies through bilateral or multilateral channels to meet the needs of the world's hungry people;

(2) Japanese aid resources could be channeled to finance, directly or indirectly, long-term contracts to purchase and deliver commodities from the United States and developing country agricultural producers as donations to nongovernmental or international organizations for use in hunger alleviation projects with developmental results;

(3) during the duration of any such long-term contractual agreement, such purchases of food and agricultural commodities and products produced in the United States which are purchased by the Government of Japan for donation and delivery to international hunger relief programs should be considered as the equivalent of increased importation into Japan of the same quantities of such product for the purposes of United States Trade Law in cases where this would be of advantage to Japan;

(4) during the time period of any such Japanese purchases from the United States, the value of United States Government purchases of the same commodities for use in food aid programs under Public Law 480 should be maintained at no less than fiscal year 1990 levels; and

(5) the commodities purchased under this program should be donated to organizations equipped to ensure that the food will be available only to projects that meet the following criteria:

(A) The use of the food will either be positive or neutral in its impact on the incomes of local agricultural producers and on incentives for production in the recipient nation.

(B) The food will be targeted for use in improving the nutritional status of impoverished and malnourished people.

(C) To the maximum extent possible, the food will be used in such programs as food-for-work, school feeding, or other programs resulting in improved smallholder agricultural productivity, health, sanitation, environmental sustainability, education or basic infrastructure as well as improved nutrition.

Allowance should also be made for the monetization of up to 25 percent of the food donated for any particular project, subject to the three conditions listed above.

TRIBUTE TO CIVITAN CLUBS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the war on drugs can only be won with the active support of our citizens. While the Federal Government can and must do much in this effort, it will also require the commitment of thousands of local groups and individuals. I would like to take this opportunity to honor an organization which has been working to stop drug abuse in my home district in Trenton, NJ.

The Civitan Clubs of Trenton, Hamilton, and Colonial Valley have been working with the Trenton Police Department as part of "Operation Drug Stop", a program which has had a beneficial effect in fighting drugs in Trenton. This program provides a hotline for the reporting of drug crimes. "Operation Drug Stop" concentrated on involving members of the community to fight back against drug dealers. As Mr. Joseph Czillich, one of the leaders in the Trenton Civitan Club has said, " * * * [we] must have a total commitment of students, parents, and all of society who do not want to be enslaved by the drug lords."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert into the RECORD the following column written by Mr. Czillich. Members may share it with leaders in their own communities and give them insight regarding this type of grassroots antidrug project.

The article follows:

THAT WAR ON DRUGS IS REAL—AND IT'S HERE!

(By A. Joseph Czillich)

Today, many people suffer from the Ostrich Syndrome. If they do not see, hear or feel it, it does not exist. Too many people are apathetic and complacent. Why get involved?

It isn't my problem. We don't have drugs in the schools my children attend. We don't have drugs in our community. My children don't use drugs or alcohol. Why should I care what happens in Trenton or other communities? It is easy to shut your eyes and mind to what is happening around you—or is it?

Our country has not had enemy soldiers walking our streets since the War of 1812. Since that war, we have not had the fear of

foreign troops on our soil. We have not had the dread of night-and-day bombing, the yellowish glare of flares dropping from the skies, the scream and wail of falling bombs.

When we were at war over many years, we could still walk the streets. We had sufficient food. We had the luxury of not seeing the wounded and dead strewn in the fields and in the streets. Yes, we were blessed. However, that is now coming to an end.

We are at war. Everywhere you see and hear that phrase—"war on drugs." It is true there is a war—war caused by drugs, and its ally, alcohol. We have had the slogan, "Say 'no' to drugs," popularized by First Lady Nancy Reagan. It is a catchy phrase.

If meant and practiced, it would be the beginning of the end of the drug and alcohol problem. The slogan is on T-shirts, banners, buttons, emblems and badges for all to see. It is so popular that on a recent raid in the city of Trenton on a crack house, three youngsters were wearing sweatshirts emblazoned with the anti-drug slogan.

The war on drugs was not thrust upon the schools and the communities of this nation. It was not a sudden sneak attack as the Japanese attack on Dec. 7, 1941. This insidious war on drugs began many years ago.

In 1969 when Carmen Armenti was mayor of Trenton, Chief Lanahan appointed Lt. Carl Worob and Lt. George "Puggy" Malone as Trenton Police Department members to the Operation Crime Stop Committee sponsored by the Civitan Club of Trenton, an international service club.

This community involvement partnership continues today. Operation Crime Stop was initiated to make the community aware of crime problems, to fight crime in the streets and to curtail the rising use and popularity of narcotics which was the principal cause in the rising crime rate.

The Trenton magazine, published by the Trenton Chamber of Commerce, carried in the August 1970 issue, an article: "Civitan's Crime Stop Is Working." It stated, "The City Council commended the Trenton Civitans in a special resolution. The Superior Officers Association of the Trenton Police Department voiced their appreciation in a resolution: " * * * this program is symbolic of the reciprocal benefits derived from mutual cooperation of law enforcement officers and the general citizenry."

The article further noted: "Narcotics arrests as a direct result of Operation Crime Stop . . . 67 with 40 cases under investigation." The alert was sounded that narcotics were a problem.

This very same project, war on drugs, is continued with the same goals and partners. The efforts of the police and the Civitans to alert the public to the dangers of drug and alcohol use and abuse were not heeded in 1969 any more than they were in 1985. Then, as now, the committee concentrated on education and awareness. It stressed community involvement. Speakers, programs, literature, etc. were available in 1969 as they are today.

In 1969, we were told that we were overreacting and we were alarmists. We were told that organizations did not want to hear too much about drugs. This was something that prevailed in depressed areas among the minorities.

Today, we are being asked for more information about drugs and alcohol. Panic has hit the suburbs as well as the inner city. It is now a universal problem which is found in every walk of life, without restriction.

The immediate cry is that we need more police. We need more federal and state money. We need changes in the laws to make

them tough on the pushers. We need tough judges who are not afraid to issue tougher sentences.

The battle cry, war on drugs, is now so popular that every candidate for office knows that he or she cannot have any opposition to their staunch stand on fighting drugs. The candidates tell us how bad it is. They talk about the evils of drugs. However, no real solution is offered.

We have hundreds upon hundreds of officeholders, bureaucrats, etc. who are so very gifted with rhetoric and so full of words that they do more harm than good. They very seldom put their money where their mouths are. They talk without saying anything of value.

Millions of dollars allocated to fight drugs are destined to filter through committees, established offices of bureaucrats, high-priced executives and staffs and through the maze of federal, state and municipal governments. By the time it gets to the front where the real war is fought, there isn't any money remaining.

So now that the money so generously appropriated is not available to hire more police, to provide better equipment, to help communications, it falls back on—guess who? The people in the community again face the same problem that the politicians vowed to solve.

So who is going to fight the war against drugs? The ordinary citizen—the same person who pays the bill and who suffers the wounds. The generals, like the politicians, are back at headquarters.

How then do we fight this war? The ordinary student is no match for the street-wise drug-pusher. The people in the communities are no match for the hardened, greedy and sometimes murderous senior pushers. So how do we fight? We certainly cannot take up arms. That is against the law. Besides, the pushers have the best weapons that money can buy.

During World War II, we found that when a country was overrun by a superior enemy, the only way to fight back was to harass the enemy wherever he was located. This guerrilla warfare took its toll of the enemy. Harass our enemy, the pusher, and we will begin his demise. Fight the pusher by helping the police.

Since drugs are a commodity, it is subject to an economic principle of supply and demand. If there is a demand for a product, the supply will be made available; that is what we call business. Take away the demand and the business fails, since there isn't the money to pay the bills or show a profit.

Now we are back to the drawing board. How do we put the pushers out of business? Answer. We reduce and stop the demand. Now that you have stopped laughing—start thinking. How do we reduce and stop the demand?

The answer is known to all of us. It is education, knowledge, awareness and involvement.

Our schools are mandated to have 10 hours of substance abuse education a year. It isn't enough, but it is better than none at all. Our schools are making a valiant effort to do the job in all forms of education, including drug and alcohol use and abuse. However, all education needs help. It needs concerned parents to help carry the load. The schools and churches are not able to do the work that is needed to be effective. They need help. They need your help.

We are in an all-out war. This is a war that will not be won in a short time. If it is to be won at all, it must have a total commitment

of students, parents and all of society who do not want to be enslaved by the drug lords.

Involvement does not mean that we take up guns, knives and clubs and go out in the streets. It means that everyone fights the battles with knowledge and being part of the guerrilla force that will harass the pushers wherever they operate.

The future of your children is in your hands. You love them. Protect them by being a caring parent—a concerned parent.

For starters, teach your child about drugs. Don't depend on the schools to do the teaching that you should be doing. There are a great many sources of drug and alcohol information. Call 989-DRUG and we will get this information to you.

Setting an example is vital to the success in fighting drug and alcohol use and abuse. Your child will scoff at you if you tell him or her to avoid drugs and alcohol when you yourself are using and abusing.

In September 1987, the Mayor's Task Force appointed by Mayor's Authur Holland held a series of public hearings to give Trenton residents as opportunity to tell what is happening in their communities. On March 29, results were made public. Less than a hundred "concerned citizens" attended that public meeting.

Those who attended, and those who received second-hand information, did not want to hear why arrests were not made immediately after the police were notified of an incident. Less were interested in the judicial process that is required before the offenders could be brought to court. Most were not pleased with the sentences that were given.

Some of the criticism made of the meeting may have been justified. When people are living with the stench of drug and alcohol problems, they want immediate and positive action—not rhetoric.

The report prepared by the Task Force should be in every home. It should be read and read again. After reading the report and digesting the contents, you will have a better understanding of the problems on the other side of the fence.

Here are some recommendations of the Task Force:

Start a Crime Watch in any neighborhood or housing project that does not have one (drug locations mentioned at the hearings are in areas where there is no Crime Watch).

Form a neighborhood unit of the Council of Civic Associations. There is strength in numbers.

Call the Operation Drug Stop (sponsored by the Civitan clubs of Trenton, Hamilton Township and Colonial Valley) when you have crime and drug information. Be specific—give full names, description, time, place, type of drug, and anything else you feel will help the police.

Get speakers, pamphlets and other aids for meetings of organizations or any group of concerned citizens, from the high school, Civitan clubs, the Mercer County Council on Alcoholism or any of the treatment agencies.

Help the high school, churches, organizations and the Drug Task Force provide more wholesome recreation in Trenton for all ages.

Seek help for drug abusers and drug addicts through the Mercer County Council on Alcoholism, the Mercer County Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse or through the treatment agencies.

What has happened is only the start. More will be done with more involvement of concerned citizens. At this time, if you see any crime or drug activity, call Operation Drug Stop, (609) 989-DRUG or (609) 989-3974. This

covers Trenton and surrounding areas. The Drug Summit report can be received by calling (609) 989-6703 or (609) 989-3030.

RULE CHANGE BRINGS VICTORY TO MARIETTA TENNIS TEAM

HON. GEORGE (BUDDY) DARDEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, once again Marietta, GA has emerged victorious over Cheraw, SC, in the annual Chinaberry Cup tennis tournament. This prestigious competition held on April 20, at Litchfield Racquet Club, near Pawley's Island, SC, is now in its 12th year. Under the rules of the tournament, each side fields 5 teams to compete at various levels. In past years, the winner has been determined by simply adding the number of winning matches by each team.

This year, however, Marietta's coach, A.D. Little, negotiated a key rules change with Cheraw's coach Malloy Evans. Under their agreement, the overall winner would be determined solely by the outcome of the match between the best team from each city.

That decision by Cheraw cost them the championship. While Cheraw won a majority of the lesser matches, Marietta's No. 1 team of Jon Burk and Dan Norris humiliated Cheraw's No. 1 team of Frank Andrews and Frank Exum and therefor won the tournament.

The Marietta team deserves to be recognized for their great effort and success at retaining their championship title. They are as follows:

A.D. Little, coach; Dr. Dan Norris; Ron King; Dr. Clem Doxey; Wallace M. Montgomery, Jr.; Jon R. Burke; Ronald H. Francis; Paul (Matty) T. McCabe; Donald R. Shamblin; John Elliott; and Buddy Darden.

To our friends from Cheraw: Best wishes in your training for next year.

The following departed with the losing team from Cheraw:

Malloy Evans, coach; Glenn (Bud) Anderson; Fred Craft; M.B. Godbold; Ted Thompson; Frank Andrews; Dr. Teddy Coggeshall; Dr. Walter Crosby; Jackie Furr; and Frank Exum.

ON THE NOMINATION OF CLARENCE THOMAS TO THE SUPREME COURT

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. Speaker, President Bush in nominating Clarence Thomas for the Supreme Court grossly distorted the fact when he proclaimed Mr. Thomas the most qualified person for the position. But what's new about Mr. Bush taking excessive liberty with political speech?

And Mr. Speaker, Judge Clarence Thomas' track record in citing history and historical events is not much better. In 1987 Mr. Thomas wrote to the San Diego Union newspaper

attacking Justice Thurgood Marshall for stating that blacks should not celebrate the bicentennial of the Constitution nor should they revere the Founding Fathers because they sanctioned slavery.

Mr. Thomas, the nominee for the highest judicial post in our Nation and the one being vacated by Mr. Marshall, sternly attacked the Supreme Court Justice. He wrote that Mr. Marshall's criticism was insulting and flawed by concentrating on the issue of slavery, an anomaly. Then Mr. Thomas decided to become an interpreter of black history by stating that "Justice Marshall's understanding of blacks and the Constitution stands in stark contrast to that of notable Americans from Frederick Douglass and Abraham Lincoln to Martin Luther King."

Mr. Speaker, let me state that Mr. Thomas is no more capable of interpreting history than he is of interpreting the Constitution, especially the Bill of Rights. It is apparent that Mr. Thomas needs to revisit the "nuns" for a refresher course if he thinks Frederick Douglass and Martin Luther King would disagree with Justice Marshall's feelings about celebrating the bicentennial. I will cite for Mr. Thomas' edification precisely what Frederick Douglass had to say about the Founding Fathers and slavery. I hope Mr. Thomas and those who are promoting his nomination will read carefully the following speech delivered by Mr. Douglass on the Fourth of July 1852 to an audience in Rochester, NY. The emphases are mine for the purpose of alerting Mr. Thomas to must reading.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS' FOURTH OF JULY SPEECH 1852

Fellow Citizens: Pardon me, and allow me to ask, why am I called upon to speak here today? WHAT HAVE I OR THOSE I REPRESENT TO DO WITH YOUR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE? Are the great principles of political freedom and of natural justice, embodied in that Declaration of Independence, extended to us? And am I, therefore, called upon to bring our humble offering to the national altar, and to confess the benefits resulting from your independence to us?

Would to God, both for yours sakes and ours, that an affirmative answer could be truthfully returned to these questions. Then would my task be light, and my burden easy and delightful. For who is there so cold that a nation's sympathy could not warm him? Who so obdurate and dead to the claims of gratitude, that would not thankfully acknowledge such priceless benefits? Who so stolid and selfish that would not give voice to swell the halleluiahs of a nation's jubilee, when the claims of servitude had been torn from his limbs? I am not that man * * *

I am not included within the pale of this glorious anniversary! Your high independence only reveals the immeasurable distance between us. The blessings in which you this day rejoice are not enjoyed in common. The rich inheritance of justice, liberty, prosperity, and independence bequeathed by your fathers is shared by you, not by me. The sunlight that brought life and healing to you has brought stripes and death to me. THIS FOURTH OF JULY IS YOURS, NOT MINE. YOU MAY REJOICE, I MUST MOURN. To drag a man in fetters into the grand illuminated temple of liberty, and call upon him to join you in joyous anthems, were inhuman mockery and sacrilegious irony. Do you mean, citizens, to mock me, by asking me to speak today? * * *

Fellow citizens, about your national tumultuous joy, I hear the mournful wail of millions, whose chains, heavy and grievous yesterday, are today rendered more intolerable by the jubilant shouts that reach them. If I do forget, if I do not remember those bleeding children of sorrow this day, "may my right hand forget her cunning, and my my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth!" To forget them, to pass lightly over their wrongs, and to chime in with the popular theme, would be TREASON MOST SCANDALOUS AND SHOCKING, and would make me a reproach before God and the world. My subject, then, fellow citizens, is "American slavery." I shall see this day and its popular characteristics from the slave's point of view. Standing here, identified with the American bondman, making his wrongs mine, I do not hesitate to declare, with all my soul, that the character and conduct of this nation never looked blacker to me than on this Fourth of July. Whether we turn to the declarations of the past, or to the professions of the present, the conduct of the nation seems equally hideous and revolting. AMERICA IS FALSE TO THE PAST, FALSE TO THE PRESENT, AND SOLEMNLY BINDS herself to be false to the future. Standing with God and the crushed and bleeding slave on this occasion, I will, in the name of humanity, which is outraged, in the name of liberty, which is fettered, in the name of the Constitution and the Bible, which are disregarded and trampled upon, dare to call in question and to denounce, with all the emphasis I can command, everything that serves to perpetuate slavery the great sin and shame of America! "I will not equivocate; I will not excuse"; I will use the severest language I can command, and yet not one word shall escape me that any man, whose judgement is not blinded by prejudice, or who is not at heart a slave-holder, shall not confess to be right and just * * *

* * * What to the American slave is your Fourth of July? I answer, a day that reveals to him more than all other days of the year, the gross injustice and cruelty to which he is the constant victim. To him your celebration is a sham; your boasted liberty an unholy license; your national greatness, swelling vanity; your sounds of rejoicing are empty and heartless; your denunciation tyrants, brass-fronted impudence; your shouts of liberty and equality, hollow mockery; your prayers and hymns, your sermons and thanksgiving, with all your religious parade and solemnity, are to him mere bombast, fraud, deception, impiety, and hypocrisy—a thin veil to cover up crimes which would disgrace a nation of savages. There is not a nation of the earth guilty of practices more shocking and bloody than are the people of these United States at this very hour * * * lay your facts by the side of the every-day

practices of this nation, and you will say with me that, for revolting barbarity and shameless hypocrisy, America reigns without a rival.

Mr. Speaker, I dare Mr. Bush and Mr. Thomas to read what Frederick Douglass thought of the Founding Fathers and slavery. It might lift the blinders from their eyes.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE FLORIDA-ISRAEL INSTITUTE

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize the Florida-Israel Institute, an international linkage organization established by the Florida legislature and jointly administered by Broward Community College and Florida Atlantic University. The institute represents the State university system and the division of community colleges. Its goal is to enhance cultural, educational, research, and economic exchanges between Israel and Florida. The Florida-Israel Institute contributes to the community in many ways; however, one of its most valuable programs in MEDAX.

MEDAX is essentially a medical exhibition that allows any country in Europe and any State to exhibit and demonstrate new techniques, and showcase improved technology and equipment. MEDAX, which is held every 2 years, is based in Jerusalem and has an important function that makes this exhibition extremely valuable to all those involved. This program offers the Israeli market an opportunity to see new products from Europe. In effect, MEDAX services as a bridge between the technology of the United States and Europe. This sharing of knowledge obviously benefits both the United States and the countries of Europe, as it offers them a chance to discuss techniques, and export their new technology.

MEDAX is also greatly beneficial to the Florida economy, as it specifically allows Florida to penetrate the Israeli market. Previous MEDAX conventions have shown their worth by creating numerous partnerships between American and Israeli companies. At the "MEDAX of 1989," many companies showed their willingness to participate in the exhibition as over 20,000 people attended from 30 countries to view the various American and European exhibits.

Another important program the Florida-Israel Institute is conducting is a Student Tuition Ex-

emption Program. This program grants Israeli students, whether they are undergraduate or graduate students, tuition exemptions. Students are eligible as long as they receive favorable recommendations from their teachers, and they have relatively high academic merit. During the 1990-91 school year, this program enabled eight community college and eight university students to pay their resident Florida tuition fees. This exemption program is indeed a helpful service to Israeli students in need.

I wish to recognize and thank Dr. Benjamin Popper, Dr. Efraim Ben-Zadok, Amber Zentis, Daniel Cantor, Dr. Lance deHaven-Smith, Susan Gilbert, Morton A. Goldberg, Dr. William Greene, Dr. Willis Holcombe, the Honorable Moshe Liba, the Honorable Norman Ostrau, Dr. Henry Pevsner, Joel Reinstein, David Rush, Adina P. Simmons, Tom Slattery, Bruce Starling, and Herb Swartzman for their tremendous work on the Florida-Israel Institute.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reemphasize that the Florida-Israel Institute, acting as a bridge between societies and is an establishment that has proven its worth through its actions. May they have continued success and happiness in the years ahead.

NATIONAL MUSHROOM MONTH

HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1991

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution designating September 1991 as "National Mushroom Month."

Last year, the United States produced over 720 million pounds of high quality, delicious mushrooms. This important food is a valuable and tasty part of the human diet, containing only 14 calories per serving and 99 percent fat free.

My congressional district produces 25 percent of the Nation's mushrooms and is the second largest industry generating over \$230 million per year. Mushroom production also benefits the environment by efficiently recycling tons of agricultural products.

As more and more Americans are becoming health conscious, the mushroom's versatility can play a larger role in our diet. You can slice'em, dice'em, stuff'em, saute'em, and serve'em with any meal. I urge my colleagues to eat mushrooms with every meal and co-sponsor National Mushroom Month.