

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO ENOLIA P. McMILLAN

HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 30, 1991

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of one of the most outstanding individuals of our time. With tremendous enthusiasm, I call your attention to Mrs. Enolia P. McMillan who has been a stalwart in the ongoing civil rights efforts of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP] for more than 50 years.

It is upon her retirement, after more than 21 years as president of the Baltimore chapter of the NAACP, and later as president of the National chapter, that we pause to laud her phenomenal accomplishments and tireless dedication to this organization and to the fight for civil rights.

Born October 20, 1904, Mrs. McMillan has been a resident of the great State of Maryland since age 3. She went on to pursue her first love, teaching, in Charles County. Later, as she pursued her master's degree in school administration at Columbia University, where she wrote a thesis focusing on the racial inequalities of the Charles County school system, Mrs. McMillan inaugurated what was to become a longstanding commitment to eradicating racial inequality. As a result of her work on behalf of black school children and teachers, she was asked to assist with the revitalization of the Baltimore branch of the NAACP.

Mrs. McMillan muses that her involvement with the NAACP and her unending fight for equal rights probably stymied her career in the school system. Nonetheless, her diligence as civil rights activist remained undisputed. For 50 subsequent years, she endeavored to recruit hundreds of young people and thousands of dollars to revitalize the faltering Baltimore chapter.

Unfortunately, few of those who were active during the first strife-filled decades of the civil rights struggle remain among us. Nevertheless, history has vividly captured those days and we are reminded daily of how far we have come. Unfortunately, we are equally reminded of how far we have to go, as the remaining years of the 20th century seem an accurate reflection of those first tumultuous decades of the struggle, even as we approach the year 2000.

As an activist charged with recruiting for the historic civil rights organization, Mrs. McMillan was faced with the major obstacle of allaying people's fear of reprisals as a result of joining the movement. Although segregation and violent opposition to any change made most people leery, Enolia McMillan successfully enlisted new members, bolstering the effectiveness and the reach of the NAACP. In 1969, she would become president of the Baltimore chapter and would continue to shape the

branch into one known throughout the Nation for its impressive recruiting and fundraising.

Perhaps her greatest accomplishment, however, was as president, convincing the national NAACP to move its headquarters to Baltimore in 1986. Here, she continued to steer the organization to its mission of attaining civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, the fight for civil rights is an arduous one and requires persons with conviction and fortitude. As activist and president, Enolia P. McMillan distinguished herself as such a person. For more than 21 years, she has been a vital force in the fight for the rights of African-Americans. Tenacious in her efforts and touching the lives of many in pursuit of her mission, she dutifully served at the helm of both the Baltimore chapter and the national office of the NAACP. As one of many who have directly benefited from her efforts, I commend her.

Mr. Speaker, I know you join me as I wish Mrs. McMillan well, and hope for her continued success in all future endeavors. She has indeed made a profound contribution to our rich national heritage. Let us hope that our Nation will strive to continue in the spirit of that legacy.

MORALITY AND U.S. POLICY IN THE GULF

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, a number of religious leaders have raised questions regarding U.S. policy in the Persian Gulf. It has been suggested that the gulf crisis does not fulfill the criteria for military action under the tradition of "just war," and that sanctions should have been continued.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the American religious community can have a legitimate role to play in the debate about U.S. policy in the gulf. Of course there is the moral underpinning of an alliance strategy to carefully consider. Even though Saddam Hussein is a thug and a despot, the United States and the allies cannot abandon their respective and collective standards of morality.

It is clear to this Member that the United States actions to cause Iraq to withdraw or be removed from Kuwait are morally justified. Saddam Hussein seized and raped a sovereign state, and positioned his armies to sustain and perhaps further expand his conquests. Saddam Hussein possesses weapons of mass destruction, and has used poison gas against his enemies and his own people. He is the leader of a terrorist state that has fundamentally disrupted the international order. America is absolutely correct in responding in

a swift and decisive manner to Saddam Hussein's aggression.

Mr. Speaker, this Member would insert into the RECORD an excellent editorial by Dr. George Weigel from the December 9, 1990 edition of the National Catholic Register that addresses the morality of U.S. policy. Dr. Weigel makes the persuasive argument U.S. policy does fulfill the requirements of the just war doctrine. He argues that, "what's at stake in the first crisis of the post-cold-war world: Will international public life be conducted according to civilized ground rules, or will we be in Hobbes' state of nature where all are at war with all?" This Member commends the editorial to the attention of his colleagues.

GOD AND THE GULF
(By George Weigel)

The facts: America's bishops have applied just-war reasoning to the Gulf crisis in a highly controversial way.

The impact: Despite their good intentions, neither justice nor peace have ultimately been served.

WASHINGTON.—At the close of the U.S. bishops' annual meeting here in November, Archbishop Daniel Pilarczyk of Cincinnati, conference president, addressed a letter to President Bush in the name of the body of bishops.

In it, he raised questions about the morality of possible American military intervention in the Persian Gulf.

Pilarczyk's letter amplified an earlier letter sent to Secretary of State James Baker by Archbishop Roger Mahony, chairman of the bishops' international policy committee.

One of the most striking characteristics of the debate over U.S. policy in the Persian Gulf is the way in which it has been couched in the language of the just-war tradition. Mahony and Pilarczyk have every reason to enter that debate, bringing the full resources of the long Catholic heritage of thought on these matters to bear in a situation fraught with both peril and opportunity.

One might have wished that the national Church leadership had entered the argument several months earlier. The two letters may raise, in sound minds, the question of whether America's bishops believed that the moral dimension of the argument had been ignored until their intervention—a dubious assumption, given the vigor with which commentators and politicians have been arguing precisely on moral grounds about the ends and means of U.S. action in the Gulf.

In any event, the issue now is not whether the bishops have the right to enter the debate—they surely do—but whether their intervention has deepened the argument in the way the bishops intended.

I would respectfully suggest that the two letters have not done the needed job.

The just-war tradition, which the bishops rightly argue is the normative Catholic framework for thinking about issues of war and peace, is a tradition under pressure at the end of the 20th century.

It's under particular pressure in the case of an adversary like Saddam Hussein. Saddam's actions in the Iran-Iraq war, in the suppression of the Kurds (through, among other

• 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.

things, the indiscriminate use of poison gas, a tool even Hitler eschewed), and in the rape of Kuwait since Aug. 2 (which has included the execution of children in front of their parents) suggest that he does not share, in even the vaguest way, our universe of moral reasoning.

That Saddam acts like a barbarian is, of course, no excuse for our abandoning our own standards. But it does complicate the situation in a grave way, and the bishops could have acknowledged this in their letters.

In fact, it's not clear that the bishops correctly identified the full measure of the threat posed by Saddam. The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait was the symptom of a deeper disease: the disease of a terrorist state, ruled by coercion, possessing weapons of mass destruction and the ability to use them far beyond its borders, and threatening to control the greater part of a resource essential to the orderly functioning of international economic life. (If Saddam controlled the Saudi oil fields, his first economic victims would not be middle-class American drivers, but the poor of the Third World.)

Because this is the threat, the policy goal in the Gulf must be (a) the elimination of Saddam's arsenal and his chemical and nascent nuclear weapons capability; and (b) the collapse of his regime. Our goal in other words, should be an Iraq shorn of weapons of mass destruction, radically diminished in its capacity to conduct offensive conventional war and capable of living in a measure of order, if not the fullness of peace, with its neighbors.

If this can be done through a combination of diplomacy, political and economic pressure, and an internal coup, so much the better. But we ought not doubt that it *must be done* if we're to avoid a tragedy of unspeakable proportions at some point in the 1990's. The bishops' letters do not adequately address this larger dimension of the Gulf crisis.

The bishops are also more impressed by United Nations and Arab support for U.S. policy than perhaps they should be. The fact of an international coalition against Saddam is a plus, at the moment, from the American point of view. But we shouldn't fool ourselves about the motives of some of our Arab allies in this affair. Nor should we be sanguine about future prospects of the U.N. Security Council as the "proper authority" (in just-war terms) for legitimating the resort to military force.

Some of the Arab states involved in the coalition have acted from the conviction that Saddam's defeat could open the path to a more rational politics in the Middle East; Egypt is prominent among them.

Others, notably Syria, have acted from sheer experience. Indeed, Syria's cynical use of the Gulf crisis as the occasion for completing its demolition of Lebanon (and, be it noted, its Christian community) goes singularly unremarked in the bishops' letters.

Does a coalition that includes the odious Hafez Assad of Syria more fully satisfy the just-war criterion of "proper authority?"

As for the United Nations, it is, as ever, a stage on which a script written elsewhere is being played out. That the U.N. has, to date, fallen into line behind the leadership of the United States is no indication of a fundamental change in that usually disappointing institution. Rather, it illustrates the fact that the post-Cold War world is a *unipolar* world, in which the United States is the sole great power capable of laying down the ground rules of international behavior.

The United States ought to exert that leadership at the head of a coalition of states

and with the agreement of the U.N., whenever possible. But the key to a more effective U.N. is more assertive U.S. leadership in that organization. Nor should we suppose that a U.N. Security Council whose members include Yemen [the December chair of the council] is a more plausible "proper authority" than a democratically elected president and Congress of the United States.

The bishops' letters urge the economic sanctions against Iraq be pressed, a position with considerable support among American [and European] political leaders. But this policy is not without its own moral difficulties. The last people to feel the "bite" of sanctions will be those whom we are most concerned to defeat; the military and political infrastructure of Iraq. The people who will suffer, first, are the non-combatant people of Iraq, who President Bush has rightly insisted are not our enemies.

There are no easy answers to this moral and political dilemma. But the bishops would have deepened the argument had they not seemed to suggest that the sanctions strategy was self-evidently more satisfactory, from a moral point of view, than the proportionate and discriminate use of armed force.

Then there's the question of "last resort," another classic just-war criterion. The Mahoney and Pilarczyk letters put great stress on this point, as indeed they should. But "last resort" is not an arithmetic concept. One can always imagine one more other-than-military tactic Mr. President, could be tried.

No, what "last resort" means is that all reasonable efforts at a non-military solution to a problem have been exhausted. This is especially important to keep in mind in the case of a dictator like Saddam Hussein, who has shown a cunning ability to manipulate our moral concerns [and our democratic process] to his own ends.

Moreover, does the criterion of "last resort" automatically exclude, in any and all circumstances, the pre-emptive use of proportionate and discriminate armed forces? Unlikely. Had Israel not used such force against Iraq's Osirak nuclear reactor in 1981, today's Gulf crisis would have taken on truly apocalyptic overtones.

The just-war tradition is a theory of statecraft as well as a calculus for relating the use of military force to the pursuit of peace, freedom, justice and security. Thinking within the just-war tradition is far more like a conductor interpreting a symphonic score than like an engineer factoring an equation.

The tradition also contains within itself a concept of peace—not the peace of a world without conflict, nor the peace of the Kingdom come in its fullness, but the peace of a minimum of legal and political order in international public life.

That, in brief, is what's at stake in the first crisis of the post-Cold War world: Will international public life be conducted according to civilized ground rules, or will we be in Hobbes' state of nature, where all are at war with all?

The Bush administration's failure to articulate this issue notwithstanding, there is no escape from American responsibility here. We have to do what we can—with whatever allies we can muster and according to our own best standards—to assure that order, rather than anarchy, characterizes the future of world politics.

Were Saddam to succeed—and any face-saving compromise that allows him to maintain his regime and his arsenal while coughing up the remains of poor Kuwait will

be accurately interpreted as a defeat for the forces of world order—anarchy would almost certainly prevail.

And that, morally and strategically, could be the worst outcome of all.

IN RECOGNITION OF HAMMOND ADULT EDUCATION

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to commend the Hammond Adult Education Program and its director, Dr. Steven E. Watson, for their outstanding accomplishments. Administered by the School City of Hammond, IN, the Hammond program was recently named a recipient of the Secretary of Education's Outstanding Adult Education and Literacy Program Award for 1990. Hammond Adult Education is certainly deserving of this high honor.

One outstanding feature of the Hammond program is a structural design that allows students to teach and support one another as they interact with the instructor, one-on-one, and in groups. A comprehensive support system, with cooperation from numerous social service agencies and local businesses, provides exceptional resources for the adult students. Their needs are also met through a strong development program for teachers and staff.

In 1988, this program was selected to become a competency-based instructional system pilot site by the Indiana State Department of Education. The curriculum is designed to prepare individuals to set and pursue individual goals, complete secondary education, acquire training and retraining for employability, and gain specialized knowledge, skills, and information.

Hammond Adult Education has also worked with local 1010 of the United Steel Workers of America and the Inland Steel Co. to develop Joblink 2000, a joint union-management training program. Hammond Adult Education provides academic instruction to steel-workers so that they can learn new skills due to increased technological and competitive demands. The voluntary program has been well-received and attended by members of local 1010 who are interested in improving their reading, vocabulary, mathematics, and test-taking skills.

Joblink 2000 is a shining example of how to prepare our work force to meet the demands of the future. Ultimately, our national security and prosperity depend upon the capabilities of our Nation's work force to compete in a global marketplace. Joblink 2000 is taking innovative steps toward meeting the needs of the workers of northwest Indiana.

All those associated with Hammond Adult Education, and Joblink 2000 should be proud of their outstanding efforts, which have had a dramatic and positive impact on the lives of the residents in northwest Indiana. I would also like to recognize the special contributions of Mike Mezo at local 1010, and Ian Hughes and Morgan Burke at Inland, whose combined efforts helped to make Joblink 2000 possible. We in the region are familiar with their accom-

plishments and I am pleased that deserved recognition has now been achieved on the national level.

**SUPPORT OUR TROOPS IN THE
PERSIAN GULF DAY**

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, February 3, I will have the honor and privilege of taking part in a very special event. At the boardwalk in Seaside Heights on the New Jersey shore, a rally will be held to express the widespread support of the people of Ocean County for our brave men and women serving in Operation Desert Storm.

The rally will mark the occasion of Support Our Troops in the Persian Gulf Day, which has been proclaimed by the Ocean County Mayors Association. The people of Ocean County, like the majority of all Americans, support President Bush and the members of our Armed Forces involved in this conflict.

At this time when our Nation is at war, Americans are united behind the President and our men and women in uniform to a degree that has not been seen in a generation. Traditional differences over political affiliation, ideology, and regional identification have melted away as we all join in admiration for the bravery and professionalism of our volunteers and pray for their safe return after the successful conclusion of this worthy mission. Perhaps the most deeply moving experience I have had as a Member of Congress occurred Tuesday night during the President's State of the Union Address when all of us assembled in the House Chamber rose for a sustained standing ovation to salute the troops in the Middle East.

In casting my vote in favor of authorizing the President to use military force to uphold U.N. resolutions that Iraq must withdraw from Kuwait, I was torn by hopes for a peaceful resolution to the conflict and the realization of the need to enforce international law. Although voting for the use of force was not a decision I took lightly, it was a clear decision and one I do not regret.

While we waited for economic sanctions to have their intended effect, Saddam Hussein would have been able to enhance his military preparedness and pose an even greater threat to the world. Iraq had been frantically working on weapons of terrible destruction, including nuclear. Saddam's cowardly missile attacks against purely civilian targets in Israel, his use of environmental terrorism in the gulf and his disgraceful and illegal treatment of POW's are further proof that we could not afford to let this dictator buy more time.

At no time since the United Nations was founded has there ever been such universal consensus and resolve among the nations of the world as there has been against Iraq's brutal takeover of Kuwait. The burden of leadership has once again fallen to the United States, and, thanks to the brave efforts of our fighting men and women, we will once again prevail over tyranny and aggression.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

**CALIFORNIA DROUGHT FORCES
WATER POLICY SHIFTS**

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the drought in California is now in its 5th year. Fundamental changes must be made in the way California allocates its scarce water supplies among competing interests. In particular, as noted in the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times, relatively small reductions in water use by irrigated agriculture could serve thousands of urban customers in this rapidly growing State.

The continuing drought will require Californians and Federal water officials to make difficult choices. The current hodge-podge of 19th century water laws, wasteful irrigation practices, and long-term water delivery contracts must be changed to face the current drought in a realistic manner.

**AGRICULTURE'S BIG THIRST IS NO LONGER A
SACRED COW**

Something long overdue is coming to California's water policy—some candor about where the richest and most populous state will get the water it needs in years to come.

From one wet year to another, regional politics have almost always dominated debate on water issues. In such years, Northern California, where most of the state's supply is captured for distribution to cities and farms, can stifle calls for action from Southern California, where the need for water outstrips supply. In such years, farmers can drown out complaints that they waste enough water irrigating marginal lands to more than make up for shortages in cities. Not this year.

Quite suddenly, agriculture is on the defensive, and serious meetings are being called to discuss future policies that involve people who have scarcely talked to one another since the last drought of the 1970s: urban water managers, environmental activists, farmers, northerners and southerners.

What turned the tables—so that questions about future water resources will dominate regional politics at least for a while—is the fifth year of a drought of historic proportions. As Times writer Kevin Roderick reported recently in chronicling the drought, water levels in California's most important reservoirs fell during December, a month when they almost invariably collect more water.

That hit home a week ago in Southern California.

The Metropolitan Water District already had served notice that it would cut residential water deliveries to the 17 local agencies that depend on the MWD for all or most of their supplies by 5% and agricultural deliveries by 10%. After reservoir levels fell, the district squeezed its local agencies even tighter, cutting residential supplies by 10% and agricultural deliveries by 30%. That same day Sen. David A. Roberti (D-Los Angeles), Senate president pro tem, hoisted water policy from near the bottom to the very top of this list of issues for 1991.

Not only that, the first of three steps he recommended in his outline to ensure adequate water supplies for all of California would require mandatory reductions in water used for irrigation, which accounts for 80% of all water distributed in the state.

January 31, 1991

Next, he said, the state should concentrate on cleaning up polluted aquifers and building new storage facilities to hold water that falls during the winter for delivery during the summer.

The California Water Code gives urban use preference over agricultural use, but the language is vague, and it is worse than vague—silent, in fact—on the crucial question of the circumstances that would give urban users the first crack at water supplies. In years past, when the federal government could always find the dollars for a new dam or reservoir or canal, urban leaders seldom mentioned the water code. Cities often needed farmers on its side in lobbying for new water projects, and discussing urban preference irritated irrigators.

In recent years, analysts have been more vocal in challenging agriculture's claim to so much of the state's water. Nor have politicians, notably Assemblyman Phillip Isenberg (D-Sacramento), been shy about talking about it.

Isenberg, who probably knows water policy better than any other elected official in Sacramento, said flatly early this year that in his opinion future supplies of water for growing urban areas would come "from a reallocation of water conserved by agriculture."

To illustrate the potential for conservation in agriculture, Isenberg said that pasture, alfalfa, cotton and rice account for only 12% of the state's total farm output. But the water that is used to irrigate those crops could provide urban areas with supplies adequate for something over twice the state's present population.

Changing water policy requires more than sensible talk or reasonable outlines. Laws that deal realistically with water and California's future are far from passage.

But with the drought, serious people are giving serious thought to the shape of new laws. That is worth celebrating.

**HONORING THE EFFORTS OF THE
PITTSBURGH FEDERAL EXECUTIVE
BOARD AFRICAN-AMERICAN
HISTORY MONTH COMMITTEE**

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, the Nation will soon celebrate African-American History Month. Across the country, Americans will take part in local programs celebrating the contributions of African-Americans to our cultural, business, educational, scientific, and political life.

I am proud of the efforts of local citizens in Pittsburgh who have labored to ensure that everyone in our city has an opportunity to join in this celebration. In particular, I want to recognize the 10-year commitment of the Pittsburgh Federal Executive Board African-American History Month Committee to making African-American History Month an enjoyable and educational event for so many members of our community.

This committee, under the chairmanship of Roland L. Saunders, has succeeded over the years in expanding the observation of African-American History Month. The committee sponsored events have grown from a series of pro-

grams observed mostly by Federal employees to an exciting range of programs in which every part of the community, from school children to senior citizens, has taken part.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the efforts of the African-American History Month Committee and wish them the very best in making this year's celebration of African-American History Month a great success. So that others may learn from these efforts, I insert a brief statement outlining the history of the African-American History Month Committee be printed in the RECORD immediately following my statement.

STATEMENT OF MR. ROLAND L. SAUNDERS, CHAIRMAN, AFRICAN-AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH, PITTSBURGH FEDERAL EXECUTIVE BOARD

In 1982, the Pittsburgh Federal Executive Board (PFEB), one of the most active FEBS in the area of "Special Emphasis Programs" (SEP), organized an ad-hoc committee to develop and produce programs to commemorate African American History Month (AAHM). Employees from 17 agencies assembled to respond to its request. The Committee was ad-hoc because, until that time, SEP programming was a function of the PFEB's Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Committee. Working with the 1982 theme, "Blueprint for Survival," approximately 12 programs were produced. All but one of these programs were held in the Federal Building and were viewed almost exclusively by federal employees who worked in that facility. The remaining program was a dinner held at the U.S. Army Oakdale facility. That year, two significant programs were initiated. They were the "Art Contest" that was conducted in the Pittsburgh middle schools and the "Outstanding Citizens' Awards Dinner."

The 1982 theme, "Blueprint for Survival," has proven to be a most appropriate beginning endeavor because the success of that year's programming resulted in the PFEB Policy Committee converting the ad-hoc committee to full and permanent committee status. As we approach February 1991, this Committee, that was to disband after the 1982 programs, will be producing and implementing its tenth year of program activities. During this period, it has more than doubled its growth in participating agencies, more than doubled its number of programs, expanded its program activities to include producing commemoration programs for the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday, expanded the "Art Contest" to an "Art/Essay Contest" conducted in Pittsburgh and adjacent county schools, awarded more than \$6,000 in U.S. Savings Bonds to the contest winners, recognized more than 30 local community people for contributions they have made to improve the quality of life of the less fortunate, produced several programs each year at non-federal facilities in local minority communities, and more than tripled the number of federal facilities at which programs are produced, thereby, substantially increasing the number of employees who benefit from the various experiences.

The 1991 program year will be another year of growth. The Committee has broader representation than ever before and it is planning to implement some new and exciting programs. It will produce a Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. program at a home for the aged and its first public AAHM kick-off event. This activity will be a two-hour jazz show featuring some of Pittsburgh's finest local talent. It's our belief that African American History Month is deserving of a

prime time public kick-off program and jazz is an appropriate presentation because of its roots in African American culture. The "Art/Essay Contest," "Outstanding Citizens' Awards Dinner," "Art/Essay Awards Luncheon," "Personnel Workshop," and "Minority Business Opportunity Workshop" will continue with the general public as the target audience. In addition to these, all of the participating agencies will produce commemoration programs for their employees.

All of us, past and present, who have enjoyed the privilege of serving on this Committee feel especially honored for being given the opportunity to produce, in program form, the products of our individual and collective creative talents, while at the same time making a difference in the level of cultural awareness of our fellow employees and the citizens of the Greater Pittsburgh Area. The leadership and staff of the PFEB are to be commended for their progressive visions and support of all the efforts of this Committee and the employees who volunteer so much of their time to do the work of the Committee are to be given a resounding vote of thanks for jobs extremely well done. I am particularly honored that I started as the Chairman in 1982 and remain there through 1991. I sincerely thank everyone for the confidence and support you have given me. Without it this testimony could not be possible.

MANSFIELD, MA CITIZENS FORM GULF WAR SUPPORT GROUP

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the citizens of the town of Mansfield for the initiative they are taking to provide support for the families and friends of those members of our Armed Forces who are serving in the Persian Gulf.

As the accompanying article from the Sun Chronicle, published in Attleboro, makes clear, Ginny Hayes and Vicki Prasad are performing a very important service for the rest of us in their work. By organizing Together Love Conquers at this time, Ginny Hayes and Vicki Prasad are both providing important help to those who are now worried over the safety of loved ones in the gulf, and also giving the rest of us the chance to help out in this effort to provide comfort and support.

I am pleased to be able to be working with them in this, and I ask that this article about their work be printed here so that it may serve as an example for other communities around the Nation.

[From the Attleboro (MA) Sun Chronicle, Nov. 25, 1991]

MANSFIELD WOMEN HOPE TO GIVE TLC TO AREA FAMILIES

MANSFIELD.—People's feelings of frustration and hopelessness over the Persian Gulf war have prompted two local women to start an extended support group designed for the general public and friends and families of servicemen in the Tri-Town area.

Ginny Hayes, whose son, Sgt. Patrick Dillon, is in Saudi Arabia with the Marine Corps, and Vicki Prasad, a volunteer with the Mansfield Cable Access group, have started TLC (Together Love Conquers) to

offer various services to families of the troops.

The first meeting, said Prasad, open to Mansfield, Norton and Foxboro residents, has been scheduled for 7:30 p.m. Monday Feb. 4 at the Mansfield Cooperative Bank, 80 No. Main Street, in Mansfield.

"I think the whole concept is to see what avenues we can open up to the families and friends of people stationed there," said Prasad.

The women stressed they want to go beyond counseling and assist soldiers' families with the everyday tasks facing them while their loved ones are abroad.

"I'm just proud of all these kids. I'm scared," Hayes acknowledged, adding she was "thrilled" by a phone call she got Wednesday from her own son.

Still, Hayes has a difficult time, as do many Americans, grasping the reality of sending a child off to war.

"I just never thought it would come to this," she said.

"I have nine children. We've (she and her husband Raymond) gone through a lot, but we've never been through a war," Hayes said, adding the time for homefront action has arrived.

"I think the realism (of the war) has to override the emotion at this point. You can't sit home and do nothing," said Hayes, whose children range in age from 21 to 31.

Services that the women want to offer include: Baby-sitting services for family of servicemen; cosmetology and hair-cutting services; tax-preparation; advice from the military; legal services; some "fun" events such as dining out, going to movies and other forms of entertainment; repairs to homes such as plumbing; help with household budgets.

"This does not have to be publicized," said Prasad, explaining the services will be handled through various organizations that the two women are in the process of contacting, including:

The Rotary and Lions clubs, Tri-Town Chamber of Commerce, Catholic Women's Club of Mansfield, Red Cross of North Attleboro, Emblem Club and American Legion Post in Mansfield.

Also, all churches and houses of worship, the support group based in the Bethany Church in Foxboro currently meeting Tuesday nights at 7:30, Foxboro Human Services, Self-Help, Inc., a fuel-assistance group that serves the greater Attleboro area, the Mansfield Women of Today, the Masons and the United Way.

"So far, everything has been positive," said Prasad. "We're getting beautiful response from people."

Individuals to be contacted, Prasad said, will include Mansfield Selectman Amos Robinson, who has spurred a letter-writing campaign by the board of selectmen, State Sen. William Keating, D-Sharon, State Rep. William Vernon, R-Mansfield and U.S. Rep. Barney Frank, D-Newton.

The group, however, stress the women, will be a political and will not take sides in the war.

"I feel very confident about this. I feel that a lot of people feel very frustrated—it will get rid of their anxiety—their feeling of helplessness," Prasad said.

Hayes concurs.

"I found myself watching CNN so much—I think a lot of people do feel helpless—and we're going to give people a chance to get involved," she said.

Those interested in helping, should contact Prasad at home (339-8797) or at the Mansfield Cable Access studios (339-2858).

BLACK NURSES DAY

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Black Nurses Day. I commend my colleague Congressman LOUIS STOKES for his leadership role in bringing to the attention of Congress the many significant contributions of black nurses.

I would like to commend especially the National Black Nurses Association [NBNA]. The members of this organization make day-to-day health care available to people in their communities who have little or no other access to health care. The Black Nurses Association was organized in 1971 under the leadership of Dr. Lauranne Sams, former dean and professor of nursing, school of nursing, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL. NBNA has 50 chartered chapters throughout the United States, the eastern Caribbean, and Africa.

Since 1971, the NBNA has provided a forum for collective action by black nurses to investigate, define, and determine the health care of black Americans and to implement change to make available to black Americans and other minorities health care commensurate to that of the larger society.

The NBNA's programs on teenage pregnancy, infant mortality, high blood pressure, and hypertension are examples of their dedication to providing important and necessary health care for all citizens.

Today I commend the black nurses in the United States and throughout the world for their dedication and commitment to providing health care and for the sick, their contributions stand as an example to all of us.

THE RIGHT TO SAFE DRINKING
WATER ACT OF 1991**HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, there is something fundamentally wrong when a country's Tax Code is structured so as to force people to drink contaminated water when other options exist.

There is something fundamentally wrong when a country's Tax Code penalizes utilities for extending safe water services to areas threatened by ground water contamination.

There is something fundamentally wrong when a country's Tax Code forces Federal agencies to use Federal funds to pay Federal taxes.

Today I have introduced legislation to change this fundamental problem with our Tax Code. My legislation, the Right to Safe Drinking Water Act of 1991, will allow a utility to exclude from its gross income, for Federal income tax purposes, a contribution received in aid construction for water main extensions in cases where public health is threatened by ground water contamination. These contributions are now taxable under section 118(b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The exemption will only apply in cases where the donation of dollars or property is received from a governmental entity. Under the current system, utilities are often required by public service commissions to pass the tax on to the public body, which must then use tax dollars to pay taxes. In addition, the legislation will only apply to circumstances where wells already in existence have become contaminated, thereby preventing developer abuse.

While this legislation addresses a growing nationwide problem, I am aware of a situation in northwest Indiana that painfully illustrates the effects of section 118 can have on communities and their residents.

The Lake Sandy Jo Superfund site is located in the center of a small northwest Indiana neighborhood. The hazardous wastes that accumulated in this one-time landfill have seeped into the surrounding environs—contaminating nearby ground water and threatening the health of nearby residents.

The Environmental Protection Agency determined that it was necessary to bring water mains to the neighborhood; however, problems with section 118 of the Tax Code have blocked progress for almost 3 years.

In June of 1988, a widow who lives next to Lake Sandy Jo was quoted in a local newspaper:

I just feel it's taking too long to do this. I don't drink the water. I'm paying \$14 a week for six gallons of bottled water. I wash in my well water, sometimes. I used to use it to water my flowers, but my African violets didn't bloom. So I started using the bottled water for that and they started to bloom again.

It is now January 1991, 9 years after Lake Sandy Jo was designated a Superfund site, and water main construction has barely started. Various Federal agencies haggled for almost 3 years about who was going to pay this Federal tax. Ironically, most of it will be paid for by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the water problem experienced by those who live near Lake Sandy Jo—and the many others like them around the country—is unnecessary. The legislation I am introducing today easily remedies the problem without affecting the larger meaning of section 118(b).

I urge my colleagues to support me in this measure. Clean water is a right that all our constituents deserve. It is unconscionable that homes in the United States not have access to safe, clean water.

SUPER SUNDAY

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 3, 1991, the Jewish Federation of Great Monmouth County, NJ, will hold its annual Super Sunday. Hundreds of volunteers will gather at the Jewish Community Center in Deal, NJ, for a massive telephone campaign in support of humanitarian services here at home, in Israel and around the world. Organizers hope to raise \$300,000 during the 12-hour phonathon coordinated nationwide.

This year's Super Sunday comes at a time of great anxiety and concern for Jews throughout the world. The ongoing Iraqi Scud missile attacks on Israeli population centers has reminded the world of the constant threat that the citizens of the Jewish State live under and the vulnerability of this tiny country. The admirable restraint that Israeli leaders have shown in not being drawn into this conflict despite such cruel provocations demonstrates the dependability of Israel as a partner for peace and stability in the Middle East. I am confident that the many friends of Israel in Congress will see to it that the Israelis' sacrifices will not go unrecognized and unappreciated by the United States.

While our attention remains fixed on the Persian Gulf, the situation in the Soviet Union continues to deteriorate. The tragic tradition of anti-Semitism in Russia, the Ukraine and elsewhere, always just beneath the surface, is being fueled by ultranationalist hate groups and the tendency to find a scapegoat for the economic collapse. As a result, life is becoming increasingly difficult and dangerous for Soviet Jews. Fortunately, the State of Israel exists to take in these refugees and provide them with a new life. However, this modern-day exodus is straining the resources of Israeli society to the breaking point—particularly during this time when the Middle East is convulsed by a war that threatens the security of Israel.

This urgent humanitarian effort needs outside support, and efforts like those of the Jewish Federation of Greater Monmouth County will provide much-needed assistance to rescue more than 1 million Soviet Jews from a very bleak future. While their future in Israel is also somewhat clouded by uncertainty, I am confident that the great sense of family and community that has marked the absorption of each new wave of immigrants to Israel—from European refugees of the Holocaust through the recent influx of Ethiopian Jews—will provide these Soviet refugees with lives of dignity and a bright future for their children.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to take part in this important event and share my pride with my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

LET BLACKS BE WHAT THEY CAN

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, for the past weeks, the attention of the Congress and the world has been focused on events in the Persian Gulf. The outbreak of war with Saddam Hussein and his armed forces in Kuwait and Iraq has raised some very serious and complex issues which our Nation must now confront.

One of the issues which I and others have followed closely are reports of the disproportionate number of African-Americans not only serving in today's Armed Forces, but who comprise the frontline troops who will see combat in Operation Desert Storm. While African-Americans represent only 12 percent of the general population, they constitute 23 per-

cent of the military, and as much as 30 percent of our frontline troops in the Persian Gulf war.

Mr. Speaker, our military has been characterized as the "highest quality we have ever had," and military recruits described as "smarter and better educated than their civilian counterparts." Yet, for the vast majority of children of working-class African-Americans, a career in the military is the only option available upon completion of high school. The issue has caused us to focus our attention on corporate America and its failure to reach out to our best and brightest citizens.

Mr. Speaker, Clarence Page, a columnist for the Chicago Tribune recently explored this issue in an article entitled, "Let Blacks Be What They Can." I hope my colleagues will take a moment to read this thoughtful analysis:

LET BLACKS BE WHAT THEY CAN

(By Clarence Page)

African-Americans are serving heroically in the Persian Gulf, just as some have served in every war America has fought. But never before has their role been challenged as vociferously as black leaders challenge it today.

Even before the bombs started to fall over Baghdad, the high numbers of blacks in Operation Desert Storm had become an obligatory invocation at peace rallies. "If that war breaks out, our youth will burn first," Jesse Jackson told a black audience a few days before bombing began.

Many other echo similar, if less incendiary, sentiments. Black Americans comprise 23 percent of the military, although they are only about 12 percent of the general population, and are variously estimated to make up as much as 30 percent of front-line troops in Operation Desert Storm.

Blacks also show higher enlistment and lower "attrition" (failure to complete a term of enlistment) rates than whites. Although the reasons are not clear, black women show the lowest attrition rate of all groups, and white women have the highest, according to Northwestern University's Charles Moskos, a widely published military sociologist.

Historically, blacks have shared the belief that progress can only be won if blacks share the burden of defending the nation. Now, barely a century after Frederick Douglass urged president Abraham Lincoln to allow black volunteers to fight in the Civil War, today's black leaders complain that blacks may be overrepresented on the front lines.

Even in the Persian Gulf, black soldiers complain among themselves from time to time that they could be "dying disproportionately for a country that won't grant them their rights," says Moskos, who visited American troops in Saudi Arabia last fall.

Although they are nowhere near staging a mutiny over it, their grumbling shows how many troops have brought with them some of the widespread bitterness many American women and minorities feel back home over President Bush's veto of the Civil Rights Act of 1990 as a "quota bill." Civil rights leaders hope President Bush will have a tougher time vetoing a revived version of the bill, now that he has sent large numbers of women and minorities to Operation Desert Storm.

Of course, there are two easy ways to even up the military's racial numbers: an outright racial quota on enlistments or an equitable draft without exemptions or loopholes. So far, neither of those alternatives has re-

ceived much support from civil rights leaders.

Besides, the private sector offers a better place to look for a solution. Just about everyone agrees that young black men and women go into the military to find better opportunities than they might get in civilian life. If they had better civilian job opportunities, maybe their military numbers would decline. It could happen, if civilian companies followed the Pentagon's example and improved their standards for recruitment, training and merit promotions as openly and fairly as the military has since the '60s.

Although critics claim affirmative action policies tend by the very nature to sacrifice quality for quotas, minorities and women have increased at all levels in America's new high-tech military during a period in which it standards for enlistment actually have become more rigorous, not less.

The lesson here is important for the growing number of private companies that are wondering how they can attract the best talent in both sexes and all races at a time when Labor Department statistics show women and minorities to be the fastest growing groups in the work force: Emphasize quality, not quotas.

Contrary to popular belief, today's military may not be drawing and rehabilitating members of the so-called urban "underclass" as much as it is creaming off black high school graduates who would have the best chance of finding work somewhere else.

Richard L. Fernandez, a Congressional Budget Office analyst, recently wrote that a young male from a community with family incomes 20 percent below the average was only slightly more likely to enlist than one from an area with incomes 20 percent above the average.

Many recruits are attracted by opportunities the private sector has been slow to offer, including education, training and promotions based more on merit than on oldboy networks and buddy systems. "The military has offered blacks a sense of inner security that they got to where they are because they earned it, not because of a quota," Moskos says.

So, if anyone wonders, as a recent Washington Post headline did, why black leaders are "trying to divide blacks from the American mainstream," perhaps a better question is: Why has America's mainstream persisted in dividing itself from blacks?

For example, a record number of black colonels and generals have retired in recent years, yet Moskos' studies show almost none have received any private-sector offers to match the top-level corporate position offers retiring senior white officers routinely receive. Social segregation still persists in the country club set.

Maybe we're not asking the right questions. Instead of asking why the military has so many courageous and intelligent minorities in its ranks, maybe we should be asking why the private sector has so few.

GENERAL MOTORS HONORS BETHLEHEM'S BAR, ROD, AND WIRE DIVISION

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Bethlehem Steel Corp.'s bar, rod,

and wire division in Johnstown, PA, for winning the General Motors Corp. prestigious Mark of Excellence Award.

This award, which is the highest honor attainable within GM's Targets for Excellence Program, demonstrates the high quality of work and the dedication of the employees at the bar, rod, and wire division. They became the first supplier of bar steel in the United States to win this award from GM.

The bar, rod, and wire division is one of the cornerstones of the steel industry in Johnstown today. Like all steel manufacturers, the BRW division has had to work hard to overcome the downturn which took place in the steel industry in the early 1980's. But the commitment by Bethlehem to the BRW division and the hard-working employees, who are committed to producing the best product possible, has enabled the BRW division to meet the high standards that GM has set for this award. The axle and drive shafts and pinion blanks that the BRW division produces for GM have proven to be of the highest quality, and the BRW division is extremely deserving of this award.

I would like to salute the employees of the BRW division for their hard work which has resulted in this award. The people of the BRW division should be very proud of this honor, and I know that this will only drive them to higher goals.

YOUTH ADVISORY BOARD GETS YOUNG PEOPLE INVOLVED

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to salute the outstanding young men and women who serve on my youth advisory board during the current school year. The young men and women who serve on the board were selected by their schools' principals and/or counselors to represent their fellow students based on the leadership they already have demonstrated in academics, student government, athletics, or other extracurricular activities.

We hear much about a growing alienation Americans feel toward the institutions of their government and toward their government officials. Perhaps some of that alienation arises because too many Americans have never met their elected officials—and too few elected officials have made a genuine effort to go out and get to know the men and women they serve. In the absence of that kind of interaction between public officials and the public, the unfortunate alienation we see today will only become more and more widespread in the years ahead.

Such alienation is especially common among our young people—many of whom believe adults aren't interested in their opinions and concerns, won't seek them out for serious discussions and, for the most part, simply don't want to bother with them. The youth advisory board sends a signal to young men and women in north and east Harris County that their opinions and concerns are important and

that they should be included in any discussion of the issues facing our country. Most of all, it indicates to our young people that they matter.

The youth advisory board, which I created when I first entered Congress 10 years ago, is composed of two students from every high school and junior college in my congressional district. The board provides high school and junior college students with direct access to their Congressman and allows them to meet prominent men and women who have succeeded in a wide variety of fields. The board involves young people in, and teaches them about, their government. The young men and women who serve on the board, in turn, talk with their fellow students about issues being debated in Congress—motivating all students to think about, and become knowledgeable of, the issues that surely will affect all Americans now and in the future. That knowledge can only motivate students to become involved in our political process, as more and more students come to understand that you have to get involved in order to succeed in life.

But in the 10 years that the youth advisory board has been in existence, I've gained from the students at least as much as I've given to them.

The youth advisory board offers high school and junior college students living in the Eighth Congressional District an opportunity to pass along their idea and opinions directly to their representative in Congress. It affords the students the opportunity to hear inspirational speakers who have excelled, in a variety of fields. In the past, youth advisory board speakers have included astronaut Alan B. Shepard; radio personalities Chuck Wolf and Derrill Holly; television newscasters Melanie Lawson and Jan Carson; and Gen. Frederick F. Woerner, Jr., commander in chief of the U.S. Southern Command [Southcom]. But most of all, by demonstrating the value of their opinions and concerns, it encourages today's students to work to become tomorrow's leaders.

As a result of organizing the youth advisory board, I have a deeper appreciation for the opinions of tomorrow's leaders—at least those who live in my congressional district. I have become a better Congressman—a better representative—because of the input and suggestions and ideas I've obtained from the members, past and present, of the youth advisory board. I remember one meeting at which the students and I discussed ideas to discourage drug use in our country. I explained several of the Federal programs designed to address this pressing problem; they, in turn, outlined approaches taken in their schools pointing out which approaches seemed to work and which did not. This is the kind of interaction that makes me a better Congressman, and makes the youth advisory board such a wonderful and valuable program.

The members of the youth advisory board for the 1990-91 school year are:

Aldine High School—Jennifer Mullins and Ronnie Loflin.

Aldine Contemporary Education Center—Anu Srivastav and Larry Shivers.

C. E. King High School—Kimberly Scott and Bryan Cannon.

Channelview High School—Tammy Early and Ricky Robichaux.

Chinquapin High School—Ana Morena and Alex Bolanos.

Crosby High School—Tracey Edmondson and Derek Eagleton.

Eisenhower High School—Alice Hardt and Jerry Froehner.

Furr High School—Diana Marroquin and Scott Abbott.

Galena Park High School—Patricia Martin and Reducindo Guerra.

Huffman Hargrave High School—Shannon Kershaw and Patrick Malone.

Humble High School—Amber Rietdijk and Greg Wachel.

Jersey Village High School—Laura Frakey and Scott Bryant.

Kashmere High School—Ingrid Baker and Nobelton Jones.

Kingwood High School—Heather Wiley and Graeme Nistler.

Klein High School—Tanya Ponton and David Myers.

Klein Forest High School—Shannon Zenger and Sean Christ.

Klein Oak High School—Stephanie Pipkin and Michael Sanders.

MacArthur High School—Cicely Youngblood and Jeffrey Saunders.

New Caney High School—Kim Early and Gilbert Pina.

Nimitz High School—Lisa Harrelson and Michael Sharp.

North Shore High School—Keri Harvey and Chris Villa.

Lee High School—Veronica Jones and Justin Poepsel.

Sterling High School—Allison Witte and Bryant Swint.

Sam Houston High School—Monique Rushing and Winslow Guiterrez.

Smiley High School—Mona White and Charles Jones.

Spring High School—Lydia Hollie and Matthew Randall.

Westfield High School—Heather Powell and David Gloystein.

Lee College—Janet Mouton and Michael Welch.

North Harris County College (North)—Laura Adams and Dale Martin.

San Jacinto College (North)—Marie Moore and Stephen Krebs.

North Harris County College (South)—Karen Callery and S. Patrick Zickert.

Mr. Speaker, each of these students has chosen to get involved, to make a difference. I know that you join with me in saluting their dedication, and the dedication of all the young men and women who have served on the youth advisory board during the past decade. These young men and women already have achieved a level of success, and already have been recognized as leaders in their schools. But I remain confident that their greatest accomplishments, their greatest successes, their greatest opportunities to demonstrate the leadership skills they have developed lay ahead.

PRAISE FOR 1991 LAMOTTA AWARD WINNERS

HON. RON de LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to make a statement today in praise of three outstanding Virgin Islanders and longstanding friends of mine, Helen Kelbert, Allen Richardson, and Frank Powell, who have been chosen recipients of the St. Thomas-St. John Chamber of Commerce 1991 Wilbur "Bill" LaMotta Community Service Awards.

Helen has endeared herself to her community through her years of dedicated work with public service organizations, particularly the chamber. Her quiet competence is an example of selfless devotion to the Virgin Islands and its people.

Allen's artistry has been seen on numerous carnival floats and costumes as well as here in the Nation's Capital by the ornaments he has crafted for the national Christmas tree. He, too, has given years to public service work particularly the Frenchtown Civic Organization.

Frank not only devoted many years to the Department of Public Works, he also served his community as one of the founders of the St. John Celebration Committee. Since 1958, he has helped to make the Fourth of July celebration a success that thousands of residents and visitors enjoy every year.

It is citizens such as these who truly embody the spirit of the Virgin Islands, and are richly deserving of the honor of the Bill LaMotta Award.

LET'S NOT FORGET OUR DOMESTIC AGENDA

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Anna Quindlen basically said it all in her January 31 column in the New York Times. All the applause lines and flag waving in the world cannot camouflage the unmet and deepening crises right here at home.

It would be a great tragedy if the budget the President sends to the American people and the Congress next month ignores the enormous challenges of poverty, health care, housing, child development, and the environment as thoroughly as did his State of the Union Message.

The column follows:

THE DOMESTIC FRONT

(By Anna Quindlen)

There are many ways to watch America in action, but one of the most colorful is to stroll the public spaces of the Port Authority Bus Terminal, that squat, ever-busy gateway to the world on wheels. You can learn something about the state of the Union by the state of this place. And it has precious little to do with cuts in the capital gains tax.

The irony of the terminal is that the building has never looked better, with neon wall

sculptures and bright lighting. It's the people that are the problem. The scammers, who do a booming business in selling telephone calling card numbers for \$10 a shot. The run-aways, their eyes as old as the stories they can tell about serial parents, prepubescent incest and foster homes. The broken men, with years of booze running red in the veins of their faces. "Excuse me, sweetheart," some of them say as you edge past, proving that chivalry is not dead, it's just drunk.

And all around them move the commuters, angry at being panhandled, tired of walking over prone bodies to get to the greener, cleaner places where they live.

America is a little like this now. In some ways it has never looked better, with its flags flying and the yellow ribbons tied around its trees. It's the inside that's rotting away, the domestic disintegration that war has given us all an excuse to forget.

On television, reporters said that children in Israel were sleeping in hotels, homeless because of the war. Children in New York slept in hotels for years because they were homeless.

On television they showed bombed buildings that were shells amid fields of rubble. I've seen those broken buildings and rubble fields in forgotten neighborhoods all over New York.

The same country that has rallied round pushing Iraq out of Kuwait has given up on parts of itself. Infant mortality. Teen-age pregnancy. Drugs. Dropouts. Bank failures. Home foreclosures. We walk around the bad stuff on our way to somewhere else and mutter under our breath: Own fault, own fault.

Fault is not the point. A capable, nononsense woman named Janis Beitzer runs the little world of the bus terminal, and it would be perfectly understandable if she said her job was to put people on buses, and all the rest is someone else's problem. But that would be shortsighted, like missing the opportunity to rally people united behind a war abroad around an equally horrible war at home. Rerouting traffic patterns to discourage loitering, opening a drop-in center for the homeless, hiring social service workers—she's had to deal with issues no one running a bus terminal ever had to consider before.

"We didn't really have a choice," Ms. Beitzer says.

Neither do we. America often has a one-track mind, and the track in the last month has led straight to the Persian Gulf. The President knew where the ovations lay in his State of the Union address, a kind of boilerplate noble-cause speech that could have been delivered by any American President engaged in battle abroad. When he praised the men and women fighting in the gulf, a great roar went up from his audience.

But the domestic initiatives in his speech were sketchy, perfunctory and shockingly beside the point. At a time when many Americans still believe this war is inextricably linked to our reliance on foreign oil, he kissed off energy conservation with one vague sentence. Elimination of PAC's and a cut in capital gains taxes don't seem like pressing issues for a country with thousands of people sleeping in the streets and thousands of mothers giving birth to addicted babies.

Time magazine named George Bush "Man of the Year" at the beginning of the month, declaring him adept at foreign affairs and muzzy on domestic issues. It was the first known case of a multiple personality defense for an elected official. Now the President has a mandate to play to his strengths, and to forget the national weaknesses. And his own.

A one-track mind is not enough for government. If the President thinks only of war, the home front will have disintegrated, in some cases beyond repair.

The soldiers he invoked to such rousing effect the other night will come home. Some of them will lose their houses if the recession continues. Some of them will watch their children die on city streets if we do not do something about crime and drugs. Some of them might even wind up someday in a bus terminal, sleeping on the floor, in the home of the free and the brave. When that happens we will know that we have lost, the war, the war we turned our backs on while we were busy with yellow ribbons.

PASSAGE OF AGENT ORANGE LEGISLATION

HON. THOMAS J. RIDGE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, the House of Representatives cast a long-awaited vote on H.R. 556, the Agent Orange Act of 1991. This legislation represents a bipartisan compromise on a controversial and emotional issue. As a Vietnam veteran and member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am pleased to have joined all of my colleagues on the committee as an original cosponsor of this well-intended and well-written legislation.

Let me begin by commending several individuals on the committee for their work on this issue and their efforts to bring this legislation forward so soon in the 102d Congress. The distinguished chairman of the committee, Chairman MONTGOMERY, and ranking minority member, Congressman STUMP, deserve recognition for their leadership to work toward a reasonable compromise. Congressman LANE EVANS also deserves a great deal of recognition for his determination to see this issue resolved for the Vietnam veteran community. Many others on the committee have sat through many hearings, reviewed this issue, and worked diligently toward an equitable and compassionate solution to the agent orange issue.

Since the 1970's, many questions have lingered regarding exposure to agent orange, and more often than not, we have been unable to respond. As many of my colleagues said earlier this week, one of the most difficult issues for members of the committee was how to balance fairness for the veteran community with our responsibility as public policymakers to enact responsible and just legislation.

Earlier this week, the House of Representatives unanimously approved legislation that would properly balance these objectives. H.R. 556 will codify decisions previously made by the Department of Veterans Affairs to recognize non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, soft-tissue sarcoma and the skin condition, chloracne, as service-connected conditions, thus guaranteeing VA compensation for individuals with these conditions. This legislation will also instruct the National Academy of Sciences [NAS] to conduct a thorough review of the existing studies that have been completed on agent orange and to report to the DVA on a regular basis as

to its findings. The Secretary would then be required to make a determination with respect to each disease, and if appropriate, to grant a presumption.

This provision addresses two important roadblocks that have been difficult to overcome in the past. First, it gives the scientific review authority to an independent organization—a step that is intended to ensure the objectivity of the agency charged with responsibility. Second, it removes Congress from the scientific role that we have tried to fill in the past—a move that will allow for compensation in appropriate cases in a more timely manner.

As I have said in the past and will restate today, our Government's commitment to the veteran should endure long after battles have ended. We fulfilled part of that commitment to the Vietnam veteran community by passage of H.R. 556, but the road to achieve this was marked by controversy and conflict—much like the Vietnam conflict itself.

As our men and women battle in the Persian Gulf, I pledge my continued, strong support for these individuals. Our commitment to them has only just begun to be fulfilled. As this week's vote indicates, it will continue long after the situation in the Persian Gulf is resolved.

Let me again express my satisfaction with passage of the Agent Orange Act of 1991.

FREE TRADE NEGOTIATIONS WITH MEXICO: NO BLANK CHECK

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress must soon decide whether to approve or reject President Bush's request for a "fast-track" negotiation process of a free trade agreement with Mexico. If granted, this authority would permit the President, under the rules of the 1988 Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act, to negotiate a trade agreement with Mexico and submit it for congressional ratification without possibility of modification or amendment. The President's trade negotiators have already announced their intention to exclude critical environmental, labor, antitrust, and drug enforcement issues from these negotiations. And both United States and Mexican officials recently signaled their intent to complete negotiations by the end of this year.

While I strongly support expansion of free trade through both multilateral and bilateral arrangements, I am deeply concerned with the haste and the limited focus that appears to characterize the Bush administration's approach to these critical negotiations. And while I respect the effort President Salinas has made to reform the Mexican economy, I fear that a hastily concluded trade agreement could have immediate adverse consequences for American industry and labor without producing significant long-term reciprocal trade benefits for the United States economy. I wish President Salinas and the Mexican people every success in their efforts, but not at the expense of American workers.

Our Nation's successful experience with the United States-Canada Free Trade Agreement [FTA] has been cited as a precedent for the proposed trade agreement with Mexico and as justification for an accelerated negotiation and ratification process. As someone who closely monitored the development of the Canadian FTA from its initial discussions, I see few parallels between the Canadian and Mexican situations to warrant the "blank-check" approach sought by the administration. The United States and Canada share similar political and cultural traditions, and decades of relatively unhindered trade and investment have also produced similar economies with compatible industrial structures and labor standards. In those sectors where differences in capital costs, labor wages, and general business costs have created competitive advantages between the two economies, many have favored American producers.

Given these similarities, plus the fact that nearly three-quarters of bilateral trade between the two countries was already duty free, negotiation of the United States-Canada FTA focused largely on harmonizing technical differences in the two nation's policies governing protected industries, State subsidies, industry regulation, and product certification and inspection. But achieving agreement even on these more technical issues required several years of negotiation, necessitated a 10-year implementation, and prompted an intense political debate throughout Canada.

An entirely different set of circumstances govern the economic relations between the United States and Mexico. While Mexico is now our Nation's third largest trading partner, it has only recently initiated steps to open broad economic and political ties with the United States. For 130 years, Mexico's overriding political objective was to separate itself from the United States, creating an economically isolated Mexican economy of Government-controlled or Government-owned industries designed to produce only for a tightly controlled domestic market. These policies stifled industrial development, bankrupted the Mexican Government, and impoverished the Nation's large and rapidly growing population.

The United States and Mexico are now at vastly different levels of economic development. Like most developing countries, Mexico lags far behind the United States in technology and productivity, but enjoys substantial advantages in labor and production costs. The average manufacturing wage in Mexico is currently 57 cents per hour, compared with \$10.47 per hour for American workers. And if fringe benefits are added, the differential is even larger. Mexican standards governing employee benefits, environmental protection, workplace safety, and public health are also extremely weak or unenforced, permitting manufacturers to avoid the significant costs that must be borne by their American competitors.

The proposed United States-Mexico Free Trade Agreement is thus unprecedented in seeking to link an advanced industrial economy with a developing country whose size and proximity carries the potential to dislocate industries and workers on a massive scale. Given the cost differences, it is easy to understand why United States manufacturers would

be drawn to Mexico in response to intensifying foreign competition. As the Maquiladora Program has shown, large numbers of American manufacturers have been able to significantly reduce labor costs and avoid compliance with costly employment and environmental regulations by simply moving their manufacturing operations across the border. This has eliminated thousands of skilled manufacturing jobs in the United States and stimulated an increase in Mexican imports that has further weakened our industrial base.

Nearly 500,000 Mexican workers are now employed at 1,500 American-financed plants in Mexico producing products destined almost entirely for the United States market. This has required movement of substantial American capital abroad that otherwise might have been employed to improve United States production facilities, enhance product quality, and train American workers. By granting Mexican products broader access to United States markets, a free trade agreement will further encourage this export of American capital and jobs. American industry would also be hurt as the Japanese and other competitors are encouraged to invest in Mexico to set up nearby production bases from which to expand their penetration of the United States market. Indeed, Japanese speakers at a recent international investment conference admitted that a free trade agreement would greatly encourage Japanese investment in Mexico as a way of reaching the United States market "through the back door."

Under traditional concepts of free trade, the closing of domestic factories and the export of some jobs could be justified if economic growth is stimulated in Mexico to such an extent that new demand is created for American exports of goods and services. Such broad-based economic development in Mexico, however, would require substantial domestic and foreign investment in production facilities and long-term capital improvements, together with a major redistribution of economic benefits to enhance the living standards and the purchasing power of the mass of Mexican workers. This is very unlikely to occur for several important reasons.

First, an expansion of Mexican economic activity in response to a free trade agreement is unlikely to enhance significantly the lives or income of Mexican workers for the obvious reason that low wages must be maintained to attract new foreign investment. At the Maquiladora plants along the border, more than 400,000 workers earn less than \$1 an hour and live in squalid shantytowns near the factories. While these workers benefit from having jobs, few can afford to buy the consumer goods they produce, let alone more expensive American exports. The Mexican Government seeks to replicate the Maquiladora concept throughout Mexico. Even if successful, this will provide only marginal improvement in the living standards of the Mexican people while perpetuating the economic inequities that characterize Mexican life.

Second, the substantial domestic and foreign investment needed to finance economic development continues to be discouraged by perceived weakness in the Mexican economy and Government. Eight years of debt crisis and devaluation have created a severe capital

shortage that has forced the Mexican Government to compete with Mexican business in seeking financing abroad. Unfortunately, the limited investment that is occurring has been targeted either to short-term securities or expansion of Maquiladora plants. Little capital is available for long-term investment to construct new production capabilities, erect distribution networks, or improve the country's decaying infrastructure.

While potential investors are impressed with the pace of reform in the Mexican economy, they continue to be deterred by the weak foundations of these reforms and the weakness of political support for the reform effort. President Salinas has acted boldly to privatize the banks and to open key industries to foreign investment. But he has never formally repudiated the Government's initial nationalization of the banks, and his efforts to liberalize foreign investment have come through administrative measures rather than legislation. Considerable fear exists that these reforms could easily be reversed. These fears are compounded by the growing instability of Mexican democracy. The most recent national elections indicate that the 60-year, near-dictatorial rule of the Institutional Revolutionary Party may be coming to an end. The absence of any sign of a new political restructuring perpetuates fears that economic reform could be the first victim of any serious political upheaval.

The third and, perhaps, most significant factor discouraging broad economic growth in Mexico is the continued withdrawal of billions of dollars in capital assets from the economy through capital flight. Between 1973 and 1987 an estimated \$64 billion in Mexican capital was invested abroad by wealthy Mexicans seeking to protect capital assets from triple-digit inflation and possible devaluation of the overvalued Mexican peso. This has significantly impeded economic growth by diverting capital needed for domestic investment and by absorbing scarce foreign exchange to finance foreign investments that could have been used to finance imports needed for economic growth.

The level of capital flight occurring between 1973 and 1987 was nearly 65 percent of the increase in foreign debt accumulated during these years. Had these private assets been mobilized within the economy, Mexico's debt burden could have been substantially reduced and austerity measures that have stifled growth could have been avoided. Instead, capital flight has continued to undermine resolution of Mexico's debt crisis by permitting a sizable portion of new resources from new foreign credit and investment to "slip out" of the economy again as new capital flight.

The key to Mexico's prosperity is persuading Mexicans, not just foreigners, to invest in their country's future. Mexico's economy cannot grow if it is dependent on the type of foreign investment represented by the Maquiladoras. It must convince Mexicans to repatriate the billions of dollars in Mexican capital for long-term investment in resource development, business expansion, and infrastructure improvement. While the Salinas government has done a great deal to attract foreign investment to Mexico, it has not suc-

ceeded in convincing Mexicans in large numbers to bring their capital back home.

Given these impediments to economic growth in Mexico, I question the potential success of any trade agreement that does not attempt to address the broader structural problems of the Mexican economy. American policy toward Mexico should seek to encourage greater liberalization of the economic process, including development of policies to encourage long-term investment and repatriation of Mexican assets and to provide Mexican workers with an increasing share of the benefits of economic improvement. Without such broad structural reforms, I fear we will be throwing American jobs away in a free trade agreement that benefits principally the wealthy elite of Mexico and provides a low-wage export platform for entry into the American market.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time to begin constructive trade discussions with Mexico. However, in view of the wide disparities between our economies, and the numerous economic and political issues involved, I do not think it appropriate to set artificial deadlines for the completion of these discussions. Moreover, I am certainly not prepared to limit the role of Congress to a single yes or no vote on any package that might emerge from these discussions.

I intend to oppose vigorously the President's request for fast-track authority to pursue free trade negotiations with Mexico. These negotiations are far too important to proceed without careful deliberation. And the outcome of these discussions is far too important to American workers in my district and across the country whose jobs may be sacrificed with little or no reciprocal benefit to the American economy.

NEW INITIATIVES IN GOVERNMENT: THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, during his State of the Union Message, the President proclaimed before the assembled Congress, leaders of Government, and the U.S. people, that the efforts of the Federal Government should not be exclusively devoted to new Government initiatives. Instead, the President called for "new initiative in Government."

Today, I am introducing legislation that goes to the heart of the President's call to action. My legislation does not propose a new Government program, does not increase taxes, and requires no reduction in other programs. Yet, this same legislation will result in increased expenditures approximating \$25 billion or more for this Nation's infrastructure—while, as best as I can determine at this time, saving taxpayer money. Additionally, the legislation I am introducing will result in increased revenues to the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I am proposing today to take the highway trust fund off budget. Certainly, this is not a new idea. Last year the House voted on this proposal only to see it narrowly defeated. I believe, for several reasons, this

should be the year Congress makes a new initiative regarding the use of the highway trust fund.

First, as we all know, the Federal-Aid Highway Program must be reauthorized before it expires at the end of the current fiscal year. This is the appropriate time to resolve the issue of the highway trust fund surplus, and the issue of how it is masking the true size of the deficit.

Second, as a result of last year's Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, taxes collected from the sale of motor fuels are, for the first time, devoted to a purpose other than the construction, maintenance, and safety of our Nation's highways and bridges. Two and one-half cents of the 5-cent increase in motor fuels tax is being sent directly to the Treasury to pay for deficit spending by the Federal Government. My proposed legislation seeks to strike an element of fairness with the States concerning the 5-cent increase in the motor fuels tax. As part of the agreement reached during deliberations on the OBRA of 1990, half of the fuels tax increase will accrue to the highway trust fund during fiscal years 1991 through 1995, but it cannot be spent. Section 3 of my proposed legislation would return this money to the States for each fiscal year 1992 through 1995, with no matching requirement. These funds would be available to be used on programs authorized under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. There can be no denying that the increase in motor fuels tax passed last year impacts the ability of States to raise revenue for highway programs. If the Federal Government is going to take half of that tax increase and apply it to reduction of the Federal deficit, and not highway programs, it is only fair that we not require the States to match the other half which will be used for highway programs.

Finally, I believe that given the condition of our Nation's economy and the need to improve our infrastructure, we must make the surplus in the highway trust fund available for obligation, in addition to immediately returning the revenue that will accrue as a result of the OBRA of 1990. Those who would argue that this action will increase the deficit are wrong. I admit that taking the Highway Trust Fund off budget will increase the bookkeeping size of the deficit, and as a result give the American public a more correct accounting of the size of this Government's deficit spending. What this action will not do is increase the amount of money the Federal Government must borrow to meet its obligations.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that promoting and investing in the Nation's infrastructure must be among the highest priorities of the Congress.

At this juncture in American history, when the need for investment in infrastructure is reaching critical dimensions, and the need to focus on improving our ability to compete internationally is paramount, we continue to chose the shortsighted path of budget expediency. According to the U.S. Department of Transportation [DOT], more than 40 percent of the Interstate Highway System—the backbone of America's network for carrying goods to market—is in need of repair. DOT's 1989 report to Congress estimated that over 40 percent of U.S. bridges are classified as "structurally deficient" or "functionally obsolete."

The House Task Force on Economic Policy has reported that spending on public works has dropped from 2.3 percent of GNP in 1960 to less than 1.1 percent in 1985.

While the conditions of our highways and bridges is getting worse, and spending relative to GNP is declining, the demand will continue to grow. The U.S. Department of Commerce estimates that the use of infrastructure by industry will increase by more than 30 percent between 1985 and 1995. Vehicle miles of travel on the Nation's highways is expected to almost double to nearly 3.7 trillion miles by the year 2020. This situation will cost Americans and the economy even more than it does today. Currently, 1.3 billion hours and 1.4 billion gallons of gasoline is wasted per year due to poor road surfaces and congestion on limited access highways. According to independent research, poor roads adds almost \$20 billion per year to the cost of driving in the United States, about \$120 per licensed driver.

In the short term, my legislation will begin to address unemployment, confidence in Government, and aid in the growth that will bring the current recession to an end. In the long-term, this legislation will result in substantive improvement to our Nation's infrastructure that will spur efficiency and its attendant growth and opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the reasons for taking the actions I propose are correct. My legislation is a clear opportunity for every Member of this body to stand up and be counted on this issue.

IN RECOGNITION AND HONOR OF MR. JOSEPH A. ALMAGNO

HON. JOHN F. REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Joseph A. Almagno on the occasion of a testimonial honoring his 27 years of valued service to the city of Providence and the State of Rhode Island. Mr. Almagno, who last month was appointed chief of staff to the mayor of Providence, is recognized statewide for his kindness, generosity, and civic activism, most notably during his 26-year rise through the ranks of the Providence Public School System to superintendent. As superintendent, he was cited for numerous achievements in the revitalization of the school system and for implementing successful collaborations between businesses, community agencies, and schools. Indeed, all donations to the testimonial will be directed to the Public Education Fund which he helped to create.

During Joe Almagno's term as superintendent, the high school dropout rate in the city of Providence dropped from 50 percent to 42 percent. Also a broad range of special initiatives were developed to address the needs of at-risk students, including the highly successful tri-city Urban Collaborative Accelerated Program, implementation of several programs in early literacy for all students, which included extensive home and community outreach support components, and the implementation of major programs to increase involvement of

parents in the education of their children. As a result of these efforts, Mr. Almagno was one of only four superintendents to be invited by President Reagan to a Youth 2000 Ceremony at the White House in 1988.

In undertaking and executing these initiatives, Mr. Almagno distinguished himself as a far-sighted innovator who time and time again projected the needs of the present into programs for the future. His early intervention programs won him the respect of the educational community, as did the kindly and accommodating manner with which he implemented them.

Outside of the educational community, Joe Almagno is known to thousands of Rhode Islanders as a tireless civic activist. His work for the International Reading Association, the Rhode Island Board of Regents, the Rhode Island Catholic Diocesan School Board, the Urban League of Rhode Island, the Providence Ethnic Tolerance Task Force, and the Italo-American Club of Rhode Island, among countless civic organizations, has earned him numerous awards of appreciation, including the prestigious Verrazano Day Award. He has always brought to these organizations the same accessibility and consideration which so endeared him to the Providence School System.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in honoring Joseph A. Almagno, a man who is universally admired and who through the years has fought consistently for the principle of equal opportunity for all. His foresight and compassionate nature have not only distinguished him among his peers, but have improved the lives and educational opportunities of countless Rhode Islanders. I am proud that Joe Almagno resides in my congressional district, and I am honored to join friends, colleagues, and family who this week salute him.

**EXTEND FEDERAL EMPLOYEE
HEALTH BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS**

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, it came to my attention that dependents of Federal employees are only covered under the Federal Employee's Health Benefits Program until they reach the age of 22. This is an inequity which places many children of Federal employees at an educational disadvantage as compared to many children of employees in the private sector.

This oversight places a financial burden on those families who have children still attending a college or university after they have already turned 22 years of age. Families in this position must purchase health insurance from private carriers so that a child will be covered if some medical emergency should occur. There are many instances in which students may find themselves in this position. For example, if a student had been held back early in school or flunked a grade, that student might not graduate from college until after turning 22

years old. Also, a student may be forced to leave college for a year or semester for health reasons; again, this student might not graduate until after turning 22. In each of these instances, it is not the fault of the student that they have not already graduated from college before their health insurance expires. In fact, in some cases it is a credit to the student's character for having completed their education after experiencing an early setback. Such perseverance should be rewarded, not punished. We in the Federal Government should strive to make it possible for a child to finish his or her education without such extraneous worries.

A student presently caught in the situation which I have been discussing would be forced to purchase a private health insurance plan. An unemployed, full-time college student would probably not have the means to purchase such a policy without neglecting his or her studies and taking an extra job. Some families might have the means to pay this added expense, but many would not.

This bill is a very simple one that would make graduating from college a little less of a burden than it already is for many families. The bill extends the age for which unmarried, dependents who are full-time college students are covered under their parent's health benefits plan to the age of 23. This bill would make this provision of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program consistent with that of the U.S. military, which already covers unmarried, dependent, full-time college students until the age of 23. We all know that in the private sector many dependents are covered up to the age of 25 or 26 in some cases.

In addition, many States such as Pennsylvania have a kindergarten age entry law which states that you must be 5 years old by a certain date in order to attend kindergarten. If a student is held back even 1 year, most likely that student will not graduate from college until after turning 22. This law has only been in effect for about 5 years so we do not know how many future college students this will affect.

I would like to thank my colleagues and former chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, BILL FORD, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. FOGLIETTA for joining me as original sponsors of this bill and I would urge all of my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the bill I introduced today to amend the Federal Employee's Health Benefits Program to cover unmarried, dependent, full-time college students.

**FEBRUARY IS GRAPEFRUIT
MONTH**

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, the State of Florida is proclaiming February, 1991, as "Grapefruit Month". For more than 175 years, Florida has been producing this citrus fruit which has changed the eating habits not only of Americans, but of people in many part of

the world. It supplies 100 percent of the U.S. RDA for vitamin C, and is usually available in abundance. In addition, Florida grapefruit is recognized worldwide for its high quality and fine sweet taste.

The total economic impact of the Florida citrus industry, including grapefruit, is more than \$8 billion annually. Grapefruit production alone covers about 125,000 acres in Florida and includes more than 11 million grapefruit trees. Florida produces more than 50 percent of the world's grapefruit supply. During the 1990 and 1991 season more than 4 billion pounds of grapefruit are expected to be harvested.

In addition to meeting most of the domestic demand for grapefruit and grapefruit products, grapefruit is a major export commodity for Florida. Consumers, particularly in Japan and Taiwan, purchase large quantities of our nutritious citrus fruit.

Given the importance of the grapefruit crop to Florida, the United States and the world, I ask my colleagues to join with me during the month of February to salute the Florida citrus industry and the world's finest grapefruit.

**HIALEAH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
AND INDUSTRIES KICK OFF THE
HIALEAH SPRING FESTIVAL 1991**

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to bring to your attention the Hialeah Chamber of Commerce and Industries annual gala which will kick off the Hialeah Spring Festival for 1991.

This gala is the chamber's main fundraiser for the year. It also is the first event in the Hialeah Spring Festival for 1991, which began 8 years ago to bring more attention to the rapidly growing and vibrant Hialeah area. The Hialeah Chamber of Commerce and Industries, which began just 11 years ago, is representative of the many new businesses and residents which have helped make Hialeah the fastest growing city among cities with over 100,000 people in Florida. Nearly 200,000 people now make the Hialeah area their home according to the 1990 census, making Hialeah south Florida's second largest city in population.

The Hialeah Chamber of Commerce and Industries is made up of over 1,000 businessmen who have united to help promote the Hialeah area. The chamber is involved in numerous civic and volunteer activities which make up this important community's contribution to the "thousand points of light" President Bush has often referred to.

This year, the gala will be held at the Park Plaza Hotel in Hialeah this Saturday, February 2. I extend my sincere hope for the chamber's continued success, and special thanks to its president, Vicente P. Rodriguez and executive director, Herman Echevarria.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the following individuals on the chamber's 1991-93 board of directors: Luis Estrada, Jr., vice president; Lila E. Cruz, vice president; Ray Flores, vice president;

Armando (Mandy) Llanes, vice president; Jorge Rivero, vice president; Manny Rodriguez, secretary; Jose Izquierdo, treasurer; Luis Estrada, Sr., vice secretary; Orlando Dominguez, vice treasurer; Antonio Fernandez Conde, director international relations; Jose Caraballo, director; Dr. Alberto Rodriguez, director; Pedro Acosta, director; Luis Miguel Diaz, director; Heliodoro Duran, director; Arturo Suarez, director; Daniel Hernandez, director; Victor Benitez, director; Nisin Kredi, director; and the many volunteers who have contributed their time and energy to the Hialeah Chamber of Commerce and Industries.

H.R. 747

HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to make student loan interest tax deductible and higher education more affordable. My legislation corrects an egregious error in the Tax Reform Act of 1986 which reclassified student loan interest as consumer interest and made it nontax deductible. As a result of tax reform, student loans are now classified as consumer loans. No longer is there a distinction between buying a new television on credit or borrowing for education. By making interest on educational bonds tax exempt for individuals earning under certain income caps, Congress recognized last year that investing in education should be provided preferential tax treatment. Educating our youth is the purest form of investing in the future of our country. My legislation reinforces this principle by making student loan interest tax deductible.

Last year my bill had the bipartisan support of 330 Members of the House and half of the members of the Ways and Means Committee which has jurisdiction over this issue. I expect that my bill will have even more support this year.

Escalating education cost place an enormous financial burden on American students. Graduate students in particular may incur debts so large that their initial payment on loans consists mainly of interest. The number of student loans distributed by the Federal Government has increased by 79 percent in the last 10 years. Higher education is pricing itself out of the hands of low- and middle-income families. Over 50 percent of Government student loans were awarded to individuals with income under \$15,000. Considering the average debt upon graduation from medical school ranges between \$50,000 to \$100,000, student loans are clearly a necessity. Allowing a tax deduction for educational loan interest could actually be a matter of economic survival for thousands of higher education graduates.

Current law penalizes low- and middle-income individuals pursuing higher education. While current law allows for an interest deduction on home equity loans used for educational expenses, the vast majority of the student population cannot benefit from this deduction since most are not homeowners.

My legislation will target those most in need by limiting the deduction to those individuals

earning under \$55,000 and couples earning under \$90,000. This policy serves to both help the people who are more affected by sky-rocketing educational costs and reduce the cost of the bill.

Unless education is made more affordable for all students, our international competitiveness may be threatened. In order to remain competitive, students must be encouraged through bills like H.R. 747 to pursue higher education.

Mr. Speaker, student loan interest deductibility is a step in the right direction for our Nation's students and our country's future.

TRIBUTE TO THE PORTLAND EVENING EXPRESS**HON. THOMAS H. ANDREWS**

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Speaker, more than 100 years ago the Evening Express, a 1-cent afternoon newspaper, first appeared in my home city of Portland, ME. At the time, competition among newspapers was intense. Portland had three dailies, four Sunday papers, three weeklies and five monthlies. Nevertheless, the Express thrived and by 1889 it was the largest circulation daily in the State.

Tomorrow, the Evening Express will cease publication after 108 years of unbroken service to Portland and its suburbs. It will leave a single daily newspaper for the readers of Portland.

The demise of a newspaper has many causes, but it provides no better evidence of a weakening economy. More than that, when a newspaper dies, part of a community dies with it. It is a final chapter in a lengthy chronicle of the city's progress, its politics and its people. For the generations of skilled workers and loyal employees who provided the newspaper with its rich history, the loss of the Evening Express is the loss of a way of life.

Ironically, the death of the Evening Express comes at a time when newspapers are needed more than ever. America is at war and we are absorbing each passing event at the speed of light through instant electronic communications. But the task of adding meaning, clarity and depth falls to newspapers. That is what newspapers do best.

The Evening Express will be remembered as a newspaper that strived to reach out to its community and provide meaning, clarity and depth to the events affecting our lives. It will be missed.

SEND OFF**HON. PETE PETERSON**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a special community which distinguished itself this past weekend.

The war has touched all of us in a very personal way. None of us will ever forget the pic-

tures of the allied POW's paraded before the cameras in a horrible display of Iraqi propaganda. The Nation struggled to understand their plight, their pain, and their courage and left with the eerie realization that the war had come home.

On Sunday, January 26, the war came home to north Florida. The National Guard's 710th Service Company of Apalachicola, FL was federalized and moved out en route to Saudi Arabia.

In my 26 years of service I have experienced many emotional moments, but none was more moving than this weekend's send off. The valor and bravery displayed by the 84 company members were matched only by the strength and support by their families, neighbors, and the 1,300 town residents who turned out to say goodbye.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the members of the 710th National Guard Unit—the 50 fathers, sons, and neighbors who were called up—along with their families and friends who with the prospects of leaving their loved ones exhibited great courage. I would also like to congratulate the community of Apalachicola on the spirit and support demonstrated at Sunday's ceremony.

It was a remarkable moment and I extend my sincere hopes that the 710th and all of our troops can come home as soon as possible.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE**HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mrs. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the 73d anniversary of Ukrainian independence. I stand with the Ukrainian people as they commemorate this important event in their history and I fully support their efforts for self-determination and independence.

On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian National Rada issued the Fourth Universal declaring the independence of Ukraine. Tragically, only 2 years later the movement for freedom and independence was brutally crushed by the Bolsheviks when Ukraine was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Much of our attention recently has been focused on the Baltic States, but we should remember that Soviet troops have also been sent into Ukraine to put down the movement for freedom and self-determination. As Ukrainians watch the Soviet Union attempt to crush the independence movements in the Baltic States, they fear that they will suffer from the brutal forces of oppression next.

These are indeed troubled times in the Soviet Union for those who want democracy and freedom. The Ukrainian people have waited so long for freedom. I only hope that next year on Ukrainian Independence Day that Ukraine will be free.

"IF I HAD THE WINGS OF AN EAGLE I WOULD FLY AWAY"—
TRIBUTE TO THE TUSKEGEE
AIRMEN

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, although the history of African Americans in U.S. military aviation begins at Tuskegee Army Air Field, the legacy of African Americans received the training that they were denied at home.

In 1941 the NAACP sued the War Department on behalf of a Howard University trained pilot to ensure that African Americans received the training they were promised. Because of this action the 99th Fighter Squadron was formed.

During World War II, there existed rigid patterns of racism; because of this fact 966 African American military aviators were trained at an isolated training complex near the town of Tuskegee, AL. Four hundred and fifty African American fighters under the command of Col. Benjamin O. Davis Jr., fought gallantly in North Africa, Sicily, and Europe.

These airmen felt that flying would be an escape from the racism they experienced at home. Although they exemplified the skill and dedication of any other airmen they were bombarded by the reality of racism in the military. They were unable to enter for "white only" officer clubs, and they continuously had to prove themselves as airmen.

Despite all of these obstacles and pressures the Tuskegee airmen fought a good fight and served this country well. It is for that reason that I wish to commend and acknowledge the Tuskegee airmen for their bravery.

I would like to commend the African American section of the Newark Public Library,

under the direction of Mr. James Brown, for the library's exhibit on the Tuskegee airmen. I appreciate your commitment to education. I encourage all of my constituents to take advantage of this opportunity and visit the exhibit.

INTRODUCTION OF THE REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH EQUITY ACT

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 31, 1991

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today my distinguished colleague from California, Mr. FAZIO, and I are introducing the Reproductive Health Equity Act, which seeks to remove the current restrictions on the use of Federal funds for abortions. We have offered this legislation since 1985 because women who depend on the Federal Government for their health care, either as an earned benefit or an entitlement, do not have the same access to abortion as do other women. We believe that such legislated economic discrimination is wrong.

Although the Supreme Court ruled in 1973 in *Roe versus Wade* that a woman has a constitutionally protected right to determine whether to terminate a pregnancy, congressional actions since 1977 on appropriations bills have resulted in the enactment of the following restrictions on a women's access to a safe, legal abortion:

If you are a Federal employee receiving health coverage from the Federal employees health benefits program [FEHB], you do not have coverage for abortion services, except in cases of life endangerment, even though you contribute to your own coverage.

If you are in the military or are a dependent of someone in the military, your health insurance, Civilian Health and Medical Program of

the Uniformed Services [CHAMPUS] does not provide coverage for abortion services.

If you are a Peace Corps volunteer you do not have access to abortion services, even if you are serving your country in a remote and isolated region of the world.

If you are a native American who is dependent on the facilities of the Indian Health Services for your health care, you cannot receive abortion services at those facilities, except in cases of life endangerment.

If you are a low-income woman who is dependent on the Medicaid Program for your health care, you cannot receive reimbursement for abortion services except in cases of life endangerment.

This discriminatory health care policy represents an intrusion that is unjust. Since the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the *Webster* case 18 months ago, there has been a heightened awareness that women are in danger of losing the right to decide for themselves whether to terminate a pregnancy. However, many women, some of them our most vulnerable citizens, already have had that right seriously restricted.

I was struck by a statement made by President Bush on January 29 in his State of the Union Address. The President said, "Freedom and the power to choose should not be the privilege of wealth. They are the birthright of every American." Although President Bush was not specifically referring to abortion when he made that statement, I believe the principle is very much applicable to the issue of abortion. Not only are decisions about one's reproductive health among the most personal decisions one can make, but those decisions are still constitutionally protected. As long as *Roe versus Wade* is the law of the land, it should be applied equally to all women regardless of their economic status. I urge my colleagues to join Mr. FAZIO and me in our efforts to overturn this unjust and horrible form of discrimination.